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Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past.
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Foreword by Dr. Eugen Gabowitsch (1938–2009)

It is impossible to make an exhaustive survey of the Russian historical and critical research performed in the XX century, so I shall just give you a brief outline of just what this new Russian critical school is all about. The first question that needs to be asked in order to understand the issue at hand is one about the exact definition of history. Let us adhere to the formula “history begins today” – after all, history is still in formation, and formulate some general postulations.

Firstly, the traditional model of the past as presented in multitudes of historical books is erroneous. Just how erroneous is what we are trying to estimate, as well as the approximate epoch when consensual history finally became crystallised in its present form, if such a thing is at all possible.

And so, our very first question was about the definition of history. One must understand that the object of our critical analysis isn’t the past itself, but rather the surviving records thereof. However, “the past” and “history” strike most people as synonyms, which is incorrect – when people refer to “history”, they can only speak about whatever they read in books and not any real past of humankind. One can very easily become confused if one doesn’t distinguish between one and the other – a virtual reality populated by a vast number of kings and pharaohs and the real past that we have no substantial information about for the most part. Let us therefore remember that history is nothing but our model of the past.

History begins today

The above postulation formulates the very essence of what the Russian critical school is all about. Any historical book we open shall tell us about historical situation for 7000 B.C. being such-and-such, with similar assessments of “historical situations” for 5000 B.C. and so on, 2800 B.C. marking the birth of the Sumerian civilization. This dating isn’t substantiated in any way at all; the precision of datings is perfectly scholastic in nature, and the great antiquity of documented history is purely arbitrary.

We shall therefore refrain from beginning our narration with a distant B.C. dating. Let us take the present as a reference point and move backwards gradually, explaining every
step of our chronological voyage. One must remember that it isn’t a real past that we are about to explore, but a mere model thereof.

The phrase “history begins today” also applies to our first steps in the direction of an interdisciplinary mindset; this is precisely what the Russian scientists are trying to do nowadays. The community of people who research critical approaches to history is of a very interdisciplinary character itself and consists of mathematicians, computer science experts, professors of history and sociology, chemists, geologists and many representatives of natural sciences in general.

Johan Huizinga wrote that one could hardly fit history into the mediaeval education system. The representation of historical science in universities had indeed been very limited; there is hardly a single important work on history dating from that period that would be written by a university scholar (up until the beginning of the XIX century). One must also add that history gradually transformed into a humanity and therefore not a “science”, strictly speaking.

If one should find it hard to grasp the concept of history beginning today, one might as well consider a situation when an alien spaceship lands on planet Earth, and we are confronted with the necessity to explain a great many things to the aliens – our linguistics, our manner of reproduction and the like. They are likely to ask us about our history, and the datings of historical events. How can one give an exhaustive answer to this question? We would have to explain everything to the aliens step by step and very logically – after all, we can’t expect them to be familiar with our general university curriculum or our model of the past.

History Creation

Next we must explicate the fact that history is still being created. Most people say a critical watershed in the entire historical formation is the Gregorian Calendar reform of 1582. However, in many cases the veracious historical period begins a great deal later. Three years ago we suggested 1650 as the beginning of the veracious period in history, all prior epochs being in need of thorough research and chronological verification. Having been in close touch with the Russian community of unorthodox historians for quite a few years, I can say that even this dating is far too optimistic; history is still being created, and this process may even be happening a great deal more rapidly nowadays. India, for instance, is attempting to introduce a new model of the Indian past – much more grandiose, yet free from conflicts, wars, violence and all “anti-Ghandian” phenomena in general. This politically correct version of history is being taught in
Indian schools today.

China can be taken as another example. The Great Wall, for instance, has only been built after 1950 – its prior existence is but an old European myth. The reaction of utter surprise and astonishment is very natural. I have published a paper with the results of my research that lead one to the abovementioned conclusion; there is another book in existence, written by a professional historian, that says the very same thing. However, this literature never gets read by the masses; everyone reads newspapers and watches films, which adhere to the model where the Great Wall of China has existed for the last 2000 years. There isn’t a single old Chinese drawing of the wall – the oldest ones come from European books. It has been different for the last 50 years or so; the Chinese Communists built an actual wall, and now declare it to be more ancient than even the most daring estimates of historians.

Another example is the invention of the printing press by the Germans in the XV century, 1440 being the earliest estimation. There is nothing odd about this invention being made in Europe around that time – after all, all European languages use phonetic alphabets. However, consensual history is trying to convince us that somebody invented printing moulds in China 300 years before, in the XI century – for tens of thousands of hieroglyphs, no less. The invention had promptly been forgotten, serving no other purpose than going down in history. The more plausible version is that a European (possibly Dutch) book about the invention of the printing press in Germany became translated into Chinese around the XVII century and became part of Chinese history.

One must also recollect the alleged invention of the logarithms in China that took place 500 years before they were invented in the Netherlands. The comparison of two publications, European and Chinese, demonstrates that a misprint from Napier’s table of natural logarithms (first published in 1620) was repeated in a Chinese book that is presumed to be 500 years older. Is that the natural way of making history, one wonders? The Spanish Armada of 300 great vessels also became an important part of Chinese history. Every Chinese history book reports about the construction of a gigantic 300-vessel armada in 1405; some of the ships are said to have been 150 metres long, which is quite impossible for wooden ships. This fleet was presumably sent to India, the Arabic countries and so on; the expedition recurred six or seven times, its purpose remaining unclear. This is obviously the Great Spanish Armada transformed into a Chinese myth.

As a matter of fact, if one does a bit of research, one shall see the very same process taking place now in Kazakhstan, Kirghizia, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and the Ukraine. I
come from Estonia, and I know the Estonians to have the longest history in the world – tribes of proto-Estonians have presumably inhabited the territory of modern Estonia in 5000 B.C. It is quite naturally a myth that cannot be verified; yet the creation of such myths is still taking place in virtually every country in the world. *Everyone tries to trace their history as far back into the illusionary past as possible.* This is the historical mindset of the XX century.

The most important period in the making of history falls on the XVIII century. This is when the Russian, the German and the Chinese history was created; the creation of Chinese history in particular has been transparent to the extreme, since it amounted to the translation of historical books in different European languages into Chinese. All of them have become native a long time ago, incorporated into Chinese history. Chinese writing is not phonetic; the language of the original becomes thoroughly lost in translation, that is. Nearly every major European chronicle, likewise every invention made in Europe, became reflected in Chinese history.

The origins of the real Chinese history date to the XIV century A.D. the earliest, which is ridiculously late from the consensual point of view. Prior to that, history in the traditional European understanding had been nonexistent in China, and may be referred to as “moral history”. This also applies to Indian history – according to a certain Japanese scientist, modern Indian history is like a telephone directory, with a hodgepodge of names culled from a plethora of chronicles without a single correct dating or indeed any historical events at all.

One can plainly see that a critical approach to history is very much called for; one must however say that critical schools of historians are anything but a recent phenomenon – it suffices to mention Sir Isaac Newton, who had been one of the most vehement critics of consensual history in his epoch. The Russian critical tradition begins with Nikolai Morozov, whose fundamental critique entitled “Christ” was published in the 1930’s. Nowadays Fomenko and his team of scientists possess unsurpassable mathematical and statistical tools that they successfully use for the critical analysis of historical data, discovering more and more irrefutable facts that prove consensual history to have just about as much in common in reality as a book of nursery rhymes. Their latest fundamental work is being translated into English, and the first two volumes are now widely available; one cannot recommend those enough, since their release is doubtlessly a very important step towards the understanding of human history as it is, which is miles and miles apart from what we have grown accustomed to believe.
Fomenko is not alone

Most historians and archaeologists are only vaguely familiar with the theory of the Academician A. T. Fomenko, the eminent mathematician, and his numerous works on chronology (written together with mathematician G. V. Nosovskiy for the most part) from very negative hearsay, yet they repudiate and criticise the works of these authors with great ardour and much malice, adhering to the principle: “I have never read the works of the renegade Fomenko, and never will, but I condemn the horrendous aspersions that they cast on our beloved Antiquity nonetheless!” All of the above notwithstanding the fact that the books that contain criticisms of the consensual chronology and historiography sell in thousands of copies.

Wide masses of historians that comprise the “consensual chronology army” get very limited exposure to the numerous critiques of chronology and history that have been coming out in Germany and several other countries for many a year. The primary goal of this article is an attempt to familiarise the above with the primary critical works that suggest a radical revision of history and chronology, as well as their authors.

One hopes that a few historians and archaeologists out there will eventually realise the enormous potential of this direction in historical research, once they become aware of the multitude of authors, methods, approaches and historical topics involved in the reformation of history and chronology in one way or another. The most promising stratum of audience is comprised of young scientists and the unorthodox minority of broadly-educated people as opposed to the bureaucratic majority of the “historian backoffice personnel”.

Eminent critics of chronology and historiography in the past

Independent thinkers who weren’t afraid of the fact that historical science and the people whose interests it represents have always been extremely hostile towards all criticisms of chronology, existed in every epoch, alongside the masses of obedient historiographers that were too scared or too reluctant to go against the grain. Owing to the fact that these independent researchers had possessed the courage to expose blatant contradictions inherent in the very chronological foundations of historiography, official science didn’t manage to keep them out of the general public’s reach. We shall mention some of them below.

The four names one finds below are merely the ones who received the most publicity. Many a honest historian has tried to criticise the condition of historical sources, but never dared to cross the border of loyalty to historical science in general, as well as the
corporate mass of fellow historians. They remained in the shade – however, their efforts helped several radical critics of chronology to emerge and voice the existence of the abovementioned contradictions and very blind spots in history publicly.

**Sir Isaac Newton**

Readers familiar with the works of Fomenko and Nosovskiy know that the great English physicist had also been an eminent chronologist; they keep emphasizing that in his every book Sir Isaac insists on the necessity of narrowing the historical temporal space drastically. I consider that the great physicist and theologian, rather put emphasis on criticisms of consensual chronology than the shortening of the historical period.

Let us assume that Joseph Scaliger, the founding father of the consensual chronology, had been perfectly scrupulous in his work with the historical sources that he had selected for his research. It is true that he may have invented some of them; however, seeing as how modern historiography regards them as valid historical sources, this circumstance (hardly an extraordinary phenomenon in the past) is of little importance to us. On the other hand, we have no reasons to assume that Newton wasn’t capable of conducting his chronological calculations without any errors, based on the sources that he had chosen for this purpose. Assuming this, we can claim that Newton de facto proves the following two theorems – empirically, if not logically:

- **Theorem 1:** The system of historical sources is woven of contradictions: some of its parts lead one to conclusions that contradict other parts:
- **Theorem 2:** Consensual chronology as used by the modern historical science is untrue. Furthermore, the general mass of historical sources that we have at our disposal doesn’t allow for its unambiguous reconstruction.
- **Corollary:** Historical chronology is nonexistent.

Moreover, Newton had been the first to use statistical considerations for testing the veracity of chronological materials. He can therefore be considered the ideological progenitor of the Russian critical school in Chronology (Morozov, Fomenko *et al.*), which is concerned with natural scientific and mathematical argumentation for the most part, albeit not exclusively.

**Jean Hardouin**

Jean Hardouin (1646-1729) was a contemporary of Newton and one of the best-educated people of his epoch. A member of the Jesuit order, he had been the director of
the French Royal Library since 1683. Hardouin had also been a Professor of Theology who would constantly surprise his listeners by the depth of his knowledge and his tremendous erudition. Hardouin is the author of several books on philology, theology, history, archaeology, numismatics, chronology and philosophy of history for a complete bibliography). Unfortunately, these oeuvres remain unknown to the wider audience of specialists, one of the reasons being the fact that they’re written in Latin for the most part.

Hardouin’s most famous work is a collection of ecclesiastical edicts in re the assembly of Ecumenical Councils, starting with the I century A.D. and on. When this grandiose oeuvre finally came out in 1715 after 28 years of labour and after the editions of 1684, 1685 and 1693 (11 volumes with comments altogether), it had remained banned by the church for the 10 years that followed, since the ecclesiastical authorities had, understandably enough, been alarmed by the criticisms of sources contained in the conclusions made by Hardouin in the course of his research. The church had only allowed public access to the materials published by Hardouin after the public renunciation of the latter’s former beliefs, which was perceived as a mere formality by Hardouin’s contemporaries.

From 1690 and on, J. Hardouin had claimed that the works of many ancient authors were written hundreds of years later than whatever was implied by the consensual datings of their lifetimes. In other words, he had exposed the works in question as forgeries. This critique of sources had been getting ever more scalding; one of Hardouin’s final conclusions had been that nearly all the ancient works of literary art date from the XIII century the earliest. He had made exceptions in several cases: the works of Cicero, the satires of Horace, Virgil’s “Georgics” and Pliny the Elder’s “Natural History”. However, his famous comments were written about his authors, and so Hardouin may have found it hard psychologically to recognise them as mediaeval authors.

Hardouin had claimed that Christ and his apostles, if they existed at all, must have read their sermons in Latin. He was convinced that the Greek translations of the New and the Old Testament date from a much later epoch than the church presumes. He had named St. Augustine among the fraudulent Christian classics and didn’t trust the veracity of his works. He had also mentioned the falsification of nearly all of the “ancient” coins, works of art, stone carvings and, particularly, the documents of all the Ecumenical Councils that had preceded the Council of Trident (1545-1563).

The reaction of Hardouin’s contemporaries to his iconoclasm is of as great an interest
to us as his criticisms of historical sources. Hardouin naturally got criticised, but usually sotto voce, which leaves one with the impression that the critics themselves were well aware that the publication of apocryphal works had been the norm relatively recently. Even his most vehement opponents acknowledged that Hardouin’s academic eminence and his highest authority in the scientific world made it unnecessary for him to seek cheap publicity of a nihilist or to amuse himself with disclosures that irritated the ecclesiastical and scientific circles alike. Only deep conviction about the veracity of the critical approach to chronology and historiography could have made Hardouin dare to oppose the entire canonical science and theology.

It is noteworthy that Hardouin criticised Newton’s book on amended chronology in the same vein of the complete negation of deep antiquity, urging Newton to stop writing about the fictitious “days of yore”. He had been of the opinion that the destruction of Jerusalem and the burning of Troy were the same event in reality, which corresponds to the point of view expressed by Fomenko and Nosovskiy.

Most of Hardouin’s work (including the ones published postmortem) were banned by the church in 1739-1742 and included in the list of banned books. After the death of J. Hardouin, most of the “ancient” sources that he had exposed have been “rehabilitated” and are once again taken seriously be historical science.

**Robert Baldauf**

If Newton and Hardouin were world famous scientists whose biographies are known in great detail, the only thing we know about Robert Baldauf, the Swiss philologist, is that he was a Privatdozent of Basel University and published two volumes out of the four that he had intended to publish under the general title of “History and Criticism”, namely, the first and the fourth volume. These two volumes are of the utmost interest to the critics of chronology and history, since Baldauf managed to come to virtually the same conclusions as Hardouin using an altogether different method, that of philological analysis.

Baldauf had studied the archives of the famous Swiss monastery of St. Gallen, formerly one of the key centres of Catholicism, and discovered the traces of the barbaric library raid made by Poggio Bracciolini and a friend of his, both of them highly educated servants of the Roman curia. They purloined numerous manuscripts and books that were considered ancient from the library of this monastery (however, the manuscripts may date to a more recent epoch, which wouldn’t preclude them from serving as prototypes for the manufacture of numerous “ancient” works by Poggio and
his assistants.

One must also mention Baldauf’s study of numerous presumably ancient manuscripts and the exposure of the latter as recent forgeries for the most part. Baldauf discovered parallels between the “historical” books of the Old Testament and the works of the mediaeval Romance genre as well as Homer’s “Iliad” that were blatant enough to lead the scientist to the assumption that both the Iliad and the Bible date from the late Middle Ages.

Some of the mediaeval chronicles ascribed to different authors resembled each other to such an extent that Baldauf was forced to identify them as works of the same author, despite the fact that the two documents were presumed separated chronologically by an interval of two centuries at least. At any rate, some of the expressions characteristic for Romanic languages that one finds in both documents fail to correspond with either of the alleged datings (one of them being the IX and the other the XI century). Apart from that, some of the manuscripts contain distinctly more recent passages, such as frivolous stories of endeavours in public steambaths (which the Europeans only became acquainted with during the late Reconquista epoch) and even allusions to the Holy Inquisition.

Baldauf’s study of the “ancient” poetry in Volume 4 demonstrates that many “ancient” poets wrote rhymed verse resembling the mediaeval troubadours. Unlike Hardouin, Baldauf is convinced that the verse of Horace is of a mediaeval origin, pointing out German and Italian influences inherent in his Latin. Furthermore, Baldauf points out such pronounced parallels between the poetry of Horace and Ovid (who were presumably unaware of each other’s existence) that one becomes convinced that the works of both belong to a third party – apparently, a much later author.

Robert Baldauf wasn’t alone in his criticism of the style characteristic for the “ancient” authors. As early as in 1847 Borber expressed surprise about the striking similarity of the Druids and the Egyptian priests as described in Julius Caesar’s “De bellum Gallico”, which he considers a later forgery, likewise “De bellum civile” by the same author. Baldauf sums up his research in the following words: “Our Romans and Greeks have been Italian humanists”. All of them – Homer, Sophocles, Aristotle and many other “ancient” authors, so different in our perception, hail from the same century, according to Baldauf. Furthermore, their home wasn’t in the Ancient Rome or Hellas, but rather Italy of the XIV-XV century. The entire history of the Ancient Greeks and Romans, likewise the Biblical “history”, which correlates with the above to some extent, was conceived and introduced by the Italian humanists, as well as their
colleagues and followers from other countries.

Humanism has given us a whole fantasy world of the antiquity and the Bible, as well as the early Middle Ages, which Baldauf had also considered an invention of the humanist writers. This fictional history, initially drafted on parchment, was carved in stone and cast in metal; it has rooted itself in our perception to such an extent that no positivist criticisms can make humanity doubt its veracity.

**Wilhelm Kammeier**

In case of Wilhelm Kammeier, a German critic of historical sources, we don’t know so much as the date of his birth; he was born between 1890 and 1900. He died in 1959 in Arnstadt (Thuringia, former East Germany). He was a lawyer by trade, and had worked in Hanover as a notary. He had taken part in World War II and was taken prisoner. After that, he had lived in Arnstadt, which became the new home of his family after the destruction of their Hanover residence during the war. All his post-war life he had been afflicted by poverty and state repressions. Very probably his death resulted from chronic malnutrition.

The job of a notary provided Kammeier with an excellent basis for the critical research of old documents, which he became fascinated with in 1923. By 1926 he had completed his 292-page manuscript entitled “The Universal Falsification of History”, where he subjects historical documents serving as the basis for the mediaeval history of Germany to rigorous criticisms. However, it had taken him many years to find a publisher for this critique.

He sent a brief summary of the key points related in the manuscript to the Prussian Academy of Sciences with a request to be given the opportunity of making a public speech in front of the historians. This request was rejected under a formal pretext that private persons weren’t allowed to address the Academy, with no substantial argumentation given. The mere fact that Kammeier had not held an office in an academic institution sufficed for the rejection of a well-reasoned critique.

Kammeier’s manuscript got published only as late as 1935. This was followed by a brochure, where the criticisms of historical sources were taken further, encompassing the entire mediaeval period in Europe, and seven more brochures on the same subject. This work ([g9]) has long ago become a bibliographic rarity. It was published again in a small number of copies as part of the book ([g10]) that also includes the following works of Wilhelm Kammeier dating from 1936-1939: “Enigmas of Global History – an Answer to my Critics”, “The Mystery of Mediaeval Rome”, “Dogmatic Christianity and
the Falsification of History”, and “The Foundation of the Roman Ecumenical Church”.

Finally, Kammeier’s manuscript on the “sources” of the early Christianity and their falsification, previously unpublished and presumed lost, came out as a book (\[g11\]).

Official science had only been reacting to Kammeier’s works during the first few years that followed the release of his first book – critically, of course. One of his critics, a certain Professor Heimpel, accused Kammeier of having no positive conception of history. A critic must naturally be concerned with the positive historical picture first and foremost, regardless of whether or not it is a work of fiction through and through: “If we see the entire historical conception of the Middle Ages disintegrate and transform into a spot of impenetrable darkness, or indeed a gigantic question mark, we shall naturally end up with feeling inner resentment against Kammeier’s criticisms, well-reasoned or not”.

Kammeier’s counter-argumentation was that it hadn’t been his fault that the history of Germany and the entire Ancient World proved a work of fiction to a tremendous extent, the literary and documental sources of the epoch being forgeries. He only pleaded guilty of discovering this historical falsification, mentioning the necessity to live with a new historical truth that new generations of historians would inevitably face (as we know, they still shudder at the mere thought), alluding to Schopenhauer’s concept about truth needing no permission for its existence. Once perceived, the truth becomes an elemental force: intelligent persons shall try to turn this force to their benefit instead of opposing it.

However, after the reasoned refutation of the historians’ criticisms by Kammeier, the learned scholars have switched to the tried and viable tactics of obstruction and concealment (after all, things that remain unknown to the general public may as well be nonexistent). The world war that broke out around that time had aided this obstruction greatly. Kammeier’s participation in military action, his captivity and the unsettled state of his post-war life had interrupted his active research for a long time.

The only job Kammeier managed to find in the East Germany was that of a schoolteacher. As soon as circumstances allowed, he resumed his research of the “ancient” documents, concentrating all of his attention on the documental foundations of the history of early Christianity. It is quite possible that he had counted on a benevolent attitude towards this topic from the part of Socialist historiography in an atheistic country that the East Germany was striving to become. Instead of that, as soon as he had offered his critique of early Christian documents to the historians of the German Democratic Republic, he became a victim of repressions: he lost his job, the manuscript
of his book ([g11]) was confiscated and had been presumed lost for a long time; his estate was nationalised, and his family forced to dwell in hunger and poverty.

Kammeier’s research of the “ancient” documents begins with the trivial remark that every donation document (the most common kind of mediaeval documents; donations could assume the form of estate, privileges, ranks etc), must contain information about the nature of the gift, the date of the donation, the names of the benefactor and the receiver and the place where the document was written. Documents with blank fields (date, name of the donation’s receiver etc) are null and void from the legal point of view, and can only serve as historical sources indirectly (in the research of historical falsifications, for instance).

Documents kept in libraries often fail to correspond to these criteria:

- One finds documents with no date, or a date that was obviously introduced later – alternatively, the date can be incomplete or transcribed in a manner that fails to correspond with the presumed epoch of the document’s creation.
- Documents dating to the same day would often be “signed” in different geographical location.

The analysis of places and dates leaves us with the following picture: all German emperors, regardless of age, health and basic human logic, don’t reside in any capital, but keep on the move all the time, occasionally covering gigantic distances in a single day, in order to make more and more donations to their loyal subjects.

It would be interesting to feed all such data to a computer in order to compile analytical overviews of the movement speed of the German feudal rulers and their supernormal Wanderlust. However, the tables that the historians have already compiled, demonstrate that German emperors often managed to be present in two mutually distant geographical locations on the same day. For instance, Emperor Conrad is presumed to have been present in 2 or 3 different cities at the same annual Christian feast for 50 years in a row.

The family name of the donation’s recipient is absent from a great number of documents (this is the case with up to half of all surviving documents for some epochs) – one can therefore speak of headers at best, valid official documents being a far cry.

Naturally, Kammeier wasn’t the first to discover forgeries during the research of ancient (or presumably ancient) documents. His primary merit is that he had managed to recognize the more or less systematic large-scale activities of whole generations of hoaxers serving the Catholic Church or individual feudal rulers and grasp the real scale
of the historical falsification campaign, which had been great enough to surprise historians even before his time.

These hoaxers have destroyed a great many of old originals and replaced them by forgeries. Old text would often be erased with new one taking its place on an ancient parchment, which would make the forgery look like an “authentic ancient relic” in the eyes of the hoaxers. It would often take a very minor alteration to change the original meaning of an old document completely.

According to Kammeier, the key goal of this prolonged and massive campaign for the falsification of historical documents had been the concealment, distortion and arbitrary extension of the pre-Christian history, with all the achievements of the pagan epoch ascribed thereto. Apart from that, “legal” acknowledgement of the possession rights must have been in high demand among the new feudal rulers, whose property was acquired from lawful pagan owners rather recently, and in a violent manner. Falsified donation documents were necessary to declare ancient rights of possession; their authorship could be traced to one of the great Christian rulers of antiquity – fictitious entities invented for this specific purpose in many cases.

The general condition of historical sources at the moment can be described as follows: the number of forgeries is mind-boggling, and every “ancient” work of history lacks an original (this is hardly a chance occurrence). However, historians keep on using forgeries in lieu of official documentation – possibly due to the fact that their inveracity has not been proven irrefutably yet, or that such irrefutable proof does in fact exist, but remains concealed from the scientific community.

One can find the following corollaries made by Kammeier in the course of his research of mediaeval documents in [g12]:

- The humanists took part in the massive falsification of history alongside the Catholic clergy striving to create some proof of the historical significance attributed to their church; this process falls on the XV century for the most part.
- The documents related to the pagan “German” history have been destroyed and replaced by Gallic and Romanic forgeries.
- The existence of Catholic Pontiffs before the so-called Avignon captivity is of a figmental nature through and through.
- Historical events that preceded the XIII century are beyond reconstruction, since all of the earlier documents have been destroyed and replaced by counterfeits.
- The pre-Papal wars between national churches were subsequently presented as struggle against the heretics and the apostates.
• “Ancient” literature is as much of a forgery as the mediaeval documents. One of such fake literary works is “Germany” by Tacitus.
• The Catholic clergy can be credited with the invention of the New Testament, or at least a radical rearrangement thereof.
• The church keeps on manufacturing counterfeited “ancient” manuscripts in order to “prove” the authenticity of Evangelical texts and their great age with the aid of the new “findings.”
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1. The mysterious Renaissance of the “Classical Age” in mediaeval Rome

1.1. The lugubrious “Dark Ages” in Europe that presumably succeeded the splendour of the “Classical Age”

As we can see from the global chronological map arranged in the sum of the three shifts, nearly all documents considered “ancient” and referring to events that allegedly predate 900 A.D. in Scaligerian chronology are most likely to be phantom duplicates of the originals referring to the events of the X-XVII century A.D. One may question the availability of “space” for the “Classical age” in mediaeval history – in other words, there may be doubts about whether our attempt to relocate the “ancient” events to the Middle Ages might fail due to the latter being “filled up” with known historical events. This doesn’t seem to be the case, according to the results of our in-depth analysis.

Firstly, the epochs that were considered different are identified as one and the same. Consider, for example, the superimpositions of royal dynasties whose similarity wasn’t noticed previously. Secondly, many mediaeval periods in Scaligerian history are believed to be “concealed by tenebrosity.” Now we are beginning to understand why. The respective mediaeval documents describing these epochs were deliberately “set backwards in time” by Scaligerite chronologists. The withdrawal of these documents immersed a great number of mediaeval periods into artificial darkness.

The historians of the XVIII-XIX century gave rise to the peculiar conception that identified mediaeval period as the “Dark Ages.” The “great achievements of the Classical Age” are said to have faced utter decline and vanished. Scientific thought presumably “rolls all the way back into the Stone Age.” The great literary works of the “antiquity” are all supposed to have been kept stashed away as dead weight until the very Renaissance, when they miraculously re-surfaced ([333], page 161). Moreover, these “ancient” texts were allegedly kept by ignorant monks whose prime responsibility was, as we are now told, the destruction of “heathen literature.”

The absolute majority of the top ranking clergy is presumably illiterate ([333], page 166). The great achievements of the “ancient” astronomy – the eclipse theory, the calculation of planetary ephemerides, etc. – are reported to be completely forgotten.
The famous Cosmas Indicopleustes, who is supposed to have lived in the VI century A.D. and researched the movement of the Sun and the stars, honestly believes that the Universe is a box whose centre contains a flat Earth, washed by the Ocean and supporting the bulk of mount Ararat. Apart from this, the lid of the box is studded with stellar nails. There are four angels in the corners of the box that produce wind. This is the level of scientific cosmography of the Middle Ages (see Chron3, Chapter 11:6.3).

Money coinage is allegedly forgotten, the art of architecture rendered unnecessary, and an “overall cultural degradation” spreads far and wide ([333], page 167). And so on, and so forth.

Of course, Scaligerian history of the Middle Ages mentions certain achievements of the period, but always with disclaimers along the lines of: “Even these sudden flashes of intellectual work were random and singular in their occurrence” ([333], page 169). We are being convinced that the “ancient” Latin in its brilliance “degrades” in an odd manner and transforms into a clumsy and squalid lingo, which only manages to regain splendour during the Renaissance – and that over a short period of time, to gain worldwide fame once again as the language of science ([333]).

Without a doubt, there are reasons for painting a picture this lurid if we are to rely upon Scaligerian chronology. But we want to give another explanation to this hypothetical “deluge of barbarity” that is presumed to have overwhelmed Europe, Asia, and Africa in the early Middle Ages. We are of the opinion that what we see isn’t a degradation of “the great legacy of the past” but, rather, the naissance of civilization and a gradual creation of the cultural and historical values, which were cast far back into the past due to the chronological errors that lit a spectral light in the “Classical Age” and left many mediaeval periods bare.

The contemporary version of mediaeval Roman history contains a multitude controversies and blatantly obvious parallels with the “Classical age” which, under close surveillance, may well be explained by the distorted concept of the historical role played by the Middle Ages. Let us throw a cursory glance at the history of Rome. Why Rome in particular? The reason is that Scaligerian history considers Roman chronology to be of paramount importance (see Chron1, Chapter 1).

We shall begin with an intriguing detail. The famous Chronicles of Orosius inform us of the fact that “Aeneas departed from Troy and went to Rome” (!). Moreover, the “ancient” Orosius adds that he was told this in school. Let us explain. Such an itinerary of Aeneas, who took part in the Trojan war, makes Scaligerian history 400-500 years shorter (also see Chron1, Chapter 1).
The fragmentary history of the “ancient” Greece made a certain impact on the formation of the Roman chronology in the days of yore. The historian N. Radzig points out that “the heroic deeds of Aeneas in Italy and the fate of his offspring comprised the Roman pre-history of Rome… Initially this pre-history wasn’t very long: it had called Romulus the grandson of Aeneas [this is the root of the 500-year discrepancy with Scaligerian history, as mentioned in Chron1, Chapter 1 – A. F.]; however, later on, when the Roman annalists acquainted themselves with the Greek chronology, they invented a whole sequence of Albanian rulers… Proud patrician clans got into the habit of tracing their ancestry all the way back to the companions of Aeneas, and the clan of Julius, directly to the son of Aeneas, whose name was arbitrarily altered for some reason”. ([719], page 8)

N. Radzig is honestly perplexed by such “ignorant endeavours of Roman chronographers.” However, below we shall demonstrate the amazing parallels between events as well as statistics that identify the ancient Trojan War of the alleged XIII century B.C. as the Gothic war of the alleged VI century A.D. that raged in Italy and the New Rome, as well as the Italian war of the alleged XIII century A.D. The Roman annalists were therefore correct in their claims that the Trojan War marks the actual beginning of mediaeval Roman history in the XIII century A.D.

We shall give a brief overview of the mediaeval history of Rome that is based, in particular, on the fundamental six-volume work of the German historian F. Gregorovius ([196]). The significance of this work is explained by the fact that it actually consists of a large number of mediaeval documents that were meticulously compiled by Gregorovius, along with his scrupulous and accurate comments on the matter. Gregorovius writes that “ever since the decline of the Gothic state [which supposedly occurred in the VI century A.D. – A. F.], the ancient Gothic rule came to absolute ruination. Laws, monuments, and even historical recollections all fell into oblivion” ([196], Volume 2, pages 3-4).

The mandatory chronological sublation of secular chronicles from mediaeval Roman history – the History of Titus Livy, for example, which was declared “ancient history” – made Rome a thoroughly ecclesiastical city from the point of view of Scaligerian and modern history. F. Gregorovius writes that “Rome had miraculously transformed into a monastery.” This mysterious transformation of “secular ancient Rome” (let us remind the reader of the iron legions and the inflexible heroes of the days of yore) into the “mediaeval ecclesiastical Rome” was proclaimed “one of the greatest and most amazing metamorphoses in the history of humanity.” ([196], Volume 2, pages 3-6).
It is significant that almost all of the political and civil institutions that comprise “the quintessence of ancient Rome” according to Scaligerian history were intact at “dawn of mediaeval Rome.” Mediaeval references to the city of Rome are extremely scarce in Scaligerian chronology. Gregorovius tells us that “the events of the years to follow remain unknown to us, since the chronicles of that age are as monosyllabic and blear as the epoch itself, and they only report disasters and afflictions” ([196], Volume 2, page 21) – all of this coming from the author of a fundamental historical tractate ([196]).

The following is told of the middle of the alleged IX century A.D.: “historians specialising in Roman history have to contend themselves with the annals of the Frankish chronographers in what concerns this period, uninformative as the are, as well as Papal biographies that only contain indications of what buildings were erected and what donations made. There is no hope for a historian to present a picture of the city’s civil life during that period”. ([196], Volume 3, page 58)

Further, we learn that: “a great many ecclesiastical acts and regestae were kept in the Papal archive… The loss of these treasures [or their arbitrary transfer into the “antiquity” – A. F.], which perished without a trace in the XII or the XIII century, leaving a tremendous gap in our knowledge of the epoch.” ([196], Volume 3, page 121)

All of this appears to mean that the overwhelming portion of surviving documents pertinent to the history of mediaeval Rome in Italy dates from the XI century or even later epochs.

F. Gregorovius writes that “if all of these regestae were in our possession… there is no doubt that the history of Rome between the VIII and the X century [three hundred years, no less – A. F.] would instantly become illuminated by a different, and a much brighter light” ([196], Volume 3, page 131, comment 30).

He writes further:

“Not a single scribe can be found who would care to immortalize the dramatic history of the city in writing. Germany, France, and even Southern Italy… have provided us with a great many chronicles; however, the Roman monks must have been so indifferent to the fate of their city that the events of that epoch remain utterly nebulous”. ([196], Volume 3, pages 125-126)

It is assumed that “at the same time, the papacy carried on compiling its ancient chronicles with vehemence” ([196], Volume 3, pages 125-126). However, this is only a hypothesis of Scaligerian history.

This Papal chronicle – or, rather, its late version we’re being offered today – is by no means continuous. It demonstrates gigantic gaps. “The biography of Nicholas I
(who is supposed to have lived in the IX century A.D. – A. F) marks the point where the Papal books cease to be kept, and we shall have many a chance to regret the lack of this source in our presentation of the history of the city” ([196], Volume 3, page 127).

1.2. Parallels between the “antiquity” and the Middle Ages that are known to historians, but misinterpreted by them

The surviving fragments of mediaeval Roman chronicles tell us things that clearly testify to the “Classical” nature of certain events in their modern interpretation. In such cases historians join their voices in unison and start descanting about the revival of ancient recollections, Classical reminiscences, imitations of antiquity, etc. F. Gregorovius, for one, writes that “certain X century Romans that we encounter have very strangely-sounding names. They draw our attention and revive ancient realities in our imagination” ([196], Volume 3, page 316). If we’re to say the same thing differently, in a simpler manner, it turns out that many mediaeval Romans bore names that are considered “ancient” nowadays. This makes the “Classical Age” just another reflection of the Middle Ages.

Scaligerian history often discussed the existence of the Senate and the Consulate in mediaeval Rome. On the one hand, these famous political institutions are considered to have existed in the “ancient” Rome exclusively, which was presumably destroyed in the alleged V-VI century A.D. with the decline of the Third Western Roman Empire; on the other hand, some of the mediaeval chronicles that have reached our time occasionally make references to the existence of a senate, senators, consuls, tribunes, and praetors in mediaeval Rome. Those titles, grades, and offices are clearly “ancient.” There’s even a “schism” of sorts in the ranks of the Scaligerites, since one party considers these “ancient” institutions to have existed in the Middle Ages as well. Others – the majority that F. Gregorovius himself adhered to, were certain that the mediaeval Romans were using these “ancient” terms by sheer force of habit, without ascribing any “original meaning” to them, and only keeping them as a “pleasant memento” of the greatness of the “ancient Rome.”

F. Gregorovius ruminates upon the same, telling us that “they [the mediaeval Romans – A. F.] call upon the ancient graves for help, the ones that already became legends, and invoke the shadows of the consuls, tribunes, and senators that keep on haunting this eternal city throughout the Middle Ages as if they were real [sic! – A. F.]” ([196], Volume 3, page 349.

Also: “Consul’s rank is frequently mentioned in the X century documents” ([196],
In the alleged X century “the Emperor [Otto – A. F.] tried to revive the long-forgotten Roman customs” ([196], Volume 3, page 388). In particular, Otto III “bore titles devised in imitation of the titles borne by the ancient Roman triumphators” ([196], Volume 3, pages 395-396). Gregorovius has got the following to say about the description of mediaeval Rome contained in a well-known mediaeval tractate titled Graphia: “the future and the past in the Graphia are all mixed up” ([196], Volume 3, page 458, comment 7).

Below we find that “this is precisely what we actually see in Otto III, who was passionately introducing the surviving remnants of the Roman Empire, such as the ranks, the garments, and the ideas of the imperial age into his mediaeval state where all of it must have looked [from the point of view of modern historians – A. F.] as patches... The will to sanitize the barbaric epoch with such reminiscing was a widespread phenomenon [sic! – A. F.]... The keeping of the priceless Papal book, interrupted at the biography of Stephan V, was resumed in Rome in the X century [our take is that it was most probably inchoated and not resumed, and that this event occurred a lot later than the X century – A. F.] – as short tables referred to as “catalogues”... The catalogues only contain the names of the popes, information about their origins, times of reign, and the odd occasional brief summary of individual events. Nothing provides better evidence of the barbarity of the X century Rome than the famous Liber Pontificalis continued in its primary and extremely imperfect form”. ([196], Volume 3, pages 458, 427, 431)

Mediaeval chronicles contain a large number of facts that contradict Scaligerian chronology and prove the existence of the three shifts in the Scaligerian chronological map that we have discovered. Furthermore, Ferdinand Gregorovius, possessing extensive and detailed knowledge of both the “ancient” and mediaeval history of Europe (he is considered one of the greatest specialists in Scaligerian history of Europe, after all), kept on running into parallels between the “ancient” and mediaeval events, some of which were blatantly obvious, that seemed extremely bizarre to him. Gregorovius points them out every now and then, and, possibly feeling vague qualms about them, attempts to provide an explanation. However, such “explanations” most often assume the shape of nebulous expatiations about the profundity of the “law of historical recurrences.” The readers should not be surprised, and, above all, are implored not to pay any attention.

It is, however, most significant that nearly all such parallels discovered by F. Gregorovius fit perfectly into our scheme of the three chronological shifts of 330, 1050, and 1800 years, respectively. In other words, the historian Gregorovius, raised
on the Scaligerian tradition, “discovers” the parallels between the “Classical Age” and the Middle Ages exactly where they are supposed to be according to the general picture of chronological duplicates as described in *Chron1*, Chapter 6. We shall be citing some of these “Gregorovian parallels” later on.

So, we learn that “Noah [the Biblical patriarch! – A. F.] founded a city near Rome, and named it after himself; Noah’s sons Janus, Japhet, and Camesus built a city called Janiculus on the Palatina… Janus had lived near Palatina, and later built the town of Saturnia near Capitolia together with Nimrod [sic! – A. F.]” ([196], Volume 3, page 437). “In the Middle Ages there was even a monument at Nerva’s forum [in Rome – A. F.] called *Noah’s Ark*” ([196], Volume 3, page 461, comment 26).

All of these presumed “absurdities” (such presumptions are only made within the Scaligerian historical reality tunnel) completely fit the superimposition that we have discovered, wherein the kingdoms of Israel and Judaea become identified as the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century as well as the Habsburg (could that name have been derived from “New Town,” or “Nov-Gorod” in Russian?) Empire of the XIV-XVI century. See more on the lifetime of the Biblical Noah and his most probable identity in *Chron6*.

Another example of such a “sottise” (according to Scaliger and company) is that “it is well-known that the Franks have considered themselves descendants of the Trojans” ([196], Volume 3, page 361, comment 28).

In general, Gregorovius points out that “only this *Classical spirit* that prevailed in the city throughout the Middle Ages can explain a large number of historical events” ([196], Volume 3, page 443). It appears that the first lists of Roman monuments – compiled in the XII century A.D. the earliest, as we’re being told nowadays – are “an amazing mixture of correct and incorrect monument names” ([196], Volume 3, page 447). A typical example of how the “antiquity” could be de facto identified as the Middle Ages is as follows:

“It [the St. Serge Church – A. F.] was consecrated to St. Bacchus as well as St. Serge; the name of that saint *sounds strange* for this ancient pagan area; however, in Rome it was hardly exceptional, for among the Roman saints [the mediaeval Christian saints, that is – A. F.] we once again find the names of other ancient gods and heroes, such as St. Achilles, St. Quirinus, St. Dionysius, St. Hyppolitus and St. Hermesus”. ([196], Volume 3, page 447)

All of these mediaeval Christian saints – Achilles, Quirinus, Hermesus and others – were later arbitrarily exiled into times immemorial, where they transformed into the allegedly pagan “ancient” gods and demigods: Achilles, Quirinus, Hermesus, etc.
1.3. Mediaeval Roman legislators convene in the presumably destroyed “ancient” Capitol

F. Gregorovius tells us that the history of the famous architectural monuments of Italian Rome cannot be traced any further back in time than the XI-XIII century A.D. with any degree of certainty at all.

Let us quote an example:

“For a long period of time (after the “Classical” age is supposed to have finished), we don’t seem to encounter the name of the Capitol; it simply disappears from the annals of history [apparently, due to the fact that Capitol wouldn’t be built until much later – A. F.]; despite the fact that the Graphia tells us that the walls of the Capitol were adorned with glass and gold [which is post-X century information – A. F.], there is no description of the temple... the imperial forums, once full of grace, have drowned in taciturnity... [which means they haven’t been built yet, either – A. F.], apart from the forum of Trajan; the forum of Augustus was encumbered with ruins to such an extent, and had so many trees growing there, that people used to call it an enchanted garden”. (196, Volume 3, pages 447-448).

Apparently, the forum of Augustus was also built much later, and the place had been grown over with virgin vegetation.

Complete chaos reigns in the mediaeval names of the monuments of Italian Rome – a perfect hodgepodge of “ancient” and mediaeval names. For instance, “the Vestal temple had once been considered to have been a temple of Hercules Victor, and is considered to have been a temple of Cybele by modern archaeologists; however, this goddess shall, naturally [? – A. F.] have to make place for some other deity, which, in its turn, shall be dethroned after some other archaeological revolution”. (196, Volume 3, pages 469-470)

All of these confused re-identifications and the general welter resemble a helpless game rather than scientific statements with a basis. This shows us how flimsy the foundations of the “archaeological identifications” that we’re offered nowadays really are.

F. Gregorovius proceeds to tell us that “for over 500 years this area remained perfectly obtenebrated [Capitol and its environs – A. F.]... Only the oral tradition allowed it to attain historical significance once again [sic! – A. F.] and become the centre of the city’s political activity, when the spirit of civil independence awoke. In the XI century the Capitol had already been the centre of all purely civil matters”. (196, Volume 4, page 391)

We cannot help asking about whether any of this really could have happened among the ruins. After all, Scaligerian history assures us that Capitol was destroyed way back
in the past, and had been standing unaltered all these years “in a semi-obliterated state” ([196], Volume 4).

And further on we also read that “the halidom of the Roman Empire resurrected in the memories of the Romans, animated conventions of the nobility and the populace alike occurred among the ruins of the Capitol [sic! – A. F.]… Later on, in the epoch of Benzo, Gregory VII and Gelasius II, the Romans were summoned to the very same Capitol during high-wrought prefect elections, when the consent of the populace was required for the election of Calixtus II, or when the Romans had to be called to arms. It is possible, that the city prefect also had lodgements in the Capitol [slept under the stars? – A. F.], since the prefect appointed by Henry IV had lived here. Furthermore, the litigations also occurred in a palace located in the Capitol [among the ruins as well, or what? – A. F.]”. ([196], Volume 4, page 391).

It goes on like this. The bundle of oddities and absurdities gets ever larger. However, the sole reason for their existence is the certainty of the modern historian that all things “Classical” turned to dust aeons ago.

Is it possible to assume – even hypothetically – that all of these meetings, conventions, counsels, elections, debates, the discussions of documents and their storage, official state pronouncements, the signings of official papers and so on, occurred among old ruins grown over with weeds and reeds, and not in a special building that had been constructed for this very purpose, and precisely in this epoch – the Middle Ages? The destruction occurred a long time later – there were enough “waves of destruction” in the Italian Rome of the XIV-XVI century.

Scaligerian tradition obfuscates the history presented to F. Gregorovius to such an extent that Gregorovius – one of the most serious “documented” experts in the history of Rome and the Middle Ages in general – carries on with his narration apparently unaware of how ludicrous the picture that he offers really is, and to what extent it contradicts common sense.

He writes that “sitting on the prostrated columns of Jupiter or under the vaults of the state archive, amidst shattered statues and memorial plaques, the Capitoline monk, the predacious consul, and the ignorant senator could sense amazement and meditate on the vicissitudes of life” ([196], Volume 4, pages 391-392).

Altogether failing to notice the comical impossibility of such legislative assemblies, Gregorovius carries on telling us that “the mitred senators in their brocade mantles came to the Capitol ruins with only the vaguest idea of the fact that in the days of yore the statesmen ratified laws here, and the orators gave speeches… No flout is more
appalling and horrendous than the one suffered by Rome!... among the marble blocks [and the senators gathering for sessions in their midst, as we may well add – A. F.] there grazed herds of goats, and so a part of the Capitol received the name of Goat Hill... like the Roman forum that became dubbed The Cattle-Run [a senatorial one, perhaps? – A. F.].” ([196], Volume 4, pages 393-39).

Gregorovius cites a mediaeval description of the Capitol in order to prove the sad Scaligerian picture of the decline of Rome, which had remained the only original source up until the XII century A.D. or even later ([196], Volume 4, page 394). The most amazing fact is that this old text that occupies an entire page of a large-format modern book doesn’t utter a word about destructions of any kind, describing the mediaeval Capitol as a functioning political centre of mediaeval Rome instead. The narration mentions luxurious buildings, temples etc. There isn’t a single reference to the caprine herds dejectedly roaming this gilded splendour.

Gregorovius, having scrupulously quoted the entirety of this mediaeval text – one cannot deny him being conscionable as a scientist – couldn’t help making another attempt at proselytizing, in his telling the reader that “in the description of the Capitol given by the Mirabilia we see it as if it were lit with the last light of a dying dawn; we have no other information about this epoch” ([196], Volume 4, page 394). And also: “even for these legendary books, everything remains an enigma and a matter of days long gone” ([196], Volume 4, page 428, comment 16).

It is most expedient to turn to original sources more often and to read them open-mindedly, without prejudice and a priori judgements. We find out lots of interesting things, the ones that Scaligerite historians prefer to hush up.

In reference to mediaeval Rome of the alleged X-XI century, Gregorovius points out (for the umpteenth time) that “Rome appears to have returned to times long gone: it had a Senate again, and was at war with the Latin and the Tuscan cities, which had united against Rome once again” ([196], Volume 4, page 412).

In the alleged XII century a “Classical revival” is observed yet again. Gregorovius tells us that “Arnold [of Brescia – A. F.] was excessively vehement about adhering to the ancient traditions” ([196], Volume 4, page 415). Apparently, he had “revived” the estate of cavaliers considered “ancient” nowadays ([196], Volume 4, page 415). Later on, in the alleged XII century, Pope Alexander III “revives the pagan triumph of the ancient emperors” ([196], Volume 4, page 503).

F. Gregorovius informs us of the fact that “the legendary name of Hannibal reappeared as a mediaeval family name borne by senators, warlords and cardinals for
several centuries” ([196], Volume 5, page 122). Hannibal is nevertheless considered an “extremely ancient” character nowadays.

Another “revival of antiquity” is presumed to have occurred in the alleged XIII century:

“The Roman populace has developed a new spirit over this time; it marched forth to conquer Tuscany and Latium as it had done in ancient times, in the age of Camillus and Coriolanus [believed to be “distant antiquity” nowadays – A. F.] Roman banners bearing the ancient S.P.Q.R. initials appeared on battlefields yet again”. ([196], Volume 5, pages 126-127).

A detailed list of the allegedly “revived” and “resurrected” traditions, names, and rites deemed “ancient” can be continued on dozens of pages, since practically all of the primary institutions of the “ancient” Rome appear to have been “revived” in the Middle Ages. We limit ourselves to a number of individual examples here. The interpretation of this amazing phenomenon as a “revival,” and not naissance, roots itself exclusively in the errors of Scaligerian chronology.

Nowadays the only original sources on the archaeology and the monuments of mediaeval Italian Rome add up to just two books compiled in the XII-XIII century at the earliest ([196], Volume 4, pages 544-545). We suddenly learn that according to Scaligerian chronology, the names of Roman monuments given in these mediaeval books are often considered erroneous and chaotic. We are now beginning to understand that what this really means is that they contradict Scaligerian history. Could it be that the old books are in fact correct, unlike the Scaligerian version?

For instance, these texts refer to Constantine’s Basilica as “the Temple of Romulus” (sic!). This sounds preposterous for a modern historian; however, this mediaeval indication concurs perfectly with the identification of Emperor Constantine as King Romulus that we have discovered as a result of a dynastic parallel (see fig. 6.52 in Chron1, Chapter 6). Apart from such “bizarre” identifications, mediaeval chronicles contradict the consensual chronology of Scaliger and Petavius every now and then.

1.4. The real date when the famous “ancient” statue of Marcus Aurelius was manufactured

Ricobaldus, for one, claims that the famous “ancient” equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius was cast and erected by the order of Pope Clemens III. However, in this case the event occurred in the XI century, and not in the “Classical Age” ([196], Volume 4, page 568, comment 74). Let us remind the reader that historians date this
statue to the alleged years 166-180 A.D. ([930], page 91). By the way, according to the parallelism that we have discovered (see fig. 6.45 in Chron1, Chapter 6), the “ancient” Marcus Aurelius of the alleged years 161-180 is but a “phantom duplicate” of the mediaeval Otto IV of the alleged years 1198-1218 A.D.

The claim that Ricobaldus makes about the statue of Marcus Aurelius (that it was only erected as late as the papacy of Clemens III) makes Gregorovius utter the following rather embarrassed remark: “this is an erroneous statement that Ricobaldus makes…” ([196], Volume 4, page 568, comment 74). What is the argumentation that Gregorovius offers? It is rather droll indeed: “how could such a bronze work be crafted considering the barbaric level of fine arts characteristic for Rome of that epoch?” ([196], Volume 4, page 573). In other words, mediaeval Romans “could not manufacture anything of value.” The “ancient” Romans that preceded them by several centuries have, on the other hand, been fine craftsmen, and could confidently cast such masterpieces in bronze (see fig. 7.1).

![Fig. 7.1. An “ancient” statue of the emperor Marcus Aurelius. According to F. Gregorovius ([196]), Ricobald used to claim that the famous “ancient” equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius was cast and mounted by an order of Pope Clemens III. However, this period falls on the end of the XI century, and not the “antiquity”. Picture taken from [958], page 9.](image)

The chronological oddities engulfing this famous statue are so blatantly obvious that they even make their way into the mainstream press on occasion. This is what our contemporaries write:

“The history of the equestrian statue is truly unusual. It contains many riddles, and has grown over with legends. For instance, its author and previous location in ancient Rome remain unknown... It was discovered by accident in the Middle Ages in one of the Roman squares... The statue was mistaken for a representation of
According to Gregorovius, this explanation was proposed by the historian Theo, who “points out that the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius became confused with the statue of Constantine, and thus managed to survive the Middle Ages. Such errancy is possible in Barbarian times” – as Gregorovius proceeds to expostulate – “but how can it be possible that the figure of Constantine could not be told apart from that of Marcus Aurelius in the times when the Noticia were written?” ([196], Volume 1, page 49, comment 32)

Scaligerian history has even got an “explanation” of sorts for the fact that “ancient masterpieces” have survived the twilight of the Middle Ages despite the militant church presumably busy destroying the pagan legacy. We are told that in the daytime the ignorant mediaeval monks destroyed pagan statues and “ancient” books, in order to secretly reconstruct them at night, copying the “legacy of the ancients” meticulously in order to carry it through the mediaeval tenebroesity to the luminous peaks of the Renaissance.

In the alleged XIII century we see a period of efflorescence in the arts which presumably represents ruthless pillaging of the “ancient” constructions and their transformation into mediaeval ones. For instance, we are now told that mediaeval Romans used “ancient sarcophagi” for their own entombments. Apparently, they had none of their own, since they did not know how to build them; the knowledge had been lost, and there were money shortages. According to the Gregorovian interpretation, new and original mausoleums – ones, that is, that didn’t resemble the “ancient” buildings (the way Gregorovius imagined them) – only started to emerge towards the end of the XIII century, and these were dubbed “mediaeval” with great relief. However, Gregorovius proceeds to voice his surprise at the fact that “not a single monument of any Roman celebrity from the first part of the XIII century remained in Rome” ([196], Volume 5, page 510). This should not surprise us. According to our reconstruction, the foundation of the Italian Rome as a capital city took place in the XIV century A.D. the earliest (see Chron5).

Incidentally, the mediaeval cardinal Guglielmo Fieschi, who allegedly died in 1256, “lays in an ancient [sic! – A. F.] marble sarcophagus, whose carvings in relief picture a Roman wedding – a peculiar symbol for a cardinal!” ([196], Volume 5, page 510). The amazement of Gregorovius is perfectly justified. Could the mediaeval cardinals really have been so poor as to be forced to use “ancient” sarcophagi, offhandedly shaking out the remains of their ancestors? It is considered sacrilege, after all. Common sense tells
us that the matter here lies in the contradiction between the planted Scaligerian chronological concepts and true specimens of mediaeval art that were later declared “ancient” (as in “very old indeed”).

The senatorial mausoleum in Arceli is a most curious artefact. This “monument appears to associate the antiquity with mediaeval forms; a marble urn with Bacchic relief carvings… serves as a foundation for a sarcophagus embellished with inlays and a Gothic superstructure” ([196], Volume 5, page 511). The amazement of Gregorovius is truly ceaseless.

Let us formulate a question: where did the powerful clans of the Guelph and Gibelline aristocracy reside in mediaeval Rome? It is hard to fathom. Apparently, we are told that they lived among the ruins of the ancient steam baths. This is precisely what the historians of today are forced to assume in their attempts to unravel the oddities of Scaligerian chronology.

This is what F. Gregorovius tells us:

“Powerful clans owned the slopes of Quirinal, and they built their fortifications near the forum of Imperial times… among them… the Capocci, who found lodgings in the thermae [in the steam baths – A. F.] of Trajan, as well as the Conti, whereas the nearby thermae of Constantine [steam baths again! – A. F.] housed the fourth castle of Colonnus… The enormous ruins of the forums built by Augustus, Nerva and Caesar have easily transformed [?] – A. F.] into a fortress, which was erected by the Conti as a citadel reigning over the entire city”. ([196], Volume 5, pages 526-527)

Gregorovius, albeit obliged to follow Scaligerian chronology, cannot squirm out of having to admit that there is no genuine evidence of the existence of this gigantic and allegedly “ancient” fortress before the mediaeval Conti – it simply had not existed! He writes that “there is no proof that it had stood for centuries and only been enlarged by the Conti” ([196], Volume 5, page 527). Doesn’t this directly imply that Conti had most probably built this castle as his fortress in the Middle Ages, and its “extreme antiquity” was declared a lot later? This was done by the historians and archaeologists of the XVII-XVIII century when Scaligerian chronology began to shift authentic mediaeval constructions into the distant past.

1.5. Could the “ancient” Emperor Vitellius have posed for the mediaeval artist Tintoretto?

Let us formulate the following concept that may strike one as somewhat unexpected at first. It is possible that the XVI century painter Tintoretto (1518-1594) drew the “ancient” Roman emperor Vitellius from nature.
The catalogue titled *The Five Centuries of European Drawing* contains a drawing by the well-known mediaeval painter Jacopo Tintoretto ([714], page 52). He lived in 1518-1594 ([1472], pages 23-24). The drawing is dated to approximately 1540 A.D. The name that it is catalogued under draws one’s attention instantly: “Etude of the head of the so-called Vitellius” ([714], page 52). See fig. 7.2.

Fig. 7.2. The etude of the head of the Roman emperor Vitellius done by the famous mediaeval painter of the XVI century Jacopo Tintoretto. According to Scaligerian chronology, emperor Vitellius and painter Tintoretto are separated by a period of roughly 1470-1500 years. Taken from [714], page 52.

Let us remind the reader that Vitellius is considered to have been an “ancient” emperor of Rome regnant in the alleged year 69 of the new era ([72], page 236). Thus, according to Scaligerian chronology, Tintoretto and Vitellius are separated by an interval roughly equalling 1470-1500 years. The modern commentary to this rather famous drawing is very noteworthy:

“Tintoretto had either a mask or a marble replica of an ancient bust in his studio, that was considered a portrait of the Roman emperor Vitellius in the XVI century. The original was given to the Venetian Republic by the cardinal Domenico Grimani as a present in 1523, and is currently part of the exposition of the Archaeological Museum of Venice (inventory number 20). Modern archaeology that dates this artefact to the epoch of Hadrian (roughly 178 A.D.), excludes the possibility of identifying the portrait as that of Vitellius, who had reigned in the years 67-68. However, Tintoretto has kept this sculpture under this very name, and the testament of the artist’s son Domenicus proves this explicitly mentioning the “head of Vitellius.”… More than twenty etudes of this head are known that were done by Tintoretto himself and his apprentices”. ([714], page 187).

The XVI century opinion was that the bust really portrayed the Roman emperor Vitellius. As we have seen, the real history of the bust only began in 1523, when it entered the possession of the Venetian republic. It may have been drawn in the XVI century either from the death-mask of the emperor, or from nature – namely, the body of
the recently deceased Vitellius. Tintoretto’s drawing clearly depicts someone who has just died, or is asleep. It is only natural that Scaligerian history deems it perfectly impossible to place the “ancient” Vitellius in the XVI century. It would therefore be interesting to try dating this bust to the XVI century within the paradigm of the New Chronology for comparison, especially considering the dynastic parallels that we have discovered. The historians consider Vitellius to have been an emperor of the Second Roman Empire ([72], page 236). As we already know, it is a phantom duplicate of the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century (fig. 6.23 and 6.24 in Chron1, Chapter 6), which, in turn, is a carbon copy of the Habsburg (New Town, or Nov-Gorod?) empire of the XIII-XVII century A.D. for the most part (see figs. 6.21 and 6.22 in Chron1, Chapter 6).

The “ancient” Vitellius is considered to have been a short-term governor, and the immediate predecessor of the “ancient” Vespasian. He is supposed to have reigned in 69 A.D. ([72], page 236). Therefore, he travels forward in time as a result of said dynastic superimpositions, and turns out to have been a mediaeval ruler of the first half of the XVI century; as can be seen from fig. 6.22 in Chron1, Chapter 6, the end of his reign and his death fall roughly on the year 1519. It is significant that, as mediaeval historians tell us, the bust that must have portrayed the recently deceased Vitellius only appeared on the historical scene around 1523, when it was given to the Venetian republic as a present ([714], page 187). Thus, the two dates correlate perfectly well: the “ancient” Vitellius dies around 1519, and a bust is made which the cardinal gives to the Venetians in 1523, four years later.

Everything falls into place. Apparently, the bust of Vitellius portrays a real mediaeval ruler of the first half of the XVI century. Tintoretto the painter and his apprentices paint Vitellius as a recently deceased famous contemporary of theirs. The latter saponaceous addition – “so-called” – added by the historians of the Scaligerian tradition, needs to be crossed out of the name of Tintoretto’s drawing, leaving it with the shorter and more correct “Etude of the head of Vitellius.”

If we’re to consider the possibility of minor veers and fluctuations in mediaeval chronology, it might turn out that Vitellius died a few years later than 1519, so Tintoretto could have drawn him from nature, while one of his colleagues was making an intravital “ancient” bust of Vitellius. The apprentices of Tintoretto naturally trained for their task by first drawing a bust being inspired by the drawing done by their mentor – who, as we feel obliged to reiterate, may have been present to witness the famous emperor’s death.
Another peculiar detail has to be mentioned. The lower part of Tintoretto’s drawing bears the legend “1263” (see fig. 7.2) – dating from 1263. But Tintoretto lived in the XVI century. Modern historians mention this circumstance as well, albeit without commenting on it: “At the bottom in the centre one sees the number 1263 drawn with a pencil” ([714], page 187). We are confronted with an important fact here. The artist Tintoretto, having done the drawing around 1540, dated it to 1263. However, usually all painters date their works to the time of their creation. Tintoretto thus transcribes the year 1540 as 1263. This shows us, which is exactly what we claim, that there were various mediaeval chronological traditions that differ from the one that we’re accustomed to. For instance, the number 1263 could have been used to refer to the year 1540. If we interpret it according to the modern tradition, we shall get a much earlier date, which would make the drawing about 277 years older. This is probably what Scaligerian historians usually did in such situations; however, this time they had to “let the drawing stay” in 1540, since Tintoretto is linked to the XVI century by various independent evidence.

1.6. The amount of time required for the manufacture of one sheet of parchment

We shall conclude with another useful observation. Many of the classical “ancient” texts are written on parchment or papyrus – however, they’re written in a perfect acrolect. On the other hand, many really old mediaeval texts are written in a clumsy and brief manner, which is quite natural. Primitive language requires time in order to become literary language. Furthermore, really ancient texts contain words written in nothing but consonants comprising semantic skeletons of words, with vowels either altogether missing, or replaced by small diacritic signs. This is the reason for the existence of the vocalization problem in many ancient texts, namely, the Biblical ones – it translates as the necessity to find just the right vowels in order to restore the original. Apparently, due to the scarcity and high cost of writing materials in antiquity, the scribes were frugal with them, and condensed the text, leaving nothing but consonants. One naturally comes to think that a polished literary style implies a long evolution of culture, and also the availability of writing materials, since style takes practice to evolve. Paper, for instance, is rather cheap (although this has not always been the case). However, there was no paper in “antiquity.” As we are being told nowadays, the “ancient” classics used parchment exclusively. Just how available had parchment been?

The manufacture of one sheet of parchment requires the following (see [544], for
1. skinning a young calf no older than 6 weeks, or a young lamb;
2. macerating the skin in running water up to 6 days;
3. scrubbing the membrane off with a special scrubber;
4. loosening the wool via souring the skin in a damp pit and subjecting it to ash and lime for 12-20 days;
5. scraping off the loosened wool;
6. fermenting the clear skin in oat or wheat bran in order to remove excessive lime;
7. tanning the skin with special extracts to make it soft after drying;
8. eliminating the roughness by pumicing the chalked skin.

This is the procedure required for the manufacture of every leaf of parchment. This made both parchment and papyrus luxuries, which had been the case until the very discovery of rag-paper before the Renaissance.

Let us open the work of the “ancient” Titus Livy. He begins his narration ornately and grandiloquently:

“Shall my writing of the history of the Roman people from the foundation of the capital be worth the effort? I do not know it well, and even if I did, I would have been too timid to utter it aloud. This endeavour, as I can see perfectly well, is far from original, and was attempted by many; also, the new writers that keep on appearing think they may either add something new factually, or excel the austere antiquity by the art of enunciation…” ([482])

We are being assured that such a free-flowing and elaborate style was used in the alleged I century B.C. for the writing of 142 (or 144, according to different sources) books of Titus Livy. Developing a style as confident as his must have required writing lots of drafts. How much parchment (and how many calves and lambs) would it require? We believe the explanation to be simple – the creation of all these “ancient” books took place in the Middle Ages, when paper was already widely known.

1.7. The “ancient” Roman Emperor Augustus was Christian, since he had worn a mediaeval crown with a Christian cross

In fig. 7.3 we can see the well-known mediaeval Hereford map, dating from the end of the alleged XIII century ([1177], pages 309-312). Its physical size is rather large – 1.65 metres by 1.35 metres. It is assumed that this map is based on the History by Paul Orosius, who is supposed to have lived in the IV century A.D. ([1177], page 311). As we understand, this map must have really been created in the XVI century at the latest.
Fig. 7.3. The famous mediaeval Hereford map allegedly created near the end of the XIII century. Its diameter is about 1.3 metres. In the bottom left-hand corner one sees the “ancient” Roman emperor Augustus sitting on a throne. On his head there is a crown with a Christian cross. See a close-in on the next illustration. Taken from [1177], page 311.

In the bottom left corner of this map we can see the famous “ancient” Roman emperor Augustus. He is handing out his edict demanding the creation of a description of the World to three geographers (see [1177], page 206, and fig. 7.4). Modern historians make the following comment: “on the left of the map we read that the measurements of the world have been commenced by Julius Caesar. In the bottom left corner we see a picture of the emperor Augustus holding his edict in his hands” ([1177], page 309).
Fig. 7.4. The bottom left-hand corner of the Hereford map showing the “ancient” Roman emperor Augustus sitting on his throne. We can see a crown with a *Christian cross* on the emperor’s head.

The fact that what we see on the head of the “ancient” Roman emperor Augustus is a mediaeval crown with *a Christian cross* (it looks very much like a Papal tiara as well, see figs 7.5 and 7.6) is perfectly astonishing within the reality tunnel of the Scaligerian history. Generally, the entire appearance of the famous Roman emperor doesn’t resemble his likeness in the “ancient history teaching aids” for the Scaligerian history whose mass production era in Western Europe peaked in the XVI-XVIII century, the least bit. In fig. 7.7 we can see an example of such a “propaganda” statue of Augustus which is kept in the Museum of the Vatican nowadays ([304], Volume 1, page 489). Octavian Augustus is represented in an austere and heroic manner here, doubtlessly an example to inspire the youths. This “ancient” statue must have been manufactured in the XVII century at the latest. On the Hereford map the very same Roman emperor Augustus is represented in a completely different manner, *in a crown with a Christian cross, a beard, and wearing typically mediaeval clothing.* As we now understand, there is nothing strange about it. The map is correct, and this ruler couldn’t have lived earlier than the XIII century A.D.
Fig. 7.5. A fragment of the Hereford map. We can see a mediaeval crown with a Christian cross on the head of the “ancient” Octavian Augustus. Taken from [1177], page 206.

Fig. 7.6. A Christian crown with a cross on the head of the “ancient” Roman emperor Octavian Augustus. Taken from [1177], page 206.
Fig. 7.7. An “ancient” statue of the emperor Octavian Augustus from the Vatican museum, most probably dating from the XVII century the earliest. Serves as a “visual learning aid” to the Scaligerian history textbook. Taken from [304], Volume 1, page 489.
2. The “ancient” historian Tacitus and the well-known Renaissance writer Poggio Bracciolini

Today it is considered that the famous “ancient” Roman historian Tacitus lived in the 1 century A.D. ([833], Volume 2, pages 203, 211). His most famous work is the History. In Scaligerian chronology, the books of Tacitus disappeared from sight for a long time, fell into oblivion, and only resurfaced in the XIV-XV century A.D. This is what Scaligerian history tells us:

“They are mostly no immediate knowledge of Tacitus, he is only known by proxy of Orosius… In the XIV century Tacitus becomes known better. The Montecassino manuscript had been used by Paulinus of Venetia (in 1331-1334)… and later on Bocaccio… Then it… came to the well-known Florentine humanist Niccolo Niccoli, and is also kept in Florence currently, in the Medicean Library… Our tradition of the last books of the Annals and History ascends to this manuscript for the most part. Only the Italian manuscript of 1475 currently kept in Leiden must have had some other source. In the 1420’s, the Italian humanists started to look for Tacitus’ manuscripts in Germany. The history of this search remains unclear in many ways due to the fact that the owners of the freshly-found texts often withheld their acquisitions, especially if they were made illegally. In 1425 the eminent humanist and Papal secretary Poggio Bracciolini received an inventory of a number of manuscripts that contained several minor works of Tacitus from a monk from the Hersfeld Abbey… Whether the manuscript had really been from Hersfeld or from Fulda, or whether Poggio had really received it, likewise the possible date of this event – all of this remains a mystery. In 1455 the manuscript or its copy was already in Rome, and provided the basis for the manuscripts that have reached our day”. ([833], Volume 2, page 241).

We have thus been told the following:

1. According to Scaligerian chronology, Tacitus lived in the alleged I century A.D., presumably around the years 58-117 A.D. ([797], page 1304).
2. However, his History had not been known in the Middle Ages.
3. The biography of the History by Tacitus that we have at our disposal can only be traced as far back from our time as the XIV-XV century A.D.
4. Nothing is known about the fate of the History before the XIV century. Hence the hypothesis that the books of Tacitus may have been mediaeval in their origin and referred to real mediaeval events of the X-XIV century A.D. However, they may have been edited in the XVI-XVII century.

This summary would have been sufficient. However, let us point out an interesting fact. The academic account of the fate of Tacitus’ books that we have quoted from [833] is written neutrally and demurely, and contains nothing that could surprise us. Except for
the odd **gap of a millennium and a half** between the moment the book was written and its surfacing in the XV century A.D.

This arid text really conceals some rather peculiar circumstances blearing the entire history of the discovery of the books written by the “ancient” Tacitus. Modern historians aren’t too keen on recollecting these facts, since they lead to a number of confused questions and serious doubts about the correctness of the datings of the events described in the books of Tacitus.

Let us give an account of what really happened in the XV century. We shall study the history of how the famous *History* by Cornelius Tacitus was discovered, according to the following works: [1195], [1379], and [21]. Towards the end of the XIX century the French expert Hochart and the English expert Ross independently proclaimed the *History* of Cornelius Tacitus to have actually been written in the XV century by the eminent Renaissance humanist Poggio Bracciolini. In other words, *they accused Bracciolini of premeditated forgery.*

The publication of the works by Hochart and Ross initially caused a great scandal in the historian community. However, their opponents were forced to give over with the discussion, since they had nothing of substance to counter the evidence of Hochart and Ross with; they resorted to the stance of complete obnubescence instead. This is a method common for such adversaries. The modern commentary to [833] is a perfect example, since it doesn’t mention the research of Hochart and Ross with a single word.

The analysis performed by Hochart and Ross was very important. Let us state right away that nowadays when we possess information that had been unknown to Hochart and Ross, we should say that we cannot agree with their conclusion about the *History* of Tacitus being a forgery. The facts that we have discovered and the new concept of the abbreviated chronology suggest that it was based on a lost *original* – which was, however, describing real *mediaeval* events and not some distant antediluvian epoch. However, this text reached us in a more recent edition, possibly done in the XVI-XVII century.

Hochart and Ross discovered distinct **relics proving the History of Tacitus to be mediaeval in its origins.** Hochart and Ross had only been wrong concerning one thing – namely, the interpretation of their own results. Remaining perfectly unaware of the inveracity of the Scaliger-Petavius chronology, they considered the facts they discovered to prove *History* a sham; however, from our point of view the very same facts may indicate that the *History* of Tacitus was a genuine historical text describing real events of the XIV-XV century A.D. However, it could have undergone a
transformation in the hands of the partisan “caring editors” of the XVI-XVII century.

Let us consider the Renaissance atmosphere that the “ancient” manuscripts were “surfacing” in.

Poggio Bracciolini is considered one of the most spectacular writers of the XV century Renaissance. An old portrait of his can be seen in figs. 7.8 and 7.9. He is the author of top-bracket historical and moralistic tractates. “In what concerns theological issues… he can speak in a language that would have been considered belonging to one of the Holy Fathers by anyone if it hadn’t been for Bracciolini’s signature” ([21], pages 358-363). He is the author of the historical study guide of Roman monuments and the famous *History of Florence*, which is a work that resembles the chronicle of Tacitus.

Fig. 7.8. A portrait of Poggio Bracciolini allegedly dating from the XV century taken from his book titled *De varietate fortunae*. The modern commentator has the following to say about it: “This fantastic miniature depicts Poggio, one of
the most famous adventurer of the entire XV century who had researched the Classical past. Poggio Bracciolini is walking down a street surveying the ruins of Rome” ([1374], page 92.

Fig. 7.9. A close-in of Bracciolini’s portrait allegedly dating from the XV century. Taken from [1374], page 92.

“This brilliant imitator had fully been a universal mastermind of his century. The critics equated him with the greatest Renaissance authors… Many found it possible to define the first half of the Italian XV century as the “Age of Poggio”… Florence built an intravital statue in his honour that belonged to the chisel of Donatello…

A rather splendid way of living had cost Poggio Bracciolini dearly… and put him in constant need of money. The search, preparation, and copy-editing of ancient authors were an additional source of income for him. In the XV century… this was a very lucrative activity. With the aid of the Florentine scientist and publisher Niccolo Niccoli (1363-1437)… Poggio Bracciolini founded a studio of sorts that occupied itself with the edition of the ancient texts, having engaged a large number of partners and counteragents, very educated ones, but most of them had been marked by obloquy…

The first findings were made by Poggio Bracciolini and Bartholomeo di Montepulciano in the epoch of the Constantian council… in a forlorn and humid tower of the St. Gallen monastery… “in a forlorn and humid tower where a prisoner would not survive three days” they managed to find a pile of ancient manuscripts – the works of Quintillian, Valerius Flaccus, Asconius Pedianus, Nonius Marcellus, Probus, and others. The discovery created more than a sensation – it initiated an entire literary epoch”. ([21], pages 358-366).

A while later Bracciolini “discovered” fragments “from Petronius” and the Bucolic by Calpurnius. The circumstances of these findings remain nebulous.
Apart from the originals, Bracciolini also traded in copies, which he sold for great sums of money. For instance, having sold a copy of Titus Livy’s manuscript to Alphonse of Aragon, Poggio made enough money to buy a villa in Florence.

“He charged Duke D’Este a hundred ducats (1200 francs) for the letters of St. Jerome, and that with great irritation… Poggio’s clients were the Medici, the Sforza, the D’Este, the aristocratic families of England, the Duchy of Burgundy, cardinals Orsini and Colonna, rich people like Bartolomeo di Bardi, universities, which… either started to set up libraries, or were busy extending their old book storages”. ([21], pages 363-366).

Let us now regard the history of the discovery of Tacitus’ books.

The main copies of Tacitus’ works – the so-called First and Second Medicean Copies – are kept in Florence, in a book storage which had Poggio amongst its founders. According to Scaligerian chronology, these copies are the prototypes of all the other ancient copies of Tacitus.

The first printed edition of Tacitus is supposed to have come out in the alleged year 1470, based on the Second Medicean copy or a copy thereof that is supposed to have been kept in the St. Marcus library in Venice. “However, it has disappeared from there, or maybe wasn’t kept in the library in the first place” ([21], pages 366-368).

“The two Medicean copies… contain the complete historical works of Tacitus that have reached our days” ([21], pages 366-368).

Scaligerian chronology is of the opinion that Tacitus was born between 55 and 57 A.D. “The year Tacitus died remains unknown” ([833], Volume 2, pages 203, 211). Thus, it is presumed that Tacitus lived in the I century A.D.

After that, his name disappears for many centuries, until the Renaissance epoch ([833]). Hochart and Ross have collected all the references to Tacitus made before Poggio’s discovery in the XV century. It turns out there are very few such references, and they are all general and vague enough that they could refer to people who have nothing in common with the author of History. Thus, even in Scaligerian chronology there is no real information about Tacitus – the author of History – that would predate the XV century.

How did the “discovery of Tacitus” really occur? “In November 1425 Poggio notified Niccoli in Florence from Rome that “some monk” was offering him a batch of old manuscripts… including ‘several works of Tacitus unknown to us’ ” ([21], page 382). Niccoli agrees upon the deal immediately. However, the actual purchase takes several months for some reason.

“Poggio procrastinates, giving different excuses… He gives a rather meandrous answer to Niccoli’s inquiry that
only makes clear the fact that he had not been in the possession of the Tacitus’ book yet... In what concerns the monk, Poggio blatantly lies and appears confused: the monk is allegedly a friend of his, but for some reason failed to have visited Poggio while in Rome... the books were in Hersfeld, but had to be collected in Nuremberg, etc.” ([21], page 382).

Niccoli demanded the book catalogue “discovered” by Poggio, being rather irritated. It turned out that “there were no works of Tacitus in the catalogue!”

“Such strange rigmarole of miscomprehensions that look clearly artificial marks the years 1427 and 1428” ([21]). Finally, Poggio notifies Niccoli in 1428 that the mysterious monk had arrived in Rome again – but without any book!

“The almost quinquennial procrastination led to the situation where Poggio’s discovery had been made public prior to having actually been made, and many strange rumours surrounded it. The latter made Niccoli worry greatly, to which Poggio replied: “I know all the songs that are sung in this respect... so this is what I’ll do: once Cornelius Tacitus arrives, I shall hide him well from strangers.” One would think – as Hochart justly remarks – that the most natural protection of the manuscript from vicious rumours would be making it public for the scientists, explaining all the ways, means, and secrets of its appearance. Poggio, on the contrary, promises to palter yet again...” ([21], pages 374-382).

Hochart and Ross have found that “in a much later edition of his letters to Niccoli, Poggio, having lost track of the dates of his Tacitus-related correspondence of the years 1425-1429, had for some reason forged the dates of 28 December 1427 and 5 June 1428 in two of the letters that were made public” ([21], pages 374-382).

In these letters Poggio asks Niccoli to send him (!) another copy of Tacitus that had allegedly already been in Niccoli’s possession. Comparing the dates of the correspondence and the texts of the letters, Hochart claims the mysterious “second copy” to have been nothing else but the First Medicean copy that had allegedly been discovered many years after!

Hochart is of the opinion that “the letter dates are counterfeited, they have been composed post factum after Niccoli had made Tacitus public in order to validate the reputation of the first... copy [the so-called Second Medicean one – A. F.] that had entered the collections of several palatine libraries, and prepare the way for the second copy” ([21], pages 374-382). Today’s historians are of the opinion that these two copies were discovered in a reverse order.

Amphitheatrov, whom we often quote here, wrote the following:

“Studying the history of the origins of the First Medicean Copy [the second to have been discovered – A. F.]... one cannot fail to notice the recurrence of the legend that had engulfed the copy of Niccolo Niccoli 80 years
ago... a northern monastery figures here again, as well as some mysterious, unnamed monks. Some German
coenobite brings the first five chapters of the *Annals* to Pope Leo X. The Pope is delighted, and presumably
designates the monk as the editor of the work. The coenobite refuses, pleading semi-literacy. One clearly sees
the resurrection of the legend about the provisioner of the Second Medicean Copy [the first to have been
discovered – A. F.] and the Hersfeld monk... the legend calls Arcimboldi the intermediator in this deal...
however, Arcimboldi doesn’t mention this with a single word, despite the fact that he is supposed to have
received 500 sequins from Leo X in order to pay for it – that amounts to 6000 francs, an entire fortune
considering the cost of money [this makes chronology irrelevant! – A. F.]. All of these mysterious monks with no
name, origin, and place of residence are the perpetrators of the falsification system started by Poggio Bracciolini
in the eyes of Hochart. No one ever sees them or knows anything about them, yet today one of them brings a lost
decade of *Titus Livy* from Sweden or Denmark, tomorrow another one comes from Corbea or Fulda with a work
of Tacitus, etc. – they always come from the North that is far away and hard to reach, and they always bring the
very goods that are sought after and that the book market of the century is starved for” ([21], pages 374-382).

The study of Poggio’s correspondence leads to stronger suspicions. The authors of the
letters either fail to mention the findings, or give mutually exclusive versions.

“Bayle tells us [already in the XVIII century – A. F.] that Pope Leo X wanted to find the missing chapters of
Tacitus so much that he promised an *indulgence of sins* for them as well as money and power. Is it surprising
that they were found with haste? [Chronology is of little relevance here – A. F.]. Therefore, both parts of the
Tacitus’ codex are of equally mysterious origins. Hochart assumes that the relation of legends and mystery that
surrounds them indicate a common origin and family, namely, that they have been *forged in the Roman studio
of the Florentine Poggio Bracciolini*. ([21], pages 374-382).

Hochart and Ross provide information that speaks unequivocally about Poggio’s
penchant for transformation. For Poggio Latin is a mother tongue. “He doesn’t write in
any language but Latin, and how he does it! His imitative flexibility makes him the
Prosper Mérimée of the XV century... when the reader wants it, Poggio becomes
Seneca, Petronius and Titus Livy; he can write like anyone, a true chameleon of word
and spirit” ([21], page 385).

The analysis of the books by Tacitus shows serious discrepancies between their
content (in what concerns the history and the geography of “ancient” Rome) and the
consensual Scaligerian version of “ancient” Roman history.

“A great list of contradictions is cited by Gaston Boissier... Having listed a great number of mistakes [have they
really been mistakes? – A. F.] that couldn’t have been made by a 1 century Roman [according to Scaligerite
historians – A. F.], Hochart points out the ones that give the author away as *someone adhering to the XV
century traditions and Weltanschauung*. ([21], pages 387-390).

This is an important moment. For Hochart, Ross, Gaston Boissier and other critics of
Tacitus all of this signifies the *History* to be a forgery. Being raised on Scaligerian
history and certain of the fact that “the real Tacitus” must have lived in the I century
A.D., they cannot interpret the XV-century relics found in the text of the *History* by

---
Tacitus in any different way. For us, there is no contradiction here. It suffices to suppose
the following: the “History” of Tacitus refers to real events of the XIII-XV century A.D.
Tacitus, being a XV century author, naturally “adheres to the XV century traditions and
Weltanschauung”; thus, the “misses” found by the historians become evidence of the fact
that Tacitus’ History is genuine, albeit with the condition that we transfer the time
period that it covers into the Middle Ages.

At the same time, Hochart and Ross have found some extremely peculiar
circumstances of the unearthing of Tacitus’ History. They consider these to be
indications of forgery; our take is that they indicate a tendentious editing of the real text
of the History by Poggio Bracciolini. However, it is possible that Tacitus was a nom de
plume used by Poggio Bracciolini. He could really have described the “ancient” Roman
events that occurred in the XIII-XV century A.D. having read about them in some
genuine documents that he managed to lay his hands on. See for yourselves:

“He [Poggio’s – A. F.] sojourn in London was marked by greatly frustrated hopes for Beaufort’s generosity… In
1422… Piero Lamberteschi offers him a project of some historical work that is supposed to have been based on
Greek sources and done in the utmost secrecy over the period of three years, for which Poggio would receive a
fee of 500 golden ducats. “Let him pay me six hundred, and I’m game” – writes Poggio, leaving Niccoli to take
care of the matter. “The task that he offers pleases me greatly, and I hope to produce something worthy of
reading.” A month later he writes: “if I see… that Piero backs up his promises with deeds, it shall not just be the
Sarmatians that I shall study, but the Scythians as well… Keep the projects that I’m telling you about secret. If I
shall indeed go to Hungary, it should remain unknown to everyone except for a few friends”.

In June: “Rest assured that if I’m given enough time… I shall write something that shall
please you… When I compare myself with the ancients, I believe in myself. If I really
get to it, I shan’t lose my face before anyone…” His subsequent location remains a
mystery. According to Corniani, he had really lived in Hungary for some reason.
Tonneli tells us that he went straight to Florence. Whether his mysterious deal with
Lamberteschi reached any results at all remains an enigma as well. Lamberteschi’s
name disappears from Poggio’s correspondence, which Hochart explains by the fact that
Poggio himself was the editor of his collected letters.

Even if the deal had fallen through and come to nothing, what possible residue could
have been left by this episode? The following: “Lamberteschi was offering Poggio the
creation of some secret historical work. The secrecy was planned to be great enough to
make Poggio work in Hungary while everyone would think him to have still been in
England. For this work he would have to study the Greek authors… and compete with
the ancient historians, which he both feared and yearned for. And, finally, all the
demands for secrecy that he had been ready to comply with demonstrate that the deal,
albeit literary and scientific, had been a murky one”. ([21], pages 393 ff).

Lamberteschi had a moral right to confront Poggio with such a suggestion, since the latter had already been caught red-handed at the manufacture of a forgery. Several years before, Poggio had published the Commentaries of Q. Asconius Pedianus via Niccoli.

“The original for these Commentaries wasn’t seen by anyone, and all the copies have been made by Niccoli from another copy that Poggio had sent him from Constance. It was a great success, despite the fact that… the world of science soon sensed that something was wrong… The success of the sham Asconius Pedianus had ensued in an entire series of forgeries bearing the name of the same fictitious author, but they were all too rough, and immediately got exposed as fakes. Poggio… simply turned out more artful than the others…

Prior to his involvement in the Tacitus business, he tries to sell some amazing copy of Titus Livy to Cosmas Medici and Leonello D’Este – again in an atmosphere of mystery, with a faraway monastery on some North Sea island, Swedish monks and the like somewhere in the background. It is improbable that we’re speaking of an actual oeuvre being forged, but a forgery of a copy may well have taken place. It is known that Poggio had been a master of Lombardian handwriting, which the manuscript that he tried to entice the princes with had been written in… however, something went wrong there, and the precious copy disappeared without a trace… It is significant that over this period the usually prolific Poggio fails to write anything of his own… However, he spends lots of time educating himself – systematically and unidirectionally, apparently training himself for some serious task of great responsibility concerning the Imperial period in Roman history. Niccoli barely manages to send him the works required: Ammianus Marcellinus, Plutarch, Ptolemy’s Geography, etc”. ([21], pages 394 and ff).

Hochart is of the opinion that Poggio had been alone when he began the forgery, but was probably soon forced to engage Niccoli as well. They must have planted the so-called Second Medicean Copy first, holding the First one back hoping to “skin the same steer twice.” However, the market had soon been addled by a great number of exposed forgeries. Poggio refrained from risking it the second time. The First Copy must have entered circulation by proxy of his son Giovanni Francesco after he had made away with the fortune of his father.

Apart from the works mentioned, the Poggio-Niccoli syndicate has put the following “Classical” texts into circulation:

The complete Quintillian, some tractates by Cicero, seven of his speeches, Lucretius,
Petronius, Plautus, Tertullian, some texts of Marcellinus, Calpurnius Seculus, etc.

The market became agitated after the finding of Tacitus. In 1455 “Enoch D’Ascoli found Tacitus’ *Dialogue of Orators, Agricola’s Biography, and Germany* (a monastery in the north yet again), whose language and character differ from the *History* and the *Annals* significantly… The *Facetiae* ascribed to Tacitus appeared on the market, and the sham took a long time to expose” ([21], pages 350-351).

Let us reiterate – Hochart and Ross insisted that the *History* of Tacitus was a sham exclusively because of their unswerving trust in Scaligerian chronology. Rejecting it and transferring “ancient” Roman events into the XIII-XV century A.D. cardinally changes our attitude even to such events as Poggio’s mysterious involvement in the discovery of Tacitus’ books.

Finally, let us cite an ancient miniature from the *Historiarum ab Urbe condita* by Titus Livy that was published in Italy in the alleged XV century ([1485], page 264). The miniature is on the very first page of the book (see fig. 7.10). The inscription below says “Titi Livii…” What we see on the miniature is a typically mediaeval interior of the house of a writer who is working on a book (see fig. 7.11). The artist must have tried to draw the author of the oeuvre, namely, Titus Livy. However, learned historians prefer to assure us that it isn’t the “ancient” Titus Livy, but, rather, an anonymous humanist writing some book. Modern historians archly comment that “On top of the first page of the text we see a writer who finishes his work… The picture shows a humanist scientist in his study” ([1485], page 264). However, most probably, the picture represents the author of the book, or the mediaeval writer Titus Livy. He may have been a contemporary of Poggio, or Poggio Bracciolini himself, who had been a humanist scientist after all.
Fig. 7.10. The first page of the Historiarum ab Urbe condita by Titus Livy published in the alleged XV century. The picture probably portrays the author himself. The entire ambience is clearly mediaeval. Taken from [1485], ill. 349.
What one has to note in this respect is that on the pages of the books by the “ancient” Titus Livy and other “Classical authors” one keeps coming across mediaeval symbolism, Christian crosses and coats of arms, for instance (see fig. 7.12). The modern commentators naturally noticed this phenomenon a long time ago. For instance, the current edition of the book by Titus Livy is commented upon in the following matter: “The beginning of Book 21… one sees a coat of arms with a cross and some angels” ([1485], page 265). However, today the commentators prefer to assure us that all these visible late mediaeval relics have been introduced into the “ancient” books by the artists just in order to please the mediaeval book-owners. The real explanation is most probably a different and more natural one – namely, that the mediaeval Christian artists used the mediaeval Christian symbols in order to illustrate a mediaeval book of a late mediaeval author who was describing contemporary mediaeval events.
3. The mediaeval Western European Christian cult and the “ancient” pagan Bacchic celebrations

According to our reconstruction, the “ancient” Dionysian (Bacchic) pagan cult prevailed in Western Europe in the Middle Ages, that is, in the XIII-XVI century, and not in “distant antiquity.” This may have been one of the forms of mediaeval Western European Christianity. Can we find support for this theory in the original sources that have reached our time? We can, and rather substantial support at that.

N. A. Morozov in his analysis of ecclesiastical history has paid attention to the known, albeit oftentimes withheld, fact of the openly Bacchic practise of Christian officiations in mediaeval Italy and France, where liturgies often transformed into orgies, convents would frequently serve as houses of ill repute, etc.

What does Scaligerian history tell us about mediaeval Western European monasticism? Let us turn to the book by Alexander Paradisis titled *The Life and Activity of Balthazar Cossa (Pope John XXIII)* ([645]).

“Nothing remained of the reclusion and the piety of the first centuries of Christianity, the decadence of the church and its morals attained grandiose proportions… The nuns’ clothing didn’t help austerity, either, since it served to emphasize their natural beauty and gracefulness… Nearly all Italian monasteries [according to Rodocanachi] allowed male visitors… As for Venetian monasteries – Casanova is not the only source of information in what regards those; St. Didier writes that “nothing attracted as much interest in Venice as the monasteries.” Noblemen have been frequent visitors there, too. Since all of the nuns were beautiful and clean-limbed, none of them went without a lover. The care of the dominae about the morals manifested as aiding the nuns in finding more elaborate ways of meeting their lovers and providing necessary alibis. During the Venetian carnival (which would last almost half a year over there), convents would turn into dance halls filled with masked men… The dresses have been narrow, fitting tight around the waist, with large scoop necklines which demonstrated the white and voluptuous bodies of the nuns.” (see Rodocanachi (E.), *La femme Italienne, avant, pendant et après la Renaissance*, Paris, 1922.)

Charles Louis Pölnitz writes that Venetian nuns curled their hair, wore short dresses that failed to cover their shapely legs, and that their bosoms were only covered when they sang in church choir. The garments worn by the Roman nuns also weren’t exactly characterized by demureness; as for the Florentine nuns, the prior of a friary who had
visited Florence writes that they resembled mythical nymphs rather than “brides of Christ” (see Pizzichi, *Viaggio per l’alta Italia*. Firenze, 1820). There were theatres at many monasteries where it was allowed to give performances, however, only the nuns could take part in those. The nuns of Genoa weren’t exactly known for continence, either. One of the Papal edicts aggrievedly stated that “the sisters from the convents of St. Philip and St. Jacob roam the streets of Genoa, committing whatever ribaldries their hotspurred imaginations dictate” ([645], pages 160-162).

Finally, the church began to persecute this Bacchic form of the Christian cult in the West.

“The dissoluteness of the nuns in the Bolognese convent of John the Baptist had been so great that the authorities were forced to disperse the nuns and close down the convent. The nuns from the convent of St. Leonard were given into custody of the St. Laurence convent which had gained prominence due to its austere and harsh regulations, known as “the tormentor of the nuns”… The amount of nuns persecuted by the justice was growing with the day. Every Bolognese convent had a nickname: “the convent of the dolls” “the convent of the gossipers,” “the convent of the repenting Magdalenes,” “the convent of the wenches,” “the monastery of the Messalinas,” etc. (see Frati (Lodov.), *La vita private di Bologna nel Medio Evo*, Florence, 1898)…

The eminent humanist Giovanni Pontano tells us that in Valencia the Spaniards had free access to the convents, and that it was hard to differentiate between these holy tabernacles and houses of ill repute. Settenbrie, who studied the last collection of Masuccio’s works, writes that the book *The Conjugality of Monks and Nuns* has been withdrawn from circulation, and entered the list of the books forbidden by the Catholic Church, while its author was anathematized” ([645], pages 162-164).

Let us stop for a moment and think. A natural question arises, namely, that of the essence of the Christian cult in Western Europe prior to the introduction of the rigid sanctions of the XVI-XVII century. Did it resemble modern Christianity? Nowadays we are often told that the mediaeval clergy frequently spent time in bacchanals. We have all heard of the alleged lechery of many mediaeval monks who are supposed to have corrupted the original ideals, which were intrinsically pure. See figs. 7.13 and 7.14, for instance.
Fig. 7.13. “The Abode of the Jolly Friars” – a Dutch “caricature” of the alleged XVII century depicting monks indulging in drunken revelry. The “caricature” bears the legend “Such is the Way to the Stars”. Taken from [492], Volume 1, page 223.

Fig. 7.14. A “caricature” of Pope Leo X and his debauched life. Copper engraving dating from the XVI century. Taken from [492], p. 181.

An unprejudiced study of mediaeval documents shows this mediaeval Christian cult to have been practically identical with the one we consider the ancient Bacchic, Dionysian cult. N. A. Morozov cites plenty of data showing that, for instance, official prostitution was an integral part of the mediaeval Western European Christian liturgy. Another example is the love-cult prevalent in a number of mediaeval temples located on the
territory of modern India. Accordingly, there exists the possibility of a stance contradicting the official modern standpoint, one which would interpret the distinct relics of the Bacchic in Christian rituals of the Middle Ages as the corruption of archetypal Christianity. These “ancient relics” persisting in the Middle Ages strike us as odd nowadays since they contradict Scaligerian chronology. A change of the latter and the dislodgement of the “antiquity” into the Middle Ages instantly eliminates the seeming contradiction.

Scaligerian history contains many relics of the mediaeval Bacchic-Christian liturgies. According to the experts in the history of religions, the Western European Christians of the Middle Ages had (see, for instance, the review given in [544]) religious rituals including nocturnal congregations called “agapes,” or “nights of love.” Despite the efforts of the late mediaeval and modern commentators to convince us that these Christian “love suppers” involved nothing but “comradely libations” and “platonic cordialities,” the initial meaning of the word “agape” reveals something completely different. As N. A. Morozov duly remarks, the correct Greek word for fraternal love is “philia,” whereas “agape” is solely used for erotic love.

Therefore the “agapes” have most probably merely been the way Christians referred to the mediaeval Western European bacchanals of the Dionysian cult with all of their orgiastic attributes – the attributes considered “extremely ancient” nowadays. What Scaligerian chronology presents as an exception must have been the rule for the Western European Christian church of the Middle Ages. For instance, the numerous references to “Papal and Episcopalian lewdness” simply indicate just how widespread the Christian bacchanal cult was in the Middle Ages. This may have been a result of a distortion of the strict Christian rites of the XII century. Let us recollect that the pagan bacchanals were described by the “ancient” Titus Livy in his famous History of the City. And the dynastical parallels that we have discovered link the “ancient Rome” of Titus Livy to the epoch of the XI-XIII century, and also partially to the Habsburg (New Town, or Nov-Gorod?) epoch of the XIV-XVI century (see figs. 6.19, 6.20, 6.21, 6.22, 6.23, 6.24, 6.52 and 6.52 in Chron1, Chapter 6).

Apparently, the necessity of curbing the Bacchic cult eventually presented itself. N. A. Morozov puts forth a hypothesis that this Christian-Bacchic practice of religious Dionysian orgies in the Western church may possibly have caused a wide propagation of venereal diseases in Western European countries ([544], Volume 5). We shan’t discuss the likelihood of this hypothesis, since it’s well beyond the scope of our work. It is however possible that the Western European church of the XV-XVI century
eventually had to return to the original, ascetic and somewhat austere style of the XII century Christianity in order to mitigate the effect of negative social aftermath of the Bacchic rites. This may have been one of the primary reasons for religious reform, as well as for the rigid celibacy edicts. This reform was later arbitrarily placed in the XI century A.D. and ascribed to “Pope Gregory VII,” or “Pope Hildebrand” (“Ablaze as Gold”), who, according to our reconstruction, is a reflection of the XII century Jesus Christ. One takes it that many events of what we know nowadays as “Hildebrand’s biography” actually pertain to the more recent periods of the XIV-XVI century.

Naturally, doing away with the “ancient” Bacchic or Dionysian cult was far from an easy task due to its great appeal, accumulated social consequences (venereal diseases, etc.) notwithstanding. Nowadays “Pope Hildebrand” is the very person who is said to have given great attention to this problem during the religious reform of the alleged XI century, which is the time period associated with the rigid edicts about the expulsion of those holy fathers who continued their married lives. This decision caused an uproar, since almost all of the Roman clergy was married. As N. A. Morozov pointed out:

“The natural facet of human existence had suffered defeat in this tragic matrimony conflict, and rigid monastic asceticism triumphed due to the influence of the Gospel according to Matthew – the actual celibacy edict must have been caused by a wide propagation of venereal diseases among the clergy as well as the laics, since it is hard to explain and justify such an innovation.” ([544], Volume 5)

The opposition was crushed, although it had taken years of struggle.

The necessity of crushing the orgiastic Christian cult entailed the establishment of the Inquisition for the initiation of hard-line reforms in both clerical and secular life of Western Europe. We should point out that the Eastern Orthodox Church and Russia in particular have never seen such open and wide dispersion of Bacchic practices. This is why there was no Inquisition in the Orthodox Church. The transition to the stricter modern form of the cult in the Western church may have been caused by the negative social after-effects of the Bacchic liturgies.

However, N. A. Morozov was persistent in regarding the Orthodox church as the heir of the Western Latin church, by and large. We consider this to be another grave mistake of his. The reason for this error is clear to us now: N. A. Morozov erroneously considered the Western church much older than the Orthodox church in general, and the Russian church in particular, since, according to the Scaligerian outlook, the formation of the Orthodox Church in Russia occurred as late as the X-XI century, whereas in Morozov’s opinion the Western church was formed in the IV-V century A.D.

However, nowadays we are beginning to understand that both the Western and the
Orthodox Church – the Russian church in particular, appeared *simultaneously* – in the XII-XIII century, qv in the new statistical chronology as related in *Chron1*, Chapter 6. Apparently, the Orthodox and the Latin church were of the same origin, and have subsequently been developing in cardinally different ways. The very name of the Orthodox (as in conservative, or ancient) Church indicates the possibility of the Orthodox practice being closer to the proto-cult of the XII century than the Latin-Catholic liturgy.

The mediaeval descriptions of the infamous “diabolic sabbats” in Western Europe must have been based on the same archetypal “agape” Bacchanals as mentioned above, but these have already been declared “a creation of the devil” (see fig. 7.15).

Let us remind the reader that dissolute orgiastic excesses had been a notable feature of

Fig. 7.15. The title picture from a book on witchcraft by Pretorius dating from 1668. A propagandist representation of a “sabbat of the witches”. Taken from [492], Volume 1, page 95.
the agapes or sabbats (according to Scaligerian history). Quite naturally, the new “reformed” Western European church conveniently delegated the responsibility for the agapes (or sabbats, or Bacchanals) to “the devil” in order to smother all recollections of the recent Bacchic Christian past in the congregation. The people’s own history was thus ruthlessly severed and attributed to a “different religion”, or even to “the devil”. After that, it was further removed into an antediluvian age labelled “antiquity.” In fig. 7.16 one can see one of the numerous and rather eloquent pictures of a mediaeval “ancient” Bacchanal – the famous oeuvre by Dosso Dossi bearing that very title. Further, in fig. 7.17, one sees a relief from an “ancient” Attic sarcophagus made in the Middle Ages with an effigy of a Bacchanal feast in the honour of Dionysius. The famed “Bacchanal” by Rubens, painted around 1615, can be seen in fig. 7.18.

![Fig. 7.16. “Bacchanal” by Dosso Dossi. Kept in the Castel Sant’Angelo National Museum in Rome. Taken from [138], page 80.](image1)

![Fig. 7.17. A Dionysian feast. A relief from an “ancient” Attic sarcophagus. Taken from [304], Volume 1, page 103.](image2)
The history of the Bacchic Christian cult in Western Europe must have been a long one. We shall give a few quotes from the rather rare œuvre of Champfleury titled *Historie de la Caricature au Moyen Age (The History of Caricature in the Middle Ages)* ([1064]). Caricature usually serves to reflect reality by hyperbolizing some of its facets in order to draw attention to them.

Champfleury writes: “The mediaeval cathedrals and monasteries have housed strange kinds of entertainment [as seen from the stance of the consensual conception of the Middle Ages that was inflicted upon us – A. F.] during big church feasts in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance epoch. It isn’t just the common clergy that takes part in the dancing and the singing, especially during Christmas and Easter, but even the top ranking ecclesial dignitaries. The monks from the friaries danced with the nuns from nearby convents, and the bishops joined the merrymaking.” ([1064], page 53. Quoted in [544], Volume 5)

Champfleury proceeds to cite the most modest example, presenting it as a caricature [!], which is a picture of a supper enjoyed by monks together with “their ladyloves” from a XIV century Bible (which is a fact we feel worthy of emphasizing), see fig. 7.19 taken from [1064], The National Library, Paris, No. 166. But how could this “caricature,” if this is indeed the case, wind up in the Bible, a holy book? The Holy Writ is hardly the place for jests and witticisms, especially considering the fact that the other miniatures from this edition of the Bible do not give the illustrator away as a
farceur. The miniature depicts a typically Bacchic scenario: a monk and a nun are entwined in a passionate embrace in the foreground, and the same actions are performed by a larger group in the background. Other similar mediaeval artwork can be seen in fig. 7.19, the phallic symbolic of the Indian god Shiva-Rudra in fig. 7.20, and other examples in figs. 7.21 and 7.22.

Fig. 7.19. The illustrations on top represent fragments from the capital of the Strasbourg cathedral. A bear is carrying an aspersorium, a wolf follows him with a cross, followed in turn by a hare bearing a torch etc. Further we see: a) a miniature from a moralistic mediaeval Bible (No 166 from the Imperial Library); b) mediaeval “Christian-Bacchic” subjects still adorning some Western European cathedrals. Taken from [1064].
Fig. 7.20. A stone effigy of Shiva Lingamurti. A phallic image of the Indian god Shiva-Rudra. Taken from [533], Vol. 1, page 222.
Fig. 7.21. Mediaeval “Christian-Bacchic” subjects that can still be observed in some Western European temples. For instance, the obscene (in modern understanding) pictures from the dome of the portal of the Notre Dame in Paris, France, and the ones from the capital of the Magdeburg Cathedral. A naked woman is riding a goat, and a monkey is playing the guitar. Otte, Manuel de l’Archéologie de l’art religieux au moyen age, 1884. Taken from [1064].
Fig. 7.22. Mediaeval “Christian-Bacchic” subjects that can still be observed in some Western European temples. Another example – a picture of a young woman tweaking her husband’s nose, a sculpture on the portal of the Ploërmel church. Taken from [1064].

A Dutch “caricature” of the mediaeval Christian cult can be seen in the History of the Papacy by S. G. Lozinsky, for instance (fig. 7.23). A crowd of parishioners bursts into a church following a priest, while a crowd is being rampantly joyous on the square in front of the church.
The number of such “caricatures” in mediaeval manuscripts that have reached our age is great enough. Incidentally, Pope Pius II, for one, was the author of “numerous erotic poems and an extremely obscene [by current standards – A. F.] comedy titled Chrysis” ([492], Volume 1, page 156). It would also be apposite to remind the reader of the “Song of Songs,” part of the Biblical canon with explicit erotic references and descriptions galore. Of course, the theologians of our age cagily interpret those as an “allegory” of sorts.

Champfleury in his attempt to make the monastic life of Western Europe in the XIII-XVI century fit modern morals and inculcated concepts of religious life and “monastic ideals” of the epoch, tries to convince us that all such phenomena in mediaeval art aren’t to be regarded as illustrations of contemporary reality, but rather as an admonishment against such actions ([1064]). However, it is most odd, since the “admonishment” is pictured in a most enticing manner indeed. Is it possible to conceive of someone who would try to restrain the public from debauchery with the aid of pornographic editions? This would most probably have the opposite effect. Furthermore, if these were “admonishments,” one would expect to see depictions of
unpleasant after-effects of such actions. However, none such are present!

Such illustrations in religious literature only make sense if they are a rendition of quotidian phenomena from the life of the mediaeval clergy – events considered normal by everyone, in other words. Had the painter wanted to express his reprehension of the subject matter, he would have shown this carousal in some unappealing light, with demons dragging sinners into inferno, the revolting aftermath of diseases, etc. Instead of this, several mediaeval Bibles contain illustrations of Bacchanal dances, and ones looking perfectly “ancient,” at that. The capital headings are enwreathed in grapevines, with little angels climbing them – spitting images of allegedly “extremely ancient” cupids. And so on, and so forth. We are referring to our personal acquaintance with certain ancient Bibles that are kept in the Moscow Planetarium Library, for instance, or those from the Rare Book Museum of the National State Library in Moscow.

According to Champfleury, it was as early as the VII century A.D., 700 years after the naissance of Christianity, that the Counsel of Chalon-sur-Saône forbade women to sing obscene songs in churches ([1064]). The date is given as VII century in the Scaligerian chronology; according to our results, all of this occurs in the XV-XVI century, which coincides with the time of the formation of the Inquisition in the West. Gregory of Tours protests against the monastic masquerades in Poitiers that occurred during the historically ecclesial “feasts of the mad,” “feasts of the innocent” and “feasts of the ass.”

Champfleury writes that: “it was as late as [the alleged date of – A. F.] 1212, that the Paris Council prohibited the nuns to partake in the “frantic celebrations” in the following form: ‘The frantic celebrations where the phallus is worshipped are to be condemned everywhere, and we forbid partaking to monks and nuns specifically”’ ([1064], page 57, quoted in [544], Volume 5, page 658). The ban didn’t seem to help much, since much later, in the alleged year 1245, the reformist bishop Odon reported, after having visited the monasteries of Rouen, that the nuns there take part in forbidden pleasures en masse ([1064], page 57. Quoted in [544], Volume 5, page 658).

The “feasts of the innocent” greatly resembled the Church “feasts of the mad,” or feste follorum (possibly renamed from feste phallorum). Apparently, the label “innocent” referred to people unaware of the difference between the allowed and the forbidden. Both feasts may have been the same old Christian agapes and bacchanals named differently. According to Champfleury, they existed in Besançon as late as the years 1284-1559 (in Scaligerian chronology), until the reformed church outlawed them in that area as well. King Charles VII forbids these religious “feasts of the mad” again in 1430,
in the Troyes Cathedral ([1064], page 58, quoted in [544], Volume 5). One sees how much labour it took the Western European church to weed out the deeply rooted Bacchic-Christian cult of the XIII-XV century.

Champfleury writes the following:

“Many a time, studying the ancient cathedrals, and trying to unravel the secret reason for their ribald ornamentation, all of my own explanation seemed to me as comments to a book written in a language that is alien to me… What could one possibly make of the bizarre sculpture that one sees in the shade of a column in an underground hall of the mediaeval cathedral in Bourges?” ([1064], quoted in [544], Volume 5, page 661, see fig. 7.19)

The sculpture in question is an effigy of human buttocks protruding from the column in a very erotic manner, done meticulously and with great expression. How could the monks and the parishioners of the times before the era when this sculpture became a tourist attraction from the days of yore, have abided it in the temple that they attended every day?

Another example is the stone sculpture allegedly dating from 1100 that is now a showpiece in the museum of the Santiago de Compostela Cathedral in Spain (see figs 7.24 and 7.25). We see a naked woman in a very explicit position. The museum plaque tells us that the sculpture had been kept inside this very cathedral prior to being made an exhibit. Then, during its reconstruction, it was taken off its original mounting and placed in the museum.

Fig. 7.24. A stone sculpture from the museum of the Spanish cathedral in Santiago de Compostela allegedly dating from 1100. We see an erotic depiction of a naked woman. Photograph taken in June 2000.
Attempts to explain away all these mediaeval sculptures and images (of which there are quite a few left) as “caricatures” of the clergy carved in stone on the walls of holy temples, very simply don’t hold water. Champfleury proceeds to ask us:

“Can one think of an imagination paradoxical enough to determine the correlation of such an improbable jape with the holy place that houses the carving? What authority did it take to let the sculptor carve such details with impunity?… On the walls of several ancient Christian temples we find, with great surprise, images of human genitalia compliantly displayed amidst the objects used for holy liturgy. The lapicids demonstrate great innocence in carving such pornographic sculptures, that resemble an echo of the Classical symbolism… These… phallic relics of the past that one finds in darkened halls [where the Bacchanals took place – A. F.] are especially numerous in Gironde. Léo Drouyn, an archaeologist from Bordeaux, showed me some highly peculiar specimens of brazen sculptures put on display in the ancient churches of his province that he conceals in the depths of his files and folders.” ([1064], quoted in [544], Volume 5, page 661)

N. A. Morozov was quite correct in pointing out that excess shame deprives us of valuable scientific information. Scaligerite historians, in remaining taciturn about the Christian genital symbolism present in a number of mediaeval temples, have slowed the potential for comparison of artefacts of the “Classical Age” with their mediaeval counterparts. Serious, thoroughly illustrated books on the phallic cult would pour some bright light on the matter and expose the Weltanschauung of the Christian-Bacchic cult devotees of the Middle Ages.

Most probably, all of these drawings and sculptures are the furthest thing from anti-ecclesial mockery, and serve the same invitatoty purpose as foamy beer steins painted on the doors of German pubs. Naturally, all of this only made sense in the epochs preceding the large-scale repressions of the new evangelical church and the Inquisition.
of the XV-XVI century against the old Western European Bacchic Christian cult.

“Classical” pornographic effigies (those from the excavations of the “ancient” Pompeii, for instance) are directly related to their Christian counterparts. Once again, the misconceived “shamefulness” keeps the scientific public from learning of those extremely interesting source materials. V. Klassovsky tells us that:

“The pictures that depict explicitly erotic and ithyphallic scenes that the ancients liked so much are kept under lock and key… In the house of the dissolute women… someone has scraped off the obscene frescoes with a knife at night… As of late, all of the Pompeian paintings and sculptures that contradict the modern concept of decency are kept in the secret department of the Bourbon museum where no visitors are allowed except for those possessing the special permission of the high officials that they have to demonstrate at the door. Obtaining such a permission by legal means is far from easy.” ([389], pages 75-76)

However, in 1836 a catalogue was published that contained engravings of some of the exhibits from this secret department ([1278]); this catalogue is an antiquarian rarity nowadays. Let us also mention that, according to Humphrey Davy, “the Pompeian painters and the Italian painters of the Renaissance epoch used identical paints” (quoted in [389], page 70).

Houses have been found in Pompeii – one of which is considered a hotel nowadays – that have stone phalluses in front of the entrance. The connexion between the phallus and the Christian cult is not only present in the Western European temples of the Middle Ages. “In Hieropolis there were gigantic phalluses carved out of granite, of 180 feet and higher; they used to be placed at the temple gates” ([389], page 122). V. Klassovsky was of the naïve opinion that these gigantic stone phalluses served “for the edification of the parish” [?] ([389], page 122). Most probably, the carving was a sign, or a facia of sorts. We can draw parallels with a similar stone effigy of the Indian Shiva Lingamurti; what one sees here is the phallic symbol of Shiva-Rudra.

If the obscene mediaeval artwork is nothing but signs whose primary purpose is to inveigle the public to partake in the Christian entertainment as was practised in Western European temples up until the XVI century – and occasionally later yet – what could the images of witches, demons, etc. that they incorporate possibly signify? The more recent ones, with demons dragging sinners to hell, are, of course, meant to intimidate. But what would be the meaning of those where the devil is playing the guitar, and naked women riding goats and asses are carried away by the momentum of sensuality? What could be the import of the stone apes dancing lewd roundels? Such are the stone sculptures on the chapiters of the Magdeburg Cathedral. Or, for instance, the bas-relief from the portal dome of Notre Dame de Paris allegedly dating from the XII century, that contains obscene imagery of naked women copulating with asses, goats, and each other – a tangle
of human bodies and demons entertaining male and female members of the parish alike with their sexual callisthenics.

We should also remind the reader of the extremely well-developed erotic cult in India. Some of the Indian temples are covered with intricate erotic sculptures from top to bottom. Also, what could the sculpture from the portal of the Ploërmel church possibly mean, the one plainly visible to the public and depicting a young wife tweaking the nose of her husband who is wearing a nightcap? See figs. 7.19, 7.21 and 7.22. A Dutch “caricature” of the mediaeval Roman church can also be seen in fig. 7.23.

Champfleury, who cites all of these pictures and sculptures, and a great deal of others to boot, does not provide a clear answer to all these questions. However, the meaning of the last sculpture, for instance, is crystal clear. “Such a picture is far from being an inappropriate caricature; one would rather think it a sign quite appropriate for the entrance to a legal disorderly house for married women [located in a temple – A. F.]” ([544], Volume 5, page 666).

In [544], Volume 5, one encounters argumentation in favour of the theory that the Western European Christian temples of the XII-XVI century combined certain distinctives consistent with the liturgy presented to us in late Christian literature, with those of brothels from which it would have been hard to distinguish them in the Middle Ages. Thus, the initially austere Christianity of the XII century has given birth to the orgiastic and Bacchic Christian cult. After the separation of the churches from the brothels (which didn’t happen in some areas of India until the XIX century), the latter became semi-legal institutions resembling their modern counterparts. All of the above mentioned imagery on the walls and over the entrances to the XII-XV century temples could only have seemed appropriate for as long as the temples served as places of erotically-flavoured entertainment honouring the vivacious “ancient” gods, and where the Eucharist chalice had also served an orgiastic purpose. Far from the abodes of pious meditation that we deem them to be nowadays.

One finds it appropriate to make the following remark in this respect: according to the Scaligerian chronology, nearly all the mediaeval Roman Christian churches have allegedly been built “on the sites of ancient Pagan temples.” These “ancient predecessors” have for some reason shared the same purpose, and even the same name as the “more recent” Christian temples ([196]). The mediaeval church of St. Dionysius, for instance, was allegedly built on the site of the “ancient pagan temple of Dionysius,” etc. From our point of view, the picture is perfectly clear. What we see here is the same old effect of Scaligerian chronology. Having declared its own recent Bacchic past
“fallacious” for one or another objective reason, the Western Christian Church in its new reformed phase of the XV-XVI century has simply re-baptised all of its recent Christian-Bacchic gods into new Evangelical saints, occasionally even keeping their names intact, since the parishioners had been accustomed to them.

One might ask the obvious question about whether we might be right, and the Bacchanals are merely a form of the mediaeval Christian cult of the XII-XVI century, the strict edicts outlawing this cult introduced by the Inquisition in the XV-XVI century finding their reflection in the “ancient” bans of the Bacchanals. Is it really so? Are there any “ancient” documents that forbid the “ancient” bacchanals? There are indeed, and they occasionally match their mediaeval counterparts of the XV-XVI century word for word.

This is what historians tell us about the “Classical Age”: “The Graeco-Roman decadence that started to infiltrate the lives of all the Roman estates… in 186 [the alleged year 186 A.D. – A. F.) manifested in one alarming symptom – secret Bacchus cults… these cults have spread across all of Rome and Italy” ([304], Volume 1, page 362). Considering the Roman chronological shift of roughly 1053 years, we get the Scaligerian date of 186 A.D. actually standing for a date approximating 1239 A.D., since 186 + 1053 = 1239. It turns out that the wide propagation of the Bacchic cult really falls on the XIII century A.D., which concurs well with the information concerning the pervasion of the mediaeval orgiastic cult of the XII-XVI century. Should this indeed turn out a manifestation of the two chronological shifts of 1383 years (a sum of 1053 and 330), the “ancient” events as mentioned above roughly fall over the middle of the XVI century, which fits our reconstruction even better.

What could have really happened later in “antiquity”? “The authorities have commenced an energetic investigation, and it turned out that the members of this cult exceeded 7,000 people in their numbers. Many have been seized and done away with quick and severe executions. . . A large number of the women that took part in the criminal cult have been handed over to their relations for the execution, and if none of their kin could bring themselves to execute the death sentence, they would be claimed by the henchman.

A most valuable relic of the time is given to us by an important governmental edict of the Senate in its original edition. The Roman Senate forbade all manner of manifestation of the Bacchic cult on the territory of the United Roman State under pain of death… The Senate’s edict forbidding Bacchanals explicitly had been carved on a copper plaque and sent to all of the districts in such a fashion in order to be put up in
public places for everybody’s information. One of such plates was unearthed in a rather secluded place, the ancient Bruttian country.” ([304], Vol. 1, pp. 362-363)

We reproduce this “ancient” document in fig. 7.26. According to our reconstruction, this “ancient” decree is one of the imperial Inquisitional prohibitions of mediaeval Bacchanals issued in the XV-XVI century, which was found in 1640, right about the time Scaligerian chronology was establishing itself. It was immediately declared “ancient” and attributed to the distant past.

Fig. 7.26. A bronze plaque outlawing bacchanals. Copied from the “ancient” original kept in the Royal Imperial Museum of Antiquities in Vienna. Taken from [304], Volume 1, page 363.
4. Petrarch (= Plutarch?) and the “Renaissance of Antiquity”

4.1. How Petrarch created the legend of the glorious Italian Rome out of nothing

According to our reconstruction, the “Classical Age” is merely another name applied in Scaligerian chronology to the mediaeval epoch of the XI-XV century A.D. As we have already mentioned, the Italian Rome was apparently founded as a capital as late as the XIV century of the new era, and not in the VIII century B.C. as Scaligerian chronology tells us. It would thus be most interesting to regard the history of the mediaeval Rome from the point of view of this reconstruction. Nowadays we are told that the Italian Rome entered “the age of decline” ([196]) in the epoch of the XIII-XIV century. Our take is that there is really a very simple explanation. Before the XIV century A.D., Rome, if it had existed at all, had been a rather small town; this is why the mediaeval documents that have reached our age fail to see anything worthy of mentioning. The historians of a later age, raised on Scaligerian chronology, began to interpret this mutism as evidence of “the utter decline of the Roman capital and all of its former splendour.”

According to our reconstruction, in the early XIV century the small Italian town of Rome was officially decreed (on paper!) to be the capital of “the Great Ancient Rome.” To this end, the events which had really occurred in a completely different Rome – the Rome on Bosporus, the City of the Czars, Constantinople, a truly great city of the Middle Ages – were transferred to the Italian Rome (again, only formally, on paper). A large part of Constantinople’s history was severed and attributed to the Italian Rome. Interestingly enough, we are in a position to give a more or less precise assessment of when this “surgical transplantation of history” really took place. Let us turn to the XIV century history.

In 1974 the world celebrated 600 years since the death of Francesco Petrarch (1304-1374), the first prominent writer of the Middle Ages who, according to Leonardo Bruni, “had been the first who… could understand and bring into light the ancient elegance of the style that had been forlorn and forgotten before” ([927]). The actual personality of Petrarch is nowadays perceived as mysterious, vague and largely unclear, and reality often becomes rather obfuscated. But we are talking about the events of the XIV century here! The true dating of the texts ascribed to Petrarch often remains thoroughly unclear.
Already an eminent poet, Petrarch entered the second period of his life – the period of wandering. In the alleged year of 1333 he travelled around France, Flanders and Germany. “During his European travels, Petrarch became directly acquainted with scientists, searching the libraries of various monasteries trying to find forgotten ancient manuscripts and studying the monuments to the past glory of Rome” ([644], page 59). Nowadays it is assumed that Petrarch became one of the first and most vehement advocates of the “ancient” authors who, as we are beginning to understand, were either his contemporaries, or preceded him by 100-200 years at the most.

In 1337 he visited the Italian Rome for the first time ([644], page 59). What did he see there? Petrarch writes (if these are indeed his real letters, and not the result of subsequent editing), “Rome seemed even greater to me than I could have imagined – especially the greatness of her ruins” ([644]). Rome in particular and XIV century Italy in general had met Petrarch with an utter chaos of legends, from which the poet had selected the ones he considered congruent to his a priori opinion of “the greatness of Italian Rome.” Apparently, Petrarch was among those who initiated the legend of “the great ancient Italian Rome” without any solid basis. A significant amount of real mediaeval evidence of the correct history of Italy in the Middle Ages was rejected as “erroneous.” It would be of the utmost interest to study these “mediaeval anachronisms” considered preposterous nowadays, if only briefly.

According to mediaeval legends, “Anthenor’s sepulchre” was located in Padua ([644]). In Milan, the statue of Hercules was worshipped. The inhabitants of Pisa claimed their town to have been founded by Pelopsus. The Venetians claimed Venice to have been built of the stones of the destroyed Troy! Achilles was supposed to have ruled in Abruzza, Diomedes in Apulia, Agamemnon in Sicily, Euandres in Piemont, Hercules in Calabria. Apollo was rumoured to have been an astrologer, the devil, and the god of the Saracens! Plato was considered a doctor, Cicero a knight and a troubadour, Virgil a mage who blocked the crater of the Vesuvius, etc.

All of this is supposed to have taken place in the XIV century or even later! This chaos of information obviously irritated Petrarch, who had come to Rome already having an a priori idea of the “antiquity” of the Italian Rome. It is noteworthy that Petrarch left us no proof of the “antiquity of Rome” that he postulates. On the contrary, his letters – if they are indeed his real letters, and not later edited copies – paint an altogether different picture. Roughly speaking, it is as follows: Petrarch is convinced that there should be many “great buildings of ancient times” in Rome. He really finds none of those. He is confused and writes this about it:
“Where are the thermae of Diocletian and Caracalla? Where is the Timbrium of Marius, the Septizonium and the thermae of Severus? Where is the forum of Augustus and the temple of Mars the Avenger? Where are the holy places of Jupiter the Thunder-Bearer on the Capitol and Apollo on the Palatine? Where is the portico of Apollo and the basilica of Caius and Lucius, where is the portico of Libya and the theatre of Marcellus? Where are the temple of Hercules and the Muses built by Marius Philip, and the temple of Diana built by Lucius Cornifacius? Where is the temple of Free Arts of Avinius Pollio, where is the theatre of Balbus, the Amphitheatre of Statilius Taurus? Where are the numerous constructions erected by Agrippa, of which only the Pantheon remains? Where are the splendidous palaces of the emperors? One finds everything in the books; when one tries to find them in the city, one discovers that they either disappeared [sic!] or that only the vaguest of their traces remain”. ([644])

These countless inquiries of “where” this or the other object might be, especially the final phrase, are amazing. They indicate clearly that Petrarch came to Italian Rome with an a priori certainty that the great Rome as described in the old books is the Italian Rome. As we are now beginning to understand, these books were most probably referring to the Rome on the Bosporus. However, in the early XIV century or even later, it was ordered to assume that the ancient manuscripts referred to Italian Rome. Petrarch had to find “field traces” of the “great Roman past” in Italy; he searched vigorously, found nothing, and was nervous about this fact.

However, the letters attributed to Petrarch contain traces of Roman history that differs considerably from the history we are taught nowadays. For instance, Petrarch insists that the pyramid that is now considered “the Pyramid of Cestius” is really the sepulchre of Remus, see fig. 7.27. Could Petrarch have been correct? Really, Scaligerian history doesn’t know the location of the grave of the “ancient” Remus. Since this pyramid was built in the alleged XII century, q.v. in [138], page 41, it would be logical to assume that the “ancient” Remus couldn’t have lived before the XII century A.D. – which is a far cry from the didactic dating of the VIII century B.C.
The real parochial Italian Rome of the XIV century surprised the poet greatly, since it strangely failed to concur with his a priori impressions based on the interpretation of the ancient texts which he considered correct. This most probably means that he rejected other evidence contradicting this “novel” opinion. The gigantic Coliseum, for instance, proved to be the castle and the fortress of a mediaeval feudal clan, and the same fate befell such “ancient” constructions as the mausoleum of Hadrian, the theatre of Marcellus, the arch of Septimius Severus, etc. Plainly speaking, all of the “ancient” buildings turned out to be mediaeval. This presents no contradiction to us; however, for Petrarch, who had apparently already perceived Rome through the distorting prism of the erroneous chronology, this must have been extremely odd.

Apparently, we have thus managed to pick out the moment in the Middle Ages when the creation of the consensual erroneous version of the history of Italian Rome began. This couldn’t have preceded the first half of the XIV century – although we should add that it is possible that all of these events occurred significantly later, namely, in the XVI-XVII century.

According to Jan Parandowski, “Petrarch’s arrival marks a new era in the assessment of the state of the great city’s decline. Petrarch had been the first person of the new era whose eyes filled with tears at the very sight of the destroyed columns, and at the very memory of the forgotten names” ([644]). Having wiped off the tears, Petrarch became quite industrious in what concerned the creation of the “true history” of the Italian Rome. He searched for statues, collected Roman medals, and tried to recreate the topography of Rome. Most of Petrarch’s energy was however directed at finding and commenting on the oeuvres of the “ancient” authors. The list of books that he allegedly
owned survived until our days, the list that he compiled himself in the alleged year 1336 A.D., on the last page of the Latin codex that is now kept in the National Library of Paris. Whether or not Petrarch had been in the possession of the original works of the authors, remains unknown. The following names are mentioned in the list:

Horace, Ovid, Catullus, Propertius, Tibullus, Percius, Juvenal, Claudian, Ovid, the comedians Plautus and Terentius; the historians Titus Livy, Sallustius, Suetonius, Florus, Eutropius, Justin, Orosius, Valerius Maximus; the orators and philosophers Quintillian, Varro, Pliny, Apuleius, Aulus Gellius, Macrobius, Vitruvius, Marcian Capella, Pomponius Mela, Cassiodorus, Boetius. As well, the names of a large number of holy fathers are listed.

We ask the following questions:

- Can we trust in Petrarch’s ownership of these volumes?
- How was the list dated?
- Did Petrarch actually hold any of the oeuvres written by the abovementioned authors in his hands, or did he just collect the names?

Do we interpret Petrarch’s statements correctly nowadays? After all, they reach us via a filter of the Scaligerite editors of the XVI-XVII century. We perceive them through the glass of a distorted chronology. Petrarch’s letters need to be studied again, if they really are his and weren’t written or edited on his behalf a great while later. One also has to emphasize that Petrarch didn’t specifically occupy himself with the dating of the texts he found. He was looking for the “works of the ancients” – apparently without questioning whether they preceded him by a hundred years, two hundred, or a thousand. Let’s not forget that a hundred years, let alone three hundred, is a long period of time.

With the growth of his income, Petrarch founded a special workshop with scribes and secretaries, which he often mentions in his letters. Everyone knew about his infatuation with collecting old books. He mentions it in every letter he writes to his every friend. “If you really value me, do as I tell you: find educated and trustworthy people, and let them rake through the bookcases of every scientist there is, clerical as well as secular” ([644]). He pays for the findings bounteously. And they keep coming to him from all directions. He makes some important discoveries himself – thus, in the alleged year of 1333 he finds two previously unknown speeches of Cicero’s in Liège, and in 1334, Cicero’s letters to Atticus, Quintus and Brutus in Verona ([927] and [644]). Let us remind the reader that according to the mediaeval legends, Cicero was a knight and a troubadour, qv above.
“Petrarch had reasons for considering himself to be responsible for the revival of interest in the philosophical works and essays of the great Roman orator” ([927], pages 87-88). Petrarch wrote: “as soon as I see a monastery, I head that way in hope of finding some work by Cicero.” The history of how he “discovered” the Cicero’s lost tractate titled De Gloria is very odd indeed. Its existence became known from a letter to Atticus that is attributed to Cicero. Petrarch claimed that he had discovered this priceless manuscript, but gave it to his old friend Convenevola. Who is supposed to have lost it.

Nowadays Petrarch’s endeavours are usually written about with great pathos:

“It had really been the first one of those glorious expeditions rich in discoveries that shall be undertaken by the humanists of the generations to follow, who have journeyed like Columbus… in their search for parchments gobbled by numerous rats” ([644]). Cicero’s letters were allegedly discovered by Petrarch in the Chapter Library of Verona, where no-one had been aware of their existence. For some reason, the original was soon lost by Petrarch, and he demonstrated a copy instead.

R. I. Chlodowsky wrote that:

“Petrarch proved a naturally born philologist. He had been the first to study the oeuvres of the ancient Roman poets, comparing different copies and using data provided by the neighbouring historical sciences… It was Petrarch the philologist who had destroyed the mediaeval legend of Virgil the mage and sorcerer, and accused the author of the Aeneid of a number of anachronisms; he had deprived Seneca of several works that were ascribed to him in the Middle Ages, and proved the apocryphal character of Caesar’s and Nero’s letters, which had a great political meaning in the middle of the XIV century since it gave authority to the Empire’s claims for Austria”. ([927], pages 88-89).

This is where the really important motives become clear to us – the ones that Petrarch may have been truly guided by in his “archaeological endeavours.” These motives were political, as we have just explained. We have ourselves been witness to countless examples from contemporary history when “science” was used as basis for one political claim or another. This makes chronology largely irrelevant. However, today when the characters of that epoch have long left the stage, we must return to the issue of just how “preposterous” the letters of Caesar and Nero were, and what was “wrong” in the mediaeval legends of Virgil.

The poet’s attitude to the ancient documents was far from critical analysis. Petrarch’s declarations of “antiquity” may have been made for meeting the conditions of some political order of the Reformation epoch in Western Europe (the XVI-XVII century). The order was given to create a dichotomy between “barbaric contemporaneity” and “beauteous antiquity”. See Chron6 for details. At any rate, one clearly sees that either Petrarch or someone else acting on his behalf was creating the mythical world of the antiquity without bothering about the exact epoch when Cicero’s speeches were written,
and whether it had preceded that of Petrarch by 200 years, or 1400. It is possible that all of this activity really took place in the XVI-XVII century and not the XIV, during the Reformation in the Western Europe, and was archly shifted into the XIV century and ascribed to Petrarch so that it would gain the “authority of antiquity.” The reality of the XVI-XVII century, which Petrarch cites as the antithesis of “ancient civilization,” was later baptized “feudal barbarism.”

4.2. Petrarch’s private correspondence with people considered “ancient characters” nowadays

We proceed to encounter facts that seem to defy all reason. Apparently, Petrarch writes a letter to Titus Livy ([644] and [1340]). The commentators of today try to assure us that this private letter written by the mediaeval Petrarch to the “ancient” Titus Livy is but a manifestation of the poet’s exalted imagination, since poets are supposed to be fantasy-prone in general. We are told that Petrarch communed with characters from the “distant past” as if they were his contemporaries. His letters to the heroes of the “distant past” are thus not to be taken literally. What is the truth here? Could such a letter simply mean that Petrarch and Titus Livy were contemporaries, and that the XIV century original was later altered by the Scaligerite editors of the XVI-XVII century in order to “sever” Livy from Petrarch and “send” the former into a distant epoch? Petrarch is supposed to have made remarks of great pathos, such as “O, why did destiny deny me life in your age… in my sweetest dreams I see myself living amongst these greatest of men, and not the thieves and rogues [sic! – A. F] that surround me nowadays” ([644]). And further on: “ancient studies have always been… a matter of great interest and importance to me, and I have pursued them with great zeal, for the time I live in had always seemed loathsome to me, and so… I have always wanted to have been born in any other age and forget about this one, and have always tried to let my soul live in different epochs” ([644]).

This letter to Titus Livy is far from being the only such example. Modern Petrarch scholars point out a peculiar facet of his epistolary legacy that they fail to comprehend. Petrarch wrote quite a few letters to his contemporaries, and it turns out that in his Latin correspondence he tried, as we are now being convinced, to deliberately obfuscate mediaeval reality, referring to “antiquity” instead. We proceed to learn that Petrarch used ancient names and nicknames – Socrates, Lelius, Olympius, Simonide, etc. His letters have an air of antiquity about them in the modern interpretation of Scaligerian chronology. That is to say, he wrote as if he had “lived in the Classical Age.” We are
told nowadays that he deliberately Latinised his letters to make them seem explicitly ancient. He allegedly even *obscured* current events from sight, “dressing them in ancient garments”.

We have the following comment to make. Apparently, the pages of Petrarch’s letters, even after being “caringly” edited in the XVI-XVII century, demonstrate to us the true epoch of the XIV century – which, as we see, was the “Classical Age” that Scaligerite chronologers hastened to send into distant past. This makes their heirs of today resort to theories about Petrarch being *deliberate* in his attempts to make mediaeval contemporaneity “resemble antiquity.” That is to say, he isn’t supposed to be taken literally.

We shall summarize, reiterating that there had most probably been no false fronts here. Petrarch wrote letters to his contemporaries whose names were “ancient” because he and his colleagues were living in the “Classical Age,” which may really have fallen on the first half of the XIV century or even later, and all the “ancient characters” bearing such names as Titus Livy, Socrates, Lelius, Olympus, etc. were Petrarch’s *actual contemporaries*. This point of view eliminates many “oddities” from his biography.

Furthermore, Petrarch wrote a series of biographies titled *The Lives of Famous Men*. This appears to be a kind of “repetition” of the work of the “ancient” Plutarch titled *Comparative Biographies*. One wonders whether Plutarch might have merely been a different name of Petrarch’s? It is well known – see more on this in *Chron5* – that the sounds “R” and “L” were often subject to flexion in old texts, which may have made the name of Plutarch sound like Prutarch, which sounds similar to the name Petrarch. Thus, Petrarch may well have gathered a doppelganger on the pages of the mediaeval chronicles, who was exiled into the distant past under the name of Plutarch.

Nearly all of Petrarch’s heroes are to be found among the eminent statesmen of the “ancient” Republican Rome, namely, the “ancient” Junius Brutus, Horace Cocles, Camillus, Manlius Torquatus, Fabricius, Fabius Maximus, Cato the Elder, Scipio Africanus. Nowadays it is assumed that Petrarch’s sources were the works of Titus Livy, Suetonius, Justin, Florus, and Caesar. Is this really so? Could Petrarch – or Plutarch – have merely written a series of biographies of his *contemporaries*? In other words, all of the “ancient” characters listed above must have lived in the epoch of the XII-XVI century. And it was only much later that the Scaligerite editors of the XVI-XVII century raked through these mediaeval biographies, inserting remarks that transferred them into the distant past, which may have created an “ancient” reflection of the mediaeval Petrarch by the name of Plutarch.
Finally, we shall cite two portraits of Petrarch (or Plutarch?) from a mediaeval book allegedly dated at 1388 ([1485], pages 252-253), seen in figs. 7.28 and 7.29. It is therefore possible that more or less accurate graphical representations of the ancient “Plutarch” have reached our age.

Fig. 7.28. A portrait of Petrarch (Plutarch?) from a book titled *De Remediis utriusque Fortunae* allegedly dating from 1388 (Milan, Italy). The commentary given by historians is as follows: “An initial to the first chapter of the first book with a portrait or Petrarch” ([1485], page 252). Taken from [1485], ill. 330.

Fig. 7.29. Another portrait of Petrarch (Plutarch?) from *De Remediis utriusque Fortunae* allegedly dating from 1388 (Milan, Italy). The historians tell us that we see “the beginning of the second book with a miniature depicting Petrarch over a bookrack in his studio” ([1485], page 252. Taken from [1485], ill. 331.
5. “Ancient” Greece and mediaeval Greece of the XIII-XVI century

5.1. The history of the mediaeval Athens is supposed to be obscured by darkness up until the XVI century

In what concerns integrality, the history of mediaeval Greece has even got more problems than that of Italian Rome. Since Greek chronology is largely determined by the history of Athens, we shall give a brief account of Athenian chronology without considering other Greek cities here. Let us consider the fundamental work of F. Gregorovius titled *The History of the City of Athens in the Middle Ages* ([195]), where many mediaeval documents on the history of Greece are collected. A propos, the “ancient” history of Greece lacks a source that would resemble the *History of the City of Titus Livy* in fundamentality and the span of time that it encompasses. This is why the Scaligerian history of Greece has to be reconstructed from a number of chaotic fragments that were put into a sequence via tying them to the Roman chronology ([195] and [196]).

As is the case with the history of the absolute majority of “ancient” cities, the history of Athens is characterized by an “ancient” period of splendour and prosperity, and subsequent slide into the mediaeval darkness that the city begins to come out of as late as the XV-XVI century – even later than the Italian Rome.

We shall begin with the most remarkable utterance of F. Gregorovius:

“In what concerns the actual city of Athens, its fate in this epoch [the Middle Ages – A. F.] is covered by such impenetrable darkness that it even led to the naissance of the horrendous opinion which does sound rather plausible, namely, that the city of Athens had grown over with trees and weeds between the VI and the X century, and ended up burnt to the ground by the barbarians. There is some firm evidence of the existence of Athens in the darkest era, but hardly anything can serve as more surprising proof of the city’s complete disappearance from the historical horizon than the very fact that one has to prove the actual existence of what used to be one of the greatest cities in a country that is historical for the most part”. ([195], page 41.)

This is coming from none other than F. Gregorovius, who tried to collect everything that was left from the mediaeval history of Athens in his work ([195]).

This amazing information about the fate of Athens in the Middle Ages had first been formulated with clarity by Falmerayer in the XIX century. In order to explain such an enigmatic “catastrophe” as the disappearance of the entire “splendorous ancient
Greece,” he suggested that the Avaro-Slavs had “slaughtered the entire populace of the ancient Greece” ([195], page 41). However, there are no documents whatsoever that would prove this “slaughter.” ([195])

F. Gregorovius proceeds to tell us the following:

> “From the VII century and on Greece becomes so unimportant for history that the names of the Italian towns… are mentioned a lot more often by the Byzantine scribes than those of Corinth, Thebe, Sparta, or Athens. All of that notwithstanding, there isn’t a single word from any scribe that would mention the city of Athens conquered or destroyed by invaders”. ([195], page 42).

It is assumed that there is no information whatsoever about Athens in the period of the V-X century A.D. in Scaligerian history. F. Gregorovius tells us that “the city [of Athens – A. F.] became desolate and poor, its naval supremacy and political life were as lacklustre as life in the entire Hellas” ([195], pages 2-3). Also, “the foundation for the glory of the modern [mediaeval – A. F.] town is provided by honey-traders, and not sages… Sinesius doesn’t write a single word about the famous monuments of the city in his letters from Athens” ([195], page 22). Most probably due to the fact that they haven’t been built yet.

Also: “The twilight that engulfed Athens and Hellas grew ever dimmer… political life has become nonexistent, trade and industry hardly galvanized any Greek cities at all, except for the spry marketplace of Thessalonica” ([195], pages 26-27).

The famous “ancient” Parthenon amazingly turns out to be a mediaeval Christian church. See figs. 7.30 and 7.31. The historians try to “explain” this fact in the following way: “Blessed Virgin Mary already began her victorious war for Athens with the ancient Pallas… The Athenians built a splendid church [in the alleged X century – A. F.] having mounted this figure [of the Christian Holy Mother, Virgin Mary – A. F.] upon it and called it Athenaiα” ([195], page 24). In other words, we are being told that Virgin Mary was baptized Athena!
Furthermore, the historians proceed to tell us that “oral tradition calls the figure of the Holy Mother Athenaia [Athena – A. F.]; this name later began to be used for referring to the “Panhagia Atheniotisse” figure that had been revered highly in the mediaeval temple of Parthenon” ([195], page 25, also see fig. 7.32). Apart from finding that the “ancient” Athena was associated with the Christian Holy Mother of God, we find out that the “ancient” Parthenon was built in the Middle Ages as a Christian temple dedicated to the Christian Virgin Mary = Athena. As we are now beginning to understand, Athena was just another name given to Virgin Mary. The classical “ancient” figure of Athena Parthenos, or the Athena of Parthenon, can be seen in fig. 7.33.
Fig. 7.32. A reconstruction of the inner sanctum of the Parthenon with a statue of Athena by the “ancient” Phidias. The reconstruction was done by H. Ralender. Taken from [304], Volume 1, page 153.

Fig. 7.33. The “ancient” Athena from the Parthenon. According to the historians, this marble figurine that was discovered in Athens in 1880 “represents a copy from the colossal effigy of the goddess that used to stand in the
F. Gregorovius carries on: “The noblest of human cities *immersed into its darkest Byzantine age with utter hopelessness*... the New Rome on the Bosporus became to look at the fallen Greece, a former leader, with growing scorn, as well as the *small provincial town of Athens*” ([195], pages 27-28).

Also:

“In what concerns the fate of the Athenian monuments – they have remained in obscurity for the most part... for centuries the Greeks have wallowed in the ruins of their ancient history... some of the most beautiful ancient constructions have tempted the Athenian Christians to *transform them into churches.* We know nothing of where the first transformation of an ancient Athenian temple into a Christian church occurred. *The history of the Athenian churches is extremely unclear*” ([195], pages 29-31).

The following is told about the “ancient” Parthenon: “The Christian religion had made the *holiest place of the ancient goddess* on the Acropolis [the temple of Parthenon – A. F.] *serve its ends* almost without *causing any harm* to it... the entire history of transformation of ancient beliefs and holy places into Christian ones knows *no other example of such easy and complete* transformation as Athena Pallas had to undergo in order to become the Christian Blessed Virgin Mary... the Athenian populace didn’t even have to change the nicknames for its divine virgin protectrix, since *the Blessed Virgin Mary retained the ancient name of Parthenos*” ([195], page 31).

However, the hypnotic suggestion of Scaligerian chronology is strong enough to restrain Gregorovius the historian from drawing any conclusions from the fact that the “ancient” Athena Pallas is identical to the Christian Mother of God, Virgin Mary. Let us draw this conclusion ourselves. We have really just been told that the history of “Classical” Greece and its “ancient” deities is but a reflection of the mediaeval Greek history of the XII-XVI century and its Christian deities.

As was the case in Italian Rome, many “ancient” temples in Athens were “turned into” Christian churches in the Middle Ages. In addition to this, the names of these mediaeval churches are “for some reason” exceptionally close to those of the “pagan shrines” that “occupied the sites of these churches” at some point in time. For example, “the Church of St. Dimitrios... became identified as the temple of *Demeter* [by modern archaeologists – A. F.]” ([195], page 34). This example is a most typical one ([195]).

We eventually find out that “the miraculous Erechteum temple was transformed into a *Christian church* during an age that remains unknown to us” ([195], pages 46-47). Apart from this, “*the entire Acropolis became a holy place of the Blessed Virgin Mary*” ([195], page 36). Documented history only seems to reflect the Parthenon...
starting as the temple of the Virgin Mary. All attempts at tracing its history further back run into considerable complications ([195]).

Mediaeval Athens only appears in the mediaeval arena after many centuries of presumed oblivion as a small Byzantine fortification “reconstructed” by Justinian in the alleged VI century A.D. on territory populated exclusively by the Avaro-Slavs ([195], pages 36-40). There is not a single trace of the “ancient Hellenic Greeks” here. Moreover, according to an old document allegedly dated from the X century A.D., the Avaro-Slavs had “made it [the Peloponnesus – A. F.] so alien to the Byzantine empire, that there is not a single Romaean bold enough to set foot there” ([195], pages 40-41).

We learn the following about the Athens of the alleged VI-VII century: “we have no factual proof of the existence of either schools or public libraries in Athens. The same obscurity covers the mechanisms of civil rule of the city of Athens in this epoch” ([195], page 48).

Why did “Classical thought” evaporate from Greece? Where did the “Classical Greeks” go? Why had the famous “ancient” military naval potential of Athens disappeared? This potential was as a matter of fact “revived” in the XII-XIII century, the crusade epoch, as was the potential of the mediaeval Venice, or the “ancient” Phoenicia.

According to the documents, the Byzantine emperors who ruled in Greece in the Middle Ages were far from persecuting sciences. There are no facts to indicate the existence of the Inquisition in Byzantium ((195)). The “closure” of the famous Academy in Athens occurred “without a sound,” as Gregorovius tells us with some embarrassment in [195], Chapter III. There were no global military coups or genocides in this epoch, either.

It is significant that the very term “Hellenes” appears very late in documented history: “It is only in the XV century that Laonic Chacocondil of Athens gives his fellow countrymen the name of “Hellenes” [after the alleged centuries of oblivion – A. F.]” ([195], page 51).

One feels like asking the reasonable question of whether the Hellenes who originally inhabited Greece were really virtually wiped out by the Slavs, as Scaligerian history tells us? Could it be instead that the Avaro-Slavs who lived there in the late Middle Ages became Hellenised? The theory of Slavs gradually taking over the “Classical Greeks” is based on nothing but guesses made by Scaligerian chronology. On the other hand, Shafarik, the Byzantine historian of the alleged X century, explicitly states that “nowadays almost all of Epirus and Hellas, as well as the Peloponnesus and
Macedonia are populated by the Scythians and the Slavs” ([195], page 54, also comment 5). F. Gregorovius adds that “due to the existence of such evidence from the part of the Byzantines, the population of the ancient Greek lands by the Slavs should be considered a historical fact” ([195], pages 54-55).

Slavic names of cities, rivers, mountains, etc. cover the entire history of mediaeval Greece in abundance – Volgasta, Goricy, Granicy, Krivicy, Glokhovy, Podagory, etc. ([195]). “The names of areas, rivers and mountains show that Elis, Arcadia and Laconia have been populated by the greatest amount of the Slavs” ([195], pages 57-58). It was only in the XVI-XVII century that the Graeco-Hellenic names started to appear, the ones declared extremely ancient in the XVII-XVIII century.

It was only afterwards, starting with the alleged VIII century A.D., that Constantinople began to gradually take this faraway province in hand. “The country had to be conquered anew; Greece was treated as an enemy country” ([195], page 62). Empress Irene sent troops to Greece in the alleged year of 783. “Stauracius returned… with plenty of loot, as if he were coming back from a conquered land… Neither Corinth, nor Thebe, nor Athens are even mentioned” (ibid). In the alleged VIII century Greece served as an exile for political criminals.

It is only in the alleged VIII century A.D. that Greece enters the real political arena as a country of revolts and mixed populace that was Slavic for the most part ([195], pages 62-63). However, “after the fall of the empress Theophano, Athens, as well as the rest of Hellas, leaves the historical scene in such a radical way that one can barely find a mention of the town’s name anywhere… The Slavs, who have rooted themselves in Peloponnesus, provided the Byzantines with the main reason to mingle in Greek affairs” ([195], page 66).

“In the middle of the [alleged – A. F.] X century, Hellas as well as Peloponnesus may have struck emperor Constantine as… countries that fell into barbarism; the Frankish conquerors of the XIII century have found Slavic residents in Morea” ([195], page 71). We keep moving forward in time using the Scaligerian chronology of Greece, and still fail to encounter any substantive information about the country.

F. Gregorovius frankly writes the following about Greece in the alleged VIII-X century:

“Neither history, nor tradition break the silence that the fate of the glorious city is bathed in. This quietude is so impenetrable that the historian that looks for signs of life [sic! – A. F.] of the famous city during the centuries in question rejoices at the sight of the most exiguous pieces of information, such as the mention of St. Luke visiting Athens in the hagiography of the thaumaturge”. ([195], pages 74 and 76).
It is only as late as the XV century that Greece and Athens emerge from the “darkness.” Greece gains special importance in the crusade epoch, beginning with the alleged XII-XIII century. Possessing a good haven in Piraeus, and being in league with Venice, Athens becomes the key city of the region ([195]). A propos, there are quite a few reasons to identify the mediaeval Venice with the “ancient” Phoenicia, qv in [904] and [908]. Athens broke the equilibrium that reigned in Greece by gaining prominence; Peloponnesus opposed such a swing in influence, which led to prolonged wars on the territory of Greece which the crusaders and the Normans took part in [195]. It is significant that this is the period of the Middle Ages that we associate with the astronomical dating of the eclipse triad mentioned in the famous History by Thucydides – the work describing the “ancient” Peloponnesian wars. Nothing is known about the wars that broke out on the territory of Greece in the XII-XIII century according to Scaligerian chronology.

An unimaginable scantiness of information on mediaeval Greece is most probably explained by the fact that many of the principal mediaeval sources of the epoch, such as the works of Thucydides, Xenophon, etc. have been arbitrarily transferred into “antiquity” by the Scaligerian chronology. Mediaeval history of the XI-XV century Greece thus became covered in “blind spots,” gaping abysses and “dark ages.”

It is important that “the chronological dates in Greece are only given in the Christian era starting with 1600 [sic! – A. F.], and in decimal (Arabic) notation at that” ([195], pages 100-101). We have thus been told that the modern chronological system only began to function in Greece as recently as the seventeenth century of the new era.

Rather meagre chronological landmarks provide us with very little data, as it turns out. F. Gregorovius notes that:

“The effect that time and the weather had on these scarce inscriptions made their interpretation considerably harder… they fail to do so much as shed light on the history of the city of Athens in the Christian epoch…”

A historian researching the mediaeval past of the city of Rome is in a much better situation is this respect [we have mentioned the problems of Roman chronology already – A. F.]… The chronicle of the dead carved in stone is altogether absent in Athens”. ([195], page 101).

“Unlike Rome, we encounter no marble effigies of dead bishops and monastery priors, senators, judges and citizens in Athens; a few tombstones, a sarcophagus or two without any statues at all, and a few inscriptions comprise all of the relics of times gone by to remain in Athens” ([195], page 101). As well as a few “ancient ruins” to boot.
There are several contradictory versions concerning Athens in the XII-XIV century in Scaligerian history, each of which assesses the role of the city differently. According to one of them, it was still covered in \textit{impenetrable darkness} as well as the rest of Greece ([195]). Another version has it that this is the period when Athens gradually began to gain prominence as a large cultural centre. The English chronicler Matthew Paris informs us that in 1202 several Greek philosophers who had allegedly reappeared in Athens after many centuries of oblivion, arrived in the English court and engaged in theological dispute ([195], page 111). Later on English scientists, among others, studied in Athens (\textit{ibid}).

\section{5.2. Greece and the Crusades}

Crusades have not just been great religious and military endeavours – they have also had stupendous secular importance. The “Latin crusade,” for instance, was initiated not just by Innocent III, but also by the Europeans who possessed great secular power as well – including the French, the Belgians and the Germans ([195]). Among the initiators were such names as Count Baldwin of Flandres, Geoffrey of Villehardouin, Marshal of Champagne, Count Hugues de Saint Paul, Louis de Blois and many others. All of them have been the top ranking members of European aristocracy ([195], page 129). The crusades were transformed utterly – from a holy endeavour into one of the most secular events of the Middle Ages.

The crusades created a mosaic of feudal states in the territory of Greece. The role of the mediaeval Latin states in Greece is usually assessed as largely negative in the Scaligerian history ([195]). On the one hand, it is considered that the barbaric and ignorant conquerors buried the great “ancient” legacy of Greece. On the other hand, the same F. Gregorovius who had just accused the crusaders of barbarism, makes the sudden statement that “it is to the Latins that it [Greece – A. F.] owes the discovery of contemporary history – which, however, turned out almost just as farraginous as that of antiquity” ([195], page 138).

Since the Republic of St. Mark, for instance, proved unable to take possession of the entirety of the Greek lands, it offered them to its noblemen to divide between themselves as inheritable fiefs ([195], page 150). These events may have reflected in Russian history as the difficulties encountered by the imperial administration during the divide of the vast lands of Novgorod and the trophies brought back by the Russian army in the XV century under Ivan III The Terrible. See more about this in \textit{Chron6}.

“The Venetian noblemen have longed for adventure, and set forth to sail the Greek
seas fancying themselves as the Argonauts of the XIII century” ([195], page 150). These mediaeval journeys may have provided the basis for the subsequent “Classical Greek” Argonaut myth poetized by the “ancient” blind Homer. This is the conclusion that one arrives at after a study of the global map of chronological shifts, qv above.

It is important that the history of the Frankish state in the territory of mediaeval Greece is only known to the Scaligerian history of the XII-XV century with lots of gaps and blind spots due to the “insufficiency of historical documentation” ([195], page 158). The only thing that’s known is that “Feudalism… was powerful, and could create a viable… and durable state” ([195], page 158). According to F. Gregorovius, “that was the time when tales and legends became reality” ([195], page 164). This must have been the mediaeval epoch when “ancient” Greece flourished. Many “ancient Greek events” are thus mediaeval occurrences that took place in the Balkans, in particular, in the territory of Bulgaria.

“The princely court of Geoffrey II of Villehardouin… possessed the reputation of a school for exquisite manners” ([195], pages 167 and 182). Genoese traders settled in Thebe and in Athens, and came to compete fruitfully with their Venetian colleagues ([195], page 184). Literature and arts flourished as well; however, according to Scaligerian history, nothing has reached our age ([195]). Our version is that all of this was thrown back into “antiquity.”

Nowadays it is considered that the title of the Duke of Athens was first introduced during the mediaeval Frankish rule in Greece. On the other hand, according to Scaligerian history, this very title had existed in “antiquity” as well ([195], pages 188, comments 4 and 5).

It is likely that the next heyday of “ancient” Greece and the Balkans falls over the epoch of the XV-XVI century after the fall of the Byzantine Empire in 1453, as a result of its being conquered by the Ottomans = Atamans. However, let us get back to the Frankish epoch.

The historian Ramon Muntaner, a contemporary of Dante’s, relates the following fact, apparently being perfectly unaware that it contradicts Scaligerian history blatantly. However, the latter came into existence after Muntaner’s age, in the XVI-XVII century. “One of the Trojan outposts was located on Cape Atraki in Asia Minor, near Isle Tenedos, a place that the nobility of Romania… made frequent pilgrimages to… for the adoration of the divine effigy. One day Helen, the wife of the Duke of Athens went there guarded by a hundred knights. Paris, the son of the Trojan king, noted her, killed all the knights in the hundred, and abducted the beautiful duchess” ([195], page 188,
Thus, mediaeval chronographers have been of a significantly different opinion on what concerned “ancient” events and their chronology, than Scaliger and his adherents.

If we turn our attention to the chronological map on fig. 6.43 in Chron1, Chapter 6, we shall see that the mediaeval prototype of the Trojan war falls in the middle of the XIII century A.D. Which means that Muntaner was perfectly right in his relating the events of the Trojan war as occurrences of the epoch of knights and dukes.

“The condition of the Frankish states in the early XV century Greece can be described as favourable in general” ([195], page 188, comment 34). One shouldn’t imagine this epoch as a period of constant wars and military campaigns. Peace reigned for most of the time, and trade flourished. “The Latins must have felt... safe in Greece; a splendid knightly life evolved, which can be proved... by the existence of a parliament... in May 1305, in Corinth... on the isthmus where in ancient times the Games of Poseidon took place in the holy pine grove... the knights now engaged in jousts, dedicating their deeds of bravery to beautiful women... the clamorous festivities lasted for twenty days” ([195], page 188, comment 34).

It is significant that the Frankish barons “adorned their constructions with Greek [sic! – A. F.] inscriptions” ([195], pages 204-205). Some of them may have been declared “extremely old” nowadays. Scaligerites themselves point out the numerous parallels between the “ancient” and the “mediaeval” events in Greece. F. Gregorovius, for instance, mentions the famous battle at Cephissus dated to 15 March of the alleged year 1311 A.D. It is described in practically the same words in both the mediaeval sources of the XIV century and the “ancient” biography of Emperor Sulla written by the “ancient” Plutarch (Petarch?). Nowadays both Sulla and Plutarch are dated “days long gone.” However, both the “ancient” and the mediaeval descriptions of the battle are practically identical: the geographical localization of the battle, the opposing sides, and the victor ([195]). F. Gregorovius cannot help noticing the parallel here: “The banks of Cephissus saw the recurrence of the fate of the troops of Mithridates which had once been chased into these very swamps by Sulla” ([195], page 198). Let us point out that this parallelism concurs fully with the global chronological map falling into the sum of the three shifts.

The Frankish states on the territory of XII-XIV century Greece may be (at least) a partial reflection of the Ottoman states of the XV-XVI century that appeared in Greece and the Balkans after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 and the birth of the Ottoman = Ataman Empire. “Greek antiquity” may have similar Ottoman-Balkan roots going back
to the epoch of the XV-XVI century.

It is significant that the history of the Frankish states in the territory of Greece hadn’t been studied until the XIX century. According to W. Miller, “these archives only provide us with a skeleton of the romantic drama that Greece served as theatre for during 250 years [in the alleged XIII-XV century – A. F.], the one where the leading roles were played by a motley crowd of Burgundian nobility as well as German knights, the Catalan filibusters… the Florentine plutocrats… and, finally, the princesses and noblewomen from the oldest families of France” ([1274], quoted in [544], Volume 4, page 750).

We are further told that in the XII century the “ancient” Parthenon functioned as a Latin temple of the Athenian Virgin Mary, “as if it had just been built” ([1274], page 16, quoted in [544], Volume 4, page 805). The famous XIII century statue of the Catholic Virgin Mary stands in the mediaeval Parthenon as if playing the role of the duplicate [!] of the famous “ancient” statue depicting the pagan “Virgin of Athens by Phidias” (see figs 7.32 and 7.33), whose loss is lamented greatly by the Scaligerian history ([544], Volume 4, page 806).

Modern historians are of the opinion that “in 1460 Muslim rulers added a prayer-tower to the Parthenon, turning the ancient temple of Athena Pallas into a mosque” ([198], page 14). However, as we are beginning to understand nowadays, it is possible that the Parthenon had originally been a Christian temple where the elements that were subsequently separated and declared exclusively Muslim, Orthodox, or Catholic, still existed in fusion with each other. Thus, a high belfry may well have been baptized the “minaret of the Parthenon.”

Another “ancient” temple that was active in the XIII century – also seemingly built only recently – was dedicated to the Holy Mother of God, and is called “the ancient Erechtheion Temple” nowadays ([1274], page 17, quoted in [544], Volume 4, page 807).

The same XIII century sees the temple of St. George, which is called “the ancient temple of Theseus,” operational and active. Its “undisputable antiquity” was estimated as recently as the XVII century ([1274], page 17; quoted in [544], Volume 4, page 807).

The entire Athenian Acropolis is perfectly functional in the XIII century as an active fortress protecting Athens. In fig. 7.34 one sees a later theoretical reconstruction of the Acropolis performed by H. Ralander. It was relatively recently that the fortress became declared “extremely ancient.” The ruins of the Acropolis can be seen in fig. 7.35 the way they were in the XIX century. See similar examples in [1274] and [544], Volume 4.
F. Gregorovius tells us that “The famous Byzantine George Gemisto (Pleon) – an ancient Hellene born again… the fantastical admirer of the ancient gods – lived at the court of Theodore II” ([195], pages 308-309).

According to historians, that was the time when the “concept of Hellenism” came to existence, whose main goal was the unification of the mediaeval Greeks against the Ottoman = Ataman conquerors ([195]).

We are also told that “The total absence… of foreign chroniclers in Athens and Hellas in general is most woeful indeed. Since the Byzantine chronographers didn’t consider the Hellenic history worthy of attention, the Hellenes were the only ones that
their descendants could turn to for this kind of information” ([195], page 326).

We also find out that the genesis of “ancient” Greek history can be traced to Florence of the alleged XIV century. “The Strozzi and the Medici… have been philhellenes, they have invested their funds into… Greek literary studies… Cosimo conceived of the plan to revive the academy of Plato in Arno” ([195], page 330). The head of this undertaking was Pleton, the double of the “ancient” Plato in both name and occupation (see Chron1, Chapter 1). It is assumed that the propagation of the “ancient” Greek literature across Europe started in Florence.

5.3. The history of Greek and Athenian archaeology is relatively short

Archaeology first came to Athens in 1447 – the XV century! Furthermore, there is hardly any information left in what concerns those “origins.” In the XV century Ciriaco d’Ancona arrived in the city. He is also known as Ciriaco de Pizzicolli nowadays ([198], page 14). He was the first to “introduce Western science into the world of the Athenian ruins… he thus occupies an honorific place” ([195], page 331). He created the first catalogue of inscriptions and local monument names. However, these documents perished ([195], page 339). Modern historians are only familiar with the data obtained by Ciriaco from paraphrases done by later authors of the XV-XVII century. “The notebooks [of Ciriaco – A. F.] were destroyed in a blaze in 1514, as it is assumed. There is only one fragment that is written by his own hand” ([198], page 14).

F. Gregorovius tells us the following: “After the passage of some time, the initial names of most Athenian monuments have been forgotten… the fantasy of certain archaists… tried to link them to the names of great men of the past” ([195], pages 340-342).

The ruins of the “ancient” Olympion used to be called a basilica in the Middle Ages, since, according to F. Gregorovius, “nobody knew [sic! – A. F.] that these were the ruins of the famous Olympian temple. Ciriaco calls this colossal wreck… the palace of Hadrian, as the Athenians did” ([195], pages 340-342). The latter apparently were wrong; only the historians of the subsequent generations managed to “learn the truth” and “correct” the allegedly ignorant inhabitants of mediaeval Athens.

Gregorovius also tells us that “as early as 1672 Babine had no idea as to the correct location of the Temple of Zeus in Athens… in a few years… Spone would be similarly confused… The Stoa ruins were fancied as the palaces of Themistocles or Pericles; the walls of the Odeon of Herod Atticus – as the palace of Milthiades, the ruins of other
unidentified buildings – as the residences of Solon, Thucydides, and Alcmeones.

As early as 1647... Pointel was shown the ancient ruins of the palace of Pericles; the tower of the winds was called the tomb of Socrates. The memories of Demosthenes were associated with the monument to Lisicrates... this monument of the choir patrons... was called... the Lamp of Demosthenes...

The Academy, the Lyceum, Stoa, and the Epicurean gardens... were gone without a trace. In the times of Ciriaco, some group of basilicae, or large ruins, was called “Academy”; nowadays, this site is impossible to locate...

Plato’s “didascalion” in “the garden” had also been shown; it may have been a tower in the Ampelokipi gardens... there were legends about the schools of a certain Caisarini on this hill... the Lycaeum or the Didascalion of Aristotle would be located in the ruins of the Dionysian theatre...

Stoa and the Epicurean School have been moved as far as the Acropolis, to the large buildings that possibly constitute part of the Propylaeae, and the Nike temple... had seemingly been taken for... the school of Pythagoras.

To the West of the Acropolis the school of the Cynics was shown, as well as the school of the Thespians that wound up in its vicinity in defiance of all comprehension. The ruins by Kalliroe turned out to be the remnants of the scene of Aristophanes.” ([195], pages 340-342)

We shall cease with quoting. This list goes on for several pages. The general picture of archaeological chaos and confusion in the history of Athens is perfectly clear. And all of this happens in the XVI-XVII century a.d.

Byzantium fell in 1453. The last of the Franks defended the Acropolis for some time; however, the Ottoman warlord Omar, infuriated by the resistance of this stronghold, ordered the Acropolis and its environs to be shelled (!), which resulted in the demolition of the Acropolis and its temples [195]. This great destruction, which claimed many beautiful monuments of the XIII-XV century, created many ruins in the territory of Athens that were subsequently declared “ancient” – see figs. 7.30, 7.31, and 7.35.

After the Ottoman conquest of the XV century, Athens become obscured by darkness yet again. “The historian studying Athens and Greece in the period of Turkish rule has as formidable a task before him as it is mirthless. What he sees before himself is a desert” ([195], page 362). It is possible that the XV-XVI century documents describing the events in Greece and the Balkans, which belonged to the Ottoman empire in the XV-XVI century, were destroyed after the defeat of the Ottoman and their withdrawal from
the Balkans. The Ottoman period in the history of Greece thus became immersed in utter obscurity.

“The West… had become reconciled to the decline of Greece, and had almost completely forgotten it… Already in 1493 a German humanist had considered it sufficient to make the following passing remark in his chronicle: “the city of Athens used to be the most glorious one in all of Attica; only a few traces of its existence remain”” ([195], pages 364-365).

Finally, towards the end of the XVI century, “the need of the scientists for possessing veracious and exact information about the fate of the splendidous town could be formulated by just one question, that of whether Athens still existed. The person to ask this question was Martin Kraus, a German philhellene… this is how his name became immortalized. Martin Crusius… rediscovered Athens. In 1573 he had written a letter to Theodosius Zygomalas, the chancellor of the Patriarch of Constantinople, asking him to tell whether the mother of all knowledge could have indeed reached complete decline, as German historians claimed; whether the great city of Athens could really have vanished and whether it were true that nothing remained of it but a few fishermen’s huts standing on its former site.

The answer of the illuminated Byzantine, together with the letter from the Akarnan Simeon Cabasilas that followed… proved the first exact information that reassured the German scientist in what concerned the city’s existence; it was the first dim light shed on its monuments and their condition, as well as the obscure vegetation of its inhabitants”. ([195], pages 364-366).

Obscure vegetation or not, the inhabitants, according to the Scaligerian history, still kept the tradition that the Parthenon had been built by the “ancient” architects Ictinus and Kallicrates in the time of the famous orator and warlord Pericles, the leader of the democratic party that had allegedly originated in Athens as early as the V century B.C., and expired of the plague together with its dux in the alleged year 429 B.C. However, the month when this is supposed to have happened remains unknown.

All knowledge of “ancient Greece” remained rudimentary up until the beginning of the XVII century. In 1607, for instance, the Geographical Atlas of H. Mercator and J. Hondius was published. It contained a map of Greece, with the following written on its reverse, among other things: “Back in the days of yore Athens gave the world well-educated scientists who wrote books on all subjects of all sciences, which were kept in Athenian libraries, public and private. However, nowadays no one in either Greece or any other barbaric country studies or even understands belles letters and science. It
is impossible to find a town that would have an academy... the people of Greece remember nothing of their history nowadays” ([90], page 71).

Scientific Athenian archaeology developed as late as the middle of the XVII century – that is to say, when Scaligerian chronology had already been in existence. Archaeology first reached Athens by the agency of the Dutchman Jaan de Maer ([195], page 366). Nevertheless, “as late as 1835, a German scientist... had voiced the opinion that after Justinian, Athens had remained a wasteland for four centuries. In comparison to the Roman studies, the archaeology of Athens was about two centuries late...

Only immediate acquaintance with the matter could destroy the superstition that Athens didn’t exist anymore, which was rather widespread in Europe: the French Jesuits and Capuchins are to be credited for it, since they were the first to come to Athens in 1645.” ([195], pages 364-66)

In the second half of the XVII century, the French monks drew the first (!) plans of the city. That was the moment when the uninterrupted and more or less scientific studies of Athens really began. This happened in the environment where Scaligerian chronology had already existed for the most part; therefore, the historians of the XVII-XVIII century who began the reconstructions of Greek history based their research on the Roman chronology, ipso facto distorting the history of Greece.

5.4. The tendentious distortion of the image of mediaeval Athens in the “restoration works” of the XIX-XX century

Let us now divert our attention to the moment in the XIX century when the Europeans achieved a hard and final victory over the Ottomans, and come to the territory of Greece in general and Athens in particular. One would wonder what they saw, in the Athenian Acropolis, for instance? They witnessed the most natural things of all. It turned out that Athens (including the Acropolis) ware full of Ottoman buildings, towers and temples. Many of them were damaged in the Ottoman wars of the XVII-XVIII century. For instance, we are nowadays told that “when war broke out between Venice and the Ottoman empire, a shell from a cannon hit the Parthenon, where the Turks kept their ammunition. It detonated, and many of Phidias’ sculptures were shattered” ([198], page 19).

However, it isn’t exclusively the Ottomans who are portrayed as culprits responsible for the majority of destructions that occurred in the territory of Greece. Lord Elgin, for instance (fig. 7.36), and the Italian painter Lusieri, who headed the International Commission for the Restoration of Athens, uttered loud public lamentations about “the
state of the surviving statues being truly deplorable… which is to be blamed on the
Turkish garrison of the Acropolis; some of the Statues were smashed to bits by the
Ottomans for the production of shells [? – A. F.]. The actual ancient Parthenon remained
untouched for the most part even after the explosion of 1687, and was baptised ‘the
ancient idol temple’ by the Turks, who had periodically ransacked it in search of lead”
([198], page 19). That is to say, the benevolent and righteous West Europeans have gone
out of their way in order to keep the “ancient” Greek masterpieces for posterity –
masterpieces which, as we are beginning to understand, were created there by none
other but the Ottomans in the “Mongolian” period of the XIV-XVI century.

Modern accusations of the Ottomans that incriminate them in a total destruction of
Greece are hardly wholly justified. Some of the destructions may have occurred during
the Ottoman = Ataman conquest of the XV-XVI century, of course; however, a lot had
obviously perished in the “liberation wars” against the Ottomans in the XVII-XVIII
century. As we have already learnt, the famous Parthenon, for instance, was destroyed
by the Venetians, and not the Ottomans (see above and in [198], pages 15-16).

Let us now regard the preservation of the ancient legacy of the past in the
interpretation of the civilized XIX century West Europeans. Having thrown a cursory
glance over the Acropolis, for instance, they would claim with absolute certainty that
some of the constructions had doubtlessly been “ancient Greek” –and the others, ugly,
barbaric-Ottoman. Nowadays we possess no knowledge of just how the noble lords and
dainty artists separated “antiquity” from the Middle Ages. Most probably, their judgement was quite simple. Everything that bore visible signs of Christianity or Islam was declared a distortion of the classical city of Athens. The belfries, minarets, Christian crosses, Ottoman crescents, Slavic and Arabic inscriptions, “irregular” sepulchres, etc. were clearly “travesties.” Everything else was confidently declared “ancient.”

After the separation of the “untainted” buildings from the “corrupt” ones, the second stage soon commenced. The buildings that could be authoritatively declared priceless, Greek, and ancient would naturally have to be preserved for posterity, to serve as tourist attractions for everyone in the whole world. As for the ugly and preposterous Ottoman constructions – those were to be blown up immediately so as not to spoil the refined classical shapes of antiquity revived.

In the XIX century, a wave of the noblest destructions archly dubbed “restorations” swept over the entire Acropolis. Incidentally, “Heinrich Schliemann, the discoverer of Troy, had been among the numerous restorers [of Athens – A. F.]… He financed the demolition of the 21 metre tall tower built on the site of the Propylaea in the Middle Ages since he had understood that the tower distorted the harmonious outline of the entire Acropolis” ([198], page 99). We shall give a detailed account of Schliemann’s actual “discovery” of Troy, and tell the reader what exactly it was that he had unearthed, in Chron2.

And so it came to pass that the Ottoman buildings, towers and other constructions were destroyed on a great scale, zealously, and with the feeling of total impunity, primarily in Athens. Some of the rarest photographs reflecting the state of the Acropolis in the XIX century are still in existence, and they can show us the final stages of this “scientific restoration.” In fig. 7.37 we can see a panoramic photograph of the Parthenon’s environs in 1869. The commentary given by historians is as follows: “On the landscape snapshot made by Stillman in 1869 we can see the Parthenon in the Acropolis with only a small part of the Turkish dwellings, which have covered the ancient relic from top to bottom, cleared away. The restoration of the temple and the methodical liquidation of ground layers had not yet begun” ([198], page 34).
As we understand nowadays, a lot had been demolished before that, and therefore couldn’t be photographed. However, we can see a tall Ottoman tower on this old photograph, to the right of the Parthenon. Nowadays it doesn’t exist anymore. The restorers destroyed it after 1869 in order to keep the classical landscape with its harmony of lines, as we are told nowadays. Other vulgar Ottoman fortifications have also been destroyed, qv below.

Another valuable photograph of the 1860s can be seen in fig. 7.39. The historians comment as follows: “the foundation of the small temple of Athena Nike (top right-hand corner on the right photograph) was only unearthed in 1835, when the Turkish bastion had been destroyed. The square mediaeval tower behind the temple would be demolished in 1875, in order to reconstruct the ancient image of this part of town” ([198], page 38).
Fig. 7.39. A rare photograph dating from the 1860’s. This part of the Acropolis owes its condition to the destruction of the Ottoman=Ataman bastions that once stood here ([198], page 38). One sees the fundament of the Athena Nike temple and the mediaeval tower behind it, whose demolition occurred somewhat later. There isn’t so much as a trace of the Ottoman tower nowadays. Taken from [198], pages 38-39.

Fig. 7.40. A close-in of a fragment of an old photograph dating from the 1860’s. It is clearly visible that the mediaeval Ottoman tower and the “ancient” foundation of the Athena Nike temple have identical masonry and are built of the same kind of stone. These constructions obviously belong to the same epoch. Taken from [198], page 39.

However, the close-up of a fragment of the photograph that can be seen in fig. 7.40
makes it plainly visible that the masonry of the mediaeval tower is identical to that of the “ancient” temple foundation. One gets the idea that all of this was erected around the same time by the same masters who had used similar construction materials – around the XV-XVI century. Why would the Ottoman tower have to be demolished then, and the foundation of the nearby temple left intact? One would think it needed to be pulled down as well, since it was just as mediaeval as the tower. Apparently, the sole reason for this was the existence of some columns upon the mediaeval foundation, which were simply declared “ancient” and classical ipse dixit.

Furthermore, the demolition of the Ottoman tower had been an absolute necessity, since its proximity to the “ancient” foundation with identical masonry posed a danger for Scaligerian history. Any unprejudiced observer would have the right to ask the historians about the difference between the mediaeval constructions and the ancient ones, and they would have nothing to say in reply.

After the destruction of all the buildings that had obvious mediaeval, Christian, or Ottoman indicia, the ones remaining could not be compared to anything anymore. All the dangerous questions became impossible when the debris of the Ottoman buildings and fortifications had been pulled away. The old photographs of these parts aren’t really available to that many people. The German, English and French restorers ([198]) were thus certain of their impunity, and didn’t have to worry about anyone asking them the reasons why the “ancient” and the mediaeval buildings were made of the same stone and in a similar manner.

A few years later the Athenian guides have all started to assure the tourists that the city has “always been like this.” It isn’t difficult to understand the guides, since that was how the historians had taught them.

The scale of the “restoration works” in Athens was truly impressive. In figs. 7.41 and 7.42 one can see another rare old photograph taken in 1865. The comment of the historians is as follows: “on this snapshot of the Acropolis made in 1865 one can observe the uneven trenches going from top to bottom that remained after the Turkish buildings had been pulled down and shipped away. The Propylaea and the mediaeval tower that hadn’t been demolished yet can be seen on the left” ([198], page 40). In fig. 7.43 we see a close-up of a photograph fragment showing this mediaeval Ottoman construction that was pulled down shortly afterwards.
Fig. 7.41. A rare photograph of the Acropolis dating from 1865. One sees the aftermath of the demolition of a large number of Ottoman buildings. Great piles of stone and rubble flow over the walls of the fortress in some places. One sees the mediaeval tower, still intact, on the left. Taken from [198], pages 40-41.

Fig. 7.42. A close-in of a photograph dating from 1865. We see the Propylaea, and an Ottoman fortification next to it, as well as piles of rubble from the buildings demolished by the caring restorers. Taken from [198], page 40.
We also came across a photograph of the Athenian Acropolis taken in 1896 during the Olympic Games in Athens (see fig. 7.44). One still sees the tall Ottoman tower on it, rising higher than the Parthenon. This means there were still many remnants of Ottoman buildings in the Acropolis towards the end of the XIX century, and considerable ones at that.

Fig. 7.43. A close-in of a photograph dating from 1865. The mediaeval Ottoman tower clearly belonged to the same group of buildings as the Propylaea. Nevertheless, it hadn’t survived to our day. Taken from [198], page 40.

Fig. 7.44. A picture taken from 1896 depicting the subsequently demolished Ottoman tower on the Acropolis. It was taller than the Parthenon. Taken from [340], page 40.
In fig. 7.45 we can see a modern bird’s-eye view of the Acropolis. It is plainly visible that the entire surface of the rock had once been occupied by buildings of some sort. Only the remnants of their foundations remain. The “restorers” of the XIX century have left nothing but a few buildings intact – the ones they declared “ancient” – namely, the Parthenon, the Propylaea, and some others. The remaining, and clearly predominant, part of the constructions obviously failed to satisfy them – most probably due to their indisputably mediaeval or Ottoman origins. They have been nonchalantly demolished and taken away. The landscape contours became harmonic, according to the frank and somewhat cynical statement made by Schliemann ([198], page 99). The remnants of the foundations were, with some foresight, left intact, since these silent stones barely seen above the ground couldn’t tell anything to anyone anymore, and were declared “very old indeed” on the spot. The awed tourists have been visiting them ever since the end of the XIX century. They would be told that the great Plato used to sit and meditate on “this very stone,” whereas the legendary Demosthenes would deliver his inspired orations standing on another one nearby. The tourists posture happily, and take countless photographs.

The tendentious “restoration” of Athens continued well into the XX century. “The Acropolis only assumed its modern world-famous shape after the Greek engineer Nikolaos Balanos had started his work here in the late XIX and early XX century” ([198], page 99). He had done a great body of work; however, we learn that his
“reconstruction” of the Parthenon, for instance, had very little to do with the original image of the temple. “Thanks to Balanos, Parthenon regained its primary shape by 1933, to the extent feasible by that time, and began to look the way it had presumably 250 years ago, although the opinions of the scientists as to whether such an achievement should be commendable were polarized. As early as 1922, Anastasios Orlandos, the personal assistant of Balanos, protested against the reconstruction of the colonnade… and publicly ceased all relations with his superior. Others have accused Balanos of wanting to build [and not reconstruct – A. F.] an imposing evidence of the glory of the Periclean Athens, not caring too much about the information concerning the true shape of the temple.

What Balanos has really done was to use the first pieces of marble he could find for the reconstruction, without paying much attention to the original locations of the stones. Furthermore, if the shape of the fragments failed to satisfy him, Balanos would cut them the way he needed so that they would fit his master plan” ([198], page 104). As we can see, Balanos basically built the surviving fragments of the Parthenon anew, guided by his subjective concept of “antiquity.”

There is good evidence of the blatantly tendentious “reconstruction” of the Acropolis by Balanos, who had based his work on Scaligerian chronology. Exempli gratia, he thought it a travesty to reconstruct the parts of the Parthenon that the historians had considered a Moslem mosque ([198]). Everything is perfectly clear. Scaligerian chronology considers it a crime to so much as assume that the Parthenon had originally been a Christian temple, and was subsequently transformed into a mosque. All the evidence of the Parthenon having served as a Christian or Islamic temple that we cite above is declared to be a result of its “barbaric reconstruction in the Dark Ages” by modern historians.

However, nowadays we may be seeing the signs of changes for the better. A couple of years ago, the eminent architect Manolis Korres, who took charge of the Parthenon’s restoration, declared his intention to reconstruct the “Parthenon mosque.” It is needless to say that he immediately faced strong opposition on the part of the historians. It is said that “the greatest debates arose in regard to the plans of Korres to keep the relics of some of the changes done to the Parthenon over the many centuries. For instance, he intends to make the Muslim mosque erected inside the temple partially visible” ([198], page 102). As far as we know, the attempts of Korres to make the Parthenon look the way it did in the XIV-XVI century, even partially, haven’t led to anything as to yet.
We shall conclude with a minor, but most edifying example, which clearly demonstrates that many of the modern “restorations” are to be treated with caution. In fig. 7.46 we can see the famous composition depicting Laocoon that was “found near Rome during the Renaissance” ([198], page 12). It is supposed to be a marble copy of the alleged I century A.D. made from an original presumably dated II century B.C. Antediluvian times, in other words. Nevertheless, the style and the quality of the composition greatly resemble the works of Michelangelo, for instance; that is to say, they look very much like the works of art created in the Renaissance epoch.

![Laocoon Statue](image)

Fig. 7.46. A reconstruction of the statue of Laocoon allegedly dating from the XVI century. The right hands of all three statues are raised. This is most probably an original made in the XVI century, and not a reconstruction on any sort. Taken from [198], page 13.

It is also considered that the composition showing Laocoon is a XVI century reconstruction ([198], page 13). However, it was most probably simply made in the XVI century.

Let us pay attention to the fact that the right arms of all three statues are raised. This may have had some meaning – religious, for instance. It is difficult to say anything certain about it nowadays. However, the most interesting fact concerns what we observe in fig 7.47, which shows another photograph of the same composition that had already undergone “restoration” in 1960 ([198], page 12).
What we see is that the modern restorers broke off the right arms of all the statues for some reason. Two of them now have useless stumps instead. As for the central statue, the largest one, it received some curved fragment in lieu of an arm after long scientific considerations. Historians claim it to be the very fragment that they needed so much, one that had remained buried in the ground for many centuries. It is supposed to have been found in the “Vatican storage rooms” ([198], page 11). Modern historians finally managed to recognize it amongst thousands and thousands of similar fragments without the merest shadow of doubt, and have confidently declared it to be the missing right arm of Laocoon – a much more congruous one than the arm that he had possessed for three centuries, ever since the XVI century. The incongruous arm had then been assertively sawed off, as well as half of the snake, see figs. 7.46 and 7.47. The sawed-off bits were probably thrown away as useless rubbish, with the congruous fragment taking their place. Obviously, an article had to be written in order to provide scientific basis for the absolute necessity of such an improvement. However, the historians have involuntarily disclosed that in order to make the found fragment fit they had to damage the actual statue of Laocoon. The cautious commentary runs as follows: “the extended arm was replaced by the newly-found genuine fragment… it took a marble inset to meet the due proportions” ([198], page 13).
In our opinion, it is very hard to perceive all of this activity as scientific research.
6. Strange parallels in the Scaligerian history of religions

6.1. Mediaeval Christianity and its reflection in the Scaligerian “pagan antiquity”

Let us give a brief account of the situation in what concerns the history of ancient religions. We are being convinced nowadays that every chronological epoch possessed individual religious cults of its own, with hundreds and even thousands of years between them. The XIX century historians and ethnographers have performed a great deal of comparative studies of global religions and cults. It was discovered that certain religions separated by centuries and even millennia in Scaligerian chronology have a great number of “parallels” between them, or even coincidences, as amazing as they are complete. This indisputable fact spawned a great number of theories postulating influences, naturalization, infiltration, etc. However, all of these latter-day speculations are based on Scaligerian chronology exclusively. A chronological change shall lead to the revision of the prevailing point of view on the genesis and formation of religions. We shall just cite a few typical examples of parallels in order to explain the peculiar effect of “duplicate religions” that we observe. This effect is most probably a child of Scaligerian chronological shifts.

The so-called “Celtic monument” that was discovered in 1771 is nowadays considered to be an effigy of some pagan pre-Christian Gaulish god of the woods ([966], Vol. 2, p. 465; see fig. 7.48). However, what we see above the head of this deity is a carving that clearly says ESUS. That should very plainly stand for “Jesus.” However, the pressure of Scaligerian chronology made the historians claim this to be “a totally different Jesus.” Just some pre-Christian god bearing the same name, nothing more. See also [544], Volume 5, page 683.
Fig. 7.48. A “Celtic” monument found under the choir loft of Notre Dame de Paris in 1771 which is now an exhibit of the Cluny Museum. One clearly sees the semi-obliterated but still quite visible inscription saying ESUS, or Jesus. However, the archaeologists consider this deity to be some pagan Gaulish god of the woods, pre-Christian and “very ancient”. Taken from [966], page 465.

Arthur Drews, an eminent specialist in comparative history of religions, used to claim that nearly all of the principal allegedly pre-Christian “ancient” religious cults are really nearly identical parallels (and, by our reconstruction, merely later reflections, repercussions and modifications) of the Christian cult of Jesus Christ ([259] and [260]). He wrote that he had “ascribed… great meaning to the mythological parallels between Christianity and paganism. Anyone who cannot see the commonly known relation between the resurrection story told by the gospels and the rites of the religion of Attis-Adonis-Osiris etc., anyone who claims that “there is nothing remotely resembling” entombment and resurrection in the myths of Attis and Adonis, anyone who tries to prove the death of Jesus to have been different from the way his cousins from Asia Minor had died… anyone who fails to recognize Mary Magdalene and other Maries that stood vigil near the cross and at the casket of the Saviour in the Indian, Asianic, and Egyptian mother goddesses named Maia, Mariamme, Marithale… Marianne… Mandane, the mother of Cyrus the “Messiah,” the “Great Mother” of Pessinunt, the grieving Semiramis, Mariam, Merris, Myrrah, Myra (Mera) and Maya… should ‘jolly well keep away from the issues of religious history’ [as Weis puts it].” ([259], page 150)

A. Drews cites many spectacular parallels identifying the holy family of Jesus Christ with other “holy families” of Asiatic gods allegedly preceding the new era by many centuries. If we step aside from Scaligerian chronology, we shall see that all of these parallels indicate the simultaneity of these cults, whose differences are merely a consequence of the ethnic distinctives of their localization. All of them probably hail back to the same common source – that is, they are a reflection of the life and the deeds
of Jesus Christ in the XII century A.D. The XIX-XX century historians who have
discovered these parallels, but remained bound by the erroneous Scaligerian
chronology, had to turn everything upside down. As a result, they have interpreted the
parallels as “late Christianity” drawing heavily upon the numerous “ancient cults” and
failing to produce anything original worthy of mentioning.

In fig. 7.49 we can see a picture of the allegedly Mesopotamian Assyro-Babylonian
king Ashur-Nazareh-Khabal, who had allegedly lived 930 years before the birth of
Christ ([508], also see [544], Volume 4, page 673). However, what he has on his chest
is simply a Christian cross, very much like the one worn by the present-day Orthodox
eparchs. This is most probably a mediaeval king.

In fig. 7.50 we see an old image of the “extremely ancient” Phoenician goddess Astarte
([508] and [544], Volume 4, page 673). However, she has a sceptre with a Christian
cross in her hands. It is only Scaligerian chronology that keeps the experts in the history
of religions from identifying this as a mediaeval Christian effigy.
In fig. 7.51 we see the allegedly “ancient” Gaulish figurine of the “ancient” Frankish god Jupiter. However, his clothing is all covered by regular Christian crosses ([508], [544], Volume 4, page 674).

In fig. 7.52 we see an “ancient” Egyptian effigy of the goddess Isis breast-feeding her son who has a Christian ankh in his hand ([544], Volume 4, page 675). It is hard to get rid of the impression that this really is a mediaeval representation of Virgin Mary with her son Jesus Christ – however, misdated by Scaligerian history and transferred into the “distant past.”
In fig. 7.53 we cite the most popular mediaeval anagrams of the name Jesus Christ from the Roman catacombs ([544], Volume 4, page 675, ill. 144). Anagram 8 is clearly an ankh. We see those in great abundance on the “ancient” Egyptian drawings and sculptures, dated as preceding the new era by centuries and even millennia nowadays. Ankhs were worn as pendants, the way they are today, or held in a hand. The mediaeval Christian ankh was also occasionally interpreted as symbolizing a key.

![Fig. 7.53. Mediaeval anagrams of the name of Jesus Christ from the Roman catacombs. Taken from [544], Volume 4, page 675, ill. 144.](image)

In fig. 7.54 we cite an extremely interesting table showing different shapes of mediaeval Christian crosses ([1427], page 5). The “ancient” Egyptian ankh can be seen as number 20. Note also the T-cross (number 3), and the fork cross (number 5). We shall repeatedly encounter these apparently rather old versions of the Christian cross in the future. Let us also point out number 25, which is practically the Ottoman crescent with a cruciform star.
Fig. 7.54. Various shapes of the Christian cross. We shall point out the old T-shaped cross (number 3 in the table) as well as the forking cross (number 5). The “ancient” Egyptian ankh can be seen as number 20. Taken from [1427], page 5.


In fig. 7.55 we see a print of an “ancient” Syrian sigil allegedly dated as the second millennium before Christ ([533], Volume 1, page 457). In its centre we can clearly observe the Christian ankh, whose loop may have been used for wearing it as a pendant.
In fig. 7.55 is a Syrian sigil allegedly dating from the middle of the second millennium B.C., Berlin, the Middle East Museum. Taken from [533], Volume 1, page 457. In the centre of the sigil we see an ankh with a loop on top that facilitates its use as a pendant.

In fig. 7.56 is an “ancient” statuette found in Hissarlyk, Asia Minor, portraying the goddess Maia ([544], Volume 4, page 676, ill. 145). This is most probably Virgin Mary that is represented as Jesus Christ’s mother-to-be. The Christian cross is drawn as a swastika here.

In fig. 7.57 we see a fragment of a brass statuette of the “ancient” Buddha. However, what we see on his chest is a Christian gammadion. Russian Museum of Ethnography and the museum of Gimet in France ([544], Volume 4, page 677, ill. 146).
In fig. 7.58 is an amazing “ancient” picture of the allegedly “ancient” Bellerophontes battling a chimera ([508] and [544], Volume 4, page 687, ill. 150). This is merely the mediaeval St. George fighting the dragon! Only the hypnotic effect of Scaligerian chronology has kept the admirers of “great antiquity” from seeing this.

Many of the mediaeval Christian symbols are related to the so-called keys of St. Peter which he is supposed to use for opening the Pearly Gates ([259]). Let us remind the reader that the key is but another form of the mediaeval Christian ankh (see fig. 7.53, anagram 8). However, it turns out that “classical ancient mythology” is also full of deities whose primary attribute is either a key, or a key-shaped cross – the mediaeval ankh, that is. Such are the “ancient” Greek Helios, the “ancient” Roman Pluto, the “ancient” Egyptian Serapis and the “ancient” infernal queen Hecate ([259], page 58). Dupuis and Volnay point out the de facto identity of apostle Peter and the “ancient” Roman god Janus.

In fig. 7.59 we see the allegedly “ancient” effigies of various “ancient” goddesses with infants. They are the “ancient” Roman Juno with Mars (according to Malver), the
Indian Devas with the infant Krishnu (according to Jeremias), Demetre with Bacchus, or simply “D-Mother,” or “Deo-Mater,” or Mother of God (Malver). Further on we see the “ancient” Diana with a cross on her head, and the Ottoman crescent with a cruciform star nearby. After that comes the “ancient” Egyptian goddess Athyr, or Hathor, with the infant Osiris (Jeremias). Finally, we see the so-called “Our Lady of Salisbury” (according to M. Brocas). See [544], Volume 3, page 631, ill. 101.

6.2. Mediaeval Christianity and the “ancient” Mithraism

A. Drews provides an illustration for [259] that portrays the “ancient” god Mithras on a so-called “Mithraist icon,” q.v. in fig. 7.60. Mithras’ head has a halo with sunrays – exactly like the halos on the icons of Christ. The halo is obviously Christian in its origin. Failing to realise the profound inveracity of Scaligerian chronology, Drews
makes the following cautious comment: “It is hardly a coincidence that many Christian icons resemble this effigy. There is a circle, or a halo, around the head of the deity.”

To this comment we reply that it isn’t a case of Christ resembling the “ancient” Mithras, but rather that Mithraism was a form of the Christian cult after the XI century A.D. As we know, Scaligerian history considers Mithras to be an “ancient” Aryan god from the Orient, and subsequently an “ancient” Persian deity, whose cult spread across all of Asia Minor ([966], Volume 2, page 416). One of the effigies of the “extremely ancient” Mithras can be seen in fig. 7.61. Mithras is shown here slaying an ox. It is possible that bullfighting, which is still popular in Spain and parts of France, is a reflection of this archetypal subject – possibly also Mithraist, but clearly Christian in origin, and reflected on many Orthodox icons. One can observe an Orthodox Trinity icon in fig. 7.63. The foreground of this icon is identical to the “ancient” bas-reliefs representing Mithras slaying an ox.
Fig. 7.61. An effigy of the “ancient” Aryan and “ancient” Persian god Mithras slaying a bull. Taken from [966], Volume 2, page 416.
Fig. 7.62. “The Holy Trinity”, Russian icon dating from the first half of the XVII century. In front we see the “ancient” Mithras killing a bull, which makes this subject Christian and Orthodox (this theme is often linked to Abraham nowadays). Taken from [647], page 36.

Fig. 7.63. A close-in of the fragment of the Orthodox Holy Trinity icon with Mithras killing a bull. Taken from [647], p. 36.

A. Drews says this about strong and extensive parallels between “ancient” Mithraism and mediaeval Christianity:

“The main Roman sanctuary of Mithras was in the Vatican, on the site of St. Peter’s Cathedral. That is where he was worshipped, together with Attis, who had been recognized officially even earlier…. Mithras, or Attis, was called Pater, or Father. The High Priest of this deity was also called “Pater” (or the Father of Fathers); the Roman Pope is still called the Holy Father. The latter wears a tiara, or a mitre, on his head, which is a headdress of Mithras, or Attis… and red soldier shoes of the priests of Mithras, as well as keeping the keys of the “Rock God” [or St. Peter – A. F.], and has “the power to bind, and the power to permit”…. The Catholic Pope’s equal in rank was the Pater, the Pope of the Mithraist cult. This pagan Pope resided in the Vatican, worshipped the sun as the saviour, and Cybele as the virginal Mother of God, who was usually depicted sitting with a child on her lap – her Christian double is the Virgin Mary.” ([259], page 69)

Like mediaeval Christianity, “ancient” Mithraism had a concept of purgatory; the two also shared the use of the aspersorium, and the tradition of crossing oneself ([259], page 70). Ecclesial ceremonialism and public forms of church office are similar – the liturgy was read in a dead language that the masses did not understand, both services used hosts (wafers, or altar bread), albs, wide cingula, episcopal hats, etc. This parallelism was discovered by the eminent scientist J. Robertson ([1371] and [259], pages 70-71). He wrote that “the oriental saviour deities are all brothers of Jesus Christ” ([1371] and [544], Volume 4, page 695).
N. A. Koun also tells us that “the Mithraist oblation is virtually similar to the Christian Eucharist… Christians, as well as Mithraists, considered Sunday a Holy Day, and celebrated… Christmas in the Christian tradition, on the 25 December, as the day their ‘Invincible’ deity was born” ([454] and [544], Volume 4, pages 701-703). Some monuments depicting a clandestine Mithraist Lord’s Supper have reached our age. We can see altar bread with Christian crosses on these “ancient” pictures ([259], page 3). The famous Cathedra Petri, or the Chair of Peter in Vatican, also appears to belong to the Mithraist cult.

We conclude that the “ancient” cult of Mithras was virtually identical to the mediaeval cult of Jesus Christ, and the gap of several centuries that separates them is merely a Scaligerian chronological simulacrum.

“The concept of Mithras coming to Europe from Asia and not vice versa is based on the fact that we find a particularly large number of the cult’s traces in the Veda, where Mithras is one of the key figures” ([544], Volume 4, page 704). This implies that the famous Veda, which was actually discovered relatively recently, dates from the end of the Middle Ages and not some hypothetical antediluvian age. Mithraism is also present in Zoroastrianism, or the religion of Zoroaster, which is supposed to have been prevalent in “ancient” Persia before its conquest by Alexander the Great. It is also supposed to have made a sudden disappearance for the period of six centuries (!) in order to be “revived” under the Sassanides in the alleged IV century A.D. ([544], Volume 4, pages 715-716). This all leads one to the conclusion that Zoroastrianism is also mediaeval in its origin, dating to the XI century A.D. at the earliest.

J. Frazer says, on the subject of the “ancient” Attis: “Attis… had been the same for Phrygia as Adonis was for Syria… the tradition and the cults of both deities were so similar that the ancients often used to identify them with each other” ([917], page 19).

The “ancient” Greek religion also echoes the various attributes of Jesus Christ. In particular, experts in the history of religions point out that “the figure of the dying and resurrecting saviour was embodied in Dionysus and Bacchus” ([743], page 41).

6.3. References to Jesus Christ contained in “ancient” Egyptian artefacts

Ancient Egypt is considered to have been a “classical cross country.” Mesopotamia, Persia and India all have similar Christian crosses. As we have already pointed out, many “ancient” Egyptian gods are portrayed in drawings and bas-reliefs holding the mediaeval Christ glyph – an ankh ([259]). Such are the deities Re-Horakhty (fig. 7.64),
Tefnut, the goddess of moisture and dew (fig. 7.65), and the divine lions Shu and Tefnut (fig. 7.66). In fig. 7.67 we can see an incumbent effigy of the “ancient” Egyptian god Osiris surrounded by Christian ankh's. The “ancient” Egyptian pharaoh statue (fig. 7.68, on the right) is particularly impressive. There is a large Orthodox Christian cross on the back-rest of his throne, see fig. 7.69. The “ancient” statue is exhibited in the Metropolitan museum of New York.

Fig. 7.64. “Ancient” Egyptian deities Re-Horakhty and Hathor with Christian crosses in their hands. Taken from [486], page 119.

Fig. 7.65. The “ancient” Egyptian goddess Tefnut with a Christian cross in her hand. Taken from [486], page 119.

Fig. 7.66. “Ancient” Egyptian lion deities Shu and Tefnut with a Christian cross between them. Taken from [486].
Fig. 7.67. “Ancient” Egyptian effigy of the god Osiris incumbent surrounded by Christian ankhs. Taken from [533], Volume 1, page 425.

Fig. 7.68. “Ancient” Egyptian pharaoh sculpture exhibited in the Metropolitan Museum of New York. One can clearly see a broad Orthodox Christian cross on the back of the Pharaoh’s throne. Picture taken by A. T. Fomenko in 1995.
N. V. Rumyantsev compiled a table that includes 32 different versions of the Christian cross. These crosses were abundant in the entire “ancient” Mediterranean region in particular, and are often dated to hypothetical distant B.C. epochs. The apparent unity of this symbol is so amazing that this alone, proved as it is by a great body of facts, suffices to question the veracity of Scaligerian datings of all these “ancient” cults.

It turns out that the cult of Isis was also exceptionally similar to the mediaeval Christian cult, since “her idolaters had… morning, afternoon, and evening masses which were extremely similar to Catholic and occasionally even Orthodox liturgy” ([259], page 71). The expert in the history of religions N. V. Rumyantsev doesn’t question Scaligerian chronology which arbitrarily moves the cult of Isis, Osiris and Serapis into a distant age, but is nonetheless forced to make the observation that “this semblance between the Egyptian liturgy and the Christian is too great and too stunning to be a coincidence” ([259], page 72).

Let us also point out that the name of the famous “ancient” Egyptian god Osiris most probably originates from “Esu-Rex,” or Jesus the King.

This is how N. V. Rumyantsev comments on one of the “ancient” Egyptian pictures that clearly refer to evangelical events: “This is Osiris rising from the dead after having been buried for three days. He is portrayed at the moment of his resurrection, stepping out of the coffin… Next to him we see his wife and sister… Isis” ([743], page 10).
Another Egyptian deity is handing a cross to the rising Osiris. “The resurrection of Osiris... occurs on the third day after his death. This feast would end with the “mounting of the stake of Osiris.” The stake would be elevated with the aid of special contraptions... and mounted vertically” ([743], pages 10-11). This “death of Osiris at a stake” is probably a reflection of the crucifixion of Christ. We shall cover this in more detail later.

There’s a woman standing next to the rising Osiris – just like the Christian Virgin Mary and Mary Magdalene who are often depicted bearing holy oil at the coffin of Christ.

In figs. 7.70, 7.71 and 7.72 we see five “ancient” Egyptian bas-reliefs portraying five different moments in the birth of the Pharaoh Amenope ([576] and [544], Volume 6). This is supposed to have happened in 1500 B.C., a millennium and a half before Christ was born. N. V. Rumyantsev writes: “In the first picture we see a divine messenger who is standing before the virgin queen Met-em-ve [Mary? – A. F.] and gives the Annunciation of the birth of her son [see fig. 7.70 – A. F.].

Fig. 7.70. An “ancient” Egyptian picture using the evangelical subject of Christ’s birth. The Annunciation. Taken from [576], page 81.
In the second illustration we see the explanation of the pharaoh’s parentage: his virgin mother and the chief solar god Amon hold each other in a lovers’ embrace.

The third illustration elaborates on the meaning of the previous one and provides details of the immaculate conception from the divine seed. This idea is conveyed through the cross that is held near the nose of Met-em-ve [the author makes a reference to the polysemy of the Russian word dukh, which means both “breath” and “spirit” or “ghost,” and expresses the opinion that the cross symbolizes the immaculate conception from the olfactory perception of the Holy Ghost], and the roundness of her stomach [see fig. 7.71 – A. F.]... the Egyptian priests would thus write the first pages of the divine ruler’s biography on the wall of their temple.” ([743], page 130)
Commenting on this amazing, but hardly unique, series of *Christian and Evangelical* bas-reliefs of the “ancient” Egypt, J. Robertson, the prominent expert in the history of religions, wrote that “the most exact analogy of the Egyptian myth of the divine royalty birth is that with the Christian Annunciation” (quoted in [743], page 130).

We have just covered three bas-reliefs out of five. What about the remaining two?

“Three out of these five subjects depicting various moments of his [Amenope’s] birth show us the Annunciation, the coition of the lovers… and its result – *immaculate conception*… .

In the fourth illustration we see the actual birth of the divine royalty, and the fifth shows us the *adoration* of the child by the Magi [exactly the way the Gospel has it, qv in fig. 7.72 – A. F.]. The three genuflected human figures [or the evangelical magi accompanied by a king who is also on his knees, see *Chron6* – A. F.] say benedictions and present him [the infant Christ? – A. F.] with gifts, and there are gods near them doing likewise… We consider further commentary to these five effigies unnecessary.” ([743], page 149)

Historians point out that “they [the evangelical subjects of the Annunciation and the immaculate conception – A. F.] bear the greatest resemblance to similar subjects pertinent to the biographies of other famous mythical saviours of the past – the Jewish… Samson, the Babylonian and Phoenician Tammuz, or Adonis, and the Indian… Buddha” ([743], page 132).

Also “the Egyptian chrismation, or the baptism of the pharaoh by kings Horus and Thoth… they pour holy water over the king, which is represented as a stream of crosses here… with the king himself holding another cross in his hand” ([743], page 198). A similar “ancient” Egyptian picture can be seen in fig. 7.73.
In fig. 7.73 we see mediaeval Coptic representations of Christian crosses ([544], Volume 6). Let us remind the reader that the Copts were the mediaeval Egyptian Christians. It is clearly visible that the mediaeval Coptic ankhs are virtually identical to the “ancient” Egyptian ones.

In fig. 7.75 one sees an “ancient” Egyptian obelisk that stands in Italian Rome nowadays, in Minerva Square ([1242], page 43). We see a Christian cross on its top. Nowadays historians assure us that this cross is a later addition. We are extremely sceptical about that. Most probably the obelisks, including the “ancient” Egyptian ones, were built as tall pedestals for the specific purpose of bearing crosses or other
Christian symbols. Therefore, they were manufactured in the XVI-XVI century.

A similar Egyptian obelisk with a *Christian cross* on top was erected in St. Peter’s square in Rome ([1242], page 43. See fig. 7.76). In fig. 7.77 we see an ancient engraving depicting the same obelisk in the Vatican. Here we also see a Christian cross upon the spire, qv in fig. 7.78. However, another ancient engraving dating from 1585 (fig. 7.79) allegedly depicts the very same Vatican obelisk, but looking completely different, as is its setting, although it is supposed to be depicted as standing close to St. Peter’s cathedral in this picture as well ([1374], page 121). The spire of this Egyptian obelisk in the Vatican is crowned with a large sphere, possibly solar imagery (see fig. 7.79). This symbolism is Christian, since Jesus Christ was referred to as “the Sun.”
Fig. 7.76. “Ancient” Egyptian obelisk in St. Peter’s square in Rome. Taken from [1242], page 42.
Fig. 7.77. Ancient engraving depicting the “Egyptian” obelisk in Vatican with a Christian cross on its spire. It is presumed that this engraving pictures a “new consecration” of the obelisk. Taken from [1374], page 21.

Fig. 7.78. A close-in of a fragment of the engraving depicting the “Egyptian” obelisk topped by a Christian cross. Taken from [1374], page 21.
It is possible that Christian crosses or solar spheres were taken off the “ancient” Egyptian obelisks in the XVII-XVIII century, in the tumultuous epoch of the Reformation, so as to facilitate dating them to some hypothetical “ancient” period long before Jesus Christ.

Furthermore, there’s a XVIII century obelisk in front of the façade of the “ancient” Roman Pantheon, which dates from the alleged II century A.D. (fig. 7.80). However, its style isn’t any different from that of the other “ancient” Egyptian obelisks that one sees in other Roman squares and in Egypt. All of them most probably belong to the same epoch and tradition of the XV-XVIII century.

Fig. 7.80. A XVIII century obelisk in front of the façade of the “ancient” Pantheon allegedly built in the II century A.D. One can clearly see that the XVIII century obelisk resembles other “ancient” Egyptian obelisks in style. Apparently, the recent XV-XVII century tradition of building similar Christian obelisks still existed in the XVIII century. Taken from [726], page 61.
In fig. 7.81 we see a picture allegedly dating from 1650 which shows an “ancient” Egyptian obelisk covered in hieroglyphs from top to bottom. The obelisk of Pamphilius can be seen in the centre with either an alectryon or a dove on its top (fig. 7.82). Both are well-known Christian symbols. The same “ancient” Egyptian alectryon symbolism can be seen topping many Western European Christian temples. In *Chron6* we demonstrate that the alectryon used to symbolize the Ottoman=Ataman crescent. Also, modern commentators assure us that Kircher, the author of the XVII century book this picture is taken from, interpreted the hieroglyphs in a “fanciful manner” ([1374], page 123). It would be interesting to find out what exactly it is that the present day historians dislike in Kircher’s translation. We haven’t had the opportunity of studying this issue yet.

Fig. 7.81. An “ancient” engraving of 1650 depicting “ancient” Egyptian obelisks covered in hieroglyphs. The obelisk of Pamphilius at in the centre; we can clearly see an alectryon or a dove on its spire – a Christian symbol, in other words. One can still see such ornithic images on tops of many mediaeval cathedrals. As we shall demonstrate in *Chron6*, it used to symbolize the Ottoman crescent. Taken from [1374], page 123.
In fig. 7.83 we see an engraving allegedly dating from 1499 that shows an “ancient” Egyptian obelisk mounted upon an elephant ([1374], page 119). Once again, we observe a spherical solar symbol on the top of the obelisk that symbolizes Jesus Christ. This engraving is taken from a book by Francesco Colonna which never fails to irritate the present day commentators. For instance, they have the following to say about this “ancient” Egyptian obelisk: “This romantic pseudo-Egyptian image was very popular in the XVI century. The book that [the drawing] was taken from originally is called the Hypnerotomachia, and really is a romantic fantasy text written in a strange mixture of languages – Italian, Latin, babelized Hebrew, and imaginary hieroglyphs. However, the illustrations are very artful; the ascetic style was considered authentically Classical by many readers” ([1374], page 119).
In other words, despite the fact that this old book is written in a rather austere manner, modern historians know the exact nature of “real Egyptian antiquities” better than the mediaeval author. Their consensual decision treats Francesco Colonna in a patronizing manner, deftly withdrawing his book from scientific circulation.

6.4. Researchers of the ancient religions commenting on the strange similarities between the cults of the “antiquity” and of the Middle Ages

The “ancient” Greek legends would have it that the “ancient” god Dionysius (fig. 7.84) performed the miracle of transforming water into wine ([743], page 198). Experts in the history of religions have noted this to be a perfect analogue of the famous evangelical miracle, or the transformation of water into wine by Jesus Christ in Canaan, Galilee. Could Galilee refer to “Gaul,” or France, and the well-known city of Cannes? Saintyves wrote that “after this, no one could possibly fail to see the origins of the matrimonial miracle in Galilean Canaan… ever since the Dionysian cult and during the age of the Christian cult, water never ceased to turn to wine on the 9th of January” (quoted in [743], page 259).
A great body of scientific literature is dedicated to the discovery of parallels between the legends of the “ancient” Indian Buddha and Jesus Christ. Buddha’s “biography” doesn’t only include the principal evangelical myths, such as the immaculate conception, the birth miracles, Candlemas etc, but finer details as well – the baptism, the temptation in the desert, and so forth. Lists of such parallels can be seen in the works of Drews, Frazer, Saintyves, Rumyantsev, etc.

N. V. Rumyantsev wrote the following as a summary of his research:

“An entire caravan of suffering, dying and resurrecting ancient gods has passed in front of our eyes; we have seen their mythology, studied their feasts and rites. However, despite the fact that they have different names, individual mythological characteristics, countries of origin, or specialization, one feels a clear presence of something that unites them all. The ancients themselves have marked this fact… .

Indeed, if we regard the last centuries before Christ and the first centuries of the new era we shall see a most peculiar tableau. All of the deities that we have listed with all their attributes appear to have blended into each other, often to the extent of becoming indistinguishable. Osiris, Tammuz, Attis, Dionysius and a host of others appear to have formed a common gestalt of sorts, transforming into some syncretic deity that reigned supreme over the entire territory of the Roman state… the deities have transformed into a single eclectic, but de facto unified saviour figure. This intense merging occurred during the age of the Roman Empire, and affected Rome itself in particular.” ([743], pages 44-45)

Let us conclude with a discussion of another issue that is of great interest to us. N. A. Morozov paid special attention to the evangelical fragments where “our translations speak of the crucifixion of Jesus. I emphasize ‘our translations’ in particular, since the original Greek text of the Gospels uses the word stavros instead of ‘cross,’ and the verb
stavroo instead of ‘crucifixion.’ However, stavros is used to refer to a stake or a pale, and not cross” ([544], Volume 1, page 84). N. A. Morozov suggests the translation “execution at the stake” instead of crucifixion – as in being tied to a stake. The semantic transformation of the Greek word for “stake” (stavros) occurred in the Latin translation of the Bible where, according to Morozov:

“The word crux, or cross, was used instead of the Greek stavros, and the feedback from this transformation affected the interpretation of the original Greek word stavros. The Slavic translation is actually somewhat more precise, since it tells us Jesus was “pinioned to a tree”… Contemplating a possible solution to my quandary, I decided to go by the Church Slavonic text and translate the Greek word stavros as “stake,” and the verb stavroo as “execute at a stake,” since it reports no details of the execution.” ([544], Volume 1, page 85)

In fig. 7.85 one sees an ancient miniature taken from The Great French Chronicle titled “Kings Hildebert and Lothar Laying Siege to Saragossa and the Death by Stoning Inflicted by the Franks upon the Roman Prince Belisar [Belisarius – A. F]” ([1485], page 156). We see the execution of Belisarius (the great Czar?). He was tied to a stake and stoned to death (see fig. 7.86).
Fig. 7.85. An ancient miniature from a book allegedly dating from the mid-XV century and titled *Les Grandes Chroniques de France*. It depicts the execution of Prince Belisarius [the name bears some semblance to *Velikiy Czar*, which stands for “the Great Czar” in Russian]. He was tied to a stake and stoned to death. Taken from [1485], ill. 186.
Let us now turn to the allegedly pagan “ancient” Greek myths. Heracles is one of the protagonists of the “ancient” Greek mythology. Drews points out that “Heracles carrying pillars used to be a symbol greatly favoured in antiquity… Furthermore, the mystical meaning ascribed to those columns is the same as that of Christ’s cross. We can see God stoop under… the weight of the pillars and recognize him as the Saviour from the New Testament” ([259], page 49). Thus, the pictures of the “ancient” Hercules bent over under the weight of the cruciform pillars are probably mediaeval pictures of Christ carrying a cross and suffering from its great weight. See the mediaeval paintings by Tintoretto in fig. 7.87, for instance [1472], or those by Marko Palmezano allegedly dating from the XVI century, seen in fig. 7.88 ([713], ill. 129).
A. Drews continues, telling us that:

“The cross made of two bars in Christianity is as much of a symbol of the new life and all things divine… as both of the pillars in the Tyrean or Libyan cults of Heracles, Shamash, or Simon…. One of the drawings portrays Christ bearing both pillars in such a way that they form a slanting cross.” ([259], page 49)

The “ancient” Heracles bearing a cross is present in Scaligerian history as yet another phantom reflection of Jesus Christ. We are referring to the “mediaeval Emperor Heraclius” who, as we learn, is also often portrayed bearing a cross, the scene of
action being Jerusalem, no less. The names Heracles and Heraclius are virtually identical. Allow us a short reminder in this respect – Jesus was often called Horus, which was where the “ancient” Egyptian name Horus originates from (see Chron6, Ch. 3). In fig. 7.89 we see a painting by Michael Wohlgemut allegedly created in 1485-1490. Modern commentary is as follows: “King Heraclius in Jerusalem… we have a simultaneous representation of the king approaching the city gate on a horse… and then carrying a cross barefoot” ([1425], page 8). See a close-up detail in fig. 7.90. King Heraclius is also depicted barefoot and bearing a cross in an ancient picture that can be seen in fig. 7.91.

Fig. 7.89 A fragment of a painting by Michael Wolgemut on the right wing of Catherine’s Altar (1485-1490). According to historians, we see the king Heraclius (or Heracles) here ([1425], page 8). He approaches Jerusalem on a horse, and is then portrayed at the gates of Jerusalem, barefoot and in a plain shirt, bearing a large cross. Taken from [1425], page 8.
Fig. 7.90. A close-in of a fragment portraying king Heraclius = Heracles bearing a large cross near the city of Jerusalem. Taken from [1425], page 8.

The crucifix that one sees in the Cologne Cathedral is called “The Gero Crucifix,” see Chron6, Chapter 3. Let us point out that the “Grave of Jesus” located on Mount Beykos near Istanbul is also called the “Grave” or “Resting Place of Heracles” ([240], pages 76-77). More about this in Chron6.

Most probably, the “ancient” Heracles, as well as the mediaeval king Heraclius, are phantom duplicates of the XI century Christ = Horus. Both ancient pictures of king Heraclius show him bearing a T-shaped cross, which must be the original shape of the Christian cross.

In fig. 7.92 we see an ancient sculpture from Palmyra, the so-called “Palmyra God Triad” allegedly dating from 150 B.C. ([1237]). The characters that we observe, however, are clearly Christian saints. Two of them have Christian halos over their heads. Furthermore, the saint on the left has got an Ottoman crescent behind his head. One should mark the fact that the right arm of every statue is broken off, but the rest of the sculpture is in a good condition. Could their right hands have been raised in Christian benediction? It is possible that some devout Scaligerite broke their fingers that were raised in the familiar Christian gesture in order to eliminate such blatantly mediaeval relics from “antiquity.”
This array of facts proves that Christianity and the “ancient” symbolism share the same mediaeval origins that can be traced back to the XI-XIII century A.D.

In fig. 7.93 we see an archaeological finding from Iran allegedly dating from the XIII-XII century B.C. ([1237]). It is kept in the Louvre nowadays and considered an “ancient” figure of some “fantasy monster.” However, the unprejudiced observer will instantly recognize it as the bicephalous eagle, which was a well-known imperial symbol in the Middle Ages.

6.5. Moses, Aaron and their sister Virgin Mary on the pages of
the Koran

As one sees from folding the “Scaligerian History Textbook” into a sum of four shorter chronicles, we get several options for dating the beginning of the Muslim Hijra era, that is dated at 622 A.D. nowadays. All of them supersede the Scaligerian version. N. A. Morozov cites a great number of exceptional oddities pertinent to Muslim as well as Christian history. Let us give an example.

The chronology of the Koran is often radically different from the Scaligerian chronology of the Bible. The Koran insists on Aaron (Arius?) being the uncle of the evangelical Jesus, no less. Mary, the mother of Jesus, is declared to be the sister of Moses and Aaron. Thus, according to the Koran, these Old Testament characters belong to the generation that immediately preceded Jesus Christ. Naturally, this is in drastic contradiction of the Scaligerian chronology, the discrepancy comprising several centuries. However, it concurs well with our abbreviated chronology. Let us turn to the 19th Sura of the Koran ([427], page 239). The Koran commentator I. B. Krachkovsky writes that it is “the oldest Sura that mentions such evangelical characters as… Mary and Jesus” ([427], page 560). The 19th Sura refers to the birth of Jesus, the son of Mary, in the following manner: “O Mariam, thou hast performed a feat unheard of! O sister of Harun [Aaron – A. F.]…” ([427], the 19th Sura, 28(7); 29(28), pages 240-241). The commentary to this fragment is as follows: “the sister of Moses and Aaron is the mother of Jesus” ([427], page 561, No. 17).

6.6. The XII century as the apparent epoch of St. Mark’s lifetime. The history of Cathedral of San Marco in Venice

The gigantic Venetian cathedral of San Marco is a true architectural gem adorning the city. It is also one of the most popular mediaeval buildings in Italy. Its history proves to be particularly fascinating in light of the new abbreviated chronology. Let us begin with reminding the reader of the official history of San Marco as it is related in the books titled Basilica of San Marco ([1265]) and Venice ([1467]). This is what we learn from [1265]:

“The Basilica of San Marco is an object of adoration of the Venetians that also symbolizes their historical unity. This is doubtlessly the main symbol of Venice that attracts visitors from afar by the uniqueness of its beauty and its oriental splendour.

The Basilica of San Marco had been a ducal chapel until the end of the XVIII century and has thus absorbed the secular and the ecclesial history of the Venetian republic.
Ever since 1807, when the church transformed into the city cathedral having substituted the church of San Pietro de Castello in this capacity, it became a Mecca not only for the Venetians, but also visitors from across the world. Its bishop bears the ancient title of the Patriarch.

The initial construction of the Church of St. Mark occurred… after 828 A.D., when the body of St. Mark was saved from desecration and delivered from Alexandria on a ship by some Venetians”. ([1265], page 7).

The story unfolds as follows: nowadays St. Mark is supposed to have been the first of the four canonical evangelists ([765]). His Gospel – The Gospel According to Mark – is presumed to be the oldest, written around 50 A.D. at the insistence of either St. Peter or the Christian community. Sometime later Mark returned to Alexandria in Egypt, which is where he died on 25 April of the alleged year 68 A.D. ([1265], page 26).

Scaligerian chronology contains an informational gap of many centuries in what concerns St. Mark, whose name allegedly resurfaces from oblivion in the IX century A.D. – a millennium later, in other words. His body is supposed to have been secretly delivered to the Italian Venice from the Egyptian Alexandria. The canonical legend runs as follows ([1265]): two Venetian traders paid a chance visit to a Christian church in Alexandria that was consecrated to St. Mark and housed his ossuary. Some monk, as well as the prior, complained to them about the constant desecrations inflicted upon the church by the Muslims seeking to convert all Christian churches into mosques. The Venetian traders then uncoffined the body of St. Mark and smuggled it out of Alexandria in a basket full of vegetables and pork. After a sea journey full of deadly perils, the salvaged holy relic was delivered to Venice, where the construction of a new temple instantly began, designed as a shrine for St. Mark. All the episodes of this abduction are illustrated by inlays covering the walls of the Venetian cathedral.

The first church of St. Mark was thus constructed after the alleged year 828 A.D. as a shrine for his body that was “miraculously salvaged” from Alexandria. However, alack and alas, there are no traces of the first Venetian church of St. Mark anywhere. The historians say: “There is a large number of different hypotheses concerning the shape of this original church, all of them based on a very limited number of archaeological findings” ([1265], page 7).

The first Basilica of San Marco is supposed to have burnt down in the alleged year 976. According to [1265], page 7, “it was immediately reconstructed.” As a result, the second San Marco Basilica was built in Venice, allegedly towards the end of the X century. It was destroyed as well ([1265]).
Then, allegedly around 1063, the doge Domenico Contarini began the construction of a new and much larger church of St. Mark on the site of the second basilica. It is assumed that this third basilica was built in the fashion of the Basilica of the Twelve Apostles in Constantinople.

This is where oddities begin, well shrouded in mystery. See for yourselves, we are quoting verbatim:

“The rediscovery [sic! – A. F.] of St. Mark’s body is the last episode of the Venetian legend. During the construction of the third basilica, the ossuary was hidden so well [?! – A. F.] that several years later, after the death of the doge, no one had a clue about their possible location. It was only in 1094, after several days of ardent prayers of the doge Vitali Falier, the Patriarch, and the entire populace, that the holy relic [the body of St. Mark – A. F.] had manifested itself miraculously from inside a column [sic! – A. F.”]. ([1265], page 67).

This miraculous event is also represented on one of the inlays inside the Cathedral of St. Mark. Below one can see the famous painting on this subject by the XVI century artist Tintoretto.

Now then, we are being assured in a poised, no-nonsense manner that the XI century Venetians erected the gigantic cathedral of St. Mark without having the slightest notion of the location of the holy relic that had served as the very reason for the cathedral’s construction. And all the while, the body of St. Mark the evangelist was right there, on the building site!

Apparently, the cathedral was erected first; after that, the loss of the holy relic was suddenly noticed, and the search for it was long and fruitless. It took the fervent prayers of the doge, the Patriarch, and all of the population of Venice to make the body of the evangelist manifest itself inside a stone column (?). It was taken out with the utmost care (does that mean the stone pillar had to be shattered?) and solemnly buried by the altar.

This is where the body of St. Mark lies until the present day, being the central object of adoration in the cathedral. Scaligerian chronology of the events that we have related is shown in fig. 7.94. It is noteworthy that the eminent XVI century artist Tintoretto had an altogether different concept of the history of St. Mark’s burial in this cathedral. His famous painting with this exact subject can be seen in fig. 7.95 ([1472]). Mark the fact that St. Mark does not resemble a desiccated mummy the least bit, looking like a man who has just died and is going to be buried, q.v. in the left corner of the painting. According to the opinion that prevailed in the XVI century, St. Mark the evangelist was buried in the cathedral built specifically for this purpose in the alleged XI century as befitting a person who has just died and earned great honours. As we can see, there
wasn’t any “millenarian vagrancy of St. Mark’s body” in Tintoretto’s perception.

Fig. 7.94. Scaligerian chronology of the events related to the burial of the evangelist Mark in Venice.

Fig. 7.95. A XVI century painting by Tintoretto titled “The Discovery of the Body of St. Mark”. It may have had a different title at some point, something along the lines of “The Burial of St. Mark”. Taken from [1472], ill. 17.

Apparently, the bizarre legend of the “pilgrimage of Mark’s body” was a product later historians’ efforts to delve deeper into the real events of the XII century and make them concur with the erroneous Scaligerian chronology. This is what we think really
happened:

St. Mark, the first evangelist, lived in the XII century A.D. and died in the second half of that century. He was buried for the first and the last time in the Cathedral of St. Mark, erected in his honour. This opulent inhumation, which took place in the alleged year 1094 (around 1194, most likely) with the doge, the patriarch, and the entire city present, was later misinterpreted as the rediscovery of his body, since Scaligerian chronology had already shifted the lifetime of St. Mark into the I century A.D.

There were no mysterious disappearances or miraculous rediscoveries. These legends date from a much later age, when historians attempted to make Scaligerian chronology concur with the documents that explicitly pointed to the XII century as the age of St. Mark’s life and activity.

The cathedral of St. Mark obviously assumed its current shape a great deal later than the XII century. When we look at this cathedral nowadays we see a building whose construction was finished by the XVI century. On its walls we see inlays illustrating the rather airy legend of the fate of St. Mark’s body. Even within Scaligerian chronological paradigm, the cathedral’s construction continued well into the XIII century, when it was adorned with an equine sculptural group that was allegedly smuggled from the hippodrome of Constantinople in Byzantium ([1467], page 39).

It is difficult to pinpoint the exact place of St. Mark’s residence. It may have been Asia Minor or Constantinople, as Scaligerian history insists, and not Italy. But, at any rate, his lifetime falls within the XII century A.D. and not the first.

The idea that St. Mark could have lived in Venice for some time is indirectly substantiated by the fact that “for many centuries the town was associated with the symbol of the winged lion that the Christian tradition ascribes to St. Mark the evangelist. Venetian banners, churches, palaces and ships, as well as the lands that the Venetians conquered all bore the sigil of the winged lion” ([1265], page 27).

It is however possible that Italy received the “copyright” for St. Mark merely as a result of a chronological and geographical transfer of Byzantine events from Constantinople (on paper, naturally).

This conclusion fits our hypothesis that Jesus Christ lived in the XII century A.D. Mark, the first evangelist, lived in the same century and died near its end.

The implication is that the other three evangelists – Luke, Matthew, and John – also couldn’t have lived earlier than the XII century, since they wrote their Gospels after Mark, according to Scaligerian history. It would be very interesting indeed to find the real graves of these three evangelists as well.
7. The “ancient” Egypt and the Middle Ages

7.1. The odd graph of demotic text datings

We give a detailed account of Egyptian history in *Chron5*. Presently, we shall limit ourselves to several brief introductory notes.

As we have already mentioned in *Chron1*, Chapter 1, Scaligerian chronology of Egypt contains gigantic gaps and actually consists of assorted fragments, either linked in an arbitrary manner or altogether independent. [1069] contains a complete list of all dated demotic texts for 1966. It goes without saying that certain Egyptian texts can be ascribed no exact dating; we shall refrain from considering them here and turn to the ones described in [1069] instead. It is most edifying to observe their distribution across the time axis of Scaligerian history. The result can be seen in fig. 7.96. The resulting graph is extremely noteworthy.

![Fig. 7.96. Quantity distribution graph for dated demotic Egyptian documents compiled from the data collected in [1069]. One’s attention is instantly drawn to the strange gaps in the beginning and at the end of the Second Roman Empire, as well as a suspicious lack of such documents pertinent to the Third Roman Empire epoch.](image)

Primo, one sees that the majority of dated demotic Egyptian texts falls over the epoch of the Second Roman Empire allegedly covering the period of the I-III century A.D. It is significant that the gaps in the graph fully correspond to the chronological framework of the Second Roman Empire. Some of them are dated to earlier epochs, but those are separated from the Second Roman Empire by a strange gap in the middle of the alleged I century A.D.

Secundo, the graph in fig. 7.96 shows a complete absence of dated demotic documents in the epoch of the Third Roman Empire.

The Scaligerian chronology of demotic texts ipso facto reveals itself as several groups of documents whose relation to each other is rather far-fetched and fanciful.
These groups are separated by gaps whose boundaries most peculiarly coincide with the break points between the dynastic duplicates that we have discovered with the aid of completely different methods – those based on statistical analysis, qv in *Chron1*, Chapter 5. Ergo, the folding of the European chronological scheme results in a corresponding abbreviation of the “ancient” Egyptian chronology.

7.2. The enigmatic “revival periods” in the history of “ancient” Egypt

In *Chron1*, Chapter 1, we have already discussed the fact that the chronology of Egypt counts amongst the youngest of historical disciplines. Its formation was based on the existing Scaligerian chronology of Rome and Greece, and has therefore been dependent on it from the very start. The Egyptologists who initiated the compilation of the Egyptian chronology did not possess the objective criteria necessary for the verification of their hypotheses. This led to major discrepancies between the “different chronologies” of Egypt, amounting to 2-3 millennia, q.v. in *Chron1*, Chapter 1.

The few dynastic lists that have survived until our day occasionally indicate reign durations for certain pharaohs, but the pharaohs are often referred to by different names; moreover, these numbers change drastically from list to list.

For instance, Eusebius gives 26 years as the reign duration for Amenmesse (second version), as it is pointed out in [544], whereas Africanus gives 5 years. The durations differ from each other by a factor of five.

Eusebius indicates 40 years for Amenope (both versions), Africanus indicates 20, and Ophis only 8. And so on, and so forth.

Nevertheless, all of these data can still provide the basis for some speculation at least, the obvious and numerous distortions notwithstanding, and it is little wonder that the XIX century Egyptologists attempted to use these numbers for the construction of chronological scales. However, their calculations were afflicted by discrepancies of several millennia, as we have seen above, not to mention the inveracity of the very concept of Scaligerian “elongated history.”

However, for most Egyptian dynasties, reign durations of the pharaohs remain a complete mystery ([99], pages 725-730). The entire sixth dynasty can be cited as an example (according to Brugsch). There is no chronological data for most of its pharaohs, which makes it all the more peculiar to observe Brugsch ascribing reign durations of 33.3 years to every pharaoh of this dynasty with some determined and glum exhilaration, counting 3 pharaohs per century. His datings of the sixth dynasty are as
follows:

- Userkaf – reigned from 3300 B.C. onwards,
- Teti – from 3266 B.C.,
- Pepy I (Meryre) – from 3233 B.C.,
- Merenre – from 3200 B.C.,
- Neferkaf – from 3166 B.C.,
- Merenre Zafemzaf – from 3133 B.C. (see [99], page 725).

Furthermore, Brugsh used the very same principle – numbers ending in 00, 33, and 66, for the “dating” of every dynasty starting with the first and ending with the twenty-fourth inclusive. Only the pharaohs of the last seven dynasties (out of thirty!) that enjoyed some sort of heterogeneity in the dating of their reigns ([99], pages 725-730).

This “dating method” is so ludicrous one feels embarrassed to so much as discuss it nowadays. Nevertheless, this is the very method, with a number of minor later modifications, that the consensual version of Egyptian chronology was based upon. Brugsch’s datings haven’t ever been revised in any cardinal way. See [1447], page 254, for instance.

The dynastic history of Egypt is anything but continuous. Some of the gaps that it contains swallow entire dynasties ([99] and [544], Volume 6). At the same time, the researchers of the “ancient” Egyptian history have noted that it has an uncannily cyclic nature. Scaligerian history of Egypt demonstrates a strange “renaissance effect,” much like its European cousin. This effect is well known to us already – we constantly encounter phantom duplicates of the same mediaeval events that were cast far back into the past.

Chantepie de la Saussaye, for one, wrote:

“If we are to turn to later ages in Egyptian history, we shall be surprised to discover that the culture of the Sais epoch is a spitting image of the culture of the pyramid epoch. The texts used almost 3000 years ago [sic! – A. F.] enter circulation once again, and the ancient fashion of decorating graves makes a comeback”. ([966], page 99)

H. Brugsch pointed out the following:

“As Mariett-Bey justly noted, the names typical for the twelfth and especially the eleventh dynasty come back on the monuments of the eighteenth dynasty in the same shape and form as they had once possessed, and similar sepulchres with identical ornamentation were used in both these periods. What we have in front of us is a historical enigma that we sadly lack the means to solve so far”. ([99], page 99)

Egyptologists find inscriptions referring to pharaohs and kings set apart by millennia in
Scaligerian chronology, coexisting side by side on the walls of Egyptian temples. In order to provide some kind of explanation, the Egyptologists have thought up the following hypothesis:

“The temples, constructed recently by the Ptolemaic rulers and adorned by the Romans, have all been built on the sites of the ancient shrines; all the ancient inscriptions found on temple walls were meticulously and devoutly copied onto the walls of the new temple,” suggests Brugsch in [99], page 145.

The practice of copying old and unintelligible inscriptions from the walls of ancient temples hasn’t been noted in any veracious historical period. One has to think no such nonsense occurred in “ancient” Egypt, either.

All of these recurrences and renaissances have received the legitimate and earnest title of “restorations.” We are told, for instance, that the nineteenth dynasty was followed by a restoration when “Egypt… returned to the ancient epoch of pyramid construction, which becomes regarded as an age worthy of imitating. The ancient religious texts are resurrected, although the ability of the Egyptians to understand them is supposed to be limited. The funereal rites of the fourth dynasty are adhered to once more. Their pyramids are restored; the ancient titles of the kings that have remained in complete obscurity for over two millennia are celebrated in quotidian use yet again. Art comes back into the solid realistic manner of the Old Kingdom” ([966], page 166).

It is obvious that Scaligerite historians should want to find some sort of explanation for these bizarre “mass recurrences” of ancient rites, failing to recognize them for the products of an erroneous chronological system that they are. The “explanation” offered by historians is the alleged extreme conservatism of the Egyptians. It is written that “the Sais restoration can be counted amongst the most significant periods in the history of the Egyptian culture, and provides for the best possible illustration of just how conservative the Egyptian national spirit was” ([966], page 166).

This is what B. A. Turayev has to say about the “restorations”:

“Attempts were made to edit all of the official texts using an archaic language that is hardly understood by many… the forgotten ranks and offices are revived, the inscriptions made during the epoch, even the private ones, can be taken for those made during the epoch of the Old Kingdom [sic! – A. F.]… . The most typical phenomenon here is the appearance of the pictures of agricultural works, pastoral scenes, etc., on the sepulchral wall that are familiar to us from the Old Kingdom epoch.” ([853], Volume 2, pages 102-103)

All of this after two thousand years?

Imagine having to write a message to your friends using the language of I B.C. This hardly seems possible, even if one were to express such a volition.
The new chronology eliminates the necessity of inventing such absurd explanations. Apparently, there have been no “global renaissances” on such a scale.

N. A. Morozov gives a consecutive analysis of all thirty dynasties of the Egyptian pharaohs. He comes to the conclusion that nearly all of the dynasties preceding the IV century A.D. are phantom duplicates of several mediaeval dynasties.

We shall refrain from quoting his speculations here. It isn’t Morozov’s conclusions that our research is ultimately based upon, but, rather, our mathematical and statistical research, qv in the bibliography of our publications. Our research has shown, among other things, that N. A. Morozov was really very far from concluding his research. He stopped at too early an epoch – the beginning of the IV century A.D. – having adhered to the erroneous opinion that subsequent Egyptian history doesn’t need to be revised.

He turns out to have been wrong. Apparently, the entire “Scaligerian Textbook of Egyptian History” preceding the X-XII century A.D. is compiled from phantom duplicates of the mediaeval history of Egypt of the XIII-XVII century A.D., as well as the XIV-XVII century history of the Great=Mongolian empire, qv in Chron5. Furthermore, the Biblical “Land of Egypt” apparently has got nothing to do with the territory of modern Egypt, since the Biblical Egyptian events apparently took place in an altogether different location. See Chron6 for more details.

7.3. The ancient Hittites and the mediaeval Goths

It is commonly known that the “ancient Hittites” were “discovered” as late as 1880, when Professor Archibald Sayce read his lecture proclaiming the existence of “the ancient nation of the Hittites,” basing his research on analysis of the Bible, q.v. in [291], page 21. Sayce was granted the title of the Inventor of the Hittites ([291]). The Biblical studies of Archibald Sayce and William Wright led them to the conclusion that the “Hittites” used to live to the north of the Biblical Promised Land. Being raised on Scaligerian history and adhering to the erroneous opinion that the Promised Land was located on the territory of modern Palestine, Sayce and Wright confined the “ancient Hittites” to Asia Minor, which lies to the north of Palestine. However, nowadays we are beginning to understand that the Biblical Promised Land covers large territories in Southern Europe and the Mediterranean lands, q.v. above and in Chron6. However, in this case the “Hittites” would have lived to the north from Southern Europe – in the lands populated by the Goths. What we witness here is a superimposition of the “ancient Hittites” over the mediaeval Goths.

We can now see the roots of the mistake made by Sayce and Wright. They suggested
searching for Hittite relics in Asia Minor, which was the place of the erroneous XVII century Scaligerian localization of Biblical events, and not in Europe, where one wouldn’t have to search for them since these “Hittites” were already perfectly well known under the name of Goths. The “Hittite studies” were conducted in the same manner as previous Biblical research, with archaeologists going to Asia Minor in search of ruins and finding plenty to ascribe to “Hittites.” This is how another error of Scaligerian chronology received “archaeological proof.”
Scaligerian chronology of the East is closely related to the history of Europe and Egypt as presented by Scaliger and Petavius. Thus, all possible alterations of the European chronology automatically affect the chronology of “ancient” India. Let us give a brief summary of Scaligerian chronology of India. The historian N. Gousseva writes that “historical science runs into such problems in India as the researchers of the ancient history of other countries and peoples cannot even conceive of [this confession was made in 1968 – A. F.]. The primary difficulty here is the absolute lack of dated monuments” ([433], page 5). Apparently, all of the main “chronological landmarks” in Indian history are a product of a rather recent age, and they are directly dependent on the previously compiled Scaligerian chronology of Rome, Greece, and Egypt. Hence the obvious necessity for the revision of Scaligerian history of India.

The historian D. Kosambi reports:

“There is virtually nothing of what we know as historical literature in India… all we have is a vague oral tradition and an extremely limited number of documented data, which is of a much greater value to us than that obtained from legends and myths. This tradition gives us no opportunity of reconstructing the names of all the rulers. The meagre remnants that we do possess are so nebulous that no date preceding the Muslim period [before the VIII century A.D. – A. F.] can be regarded as precise… the works of the court chroniclers didn’t reach our time; only Cashmere and Camba can be regarded as an exception of sorts… all of this leads some rather earnest and eminent scientists claim that India has no history of its own”. ([433], pages 19-20).

For instance, this is what the historians tell us about the “ancient” culture of the Indus valley:

“Written memorials of the Indus culture defy decipherment to this day… not a single finding can be associated with an actual person or historical episode. We don’t even know the language that was spoken by the inhabitants of the Indus valley”. ([433], pages 65-66).

We are told that Scaligerian chronology of “ancient” India contains gaps larger than 600 years ([433], pages 65-66). Likewise the Scaligerian “ancient” Europe, India “suddenly” rolls back to barbarism around the beginning of the new era, and then “resumes” its ascension to the mediaeval “position of eminence”; which is suspiciously similar to the fate of the culture of “ancient” Europe, allegedly forgotten by everyone and only achieved once again in the Middle Ages.

The VII century A.D. is the time when the alleged “renaissance” of the Indian culture began – rather gradually, based on the Aryan culture (possibly the Christian-Arian
ideology). The famous “ancient” Indian “Aryans” can apparently be identified as the Arian Christians of the XII-XIV century, according to our reconstruction. The mysterious Aryans began to haunt an antediluvian age courtesy of Scaligerian chronology.

Furthermore, it turns out ([433]) that the texts concerning the cult of Krishna in India are of a relatively recent origin. Specialists in the history of religions have long since confirmed the existence of a vast number of parallels between Krishna and Christ ([544], Volume 4). This is why certain statements made by latter day historians reek of ambiguity, such as “the complete biography of Krishna was completed as late as the XII century A.D.” ([433], page 122). It is possible that the Indian Krishna cult is nothing but the cult of Jesus, brought to India by the Christian missionaries of the XII-XIV century.

It is assumed that the god Krishna is mentioned in the Bible ([519], Volume 4, page 17). According to some Indian sources, the god “Krishna” can practically be identified as Christ ([519], Volume 4).

Mediaeval authors occasionally located India in Africa or Italy (!). See more details in Chron5. We should point out another very odd fact of Scaligerian history in this respect. It is presumed that the “ancient” Alexander the Great had reached India and defeated the Indian king Porus, having conquered many lands in India ([433]). One would think an event of this calibre would leave some trace in Indian history at the very least. However, this doesn’t seem to be the case. “This invasion… appears to have remained unnoticed by the Indian tradition, although some foreign historians consider it to be the only large-scale event in the ancient history of India” ([433], page 143).

One feels like asking the obvious question of whether the “India” of the mediaeval manuscripts really is the same country as the modern India? Could it have been an altogether different country that Alexander had conquered?

We are told further on that many vital issues concerning the “ancient” history of India are based on the manuscripts found as late as the XX century. It turns out, for instance, that “the main source of knowledge in what concerns the governmental system of India and the policy of the state in the epoch of Maghadhi’s ascension is the Arthashastra – the book… that had only been found in 1905, after many a century of utter oblivion” ([433], page 146). It turns out that this book is basically the Indian version of the famous mediaeval oeuvre of Machiavelli. However, in this case the “ancient Indian Arthashastra” couldn’t have been written before the Renaissance. This could have happened in the XVII-XVIII century, or even the XIX.

Scaligerian history of India resembles its European cousin in that it rolled back to
barbarism in the beginning of the new era, and had to “resume” its “long ascension to
the heights of civilization” ([433]). We are also told that the “first significant Sanskrit
inscription was found in Ghirnar and dates from roughly 150 A.D.” ([433], page 172).
However, we instantly discover that the heyday of Sanskrit literature in India began
around the XI century A.D. This is most probably a result of the chronological shift of a
thousand years that we so familiar with by now. A propos, could “Sanskrit” stand for
“Saint Script,” or the Holy Writ?

Scaligerian history of mediaeval India also contains a great number of centenarian
chronological gaps, and is confusing and chaotic.

“The apathy of the Brahmans to everything real in the past and the present … had erased the history of India
from human memory… The reconstruction of the history and the realities … of the ancient India … we have to
rely on the reports of the Greek geographers and Arab travellers … there isn’t a single Indian source that
would equal the reports of the foreigners in value”. ([433], page 180).

Thus, Scaligerian history of India is wholly dependent on the consensual chronology of
Rome and Greece and will have to be reconstructed in turn.

Historians characterize the dynastic history of India thusly: “The names of individual
kings are obscured by the quaint haze of legends. We possess nothing that would
remotely resemble palace chronicles” ([433], page 192). We fail to see the quaintness
of historical haze. Could it reside in the freedom it gives to one’s fantasy?

The famous Mahabharata, a collection of the “ancient” Indian epos, is relegated to a
distant B.C. epoch by Scaligerite historians. On the other hand, the work is supposed to
have been based on the “ancient” Greek epos. A large number of parallels between the
Mahabharata and the poems of Homer were discovered quite a while ago ([519]).
Historians claim that the Indians were “rephrasing Homer” ([520], page 13). If this be
the case, the dating of the Mahabharata becomes completely dependent on the datings
of the poems written by the “ancient” Homer. We have already demonstrated that events
that occurred in “ancient” Greece were most probably really mediaeval, that is, dating
to the XIII-XVI century A.D.

An in-depth analysis of the Mahabharata, the great body of epic text, as seen from
the stance of the new chronology, is performed in our new book titled The Chronology
9. Was the artificial elongation of ancient history deliberate?

According to the results obtained by the new methods of dating, virtually all of the old documents that have reached our age are copies from ancient originals, presumed lost. These originals were written in order to reflect the current events of the XI-XVI century A.D., and not for the purpose of confusing future historians. It seems that earlier documents simply failed to have survived until the present day. However, the overwhelming majority of XI-XVI century originals either got destroyed, or were subjected to tendentious editing in the XVI-XVII century, during the creation of Scaligerian chronology. Whatever meagre genuine evidence of antiquity escaped such editing (or re-writing in the light of the veracious Scaligerian Chronology) are declared to be forgeries or creations of ignorant authors.

In *Chron5* and *Chron6* we give examples of how our revised chronology acquits several old documents from accusations of forgery, such as the famous Gift of Constantine, the Gift of Alexander the Great, and so on. In other words, many of the documents declared counterfeits nowadays turn out to be original, concurring perfectly well with the new chronology. Such is the case with the “Privileges” given to the mediaeval Ducal House of Austria by Caesar and Nero (see *Chron1*, chapter 1). In our opinion, nearly all of the events described in the ancient chronicles really did take place. The question is one of their exact location and timing. This is precisely where chronological and geographical confusion began, aided by the deliberate distortions of Scaligerite chronologers, which has led to the “elongation of history.” However, the key role was most probably played by the tendentious “editing of history” in the XVI-XVII century.

**Summary.**

1. Most of the documents that have reached our age – the ones referring to pre-XVI century events – are based on old originals. However, nearly all of the latter went through the hands of the tendentious editors of the XVI-XVII centuries. Their reading and interpretation are ambiguous, and an altered chronology leads to a new understanding.

2. Some chronological errors were accidental. A millenarian shift of the years of Christ’s life from the XII century A.D. to the I might be an example of such an error.
3. Some of the distortions of mediaeval history preceding the XVI century A.D. were deliberate and verged on blatant falsification. We shall provide more details in *Chron5*, *Chron6* and *Chron7*. 
What mainstream historians say about the New Chronology?

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

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

History of New Chronology

The idea of chronologies that differ from the conventional chronology can be traced back to at least the early XVII century. Jean Hardouinthen 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.

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

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

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

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

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

**Convergence of methods in archaeological dating**

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

In the specific case of dendrochronology, Fomenko claims that this fails as an absolute dating method because of gaps in the record. However, independent dendrochronological sequences beginning with living trees from various parts of North America and Europe extend back 12,400 years into the past. Furthermore, the mutual consistency of these independent dendrochronological sequences has been confirmed by comparing their radiocarbon and dendrochronological ages. These and other data have provided a calibration curve for radiocarbon dating whose internal error does not
exceed ±163 years over the entire 26,000 years of the curve. In fact, archaeologists have developed a fully anchored dendrochronology series going back past 10,000 BCE. “The absolutely dated tree-ring chronology now extends back to 12,410 cal BP (10,461 BC).”

*Misuse of historical sources and forced pattern matching*

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

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

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

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

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

Selectivity in reference to astronomical phenomena

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

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

Magnitude and consistency of conspiracy theory

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

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

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

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

**Popularity in forums and amongst Russian imperialists**

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

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

(Wikipedia text retrieved on 2nd August, 2015)

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

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

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


• BOOK TWO, PART TWO: Methods-2.


[Meth2]:2. A revised and substantially extended version of the book as the second volume in a series of two:

[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.

MSU Centre of Research and Pre-University Education. Two editions, 1995 and 1996. 672 p.


**BOOK FIVE: The Empire.**


**BOOK SIX: The Biblical Russia.**


**BOOK SEVEN: Reconstruction.**


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

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