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_The Testament of Peter the Great_ consists of chapters that complement and develop the reconstruction of the Russian history as related in the previous books of the *History: Fiction or Science?* series. The sequence of individual topics is usually of little importance, and the sections can be read in a random order. Every individual issue mentioned below is of interest per se, and can serve as basis for further research.

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

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

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

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

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

About the authors
From the publisher

1. The testament of Peter the Great
2. The foundation of most modern European capitals: a chronology
   2.1. Our reconstruction: most of the modern Eurasian capitals were founded after the Great = “Mongolian” conquest of the XIV century
   2.2. A most noteworthy mediaeval table of distances between Moscow and various capitals
   2.3. The European capital circle and its centre
3. How the figure of St. George ended up on the coat of arms of Russia
4. The real meaning of the inscriptions on the old “Mongolian” coat of arms of Russia. How the Romanovs had attempted to conceal this
   4.1. What we know about the history of the Russian national coat of arms
   4.2. The national coat of arms of the Russian Empire, or the Horde, in the XVI century
   4.3. The Great Perm as mentioned in the Russian Chronicles and drawn on the Russian coat of arms dating from the XVI century. The real location of Perm
   4.4. The land of Vyatka as described in the Russian chronicles and represented on the XVI century coat of arms of the Horde. The real location of Vyatka
   4.5. Tver as reflected in the Russian chronicles and represented in the Russian coat of arms in the XVI century
   4.6. Pskov = Pleshkov = Prussia on the coat of arms of Russia, or the Horde, in the XVI century
   4.7. The disposition of the twelve kingdoms (tribes) as seen on the
XVI century Russian coat of arms in the geographical maps of Europe
4.8. The Romanovian coat of arms from Korb’s diary
4.9. The British Isles = England or the Isle of Crete as the Cantian island on the coat of arms of Russia, or the Horde
4.10. Obdora in the Russian coat of arms and the “ancient” Abdera in Betica, Spain
4.11. The mysterious Oudoran principality on the Russian coat of arms and River Odra in Germany
4.12. Our reconstruction
5. The old coat of arms of Yaroslavl depicting a bear holding a Cossack pole topped by an Ottoman crescent. These poles were considered a symbol of power all across Europe up until the XVII century
6. The “ancient Olympus” and Russia as the Horde in the XIV-XVI century
   6.1. Kronos and other Olympian deities of the Western Europe
   6.2. The name Irina reflected in the historical toponymy of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire
7. World history according to some German authors of the XVII-XVIII century. The book of Johannes Heinrich Driemel
8. The imperial bicephalous eagle and the possible origins of the symbol
9. The genealogy of the Great Princes of Moscow as re-written in the XVII century

What mainstream historians say about the New Chronology?
Overview of the e-Series
Overview of the seven-volume print edition
Also by Anatoly T. Fomenko
Also by Gleb V. Nosovskiy
Bibliography
History is a pack of lies about events that never happened told by people who weren’t there.

George Santayana,  
American philosopher  
(1863-1952)

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

St. Augustine

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

Clarence Darrow

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

George Orwell, 1984
The testament of Peter the Great has not survived. However, a document entitled “The Testament of Peter” was rather well known and published in the Western Europe several times. It contains “The Plan to Conquer Europe and the Entire World” and is believed to be a blatant forgery nowadays ([407], page 79). It is described at length in [407], for instance. However, the opinion about the falsehood of the document in question isn’t shared by everyone – according to [407], certain researchers from the Western Europe (France, Poland and Hungary in particular) did not doubt its authenticity for one second. “The popularity of the ‘Testament’ abroad contrasted with total silence maintained by the Russian scientists” ([407], page 82). “A Russian synopsis of the ‘Testament’ only appeared in 1875… In 1877, the first large research publication came out that was specifically concerned with proving the ‘Testament’ to be a forgery… Presently, the fake ‘Testament’ is regarded as a curio by most” ([407], pages 82, 84 and 85).

Nevertheless, many diplomats from the Western Europe had believed the “Testament” to be a genuine document. Moreover, it is known that “the legend of some mysterious global expansion plan harboured by Russia dates back to the reign of Peter the Great” ([407], page 87).

F. Colson, a French historian, wrote the following in 1841: “In the beginning of the XVIII century Peter the Great stopped his glance at the world map and exclaimed: ‘The Lord has only made Russia!’ This is when he conceived the grandiose plans that later became part of his testament” ([407], page 82).

It is quite natural that the modern Scaligerian and Romanovian version of history makes these claims of Peter I look quite ridiculous – after all, wasn’t the ignorant Russia just emerging from centuries of mediaeval
obscurity and taking its first lessons of real warfare from the Westerners – the Swedes, for instance, and very clumsily so. Yet it suddenly turns out that “the Lord has only made Russia.” How could Peter have come up with a fancy this wild? General considerations implied by the Scaligerian history make all of the above “an obvious forgery.”

However, our reconstruction makes such ideas voiced by Peter anything but strange.

After all, about a century earlier, Russia, or the Horde, had indeed ruled over all of the countries that Peter wishes to conquer in his testament, be it authentic or not. It would be odd if Peter didn’t have any of the thoughts voiced in the “Testament” visit his head. The Romanovs managed to secure their positions in the very centre of the former Great = “Mongolian” Empire at the very end of the XVII century, albeit on a relatively small territory. They would obviously consider the next step to be the restoration of the Empire’s former boundaries, just as any ruler taking control of the very centre of a former empire would, and they naturally wanted to rule over all those territories.

This does not imply that the “Testament” ascribed to Peter is genuine; however, the ideas voiced therein must have indeed been vital for Peter and not merely thought up by some hoaxer in the days of yore. Couldn’t this be why Peter had ordered to translate a book of Mauro Orbini entitled “On the Slavic Expansion …,” which is most often referred to briefly as “Kingdom of the Slavs” nowadays ([617], page 93). An abbreviated Russian translation of this work came out in St. Petersburg in 1722. Orbini’s book tells about the Great = “Mongolian” conquest of Europe and Asia by the Slavs, q.v. in Chron5.
2. The foundation of most modern European capitals: a chronology

2.1. Our reconstruction: most of the modern Eurasian capitals were founded after the Great = “Mongolian” conquest of the XIV century

According to Scaligerian history, many of the modern cities, first and foremost – the capitals of nations, were founded as colonial settlements of the “ancient” Roman Empire thousands of years ago. This would look perfectly natural – imperial authorities founded their forts in the wilderness; a military garrison would come, followed by the imperial representative and the local administration. These settlements would eventually grow into largest and most important; everybody would get accustomed to their leading position, and so they would automatically become capitals of the new states that came to existence as independent political entities after the fragmentation of the Empire.

According to the New Chronology, the picture is correct in general, but it does require an actual chronological revision. As we are beginning to realise, the real colonisation of Europe started with the Great = “Mongolian” conquest and later. The centre of the newly-formed Great = “Mongolian” Empire had been in Vladimir and Suzdal Russia, whose capitals had been in Yaroslavl = Novgorod the Great, Kostroma, Vladimir and Suzdal at various times; Moscow only became capital in the second half of the XVI century, q.v. in Chron6. Therefore, the above passage on the “colonization of Europe, Asia and a part of Africa by the Ancient Romans” needs to be applied to the epoch of the XIV-XV century, which is when the Great = “Mongolian” Empire had created a system of trade
routes that connected the centre of the Empire with its faraway provinces, such as China, India, France, Spain and Egypt. The “ancient Roman colonies” of the Horde were founded around the same time, in the XIV-XV century. Some of them became capitals of independent states that became independent from the Great = “Mongolian” Empire in the XVII century.

However, if the colonization of Europe, Asia and Africa by the “Romans,” or the Horde, took place in a relatively recent epoch, and appears to have been implemented in a planned way, the distribution of these imperial colonial centres must have some sort of regularity about it. Let us imagine what a Czar, or a Khan, would do when faced by the necessity to organise a government of some sort on the vast territories that have just been conquered, quickly and efficiently. Many of them had not been developed at all, according to Mauro Orbini’s book, for instance ([617]; see also Chron5).

Thus, Orbini claims that when the army of the Slavs had first arrived in Holland, it had still been void of populace ([617]). It is most likely that the local centres must have been distributed along the imperial trade routes; this process was hardly random, and must have conformed to a pattern of some sort – a settlement every thousand verst, for instance. The terrain would quite naturally sometimes hinder the implementation of the pattern, but it must have still been followed as a general plan of sorts.

Why would anyone have to introduce such a system? Well, first and foremost, this system brought some order into trade, the postal and the courier services. The Khan had known the approximate amount of time that it took his couriers to deliver one of his decrees from the centre of the empire to one of its distant regions. Large distances would be measured in units of a respective size – thousands of verst, for instance. The nearest colonial centres would lay at the distance of a thousand verst, the next line would be separated from the capital by two thousand verst and so on.

This would be a natural expansion pattern for an empire that managed to conquer a large amount of territory over a short period of time. This is
how the “ancient Rome” in Scaligerian history must have acted, and so this is precisely what the Great = “Mongolian” Empire has done – the very same “ancient Rome” in our reconstruction (see *Chron1* for dynastic identifications). The Empire would draw a web of sorts on the geographical map; local capitals would emerge at the radial intersections thereof, q.v. in fig. 14.69. It is natural that over the course of time some of them may have been replaced by new capitals, built more recently, in different places and for different considerations. Moreover, this scheme would naturally be offset by the geography – seas, mountains, rivers, swamps, etc. Building a network of roads on the actual terrain couldn’t always conform to this ideal a scheme.

Fig. 14.69. The disposition of local capitals as compared to the imperial capital. Such concentric disposition of provincial centres linked to each other by trade routes should be perfectly natural for an empire founded on a vast territory that had formerly been uninhabited.

Nevertheless, it would be interesting to take a look at whether any traces of this pattern can still be made out nowadays. If the above hypothesis is
correct, many of the modern capitals must form circles around the old centre (see fig. 14.69). The location of this centre should also tell us where the old capital of the Empire that colonised the whole of Eurasia had really stood. Could it be the Italian Rome? This can only be estimated from calculations; however, we shall begin elsewhere.

2.2. A most noteworthy mediaeval table of distances between Moscow and various capitals

The book entitled “Ancient Engraved Maps and Plans of the XV-XVIII Century” ([90]) contains an interesting chapter called “Table of Distances between Moscow and Various Capitals.” This table is “usually associated with the name of Andrei Andreyevich Vinius (1641-1717), who had played an important part in Russian history during the transition period of the late XVII – early XVIII century. His father, Andrei Vinius, a Dutchman … came to Russia during the reign of Mikhail Fyodorovich… As a young man, Andrei Andreyevich Vinius received the position of a translator from Dutch at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs… This is where he compiled several almanacs of secular and ecclesiastical works and drew maps… Vinius had organised the Russian postal system, became the first Minister of Communications, occupying this position … for well over a quarter of a century” ([90], page 167). Vinius had therefore been an important government official. Under Peter the Great, “Vinius had been in charge of the Ministries of Apothecaries and Foreign Relations, and in 1697 he was also put in charge of the Ministry of Siberian Affairs” ([90], page 168).

We must instantly emphasise that Vinius had lived and worked in the epoch of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire’s fragmentation and decline. He had been a representative of the new blood that came to replace the deposed ministers appointed by the old dynasty; most of the newcomers were foreign. Vinius and those of his ilk took charge of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire’s ministries (in his particular case it was the Ministry of Foreign Relations).
Apparently, Vinius compiled a table of distances between Moscow and various capitals as head of the Ministry. However, one mustn’t think he was the first to come up with the idea of compiling this table. Its title is as follows: “Summary of Distances between Capitals of Glorious States, Maritime and Continental, including Islands and Straits, Compiled in Accordance with the Old Alphabetic Description of Maritime and Other Distances within the Russian State, Measured from the Capital” ([90], page 166).

The very title of the book implies that it is based on some earlier work – another book kept in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which must have been used in Moscow a long time before Vinius. Needless to say, the book doesn’t exist anymore – at least, we know nothing about it ([90], page 166). It is most likely to have been incinerated, likewise many other documents of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire after the usurpation of power by the Romanovs, or the victory of the Reformation mutiny in the Western Europe, when the losing party was re-writing history and erasing all traces of the Horde Empire.

The name of this old imperial book that hasn’t survived until our day and age shall remain a mystery to us; however, in the rendition of Vinius, it is presumed to have been known as the “Alphabetic Description of Maritime and Other Distances within the Russian State, Measured from the Capital” ([90], pages 166-167). We cite the table in fig. 14.70.
Fig. 14.70. Table of distances between Moscow and different capitals (as well as other cities of importance). Compiled by A. A. Vinius in the XVII century – possibly based on an older table of distances between the capital of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire and the local capitals of states subordinate thereto, a document destroyed by the Romanovs. Taken from [90], page 167.

Judging by the title of his table, Vinius got his figures from this old book,
indicating distances between Moscow and Paris, Baghdad, Vienna and Madrid, as well as Mexico, of all places ([90], pages 167 and 169). Is one supposed to understand this as an implication that the ancient Russian source had considered Mexico part of the Russian Empire? Modern Scaligerian and Romanovian history would naturally consider this absurd; however, there is nothing absurd about it inside our reconstruction (see纪年6). On the contrary, the reverse would be strange, namely, if the distance between Moscow and Mexico hadn’t been in the table. After all, Mexico needed to be reached as well, in order to get decrees over to the local representatives of the Horde and enable the exchange of diplomatic correspondence.

By the way, the reference to Mexico in the old source from the Horde clearly troubled Vinius a great deal. How could Mexico in America have belonged to Russia? What trade relations could have existed between Russia and the faraway Mexico in the XVI century? There had already been no room for them in the new Scaligerian and Romanovian version of history that was being created around that time. Vinius decided to edit the text. Apparently, the easiest thing to do would be to erase Mexico from the list, but Vinius decided to leave it intact for some reason, having just added (possibly, replacing some old text) that Mexico was the capital of the “Swedish Kingdom,” q.v. in fig. 14.71. However, the Swedes had already had a capital in Stockholm (see fig. 14.72). This is common knowledge; naturally, the old book from the Horde epoch also cited Stockholm as the capital of the Swedish Kingdom. The table of Vinius ended up containing two capitals of Sweden – Stockholm and Mexico. We believe this to be a trace of tendentious editing performed by such characters as Vinius who had tried to erase all references to the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. They would occasionally succeed, but not in every case.
Fig. 14.71. Fragment of Vinius’ table that depicts the “City of Mexico,” which is, however, referred to as the capital of the Swedish Kingdom, no less. Taken from [90], page 167.

Fig. 14.72. Fragment of Vinius’ table that depicts Stockholm (Steckholm), which is also referred to as the capital of the Swedish Kingdom. Sweden is thus presumed to have had two capitals for some reason. Taken from [90], page 167.

Fig. 14.73. Fragment of Vinius’ table with the description of the city of Toledo: “The great city of Toledo, where the Ocean joins the White Sea between the Spanish lands and France.” The Mediterranean is explicitly called the White Sea – we find Spain at the junction of the Atlantic (the Ocean) and the Mediterranean. Taken from [90], page 167.

Another echo of the former imperial geography of the “Mongols” carried across by the distance table is as follows: the table of Vinius refers to the
Mediterranean as to the White Sea. Thus, the description of Toledo in Spain contains the following passage: “the great city of Toledo at the junction of the Ocean and the White Sea…,” which can only mean that the White Sea had been another name of the Mediterranean used in the days of yore. This identification is also confirmed elsewhere in the table, which blatantly locates the island of Cyprus in the White Sea. It is rather interesting that the Aegean Sea, which is a part of the Mediterranean, is known as “Byalo More” (The White Sea) in Bulgarian. It washes the coast of the Balkan Peninsula, or, possibly, the land of the White Khan (“Byeliy Khan”). Also bear in mind that “Ak Sha”, or “White Czar,” is the standard Turkic title of the Russian Czar.

Once again we see that the old Imperial geography of the Horde that was used in the XIV-XVI century had occasionally been significantly different from the one introduced in the Romanovian and Scaligerian epoch of the XVII-XVIII century. This is yet another mark left by the tendentious editor, whose attention neither spared the ancient history, nor geography.

However, what we find the most amazing is the following fact. The table of Vinius lists the distances between Moscow and the abovementioned cities and capitals; the distances are “given alongside the most important ancient trade routes” ([90], page 168). Therefore, all the distances indicated in the table are given in accordance with the old trade routes, which hadn’t always been straight, although they were usually designed and constructed to be as short as possible, which means straight. All the distances in the table are given within the aberration threshold of 100 verst. The verst indications in the table have values of 4100, 6300, 2500, 2700, 2900, etc. Therefore, a random distribution should make the share of figures divisible by a thousand roughly equal 1/10. The table contains a total of 56 distances; therefore, random distribution should give us five or six city names whose distance values are divisible by one thousand. What do we see in the table of Vinius?

It turns out that 22 figures out of 56 contained in the table are divisible by thousand – almost one half. This is impossible to explain if the
distances are “random”; this fact alone reveals the existence of some pattern in the location of capitals. It turns out that almost half of the large old cities in Europe, including capitals, are located at distances divisible by thousand verst from Moscow.

We believe this to confirm our hypothesis that many of the large cities and capitals in Europe and Asia were founded in the XIV century, forming the communication grid of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, or the Horde, whose centre had been around Vladimir or Suzdal.

Let us list the distances whose value as indicated in the table of Vinius is divisible by a thousand; those values correspond to the radial distances from the centre, which is in Moscow.

1. Alexandria, 4000 verst.
2. Amsterdam, 3000 verst (via Arkhangelsk).
3. Antwerp, 3000 verst (via Riga).
5. Warsaw, 1000 verst.
6. Vienna, 3000 verst (via Riga).
7. Venice, 3000 verst (via Arkhangelsk, maritime).
9. Georgia, 3000 verst.
11. Jerusalem, 4000 verst. There is no indication of any nation whose capital the city may have been.
12. Kandian Island in the White Sea, or the Mediterranean, 2000 verst. A propos, the name Kandian was included in the title formulae of the Russian Czars ([162], page VII; also [193], page 239).
14. Lahor in Pakistan, 5000 verst. The name Pakistan might be derived from “pegiy stan”, or the residence of the Motley Horde, q.v. in Chron5.
17. Madrid, 4000 verst.
19. Strait City (possibly, Copenhagen, which is situated right over several straits), 3000 verst.

2.3. The European capital circle and its centre

Our opponents might want to suggest that these calculations of Vinius and his predecessors are obsolete, and that nowadays nothing of the kind can be found on any map. The old trade routes are presumed forgotten, and their ancient locations unknown. It is impossible to check Vinius, let alone his ancient source. Moreover, Vinius had introduced some of his own corrections, such as locating Mexico in Sweden … what an odd fellow.

Let us therefore check with the modern globe – a globe and not a flat map that distorts the true distances. Let us mark all the modern European and Asian capitals thereupon: Amman, Amsterdam, Ankara, Athens, Baghdad, Beirut, Belgrade, Berlin, Berne, Bratislava, Brussels, Budapest, Bucharest, Copenhagen, Damascus, Dublin, Geneva, Helsinki, Istanbul, Jerusalem, Kabul, Lisbon, London, Luxembourg, Madrid, Moscow, Nicosia, Oslo, Paris, Prague, Rome, Sofia, Stockholm, Tehran, Tirana, Vienna and Warsaw. Now let us select a random point on the globe, which we shall then alter, and measure the distances between this point and all 37 capitals. We shall come up with 37 numbers. Let us emphasise that the distances are measured on a globe, or the model of the real telluric surface, and not a flat and distorting map.

Let us see whether the point we selected can be the centre of several circumferences, whereupon all, or most, of the abovementioned cities lay (see fig. 14.69). If it isn’t, we shall choose another point, and then another,
close nearby, thus exhausting all the points on the globe. It is perfectly natural that if the distribution of the capitals across the globe is chaotic, no central point can ever be found by definition. However, if the foundation of the capitals took place in accordance with our reconstruction, there might indeed be a central point. Where shall it be? In Italian Rome, which would be natural for the Scaligerian version of history? Istanbul, which would make the Byzantine Kingdom the former conqueror of Eurasia? Or could it have been in Vladimir and Suzdal Russia, as our reconstruction suggests?

The answer required the performance of some simple, although cumbersome, computations. This was performed by A. Y. Ryabtsev.

The answer is as follows. Indeed, there is a central point that can be considered the centre of the two circumferences upon which we find almost all of the capitals listed above. This point is in the city of Vladimir, Russia. By the way, could this explain its rather sonorous name, which translates as “Ruler of the World”?

The job in question was performed by A. Y. Ryabtsev, a professional cartographer from Moscow. We must also give him credit for turning our attention to this rather curious effect manifest in the disposition of European capitals. A. Y. Ryabtsev ran into it in course of his professional activity, which has got nothing to do with ancient history.

Let us consider the actual calculation results in more detail. In fig. 14.74 one sees the geographical map of Europe in a special projection that does not distort the distances between the central point of the map and other points taken into account. We see the city of Vladimir in the centre of the “European capital circumferences,” which is where the calculations imply it to be. The first circumference is the most impressive (see fig. 14.74). It spans Oslo, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Bratislava, Belgrade, Sofia, Istanbul and Ankara with great precision, with Budapest and Copenhagen close nearby. The second circumference isn’t any less impressive, but most of it is comprised of maritime distances. These are the cities that we find upon the second circumference or close nearby: London, Paris, Amsterdam,

Fig. 14.74. Concentric disposition of modern European capitals as compared to the centre – the Russian city of Vladimir. It is obvious that the majority of the capitals are arranged alongside the two concentric circles whose centre is in the city of Vladimir. The radius of the circles equals some 1800 and 2400 kilometres, respectively.

Stockholm, Helsinki, Warsaw, Tirana, Bucharest, Dublin and Jerusalem aren’t on any of these circumferences; Madrid and Kabul might pertain to the circumferences of the next level, being located at the greatest distance from Vladimir.

Let us construct a frequency histogram for the distances between Vladimir and the abovementioned capitals, using the horizontal axis to represent distance, while the vertical lines shall correspond to the statistical frequency of a given distance. We have distributed the distance scale into 50-kilometre fragments, and then used three sliding points for making the histogram look smoother. The result is represented in fig. 14.75.
Fig. 14.75. Frequency histogram for the distances between Vladimir and the capital cities of Europe and Asia.

Two manifest peaks of the histogram make it quite obvious that there are two typical distances between the city of Vladimir and European capitals, equalling roughly 1800 and 2400 kilometres. In other words, the distance between the city of Vladimir and a random European capital is very likely to be close to either 1800 or 2400. There are exceptions, but the general tendency is as described above.

Shall we get a similar picture if we’re to replace Vladimir with some other geographical location – Rome in Italy or Athens in Greece, for instance? The answer is in the negative. In figs. 14.76 and 14.77 we cite similar histograms for all the abovementioned capitals regarded as the possible centre; the histogram of Moscow is the closest, but this is explained by the geographical proximity between the two cities. However, even in this case the peaks look worse than their very distinct counterparts in the Vladimir histogram. The Moscow histogram is worse, and others are even worse than that.
The result that we came up with demonstrates that the very geographic disposition of most European and Asian capitals might reflect a certain ancient construction order, or the concentric disposition of most European and Asian capitals around a certain centre, the Russian city of Vladimir, whose name translates as “Ruler of the World.” This disposition may be of
a random nature; however, our reconstruction explains the concentric circles of capitals perfectly well. Let us reiterate that it might owe its existence to the rapid conquest of new lands and the foundation of new settlements by the “Mongols” in the XIV century. The centre of these circles had been in the Vladimir and Suzdal area of Russia. It is possible that prior to the conquest there had been several cradles of civilization, and they had not spanned such enormous spaces as the gigantic Eurasian Empire with its communications, centralised government and powerful rulers. Concentric circles of settlements that later became local capitals emerged at every focal point of the future communication system, at roughly equal distances from the centre.

Of course, the above is nothing but our own reconstruction based on the abovementioned calculation experiment. However, common sense dictates what we have discovered above to look perfectly sane – it is therefore possible that the reconstruction corresponds to the truth.
3. How the figure of St. George ended up on the coat of arms of Russia

It is usually supposed that the figures of St. George as found on the Russian seals and coins dating from the XII-XIV century had represented a certain Byzantine saint by the name of George, as they are supposed to do nowadays. However, according to our reconstruction St. George (known in Russia as “St. George the Victorious”) is the Russian Czar, or Khan, by the name of Georgiy Danilovich, who had ruled in the early XIV century and instigated the Great = “Mongolian” conquest, also known as the famed Genghis-Khan. One wonders about the exact epoch when this knowledge was lost, and why we believe St. George to be of a Byzantine origin nowadays? It turns out that the answer is already known to historians. This took place in the XVIII century, under Peter the Great, and had been different before. The historian Vsevolod Karpov, for instance, reports that “the mounted knight fighting the dragon as seen on the seals and the coins of the XIII-XIV century … is definitely interpreted … as a representation of the Czar, or the Great Prince in the official documents of that epoch” ([253], page 66). The author is referring to Russia.

Further also: “This is precisely the same way we see Ivan III depicted [as St. George “The Victorious” – Auth.] on one of the earliest artefacts known to us that bears the official insignia of the Russian state – a double-sided seal of red wax on the decree of 1497. The inscription on the seal reads ‘Great Prince Ioan, Lord of All Russia by the Mercy of the Lord’” ([253], page 65).

It turns out that the armed riders depicted on Russian coins were presumed to represent the Great Prince himself in the XV-XVI century: “Under the Great Prince Vassily Ivanovich the coins bore the image of the
Great Prince on a horse, holding the sword; Great Prince Ivan Vassilyevich introduced the custom of portraying the rider armed with a spear, hence the name of the coins – kopeks [kopeiki in Russian; derived from the word for “spear” – “kopyo” – Transl.]” ([253], page 66).

This is also why St. George would often be depicted without a beard. It turns out that Czar Ivan IV “The Terrible” ascended to the throne at a very early age. According to V. Karpov, “it is significant that upon the first kopeks the ruler represented in this militant manner had really been an infant crowned around that time, who would only become known as Ivan the Terrible much later. He was depicted without a beard in the early coins – it wasn’t until Ivan IV turned 20 that the rider on the coins grew a beard” ([253, page 66).

Since when, then, have the Russian Princes been depicted as St. George the Victorious? The article of the historian V. Karpov gives the following answer to this question, which is in perfect correspondence with our reconstruction. He writes the following: “The seals of Prince Youri Danilovich are an amazing example of such a transformation. He had ruled in Novgorod for a total of 4 years, between 1318 and 1322. About a dozen of his seals are known to us; in most cases, the holy rider is armed with a sword. However, the Prince must have been a very vain man, since he eventually introduced new seals portraying ‘a crowned rider’, or the Prince himself. It is significant that the reverse of the seal retained its original meaning” ([253], page 65).

In other words, we are being told that Great Prince Youri (or Georgiy) Danilovich is the same person as St. George the Victorious, which is precisely what we claim. The sly “theory” about the alleged vanity of Youri, or Georgiy Danilovich only appeared because the historians have forgotten the initial meaning of the symbolism contained in the Russian coat of arms. When was it forgotten? The answer is known to historians well enough – under Peter the Great: “It wasn’t until much later, the XVIII century, that this ambiguity was removed from the interpretation of the victorious figure upon the state symbols of Russia. The heraldic
commission founded by Peter the Great made the resolution that the
mounted figure upon the coat of arms was to represent St. George the
Victorious … In the epoch of Anna Ioannovna, the mounted figure with a
spear that one sees on the Russian coat of arms became commonly known
as St. George the Victorious” ([253], page 66).

There is a certain contradiction here. Modern commentators fail to
realise that St. George the Victorious had not been an ancient Byzantine
saint, but rather one of the first Russian Czars, or Khans. The ecclesiastical
calendar refers to him as to the Saint Great Prince Georgiy Vsevolodovich,
which is a phantom duplicate of Georgiy Danilovich misdated to the XIII
century by the Romanovian historians, which is also where they placed the
Great = “Mongolian” conquest of the XIV century. Memory of St.
George’s real identity had remained alive all across Russia up until the
XVII century; however, this memory began to fade after the epoch of the
first Romanov, who had launched their massive campaign for the
obliteration of the Old Russian history dating from older epochs when
there had still been a Great = “Mongolian” Empire.

This resulted in the formation of an odd contradiction in the epoch of
Peter the Great. People were confused about the identity of the figure
drawn upon the Russian coat of arms. On the one hand, everybody knows
it to be St. George; on the other hand, it is supposed to represent a Russian
Great Prince, and that’s common knowledge as well. After the
Romanovian distortion of history, the combination of the two became
impossible, and some choice had to be made. This was promptly done –
out came the decree proclaiming that the Russian coat of arms depicted an
ancient Byzantine saint by the name of George, bearing no relation to the
former Russian Czars whatsoever. This is the time that confuses the
commentators to some extent, and traces of this confusion remain until the
present day. Let us reiterate – we suggest a total elimination of the problem
via the identification of St. George the Victorious as the Russian Czar
Georgiy, also known as Youri Danilovich or Genghis-Khan.

The fact that modern commentators have got a real problem with the
identity of St. George is mentioned explicitly by V. Karpov: “Specialists in ecclesiastical history as well as theologians have tried their best ‘to shed some light over the obscure origins of the legend’ [of St. George the Victorious and the dragon – Auth.], as the historian and literary critic of the previous century, A. Kirpichnikov, pits it. Finally, they found a fitting figure – George, Bishop of Alexandria who had been put to death by the pagans in the second half of the IV century. However, historians regarded this candidate as suspicious. Other versions were suggested and rejected; no real historical predecessor of St. George the Dragon-Slayer has ever been found” ([253], page 73).

The famous ecclesiastical hagiography of St. George bears no relation to the legend about St. George and the snake whatsoever; the historical indications given in this hagiography defy comprehension ([253], page 73).

Our reconstruction makes the situation more or less clear. The arbitrary distinction made between St. George the Victorious and the great Czar, or Khan of the XIV century known as Georgiy, or Youri Danilovich, led to the need to search for this character in the ancient history of Byzantium. However, none such has been found to day. This has created a “scientific problem” that is still being “solved.” However, the famous “Legend of George and the Serpent” (or the dragon) claims St. George to have baptised the mysterious land of Lathia: “George … accompanied by the Archbishop of Alexandria, as the legend puts it, ‘baptised the Czar, his government officials, and the entire populace, some 240,000 people, in a matter of fifteen days’… This legend oddly suppresses the ecclesiastical and the popular memory of all the other miracles wrought by this saint and martyr, as indeed the rest of his biography in general” ([253], page 72).

The location of the mysterious Lathia also remains unknown to modern commentators. We could give them a hint or two. One must remember the common flexion of R and L – the two sounds are often confused for each other; little children often replace their R’s with L’s, finding the latter easier to pronounced. In some languages, L is altogether nonexistent, and
commonly replaced by R – in Japan, for instance.

The mysterious Lathia easily identifies as Russia. Russian history contains a parallelism between the epoch of Vladimir Krasnoye Solnyshko (nickname translate as “The Red Sun”), who baptised Russia in the alleged X century A.D. and that of Youri, or Georgiy Danilovich, aka Genghis-Khan, q.v. above – the XIV century.

We are by no means claiming Russia to have been baptised in the early XIV century. According to our results, the first baptism of Russia is to be credited to the very Andronicus, or Christ, and dated to the end of the XII century, q.v. in our book entitled “King of the Slavs.” Then we discovered that the whole of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire was baptized for the second time by Dmitriy Donskoi at the end of the XIV century, after the Kulikovo Battle, q.v. in “The Baptism of Russia.” However, the respective biographies of Genghis-Khan, or Youri, aka Georgiy Danilovich, and Vladimir Krasnoye Solnyshko doubtlessly contain a parallelism, q.v. above. This may have resulted in the baptism of Russia becoming reflected in the Legend of George and the Dragon. A more detailed analysis of the common mediaeval cult of St. George is given in Chron5.
4. The real meaning of the inscriptions on the old “Mongolian” coat of arms of Russia. How the Romanovs had attempted to conceal this

4.1. What we know about the history of the Russian national coat of arms

Let us use the collection of Russian emblems and coats of arms that we have already been referring to in the present volume ([162]). The book reports the following: “The national Russian coat of arms … is comprised of a black bicephalous eagle with three crowns over its heads, and a sceptre and orb in its paws. On the chest of the eagle we see the coat of arms of Moscow … and on its wings – those of Kingdoms and Great Principalities” ([162], page 27).

The Imperial Russian coat of arms has undergone many transformations over the years. For instance: “The wings of the eagles had initially been folded; however, several seals of the False Dmitriy depict the eagle with its wings spread. The craftsmanship is Western European. The coat of arms of Moscow that one sees on the eagle’s chest was introduced in the epoch of Alexei Mikhailovich, likewise the three crowns, orb and sceptre… There were two crowns before the epoch of Mikhail Fyodorovich, which were usually separated by the Russian cross of six points…

It was customary (especially for the XVIII century coins) to depict the eagle without the Muscovite coat of arms; the orb and sceptre in the eagle’s paws were occasionally replaced by a sword, a laurel-tree branch or another emblem…

The bicephalous eagle on many of the XVI-XVII century artefacts doesn’t come alone, but rather accompanied by four figures – a lion, a
unicorn, a dragon and a griffon. The custom of depicting the Muscovite coat of arms, or a rider slaying a dragon with his spear, is of a later origin” ([162], page 28).

We learn of several allowed variations of the Russian national coat of arms – with folded or spread wings of the eagle, etc. One must remember this when one analyses the “ancient” and mediaeval representations of the symbol.

Towards the end of the XIX century, the Russian national coat of arms, ratified in 1882 for the last time, attained the following form. The bicephalous eagle is crowned with three crowns and holds an orb and a sceptre; there is a shield that depicts St. George on its chest – the Muscovite coat of arms. The main shield is surrounded by nine other shields bearing the following coats of arms:

1. The Kingdom of Kazan,
2. The Kingdom of Astrakhan,
3. The Polish Kingdom,
4. The Siberian Kingdom,
5. The Kingdom of Chersonese in the Tauris,
6. The Kingdom of Georgia,
7. The Great Principalities of Kiev, Vladimir and Novgorod,
8. The Great Principality of Finland,
9. The coat of arms of the Romanovs.


4.2. The national coat of arms of the Russian Empire, or the
Horde, in the XVI century

As we have mentioned above, the national Russian coat of arms was subject to variations and has changed over the centuries. It would therefore be very interesting indeed to see how it had looked in the XVI-XVII century, or the pre-XVI century epoch in the Great = “Mongolian” empire, as well as its fragmentation in the XVII century. According to [162], there are four old versions of this old imperial symbol in existence, dating from the XVI-XVII century, namely:

1) The State Seal of Ivan the Terrible. Here we see 12 seals, or coats of arms, that surround the imperial bicephalous eagle ([162], page VIII, and [568], page 161; see also fig. 14.78). Apart from the twelve seals, indicated by words “seal such-and-such,” above we also see the Orthodox cross of eight points with the legend “The tree giveth the ancient legacy.” In fig. 14.79 we see the reverse side of the seal of Ivan the Terrible ([568], page 163). An actual print of the seal can be seen in fig. 14.80.

Fig. 14.78. The Great Russian Seal of State of the XVI century. Presumably, the seal of
Ivan the Terrible. Taken from [568], page 160; see also [162], page VIII, ill. 23.

Fig. 14.79. The reverse of the royal Russian seal of "Ivan the Terrible." Taken from [568], page 163.

Fig. 14.80. A print of the Great Russian Seal of State ascribed to "Ivan the Terrible." Taken from [550], page 93.

2) The coat of arms from the throne of Mikhail Fyodorovich. The extra
coats of arms that we see here pertain to the 12 imperial provinces.

3) The coat of arms from a silver plate belonging to Czar Alexei Mikhailovich. Here we already see 16 province crests.

4) The Imperial coat of arms as depicted in the diary of a certain Korb, who had accompanied the Austrian envoy of the Habsburgs to Moscow in 1698-1699 on a mission to negotiate about the war with Turkey. Here we already see 32 coats of arms apart from that of Moscow, q.v. in fig. 14.81.

Fig. 14.81. Great Seal of State of the Russian Empire dating from the late XVII century. The drawing is taken from the diary of Korb, who had accompanied the envoy of the Habsburgs to Moscow in 1698-1699. The coats of arms we see on the wings of the eagle belong to the following cities and provinces, left to right: Kiev (Kiovia), Novgorod (Novogradia), Astrakhan (Astrakan), Moscow (Moscou), Siberia (Siberia), Kazan (Casan) and Vladimir (Volodimiria). The coats of arms seen in the oval are as follows (arranged clockwise): Pskov (Plesco), Tver (Tweria), Podolsk (Podolia), Perm (Permia), Bulgaria (Bologaria), Chernigov (Czernichow), Polotsk (Polotskij),
Yaroslavl (Ijaroslafskij), Oudoria (Oudoria), Condia (Condia), Mstislavl (Mstislafskij), Iveria (Iweria), Kabardinia (Cabardinia), the Cherkassian and Gorian lands (Car Kaskij & Iugoria), Kartalinia (Car talinensium), Sweden (Scweia), Vitebsk (Vitepskij), Obdoria (Obdoria), Byeloozero (Bieloserskij), Rostov (Rostofskij), the land of Novgorod-Nizovsk (we haven’t managed to read the legend here), Vyatka (Vijatskij), Yougoria (Ugoria), Volynsk (Volinia) and Smolensk (Smolensco). Taken from [162], page XI (drawing), pages vi-vii (interpreted legends).

One must note that the coats of arms that pertain to the same imperial provinces on the two Imperial coats of arms that we see in figs. 14.78 and 14.81 are often completely different. Apparently, “the appearance of the local coats of arms became more or less rigid in the middle of the XVII century … towards the end of the century, the numerous provincial coats of arms attained their final form” ([162], page VIII, section entitled “The coats of arms of the Russian towns and cities. A historical review”). We can clearly see that the old coats of arms could have significantly differed from their modern form. It turns out that they were also edited tendentiously in the epoch of the Romanovs.

Let us now turn towards the national coat of arms of the Russian Empire, or the Horde, in its XVI century version, or the coat of arms that we find on the state seal of Ivan the Terrible (see fig. 14.78). This coat of arms is presumably the oldest of the four that we list above. Let us consider the twelve provinces that we see around the eagle in this version, for they are extremely interesting to any researcher. We find these provinces are listed on the “Mongolian” Imperial coat of arms in the following order (we go from top to bottom, alternating between the coats of arms listed on the left and on the right – see [162], page VIII):

“Ivan Vassilyevich, Lord of All Russia, Czar and Great Prince of Vladimir, Moscow, and Novgorod;
Czar of Kazan;
Czar of Astrakhan;
Liege of Pskov;
Great Prince of Smolensk;
(Great Prince) of Tver;
(Great Prince) of Yougoria;
(Great Prince) of Perm;
(Great Prince) of Vyatka;
(Great Prince) of Bulgaria, etc.;
Liege and Great Prince of Lower Novgorod;
Liege and Great Prince of Chernigov” (see fig. 14.82).

Fig. 14.82. Lettering from the seal of Ivan the Terrible dating from the XVI century.
Arranged by M. I. Grinchouk.

We must instantly point out the two most conspicuous Great Principalities that became independent from the Russian Empire under the Romanovs – Bulgaria (see figs. 14.83 and 14.84) and Yougoria, or Ugoria (see figs. 14.85 and 14.86), both of them Great Principalities. They exist until the present day; the first one has even retained its name, whereas Yougra, or Yougoria (Ugoria) is the Old Russian word for Hungary. Let us recollect that Hungarians from the Danube, as well as several other peoples, speak a Finno-Ugric language, and are still referred to as an Ugric nation ([797], page 1368). Although the Finno-Ugric nations are scattered all across Eurasia, the history of the Middle Ages knows just one Ugric nation that had been large enough and possessed sufficient military power – namely, Hungary. Therefore, this country appears to be represented in the Imperial Russian coat of arms dating from the XVI century as one of the Great Principalities included in the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. Let us reiterate that we also find Bulgaria here, which had also been a Great Principality of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire once, according to the XVI century Crest
of the Empire, q.v. in fig. 14.78.

Fig. 14.83. Bulgarian coat of arms from the seal of Ivan the Terrible. Taken from [568], page 160.

Fig. 14.84. Bulgarian coat of arms on the State Seal of the Russian Empire. Taken from [162], page XI.

Fig. 14.85. The Yougorian (Hungarian) coat of arms on the seal of Ivan the Terrible. Taken from [568], page 160.

Fig. 14.86. Coat of arms of Yougoria (Hungary) on the State Seal of the Russian Empire. Taken from [162], page XI.
Before we proceed any further, let us emphasise that the entire Great = “Mongolian” Empire is presumed to have been separated into twelve kingdoms, or districts, which must have been the largest and the most important. They are likely to have become reflected in the Bible as the Twelve Tribes of Israel, q.v. in Chron6. These very Twelve Tribes of Israel, or Twelve Theomachist Armies, have settled all across the world after the conquest of the new “promised land,” or the South and the West of Europe, Africa, Asia and America. As a result, all these territories ended up as parts of the Empire, which became a great deal more centralised in the XV century and on.

Quite naturally, some of the twelve kingdoms, or provinces, listed above, had initially belonged to Russia, or the Horde, such as Novgorod the Great, whose coat of arms is perfectly correctly united with those of Moscow and Vladimir, or the Kingdoms of Kazan and Astrakhan, the Great Principality of Smolensk, and so on.

However, one cannot evade a rather poignant question that needs to be asked in this respect. According to our reconstruction, the Great = “Mongolian” Empire must have included the lands of the Western and Southern Europe, especially so after the second Ottoman = Ataman conquest of the XV century, as well as Constantinople, which also fell into the hands of the Ottomans (or the Atamans). That means a part of Asia Minor, Egypt and several of the countries nearby.

Do we see them anywhere in the Russian Imperial coat of arms of the XVI century? Have we run into a contradiction between real facts and our reconstruction? We have not – on the contrary, we shall see a number of interesting facts below, which confirm the correctness of our reconstruction.

4.3. The Great Perm as mentioned in the Russian Chronicles and drawn on the Russian coat of arms dating from the XVI century. The real location of Perm
Let us ask a simple question. Can it be true that all the names that we find in the Russian, or “Mongolian,” XVI century coat of arms mean the same thing these days as they did back then? We already mentioned Bulgaria and Yougra, which the Romanovian historians cannot locate anywhere on the XVI century maps of Russia to date, whereas we instantly pointed them out as Bulgaria and Hungary.

However, this is far from being all; there are several much brighter examples. It turns out that two more Great Principalities of the XVI century represented in the Old Russian coat of arms, namely, Perm and Vyatka, only appear on the map of the Romanovian Russian Empire at the end of the XVIII century – the same year, as it turns out, in 1781. There had never been any areas by those names to the East of Volga, which is where the Romanovian historians locate them today, prior to that.

Let us begin with Perm (see figs. 14.87 and 14.88). Old Russian chronicles mention the Land of Perm very often, reporting its high military potential and great wealth. Many Western European and Scandinavian authors must be mentioning the same land under the name of Biarmia. The opinion that Perm and Biarmia mean the same country was already voiced by several commentators, although it isn’t considered consensual (see the review in [523], for instance, on pages 197-200). Y. A. Melnikova sums up in the following way: “According to these data, Biarmia is a rich country whose inhabitants possess vast quantities of silver and precious adornments. However, the Vikings aren’t always able to bring back the loot, since the Biarmians are rather militant and capable of standing up to the attackers” (ibid., page 198). Modern historians cannot come to a single opinion about the location of the famed Biarmia, or Perm, anywhere on the Scaligerian geographical map of the mediaeval Europe. A lengthy scientific debate on the subject can be read in [523], for instance (pages 197-200).
Let us return to the Russian chronicles. It is presumed that the land of Perm was only conquered and made part of Russia in the XV century. However, this makes it coincide with the epoch of the Ottoman = “Ataman” conquest in time. Historians of today are also trying to convince us that Perm is the name that the Russian chronicles had used for “the territory to the West of the Ural, along the rivers of Kama, Vychegda and Pechora populated by the Komi (referred to as Perm, the Permyaks or the Zyryane in the chronicles)” ([85], Volume 32, page 511). The Great Perm is therefore presumed to have been a distant imperial province, which had been comprised of the wilderness that lies between the Ural and the Volga for the most part. As we shall see below, this claim made by the Romanovian historians isn’t backed up by anything at all, and results from the “Romanovian activity” for the creation of Russia’s “authorised history.”

Furthermore, according to the Russian chronicles, the Land of Perm had neighboured with the Yougra, or Hungary. The following is reported:
“The natives of Novgorod, who had sent trade caravans and armies to the land of Yougra … made the Komi [the Perm nation in the original, since the chronicles did not refer to the Komi anywhere – Auth.] pay tribute to them. Ever since the XIII century the Perm land has been listed as one of Novgorod’s domains; the people of Novgorod used their military leaders and the local aristocracy for the collection of the tribute. Local princes had still existed and maintained a substantial degree of independence … the land was baptised Christian by Stefan of Perm (who had … founded the Perm Eparchy in 1383 and compiled an alphabet for the Zyryane)” ([85], Volume 31, page 511).

“In 1434 Novgorod was forced to give some of the tribute that it had collected from the Land of Perm to Moscow… In 1472, Great Perm … became a province of Moscow … the local princes were made vassals of the Great Prince” ([85], Volume 32, page 511).

Thus, the Land of Perm is said to have possessed princes of their own up until the XV century, ones who were de facto independent, likewise its own bishop and alphabet. The very name (Great Perm) indicates this province of the Empire to have been special in some way – we cannot exactly say that every province of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire became known as The Great.

Let us see just what could have made the Romanovian historians claim that the lands adjacent to River Kama and populated by the Komi identify as The Great Perm as mentioned in the chronicles? Also mark the similarity between the names “Komi” and “Kama.”

We must begin with the observation that the ethnic groups referred to as the Komi nowadays, the modern inhabitants of the territories adjacent to the Kama River, neither call themselves Permyaks, nor Zyryane. It turns out that both names were received from the Romanovs, and apparently taken from the Russian chronicles, likewise the name of the city of Perm – a mere village until 1781, which had formerly been known as Yegoshikha and not Perm, q.v. below. Even the village was founded in the XVII century. How did the Romanovian officials come to identify the famous Great Perm of the XIV-XVI century, described at length in the Russian
chronicles, as the village of Yegoshikha, which was founded in the XVII century? Why did they rename it Perm? Why did the unsuspecting locals receive the sonorous names of Permyaki and Zyryane? What’s become of the famous Perm Alphabet invented by Stefan of Perm? After all, the Komi nation had not been literate until the revolution of 1917, which is stated blatantly in the encyclopaedia (see [85], Volume 22, page 146).

According to another source ([485], page 232), in the XVII century the Komi used an alphabet that was based upon Cyrillics and not the one introduced by Stefan of Perm.

Further we learn:

“The Komi (who refer to themselves as the Komi, or the Komiyas) were known as Zyryane in the Czarist [Romanovian, that is – Auth.] Russia. The population of the Komi equals 226,300 people according to the data of 1926” ([85], Volume 22, page 138).

“The Komi nation hadn’t known trade for a long time … in the XVII century there were only two large settlements in the entire region, Yarensk and Touria, and just one trade village – Touglim … Trade didn’t develop until the XVII century; in the XVIII century it flourished, and numerous local markets came to existence” ([85], Volume 22, page 142).

“Before the revolution, there had been no national press in the land of the Komi” ([85], Volume 22, page 146). There hadn’t even been any press in Russian. It was only after the Revolution of 1917 that “a polygraph facility was created in Komi for the production of books, magazines and newspapers in Russian and in the Komi language” ([85], Volume 22, page 146).

“The founder of the Komi literature is … the poet and educator I. A. Kouratov (1839-75)” ([85], Volume 22, page 146).

However, Kouratov wrote in Russian ([85], Volume 22, page 147). This is easy enough to understand, since the nation of the Komi had still possessed no literacy in his epoch.

“The language of the Komi and the Zyryane, also known as the Komi language, is spoken by the ethnic group known as the Komi (formerly Zyryane)… There are
around 220,000 speakers of the language, whose literary variety was formed … after the revolution, based on the dialect of Syktyvkar and Vychegda, which resembles all the other dialects of the Komi and the Zyryane spoken in the area” ([85], Volume 22, page 149).

We have thus familiarised ourselves with the data that concern the nation of the Komi, which is presumed to play the part of the Zyryane as mentioned in the chronicles according to the Romanovs. Another ethnic group of the Komi, related to the above, played the part of the Permyaki. In both cases the local populace has never bothered to “learn” the names received from the Romanovs, and keeps on referring to itself as to the Komi.

“The Komi Permyaki (who call themselves the Komi, as well as “Komi-Mort,” “Komi Man,” and “Komi-Otir,” “Komi People”) were known as the Permyaki in Russia before the Revolution [under the Romanovs – Auth.]… According to the data of 1926, the Komi population equals 149,400 people. The language and culture of the Permyaki Komi are very similar to those of the Zyryane Komi… The Permyaki Komi have been influenced by the Russian culture since the XIV century, or, possibly, an even earlier epoch” ([85], Volume 22, page 150).

By the beginning of the XX century, “the Komi Permyaki had been a minor nation … heading towards losing its national identity completely… Over the years of the Soviet rule, the literary language and the alphabet were created” (ibid.).

“The language of the Komi Permyaki … is spoken by some 149,000 people. The literary version of the language came to existence … after the revolution, based on the Inven dialect” (ibid., page 153).

Nowadays we are told that it had been exceptionally difficult to make the Komi Permyaki part of the Russian State. Indeed, “the territory of the Komi Permyaki (referred to as ‘The Great Perm’ in Russian sources) became part of Russia as late as in the XV century” (ibid., page 150). In
other words, according to the Romanovian interpretation of the Russian
chronicles, Russia as the Horde had only managed to conquer the bitterly
resisting Permyaki, or the Komi, in the epoch of the Ottoman = Ataman
Conquest, making their empty lands part of the Empire. After that, the
“Perm Seal” was included in the 12 coats of arms corresponding to the
Empire’s main provinces as found on the Russian coat of arms – with
much ceremony, one must suppose. The proud title of the “Great Prince of
Perm” is supposed to have been inherited by the Czar, or Khan, of
Vladimir, Moscow and Novgorod from the hypothetical ruler of the
faraway Yegoshikha village – indeed, even the village itself had not
existed until the XVII century, as we mentioned above. There had been no
traces of the name Perm anywhere in this area until the XVIII century.

This is what we learn about the modern city of Perm: the former village
received this proud name in the XVIII century, and it must have been the
biggest settlement the Romanovs could find here – not even a town!

“The city was founded at the site of the former Yegoshikha Village, whose
foundation dates to the early XVII century. In 1723 a copper processing plant was
built here, and the neighbouring settlement was renamed Perm in 1781 and made
centre of the Perm province” (ibid., page 154).

The name “Permyaki” failed to have stuck after the fall of the Romanovs.
The local inhabitants had still remembered the former name of Komi (or
people from the Kama area). The Soviet Encyclopaedia defines Permyaki
as “an obsolete name of the Komi-Permyaki, an ethnic group” ([85],
Volume 32, page 517).

Thus, the local populace doesn’t identify with the name “Permyaki” and
prefers to call itself “Komi.” The city of Perm was “fabricated” out of the
Yegoshikha Village as late as at the very end of the XVIII century. Why
would the famous Great Perm as described in the chronicles be identified
as the Komi lands nowadays? This is likely to be erroneous – the modern
Komi-Permyaki were supposed to play the part of another nation by the
Romanovs. The objective of such a replacement is obvious – the
concealment of what the name Great Perm had really stood for in the XVI, when it had still been a province of the Great Russian = “Mongolian” Empire.

Now we can formulate our reconstruction. The real mediaeval Great Perm as reflected in the chronicles appears to be Southern Germany without Prussia, Austria and Northern Italy.

The old city of Parma still exists in Northern Italy; its name rings very similar to that of Perm. As for Vienna, the capital of Austria, we can find the Cathedral of St. Stefan there – one of the largest in Europe. The very name Germany (GRM unvocalized) is a possible version of the name BJRMA (Biarma), known to us from mediaeval Scandinavian sources ([523], page 197). As we mentioned above, Biarma and Perm are most likely to identify as one and the same thing. Let us also remind the readers that the name Germany also used to transcribe as “Jermanie” in the Middle Ages ([517]; see *Chron5* for more details). Therefore, B-Jarma, or Biarma, and Jermanie (Germany) must all be versions of the same name.

This makes it perfectly obvious why the alphabet of St. Stefan (Stepan) would disappear from the Romanovian history of the Yegoshikha village without leaving a trace. It isn’t that the Komi from across the Volga, later dubbed the Permyaki, had failed to learn and keep it, but rather that St. Stephan had invented and taught his alphabet elsewhere – namely, Austria, Germany and Northern Italy, which is why he remains in the memory of the grateful local populace. The huge Cathedral of St. Stefan in Vienna was built in his honour. Thus, St. Stefan, or Stepan, must have taught his new alphabet to the Europeans in the XIV century, which is a truly ancient age in our reconstruction. We must also note that he appears to have been the first Bishop of Perm, hence the title – “Stefan of Great Perm” ([936], Volume 2, page 635).

A propos, could Stefan, or Stepan, have invented the Roman alphabet, which would later propagate across many other countries of the Western Europe used by Latin, a well-respected language of the medics, refined literature and the Catechism, and then declared “mind-bogglingly old” in
the XVII century and attributed to such great authors as Titus Livy as their native language? As a matter of fact, the latter appears to have lived in the XVI-XVII century A.D. The same applies to Julius Caesar as well – a famed “ancient” Roman emperor, whose lifetime cannot predate the XIII century A.D.

The identification of the Great Perm as described in the chronicles as the mediaeval Germany makes one of Karamzin’s stories, formerly presumed very odd, perfectly plausible and obvious. Karamzin was following some ancient sources, and apparently failed to understand the facts they would relate at times. He reports the following amazing fact: “The Mongolian expansion continued, and the invaders have reached Perm through the Kazan Bulgaria; many of the Permyaki fled to Norway in fear” ([362], Volume 4, Chapter 2, Column 58). Even a brief glance at the map suffices to realise just how improbable this is, considering the Great Perm to identify as the modern city of Perm on the banks of the Kama. Fleeing to America from those parts would be just as easy; however, if we identify the Great Perm as Germany, everything becomes crystal clear – refugees from Germany could have crossed one of the straits that separates Germany and Scandinavia and ended up in Sweden or Norway.

4.4. The land of Vyatka as described in the Russian chronicles and represented on the XVI century coat of arms of the Horde. The real location of Vyatka

In the Russian coat of arms of the XVI century, Vyatka comes right after Perm (see figs. 14.89 and 14.90). Also, Russian chronicles refer to Yougra, Perm and Vyatka as to neighbouring areas, which is why the Romanovian historians lumped them up together in pretty much the same area when they were striving to erase every trace of the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest of the Western Europe between the Volga and the Ural from documented history and human memory alike – the woody wilderness between the Volga and the Ural. Since we have already identified that
became described in the chronicles under the name of the Great Perm as Austria, Southern Germany and Northern Italy, the historical Vyatka must also be close nearby. This is indeed the case; however, before we demonstrate this, let us enquire about the date and the reason that the Russian city one finds between the Volga and the Ural known as Vyatka nowadays begat its glorious name.

Fig. 14.89. The coat of arms of Vyatka = Spain and Italy on the seal of Ivan the Terrible. Taken from [568], page 160.

Fig. 14.90. The coat of arms of Vyatka = Spain and Italy on the State Seal of the Russian Empire. Taken from [162], page XI.

According to the Encyclopaedia, “Vyatka … was founded by the inhabitants of Novgorod at the end of the XII century as the town of Khlynov … in the XV-XVII century Khlynov, or Vyatka, had been an important trade centre. After the introduction of the Vyatka regency in 1781, Klynov was renamed Vyatka” ([85, Volume 9, page 584). And so we learn that no city of Vyatka had ever existed between the Volga and the Ural – the city in question had been known as Khlynov, and actually mentioned rather often by the Russian chronicles. The name Vyatka is an XVIII century innovation in the present case; apparently, the river that
runs through these parts became known as River Vyatka around the same time, although it could naturally have been known as Vetka before that (the name translates as “branch” or “tributary”), especially considering as how the sounds YA and YE are in a constant state of flux insofar as the Slavic languages and dialects are concerned. The word “vetka” is indeed a suitable name for a river, and there are actual rivers called Vetka, Vetlouga, etc.

This is all just fine, but what connexion is there with the historical land of Vyatka as described in the chronicles?

The encyclopaedia also reports that “the land of Vyatka is the area around Upper Vyatka (and also partially the Middle Vyatka) populated by the Udmurts and the Mariy-El and founded by the people of Novgorod at the end of the XII century. Vyatka’s main city had been Khlynov, other major towns being Kotelnich, Nikoulitsyn, Orlov and Slobodskoi. In 1489 the Land of Vyatka was joined to the Muscovite Principality. At the end of the XVIII century Vyatka became part of the Vyatskaya Province” (ibid.).

“Before the Revolution … Vyatka had been a regional centre, its primary industries being small crafts … The surviving architectural artefacts include the Ouspenskiy Cathedral (1689), Classicist houses of the late XVIII – early XIX century, a gateway, two pavilions and a cast iron fence of the city park done by the architect A. L. Vitberg, who had lived in Vyatka as an exile in 1835-40” ([85], Volume 21, page 114). Therefore, historical artefacts are few and far between in this region.

Were any findings from the epoch of the mediaeval wars that chronicles describe as the famous “Wars against the land of Vyatka” ever made anywhere in the region of the modern Vyatka? None whatsoever – as we can see, the earliest construction that exists in Khlynov, later renamed “Vyatka,” is a cathedral dating from the end of the XVII century.

As is the case with the historical land of Perm, we shall have to look for another and more likely candidate, whose coat of arms had adorned the Crest of the Horde, or the Russian Empire, in the XVI century. This is easy enough to do.
Since we are currently concerned with the events of the XV-XVI century A.D., we land in the “antiquity,” as our reconstruction suggests. It is therefore perfectly natural for us to turn to the famous “ancient” geographical tractate of Strabon. This gigantic oeuvre is a collection of numerous data concerning the geography of the countries that had been around in the “Classical age,” or the XIV-XVI century A.D., as we are beginning to realise nowadays.

Let us turn to the geographical index in the fundamental edition of Strabon’s work ([819]). This is what it tells us: “Betica, a region of Iberia; Betius, a town in Iberia; Betius, or Betis (known under the name of Guadalquivir today) – a river in Iberia” ([819], pages 853-854). Iberia identifies as Spain, which brings us to the conclusion that the historical land of Vyatka as described in the chronicles is the mediaeval Spain of the XIV-XVI century.

Moreover, the same geographical index contains the entry about “Vatica, a city in Campagna” ([829], pages 852 and 856). It is also known as Bagli (ibid.). We must remind the readers that B and V are often subject to flexion, and that the sound V in many Slavic words and names turns into B in their Westernised versions. Campagna is located in Central Italy, likewise Vatican, whose name also contains the consonant root VTK. Therefore, the “Mongolian” Vatican in Italy is a fitting candidate for the centre of Vyatka as described in the chronicles, whose coat of arms had still been included in the Russian (or “Mongolian”) imperial coat of arms in the XVI century.

Apart from the region of Betica (or Vyatka), Strabon also names Vettonia as part of Iberia ([819], page 856). Another mediaeval name that attains a new meaning is that of Helvetia Prima, which we see in the mediaeval maps of the Western Europe, such as the map from Ptolemy’s Geography, for instance ([1353], see fig. 14.91). The country that we see on this map is Switzerland. The name Helvetia contains a root that is virtually identical to “Vyatka,” whereas “Prima” (or “the first”) might be related to Perm in some way. The actual name Helvetia might simply stand...
for "Gaulish Vyatka" – after all, we see the legend Helvetica upon Swiss coins until the present day. Gaulish Vetica, or Gaulish Vyatka, perhaps? Bear in mind that Switzerland is located between Austria (referred to as Perm in the chronicles), France (Gaul in the chronicles) and Italy = Vatican = Vyatka.

Fig. 14.91. Map of Switzerland ascribed to the “ancient” Ptolemy. From Ptolemy’s *Geography*. Taken from [1353], map 33.

In the XV-XVI century, these “Mongolian” names referred to large territories in the Western Europe that were parts of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. However, the Romanovian historians and cartographers have subsequently relocated these names to the least populated part of Russia as they were writing the “authorised” history of mediaeval Russia. The local ethnic groups, known as the Komi, had still been illiterate in the XVII century, and therefore didn’t notice a drastic change in the part they played in the ancient history, likewise the great and noble deeds attributed to their ancient ancestors. The Westerners were happy and grateful to get rid of the names that had attained an unpleasant
connotation for them in the Romanovian epoch, and the names of Perm and Vyatka upon the Russian coat of arms had finally ceased to embarrass the Romanovian historians as well as their colleagues from the Western Europe.

4.5. Tver as reflected in the Russian chronicles and represented in the Russian coat of arms in the XVI century

We encounter the name Tver on the official coat of arms of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XVI century (q.v. in figs. 14.92 and 14.93). What city did it refer to? According to our reconstruction, the historical city of Tver identifies as Czar-Grad, or Constantinople on the Bosporus – Tiberias, in other words. See Chron6, Chapter 4 for a more detailed account of the above.

Fig. 14.92. Coat of arms of Tver = Czar-Grad on the seal of Ivan the Terrible. Taken from [568], page 160.

Fig. 14.93. Coat of arms of Tver = Czar-Grad on the State Seal of the Russian Empire. Taken from [162], page XI.

For the time being, let us merely state that historians themselves reckon that “Tver had once been regarded as playing the part of the new
Later on, when the Romanovian historians had started their campaign for the creation of a “new” history, they moved the name Tver to the north of Russia from the Bosporus, which had also made the XVI coat of arms a great deal more palatable for themselves and their Western colleagues alike.

Let us remind the readers that the modern city of Tver has no traces of any old fortifications, citadels, royal chambers or indeed any constructions that predate the XVII century, which should tell us that the city had always been part of Russia, located hundreds of miles away from the nearest front line and void of strategic importance. In particular, this means that the modern city of Tver had never been capital of any independent nation conquered by the Empire.

4.6. Pskov = Pleskov = Prussia on the coat of arms of Russia, or the Horde, in the XVI century

It is known that the city of Pskov had also been known as Pleskov once – for instance, Karamzin reports it in [362], Book 4, column 384, geographical index. However, we have already mentioned it several times that the sounds L and R often became confused for one another, and Pleskov must really mean Preskov, or Prussia. Thus, the Western European Prussia was represented in the Russian coat of arms of the XVI century as one of its regions, or an Israelite (“Theomachist”) tribe existing as part of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire (see figs. 14.94 and 14.95). This fact is explained by our reconstruction perfectly well.

Fig. 14.94. Coat of arms of Pskov = Prussia on the seal of Ivan the Terrible. Taken from
4.7. The disposition of the twelve kingdoms (tribes) as seen on the XVI century Russian coat of arms in the geographical maps of Europe

Let us indicate the twelve kingdoms, or provinces that we see on the front side of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire’s official state seal dating from the XVI century.

In Chron6 we outline the connexions between these twelve kingdoms and the famous twelve tribes, or columns, of Israel as mentioned in the Bible. We shall end up with the diagram one sees in fig. 14.96. Large numbered dots correspond to the real capitals of the twelve kingdoms, or tribes, that one finds around the imperial bicephalous eagle of the Horde, or Russia. The numeration corresponds to their order in the seal’s coat of arms.
Fig. 14.96. The disposition of the twelve capitals of kingdoms listed on the front side of the State Seal of Russia (the Horde) dating from the XVI century. All of these kingdoms were part of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire in the XVI century. Our reconstruction.

1. Novgorod the Great, including Vladimir and Moscow, or the Vladimir and Suzdal Russia.
2. The Kingdom of Kazan.
3. The Kingdom of Astrakhan.
4. The Land of Pskov = Prussia, North and Central Germany.
5. The Great Principality of Smolensk.
6. The Great Principality of Tver, or Tiberia, with its capital in Czar-Grad, or Constantinople, on the Bosphorus.
8. The Great Principality of Perm = Germany and Austria.
9. The Great Principality of Vyatka = Spain and Vatican.
10. The Great Principality of Bulgaria.
11. The Land of Nizovsk = Nizhniy Novgorod.
12. The Land of Chernigov.

Fig. 14.96 demonstrates the kingdoms of the Horde (or the Biblical Twelve Tribes) to be grouped in a particular way, excepting the last two that were added to the coat of arms after the “etc.”

The first group is comprised of the Volga kingdoms, namely, Novgorod the Great, Kazan and Astrakhan.

The second group is the West of Russia: Pskov, or Pleskov (Prussia)
and Smolensk = White Russia or Blue Russia.

The third group is the West and the South of Europe – Czar-Grad, or Constantinople, Hungary, Austria, Spain, Italy and Bulgaria.

The fourth group is comprised of two more Russian principalities – Nizhniy Novgorod and Chernigov.

Thus, the official XVI century coat of arms of Russia, or the Horde, really reflects a large part of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. The only lands missing must be the poorly developed areas in the Far East and the West, including the American territories, q.v. in Chron6. All of the above is in good correspondence with our reconstruction.

4.8. The Romanovian coat of arms from Korb’s diary

In fig. 14.81 we represent the state coat of arms dating from the Romanovian epoch, which already dates from the end of the XVII century (see [162], page XI, section entitled “Coats of Arms of the Russian Cities: a Historical Description”). Here we see quite a few more coats of arms as compared to the imperial “Mongolian” crest of the XVI century.

In particular, we see a number of mysterious kingdoms and principalities – Udorian, Condian and Obdoran.

Apart from that, we see the principalities of Iberia and Cartalina. The latter is most likely to identify as Georgia, which makes Iberia identify as Spain.

We are by no means trying to say that Spain had still been part of the Russian Empire at the end of the XVII century, it’s just that the Romanovs have adopted the old coat of arms from the epoch of the Horde, which had contained the crests of all the faraway kingdoms that Russia had owned as the Horde in the XV-XVI century.

This “Mongolian” coat of arms is likely to be more detailed than the one discussed in the previous section.

This is why we see such famous kingdoms as Sveia, or Sweden, q.v. in fig. 14.97. Next we have the Iberian Kingdom, or Spain, q.v. in fig. 14.98, followed by the Kingdom of Yougoria, or Hungary, then Bulgaria, and
finally Perm, or Austria.

Fig. 14.97. Coat of arms of Sweden (Sveia) on the State Seal of the Russian Empire dating from the XVII century. Taken from [162], page XI.

Fig. 14.98. Coat of arms of Iberia (Spain) on the State Seal of the Russian Empire dating from the XVII century. Taken from [162], page XI.

Let us return to the three new names in the “Mongolian” coat of arms – the Oudorian, Condian and Obdoran principalities, or kingdoms. Let us once again turn to Strabon, the “ancient” author who must have lived in the XVI-XVII century, as we are beginning to realise nowadays.

4.9. The British Isles = England or the Isle of Crete as the Cantian island on the coat of arms of Russia, or the Horde

Let us begin with the Candian kingdom (see fig. 14.99). It appears that Cantius is the old name of Kent, the famous mediaeval kingdom on English territory ([819], page 876). This is where we end up if we cross the English Channel coming from the Continent – Kent can be regarded as a “gateway to England.”
Fig. 14.99. Coat of arms of the Kingdom of Candia (England or the Isle of Crete) on the State Seal of the Russian Empire. Taken from [162], page XI.

Fig. 14.100. Fragment of a map of Greece dating from the XVIII century. The map was manufactured in Amsterdam. The year of its compilation is not indicated anywhere on the actual map. Carte de la Grèce. Par G. de l’Isle de l’Academie R. des Sciences et I. er Geog. du Roy. A Amsterdam Chez R. & I. Ottens Geographes.
As we already mentioned in the section about the foundation of the European capitals and their chronology, Russian sources had retained the memory of a certain Candian Island, presumably situated either in the Mediterranean or the Atlantic Ocean, up until the XVII century. Apparently, the Mediterranean and the Atlantic had still occasionally been regarded as a single body of water in that epoch. This implies that the Candian Island is simply Britain (Isle Cantius, or Isle of Kent).

It is possible that in the XV-XVI century the entire Britain had been referred to as Cantius by the “Mongolian” Khans, or the Czars of the Great Empire. A propos, the Archbishop of Canterbury, or Kent, is still considered Head of the Church of England – thus, Russian ecclesiastical sources may still have referred to the entire Britain as to Kent, or Candius, in the epoch of the Horde, which became reflected in the coat of arms of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire.

Let us briefly quote an encyclopaedia entry on Kent: “Canterbury is a town in the South-East of England (County Kent)... After the Anglo-Saxon conquest of Britain the city became capital of the Kentish Kingdom. At the end of the VI century A.D., the country’s oldest abbey was founded here, and a bishop appointed. Kent becomes the residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury around this time – head of the Catholic Church until the XVI century, and the Head of the Church of England ever since. The English Gothic style is represented widely in the architecture of Canterbury” ([85], Volume 20, page 528).

Thus, we have Gothic architecture in Kent. As for the identity of the Goths, in Chron6 we give a detailed account of why we believe them to have been the Cossacks.

Further also: “Kent is a county of Great Britain, in the South-East of England, next to the Straits of Calais... Historically, Kent had been populated by the Belges [the Volgari, or the Bulgarians? – Auth.]. In the I
century A.D. Kent was conquered by the Romans. The region of Kent had been the most Romanised part of Britain as a Roman province. In the middle of the V century it was conquered by the Germanic tribe of the Utes, who had founded their kingdom here. In the 780’s Kent had been part of the Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Mercia, and then Wessex (from the IX century and on). After the baptism of the Kentish kings in 597, Kent became the most important stronghold of Catholicism in the country” ([85], Volume 20, page 527).

It is possible that the name Utes really refers to the same old Goths, whereas Mercia is simply a “marine country,” or the entire Great Britain. Wessex may be a derivative of “Messex,” since the scribes were often prone to confusing W and M. The double S often represented the sound SH in mediaeval texts, which would make the word Messex read identically to Meshech, the name of a legendary Biblical patriarch that was also associated with the Muscovite kingdom. This fact is known quite well, and we relate it in detail in *Chron5* and *Chron6*.

However, the island of Candia can be found in the actual Mediterranean (also formerly known as the White Sea) on a number of old maps – it is the Isle of Crete. This is how it is referred to on the map entitled “Turkey in Europe,” dating from 1714 and compiled by John Senex from the information provided by the Royal Societies of Paris and London. One of the map’s copies is kept in the archive of the Belgrade Museum in Serbia; this is where A. T. Fomenko saw it in 1997. The Isle of Crete is called Candia in this map, likewise the capital of the island. The name Crete is altogether absent.

Let us also point out that the Mediterranean had explicitly been referred to as the White Sea in certain mediaeval sources. For instance, the *Notes of a Janissary*, which were presumably written in the XV century by a janissary from Ostrovitsa called Konstantin Mikhailovich ([424]). These notes are also known as the “Turkish Chronicle.”

4.10. Obdora in the Russian coat of arms and the “ancient”
Abdera in Betica, Spain

Romanovian historians claim that the principality of Obdora as represented on the Romanovian coat of arms, q.v. in fig. 14.102, is some area in the North-East of Russia, where the mediaeval principalities of Perm, Vyatka and Candius are presumed to have been located ([162], page 29, article entitled “Territorial Coats of Arms: Heraldic Basics.”

Fig. 14.102. Coat of arms of Obdora (the city or region of Betica in Spain; alternatively, Abdera in Thracia (France) on the State Seal of the Russian Empire dating from the XVII century. Taken from [162], page XI.

We already covered Perm, Vyatka and Candius, which must identify as a number of well-known Western European countries.

However, in this case the mysterious “Mongolian” Obdora must also be located somewhere in the West or the South of Europe. Let us turn to the “ancient” Strabon once again.

We find numerous mentions to the city of Abdera in Betica, or Spain, as we now realise. We also find Abderes in Thracia ([819], page 837). In this case, the mysterious Obdora from the State Russian, or “Mongolian” coat of arms shall identify as a city or a whole province in Spain or Thracia – or, possibly, France, if we are to recollect that it had also been known as Thracia at some point.

4.11. The mysterious Oudoran principality on the Russian coat of arms and River Odra in Germany

Romanovian historians cannot indicate the Principality of Oudora
anywhere on the crest of mediaeval Russia (see fig. 14.103).

In the seal from Korb’s diary (fig. 14.81) its coat of arms can be seen in between those of Yaroslavl and Condia.

In the Imperial coat of arms, the crest of Oudora neighbours with Pskov and Smolensk on the third shield in the top row of six shields (see fig. 14.104).
At the very bottom we see the Oudoran coat of arms; Pskov’s is in the centre, and Smolensk’s is on the left.

All of the above leads us to the suggestion that the “Mongolian” lands in question are the territories adjacent to River Odra, which is where we find the border between Poland and Germany nowadays.

4.12. Our reconstruction

Let us formulate our idea, which is expounded further in *Chron6*.

1) In the second half of the XVI century a rebellion started in the Western Europe; it is known to us nowadays as the Reformation. The rebellion had been political rather than ecclesiastical, and its objective had been the independence from the rule of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire.

2) The Czar, or the Khan of the Horde regnant in the epoch of these dramatic events became reflected in many chronicles under a variety of names, such as Ivan the Terrible, Charles V (or simply “The Fifth King,” and Nebuchadnezzar, king of Assyria and Babylonia as described in the Bible.

3) The Great Czar, or the Khan of Russia (the Horde) did not manage to maintain the integrity of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire in the XVI century. A great strife began at its very centre, as the books of Esther and Judith are telling us. The Empire fragmented as a result. In the XVII century the Western Europe became independent from the Empire. However, this had not been sufficient, since the reformers had been well aware that the strife wasn’t permanent, and that the Empire was likely to attempt another expansion. In order to prevent this, they needed to drive a wedge between the two most powerful parts of the former Empire – Russia, or the Horde, and the Ottoman (or Ataman) Empire. This was done by the pro-Western dynasty of the Romanovs. They started a series of wars with Turkey. The Western European rulers, who had just become
independent and were doing their best to maintain independence, managed to draw a breath.

4) The rights of the new dynasties that had just come to power as a result of the reformation demanded justification. This, as well as the euphoria that followed the liberation from the Scythian yoke, had served as the primary cause for re-writing history – this process wasn’t advertised too much, but went on in the most intense manner imaginable in the Western Europe of the XVI-XVII century. The Romanovs had instigated a similar process in Russia. Thus, history in general splits up in two parts – before and after the XVII century. The former became distorted to a great extent; the primary motivation for it had been to get every trace of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire and Russia as the Horde. The exhilaration about final liberty from the Great = “Mongolian” Empire had been truly great, and its wave rolled over the entire Western Europe, some of the echoes surfacing as late as in the XIX century. A minor, but illustrative detail is the map of Europe that was published in England in 1877, q.v. in figs. 14.105 and 14.106. The map is kept in the British museum; one of its reproductions was included into the fundamental atlas entitled *The Art of Cartography* ([1160], pages 337-338). Russia is represented as a gigantic repulsive kraken that looms over Europe; the graphical allegories for all the other European countries are much more attractive. This agitprop tradition can be traced to certain mediaeval Western European stereotypes known to us from the *Chronicle* by Matthew of Paris, for instance ([1268]; see *Chron4*, Chapter 18:17). Matthew had used the entire weight of his authority to claim that “the Mongols and the Tartars only drink water when they can get no fresh blood” ([722], page 240).
Fig. 14.105-106. Map of Europe published in Britain in 1877. Russia is drawn as a repulsive octopus that reaches its tentacles towards the civilised nations of Europe and Asia, intending to devour them. As we realise nowadays, this fear of Russia from the part of the Western Europe goes a long way back in history. According to the commentary, “The Octopus – Russia – forgetful of the wound received in the Crimea, is stretching out its tentacles in all directions … [in reference to the Crimean War fought in the middle of the XIX century – Auth.].” Taken from the *Art of Cartography* atlas ([1160], pages 337-338).

5) A large-scale campaign for the editing of the ancient chronicles commenced in the XVII century, when the new “authorised” version of history was replacing the old. The most blatantly “heretical” chronicles were destroyed, likewise the more “radical” versions of the Bible, while others were re-written. Freshly written literary works became declared “ancient” and therefore of great authority. Unpleasant and embarrassing events became dated to phantom epochs in the distant past, and some of the key terms have altered their meanings as a result, such as
“Catholicism,” “Empire,” “The Reformation,” and so on. The events of the pre-XVII century epochs have therefore become distorted to a large extent by the XVII-XVIII century editors, and are extremely difficult to reconstruct nowadays.
5.
The old coat of arms of Yaroslavl depicting a bear holding a Cossack pole topped by an Ottoman crescent. These poles were considered a symbol of power all across Europe up until the XVII century

We have already seen the Ottoman, or Ataman crescent on many ancient Russian coats of arms. This isn’t quite as obvious nowadays, owing to the second historical and geographical reform launched by the Romanovs at the end of the XVIII century. The usurpers also instigated a second wave of mass renaming, which had concerned urban and regional coats of arms in particular. As a result, the Ottoman (Ataman) crescents vanished from the Russian coats of arms. We already mentioned the first Romanovian renaming plague that had struck Russian history in the XVII century. Apparently, it had not been sufficient, and so the Romanovs decided to finally streamline Russian history, polishing it off, in a way. Pay attention to the fact that many Russian coats of arms were re-introduced around 1781 and often also modified rather drastically, q.v. in the section on the coats of arms of the Russian cities above (Chron4, Chapter 10:2; also [162]). One must also point out the disappearance of the Ottoman (Ataman) crescent from the coat of arms of Kostroma.

The above cannot fail to make one wonder about Yaroslavl’s old coat of arms as reconstructed within the framework of our theory. Nowadays the bear is holding a poleaxe on its shoulder, but one must remember that this version of the crest was only introduced in the second half of the XVIII century, namely, in 1777 ([409], page 10). An older drawing of the coat of arms of Yaroslavl is known to us from the “National Almanac” compiled in 1672. “The city coat of arms of Yaroslavl … depicts an erect bear that
holds a protasan on the right shoulder” ([409], page 9). In 1692 this drawing was used in the making of the principality seal accompanied by the legend “Royal Seal of the Principality of Yaroslavl.” Historians claim that this version of Yaroslavl’s coat of arms only dates from the XVII century; however, they admit that the design was based on folk tradition traceable all the way back to the foundation of Yaroslavl ([409]). We shall shortly see just why historians are so reluctant to recognise the version of the coat of arms with the protasan-carrying bear as being much older than the XVII century.

What is a protasan, actually? Let us take a look at an old drawing of the Yaroslavl coat of arms taken from the Great Seal of State dating from the XVII century ([162], page XI; see fig. 14.81). The drawing comes from the diary of Korb, which is known well enough. We can see the bear hold a pole topped with a crescent (see fig. 14.107). A protasan is therefore a spear-like construction where the spearhead is replaced by a crescent. Moreover, it turns out that the pole of a protasan would usually be decorated in some way: “painted and upholstered in silk or velvet” ([85], Volume 35, page 111). And so, according to the above description, protasans were completely identical to the famous Cossack bunchuks, which were likewise adorned and had crescents on their ends. The bunchuk is presumed to be a purely Turkish symbol nowadays – however, one finds it on the crest of the Yaik Cossacks, for instance (see fig. 10.7). Consequently, the bunchuk had been the state symbol of the entire Great = “Mongolian” Empire, and not just its former Ottoman part. Moreover, we learn that bunchuks with crescents, or protasans, had been used as a symbol of power up until the XVII century. We learn of the following: “the protasan had been used as a weapon … used by the bodyguards of the feudal lieges in the Western Europe up until the XVII century. In Russia, protasans were used by bodyguards in the XVII century, and in the XVIII century the protasan eventually transformed into a ceremonial weapon worn by officers of high rank, losing its utility as a combat weapon” ([85], Volume 35, page 111).
All of the above is in perfect correspondence with our reconstruction. The Ottoman, or Ataman bunchuks with crescents had indeed symbolised royal power in the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, all across its vast territories, which had at some point included Western Europe in particular. It is perfectly obvious that the bear on the crest of Yaroslavl should have initially been drawn holding a protasan, or a Cossack bunchuk topped with an Ottoman = Ataman crescent. The Machiavellian transformation of the protasan into a poleaxe took place under the Romanovs, and rather late, at that – already in the XVIII century. The reason why they did it is right out there in the open – the usurpers were methodically destroying whatever evidence of the fact that the Ottoman = Ataman conquest was launched by the Horde, or Russia, had still remained intact by that time.

Actually, the Great Seal of State from Korb’s diary contains yet another distinctly visible Ottoman (Ataman) crescent, which can be found in the coat of arms of Byeloozero (see fig. 14.108). The latter happens to be a historical Russian city situated to the north of Yaroslavl. What we see is obviously a constellation of old crests with crescents upon them around Yaroslavl – the actual city of Yaroslavl has one on its crest, likewise its neighbours, such as Kostroma and Byeloozero.
Fig. 14.108. The Byeloozero coat of arms on the State Seal of Russia dating from the XVII century. Ottoman crescent with a cross (or a star). Korb’s diary. Taken from [162].
6.
The “ancient Olympus” and Russia as the Horde in the XIV-XVI century

6.1. Kronos and other Olympian deities of the Western Europe

As most of us were getting acquainted with the Classical mythology for the first time as children and adolescents, it was instilled into our heads that the gods of the ancient Greece had presumably lived in times immemorial, upon the mountain of Olympus in Greece. The representatives of the pantheon in question are the protagonists and participants of a great many poems and legends declared “ancient” nowadays – Kronos, Zeus, Athena, Aphrodite and many other powerful deities formerly worshipped by the Greeks.

Let us turn to the History by John Malalas, a prominent Byzantine historian of the Middle Ages ([938], [338] and [503]). Apparently, Malalas is of the opinion that Kronos, Zeus and other “ancient” Greek deities had started their divine careers as the first kings of Assyria, or the first Czars of Russia, as we realise nowadays – namely, the Russian Czars of the XIV century: Ivan Kalita, or Caliph, Georgiy Danilovich, and their numerous descendants.

This is what John Malalas reports: “The very tribe of Shem that had been in command of Syria, Persia and many other Oriental lands traces its ancestry all the way back to the first son of Noah, a giant named Kronos, named thus by his father Damius … He had been of formidable strength, which became famous even before he became king… And he had reigned over Assyria for many a year … fierce and fearsome in battle had he been, showing no mercy” ([338], page 24; also [503], pages 195-196).

Malalas proceeds to report that the wife of Kronos had been known by the name of Semiramis or Area, or Ira/Irene. The children of Kronos were
called Zeus, Nin and Ira ([338], page 24; also [503], page 196). We see several references to the same female name of Irene, or Ira. Zeus had also been known as Pik and Diy ([503], page 196). The son and heir of Zeus, or Pik, had been known as Velon ([338], page 25). According to our reconstruction, the first Assyrian Czars had been the Khans, or the Czars of the Horde, or ancient Russia; they lived in the XIV century. In particular, Ivan Kalita = Caliph, also known as Batu-Khan, became reflected in a number of chronicles as Kronos, the Olympian deity.

Let us return to the name Diy, which had belonged to the Olympian god Zeus according to Malalas, as well as an Assyrian king ([503], page 196). We know of no such name nowadays, but there is evidence that suggests that it had once been used, in Russia at least. One might recollect the large village that still exists near Yaroslavl called Diyevo Gorodishche (the name translates as Diy’s settlement); it is presumed to have been founded in the XV century (see [409], page 66). The village had initially been a fortified settlement. We can thus see that the name Diy was not invented by the Byzantine author Malalas, and that its traces can still be found in Russian toponymy. Apart from that, the name “Diy” could be a derivative of the Russian word “deyu,” which translates as “I make,” “I create,” etc. The word “theos,” or “deos” (“god”) has got similar origins, being the creator of the world.

John Malalas gives an in-depth account of the Western campaign launched by Kronos, aka Ivan Kalita, aka Batu-Khan, and tells us about a number of important new details: “Kronos left his son Pik in Assyria, likewise his wife Area, also known as Semiramis, and marched forth towards all the Western lands that had no kings to rule them, leading an enormous army … and Botiu had remained in the West, ruling over the entire land thence” ([338], page 25). The word “Botiu” strikes one as odd initially, but it is most likely to be a variation of the name Batu that the commentators failed to recognize as such.

Thus, according to Malalas, Kronos, King of Assyria, also known as Ivan Kalita and Batu-Khan, who had later transformed into the Olympian
god Kronos in numerous “ancient” poems and legends, did not return from his campaign, having founded a new capital in the West. Apparently, during the first years, when communications had not yet been developed to a sufficient extent, the Russian Czar, or Khan, was finding it very difficult to rule over the distant Western provinces from his capital on the Volga, Novgorod the Great. John Malalas specifies that the Western capital of Kronos, King of Assyria, had been in Italy ([338], page 26; also [503], page 196). This makes it instantly clear to us why the residence of the Holy See is called the Vatican – even N. A. Morozov mentions that the name Vatican translates as “Batu-Khan” ([547]).

We feel obliged to remind the readers that the Scaligerian chronology misdates the campaign of Batu-Khan = Ivan Kalita = Kronos the Assyrian to the XIII century, which is a hundred years off the mark. Once we turn to the history of Vatican in the XIII century, we learn of the most amazing fact – it turns out that right at the beginning of the XIII century Pope Innocent appears on historical arena – the name translates as Ivan-Khan! He is reported to have been a secular ruler of the entire Europe apart from being the Holy Pontiff (see fig. 14.109). The whole of Europe had simply paid tribute to him: “Innocent had been an extremely ambitious and vain person… Innocent III managed to gain control over not only the episcopate, but secular rulers as well. He became the sovereign of vast territories in Europe – the kings of Scandinavia, Portugal, Aragonia and England, likewise the rulers of Serbia and Bulgaria, recognised him as their liege, and paid him large tribute. Other countries had also paid St. Peter’s fees [once again, a tax that went to Innocent, or Ivan-Khan – Auth.], and were forced to bear with the Pope meddling in their affairs of state… He was assisted by a perfectly organised administrative and fiscal agent framework. The Curial Council and legates sent to every country in Europe had controlled the implementation of the Papal orders” ([492], page 124).
Let us also ponder the name “Curial Council.” The Latin word “curia” stands for a confederation of ten clans ([85], Volume 24, page 99). The Russian word kuren, used by the Cossacks historically, means pretty much the same thing and also sounds similar, which makes the Latin word likely to derive therefrom. The actual “ancient” division of the Roman populace into curia must have been introduced after the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest of Europe in the XIV century, and by none other than Ivan Kalita = Batu-Khan the Assyrian = Pope Innocent.

It also turns out that Ivan-Khan, or Innocent, had been “the mastermind of the Fourth Crusade [which had resulted in the fall of Constantinople – Auth.], the foundation of the Latin Empire on Byzantine territory and the universities of Paris and Oxford. The emerging new monastic orders had brought fourth a new era in mediaeval Christianity. The transformation of the Apostolic Capital [or Vatican, aka the House of Batu-Khan – Auth.] … into one of the most powerful financial powers in Europe is also credited to Pope Innocent III” ([402], page 125). Let us remind the readers that, according to our reconstruction, the word Order (Ordo) is also a derivative of the Russian word for “horde,” “orda.”

Our reconstruction gives us an altogether new perspective of the Pope’s endeavours. They came in the course of the actual Great = “Mongolian”...
Conquest of the Western Europe by Batu-Khan = Kronos the Assyrian = Pope Innocent. We see the introduction of a new clan organisation system – the curia, or the kureni, the foundation of Vatican, or the residence of Batu-Khan in Italy – his Western capital, the state-sponsored construction works all across the Western Europe and so on.

It is also most likely that Innocent III = Ivan Kalita had not been buried in Moscow, but rather in Egypt, q.v. fig. 14.110.

Fig. 14.110. Another photograph of the headstone made in the XVII century as a replica and found at the “sepulchre of Ivan Kalita” in the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral of the Kremlin in Moscow. We made this photograph in April 2002, with different lighting as compared to another photograph of the same headstone that we reproduce above, in fig. 14.11. One can clearly see that even the inscription found on the Romanovian replica did not evade the attention of the censors. The authentic sepulchre of Ivan Kalita (Caliph), also known as Batu-Khan, is most likely to be on the Royal “Mongolian” cemetery in Egypt, on the Pyramid Field, or in Luxor.

A propos, one cannot fail to note that the very physical type reflected in the portrait of Pope Innocent III, q.v. in fig. 14.109, is dramatically different from that of all the other Popes, obviously his successors. Innocent’s cheekbones are typically Slavic, and he also wears a long beard.

Let us however return to the description of the Great = “Mongolian”
Conquest as rendered in the Chronicle of John Malalas, who reports that after the troops of Kron had left Assyria and marched Westward, his son Zeus remained in charge of affairs at home. This historical personality had eventually transferred into the legendary image of the Olympian god Zeus. His duplicate in the Russian version of history bears the name of Simeon the Proud – the son of Ivan Kalita. A while later, Simeon, or Zeus, joined his father in the West and also stayed there to reign. The Assyrian, or Russian, throne, soon went to Nin, the second son of Kronos.

The name Nin appears to be a slight corruption of Ioann/Ivan/John. Malalas must be referring to Ivan Ivanovich Krasniy (“The Red”), the second son of Ivan Kalita = Kronos the Assyrian = Batu-Khan, who had indeed ascended to the throne after the “mysterious disappearance” of Simeon the Proud (according to the learned historians, he had expired of plague). According to Malalas, Simeon the Proud (aka Zeus and Pik) did not die of any plague, having moved to Italy instead, and ruled there as the successor of his father for many years ([338], page 26; see also [503], page 196).

Malalas describes Western Europe of that epoch as a wild and largely uncultivated land, without so much as towns and cities: “There had been neither cities, nor fortifications in the Western lands – just a few nomadic descendants of Japheth living here and there” ([338], page 28). It appears as though in many parts of the Western Europe the people had still maintained a very primitive lifestyle, neither building cities, nor even making fortifications of any kind. Malalas is therefore of the opinion that Kron the Assyrian (who apparently identifies as Batu-Khan, or Ivan Kalita), may have had the Western lands all but fall into his hands.

We also encounter an interesting reference to the “ancient” Diodorus made by Malalas – it concerns the burial site of Zeus (Simeon the Proud?) on the Isle of Crete. He was buried in a temple erected specifically for that purpose:

“And his sons had erected a temple in memory of his father, and they laid him into
a casket on the Isle of Crete; the coffin exists to this day” ([338], page 29; also [503], page 196).

It is possible that some remnant of the tomb of Zeus, or Simeon, had survived until our day and age. This issue is worth of a further study.

It becomes clear why the Isle of Crete had formerly been known as Candia, which is the name we discuss above. It was present on certain maps up until the XIX century – see the map in fig. 14.101, for instance. The reason might be that the name Candia derives from Khan Diy. According to Malalas, this name had been worn by Zeus, or Simeon the Proud, a Russian Great Prince. The old name of the island implies Zeus, of Diy, to have been a Khan, which is in perfect correspondence with our reconstruction.

Malalas also mentions other descendants of the Assyrian King Kronos = Ivan Kalita (Caliph), such as Hermes, etc. All of these “ancient Greek deities” had once been kings of Persia or Assyria according to Malalas, or the Russian Czars (Great Khans) in our reconstruction. They had reigned in Italy, Egypt and other countries that had been under the rule of Assyria, or Russia, in the XIV-XVI century ([503], page 196).

Our reconstruction makes everything crystal clear. Malalas is telling us about the first Czars of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, who had reigned in Russia, or the Horde (also known as the Biblical Assyria) ever since the XIV century. It is natural that the inhabitants of all the lands owned by the Horde had regarded the Khans as their mighty lords and rulers. Later on, in Greece and other warm countries on the coast of the Mediterranean, the memories of the former Assyrian, or Russian, rulers, transformed into myths of mighty gods that had lived on the faraway Mount Olympus, tall and misty, from whence they cast their thunderbolts (fired cannons), making the rebels tremble in fear. They would also occasionally visit their worshippers in the human form, take mortal concubines and sire demigods. The latter had subsequently reigned on the behalf of the “authentic Greek gods” in the beautiful “ancient” Hellas, Italy, Gaul, Egypt
Let us also point out that the name Ira, or Irene (Irina) had really been common among the wives of the first Assyrian rulers (subsequently deified). There is a possible connexion with the Temple of St. Irene in Constantinople.

6.2. The name Irina reflected in the historical toponymy of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire

The oldest temple in Czar-Grad had been known as the Temple of St. Irene, q.v. in Chron6. The name Ira, or Irene, obviously became reflected in the toponymy of the regions that had been directly related to the Great = “Mongolian” Empire – Ireland, Iran (Persia) and so forth. Let us also remind the reader that the name Persia is a version of the name Prussia, or White Russia, according to our reconstruction. We must also point out the fact that the wife of Yaroslav the Wise was called Irina ([404], page 264). Our reconstruction identifies Yaroslav as Batu-Khan, Ivan Kalita and John the Caliph. This is why we believe it likely for the name of his wife to have been immortalised in the names of places that had once been part of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire.

And now for a rather surprising fact. It turns out that the name Irina had been borne by the mother of the Biblical King Solomon, or the wife of the Biblical King David. Let us turn to the famous Gennadiyevskaya Bible, allegedly dating from 1499 (more precisely, a photocopy thereof that was published in 1992 – see [745]). In the first lines of the Gospel according to Matthew we read that “King David begat Solomon from Irina” ([745], Volume 7, page 15; see figs. 14.111 and 14.112). Could this very Irina be represented by the mosaic from Hagia Sophia in Czar-Grad that we reproduce in fig. 14.113? This would be more than natural, since, according to our reconstruction, the Biblical King Solomon identifies as the famous Ottoman, or Ataman Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent, who is also known as the XVI century “restorer” of Hagia Sophia. According to
our reconstruction, he didn’t “restore” anything – he built the temple (see *Chron6*, Chapter 12).

---

**Fig. 14.111.** The first page of the Gospel according to Matthew in the Guennadievskaya Bible allegedly dating from 1499. Taken from [745], Volume 7, page 15.

**Fig. 14.112.** Photograph of the first lines of the Gospel according to Matthew in the Gennadievskaya Bible allegedly dating from 1499. The wife of David and mother of Solomon is explicitly called Irina. Taken from [745], Volume 7, page 15.
This fragment of the Gennadiyevskaya Bible must have really sounded heretical to the meticulous XVII century editor, who had done his best to make the name Irina contrast the neighbouring names of David and Solomon as little as possible. As one sees in fig. 14.112, a small circle of O has been put in front of the name’s first letter; this would transform the sound from I to OU. Old Russian texts, such as the Gennadiyevskaya Bible, used to transcribe the letter U as either the handwritten Greek γ, or a combination of two letters, O and U (�示). The letter that stands for the sound I is called “izhitsa” (ɪ), which looks very much like γ; however, it needs to be preceded by an O to sound as “OU.” The missing letter was happily provided by the editor. Let us emphasise that it is obviously a later subscript, since the “alleged letter �示” isn’t transcribed in this odd a manner anywhere else in the Gennadiyevskaya Bible. Moreover, there are two horizontal strokes over the izhitsa (see fig. 14.112), which is a diacritic sign used in cases when the letter stands for the sound I exclusively, and never used in combination with the ⽰ at all.

What does the modern Synodal translation say? Could it have preserved the name Irina? Obviously not – the modern translation is rather oblique, and goes like this: “King David begat Solomon from one of Uriah’s kin”
(Matthew 1:6). See fig. 14.114 for the Church Slavonic original.

\textit{дѣло же црь роди соло/мона, ву оріны.}

Fig. 14.114. Quotation from the Ostrog Bible (Matthew 1:6).

The editors went even further here, having transformed Irina into an anonymous relation of Uriah, a male. Apparently, they didn’t count on the old text of the Gennadiyevskaya Bible to fall into too many hands, presuming that no one shall ever bother too hard about trying to decipher the real name. This is the way the ancient history was “amended” – slyly and succinctly; the “amendments” later became presumed to have been in the text from the very beginning.

The above quotation was taken from the genealogy of Jesus Christ, which is what we find in the beginning of the Gospel according to Matthew. This genealogy also ties the Gospels to the Old Testament chronologically, placing them at the very end of Biblical history. Another fact that needs to be mentioned in this respect is that the genealogical passage from Matthew had not been included in the list of “Evangelical readings” contained in the Gennadiyevskaya Bible. This means that this part of the Gospel had never been read aloud in mediaeval churches, and could therefore become expurgated from the so-called Aprakos Gospels used for reading aloud during service. The “chronological passage” is therefore likely to be apocryphal and introduced by Scaligerian and Romanovian historians, which may also explain why it spells the name of Jesus as Иисус, with two letters и, which is the spelling introduced after the reforms of Nikon in the middle of the XVII century. It is spelt as Исус in every other passage – the old way, that is (see \[745\]).

**Corollary:** It is most likely that the first page of the Gospel according to Matthew from the Gennadiyevskaya Bible was replaced by another, written anew in the XVII century in order to correspond with the
Scaligerian and Romanovian historical chronology.
We would like to bring an extremely interesting XVIII century book to the attention of the reader. It has been pointed out to us by Y. A. Yeliseyev, who had also been kind enough to copy a number of passages for us.

The book in question was written by Johannes Heinrich Driemel (or Drümel) published in Nuremberg in 1744. A Russian translation came in St. Petersburg in 1785 under the following title: “A Specimen Historical Demonstration of the Genealogy of the Russians as the First Nation after the Deluge.” A copy of this book is kept in the National Library of Russia, which is where Y. A. Yeliseyev had come across it.

The contents of this rather small book in German can be rendered in the following manner. History of the world begins with the Assyrian Kingdom, which Driemel also identifies as the Kingdom of the Scythians, or the Cossacks, or Gog and Magog, or the Russian Kingdom. The Biblical Nimrod was of Scythian, or Russian, descent. These are the very words that Driemel uses! In the XIII century the Russians, known as the Tartars in the West, invaded into the Western Europe. The memory of this invasion is kept alive in the toponymy of Germany, for instance. Driemel cites the name of Mount Risen as an example, and explains that the name translates as “Russian Mountain.”

Driemel concludes in the following manner:

“The word Ris is Scythian without a doubt… The word Ris is said to be German, but it can equally be Scythian. The Germans and the Scythians have many common names, and had once been brothers. This is why the Russian are also known as the
The fact that Driemel identifies the Russians as the Tartars in a perfectly casual manner must seem astonishing to a modern reader, but it had appeared perfectly natural to a XVIII century citizen Nuremberg, who doesn’t even bother with citing any evidence to support this claim, being very pedantic about it normally. He considers it axiomatic!

One must realise that the book of Driemel had been written before the propagation of the theory about the “horrendous yoke of the Mongol and Tartar invaders in Russia” thought up by the “eminent Russian scientists” Bayer and Schlezer. Driemel had simply remained unaware of their great discovery, and had adhered to the old German way of thinking about the Russians and the Tartars being but two names of a single nation.

As for the Russian origins of the Biblical Nimrod, Driemel already needs to prove those, since the Scaligerian version of the Biblical history had already become widely used in Western Europe.

We shall proceed to give a few quotations from Driemel’s book that speak for themselves.

Driemel starts with references to a number of the “ancient” authors, proving the first nation after the Deluge to have been the Kurds, whose very name can actually relate to the words “Horde” and “gordiy” (“proud”). What makes him think so? Apparently, Driemel reckons that the modern Kurdistan is part of Assyria, and every mediaeval chronicler knew about the Assyrian Kingdom being the first one ever founded. As we have tried to demonstrate in the present book, the true meaning of this statement is that the “Mongolian,” or the Great, or the Russian = Assyrian Empire had been the first kingdom to span the whole world. Driemel’s further elaborations de facto confirm our reconstruction, since he later identifies the Biblical Assyrians as the Scythians and the Russia. However, Driemel follows the erroneous Scaligerian geography and fails to understand that the Biblical Assyria had really been Russia, or the Horde,
all along. This is why he traces the origins of the Russians to the ancient inhabitants of the modern Mesopotamia, or Assyria.

Driemel reports the following:

“The northern part of this land [Kurdistan – Auth.], which comprises most of Assyria, is called Adiabene… It is mentioned by Strabon in the ninth book of his ‘Geography’, wherein he says that the inhabitants of the land are called the Sacopods or the Sacs… Ptolemy in his ‘Asian Tables’ mentions the Sacian Scythia to be the place where Noah had stopped… Solinus writes in Book XLIX that the Persians had originally been known as the Korsaks, and that the name translates as “Cordian Sacs” ([261], pages 26-27).

Driemel comments these quotations from the “ancient” authors in the most remarkable manner indeed: “These may be the ancestors of the Cossacks” ([261], page 27). Therefore, Driemel openly identifies the Scythians and the “ancient” Sacs as the Cossacks.

Driemel proceeds to tell us the following:

“The Sacs are the main ethnic group in Scythia (Strabon, Geography, Book XI)… The Sacs are identified as the Scythians everywhere (by Isidore in the ‘Characteristics’ and by Arian in the ‘Tale of Alexander’s Campaigns’, Book 3)” ([261], page 29).

Driemel’s own comment is as follows:

“The name Scythian translates as ‘catcher’ … the word ‘catcher’ is translated as ‘giant’ in the Greek Bible; other nations use the word ‘Scythian’… Therefore, the words “Catcher,” “Kurd,” “Giant” and “Scythian” are synonymous … the Bible refers to the ‘Catchers’ as to a nation” ([261], page 30).

Driemel is therefore proving that the Biblical King Nimrod, the founder of the first kingdom upon the face of Earth after the deluge, had been a Scythian. This last word is erroneously translated as “catcher” in the modern version of the Bible. Driemel further identifies the Scythians as the Russians.
“The names of Gog and Magog are Scythian in origin as well” ([261], page 33). Driemel’s commentary in re the passage from Ezekiel that mentions Gog and Magog is as follows:

“The 70 Translators render this passage as follows: ‘Thou art facing Gog, Prince of Rosh, Meshech and Thubal’… Since Magog is translated as ‘Rosh’, which is the name of a nation that the translators must have been familiar with, they [Gog and Magog – Auth.] had also been Scythian, since the nations of Magog, Meshech, Thubal, Homer and Farhaman had been Scythian – the first nations of the North (Moses, Book I, Chapter X 2.3), most of which had been known as the Scythians in the epoch that this prophecy is telling us about … Joseph Flavius, a Judean historiographer, states it explicitly that Gog and Magog are Scythian (Book VII, Chapter 1)… Stromberg, who had lived among the descendants of the Scythians, and a most trustworthy source, writes in the ‘Description of Europe and Asia’ (page 42), that the Scythians refer to themselves as Goug and Gioug, and that the affix Ma stands for the Orient; and so, Gog and Gioug are the same thing, whereas Magog is the name of the Oriental Scythians” ([261], pages 34-36).

After that, Driemel proves (quoting several “ancient” and mediaeval authors, as usual) that the Scythians can be identified as the Persians, quoting an entry from a mediaeval encyclopaedia:

“Right after the entry ‘Magic’ we read that the Persians are referred to as Magog and Nagouzei [a reference to Nogaisk? – Auth.] by their neighbours… Upper Assyria is the motherland of the Scythians. Persia lies to the East… However, no other nation fits to represent the Eastern Scythians better than the Persians… Hodollogomor, King of Elim or Persia (Genesis, Chapter XIV) is referred to as the King of the Scythians (see his comments to Genesis, Chapter X) – therefore, Gog, Magog and Giug are all names of the Scythians” ([261], pages 37-38).

One might think that the nations in question are Oriental in origin, and have always inhabited the territory of the modern Persia. This doesn’t contradict Scaligerian history that much; however, Driemel goes on to prove that the Russians and the Germans are both of Scythian descent.
Such claims naturally sound outlandish insofar as consensual history is concerned (and coming from a German author, at that), but they are in perfect concurrence with our reconstruction, according to which the Biblical Assyria, also known as Persia and the land of Gog and Magog identifies as mediaeval Russia, or the Horde, while the Germans are likely to be the descendants of the Slavs that came from Russia, or the Horde, during the Great = “Mongolian” conquest.

Let us carry on with quoting from Driemel:

“The forefathers of the Germans had been known as the Scythians (Pliny, ‘Natural History’, Book IV, Chapter 25), the Gettians, the Celtic Allemanians, the Franks and the Germans… ‘Japhet’ translates as ‘giant’, which is also the word used in the Sarmatian Chronicle, whereas the Chronicle of Alexandria says ‘Scythian’… The Germanic peoples (Gudlingian, Book 1) translate the Greek ‘giant’ into German as ‘Riesen’… the Holy Writ refers to peoples of exceptional height, strength and bravery, such as the Nephaim, Emim and Enakkim… The Norwegian and Danish chronicles report the Risi to be a Baltic nation that had signed a peace pact with the Normans” ([261], pages 39 and 42).

Driemel then tells us directly that “the Risi are the Russians” ([261], page 43).

“The name Russia is Latin, whereas the Greeks use the word ‘Rosses’ (those are mentioned by the Greek authors as a Scythian nation; in the X-XIII century, Kedren wrote the following in his ‘Brief History’ (page 453): ‘The Rosses are a Scythian tribe that occupy the Northern part of the Tauris). They call themselves Reises (Russians)’… The Germans pronounced the name as ‘Riesen’” ([261], pages 42-43).

“And thus I enquire – what are the origins of Mount Riesen’s name, whence did the name come to the hills between Bohemia and Silesia? The only reason I believe to be true is that the Tartars, also known as the Rises and the Russians, had sadly invaded Silesia as a hostile force in the XIII century” ([261], page 45).

This is how Driemel casually refers to the Tartar and Mongol invasion,
calling it the Russian conquest and obviously unaware of the extent to which he compromises the pact made by later historians about never ever recollecting that the Russians were formerly known as the Tartars, or that the Horde had colonised the West.

Further also:

“The writers of all epochs recognise the Rises, the Rosses or the Reises as a Scythian nation (Kedren)” ([261], page 46).

This is how a German author from the early XVIII century saw global history. The adepts of the modern textbooks shall of course treat the above information as utter nonsense and wonder about how an author as ignorant as Driemel could possibly have written a book and get it published. Actually, in Chron5 we explain (referring to A. D. Chertkov) that there were many such books published in Germany. It would be very interesting to analyse all of them. We haven’t done this and just used a single example – the book of Driemel, which also exists in Russian translation. As we can see, many Germans had still remembered the true course of world history in the early XVIII century, albeit vaguely.
8.
The imperial bicephalous eagle and the possible origins of the symbol

In 1997 the book of G. V. Vilinbakhov entitled *The Russian National Coat of Arms: 500 Years* ([134]) was published. The author writes about the history of the Russian coat of arms – the bicephalous eagle, deeming it perfectly natural that the Russians had lacked the imagination necessary to invent a symbol of their own and had to adopt it from elsewhere. Three possible sources are named – Byzantium, Western Europe and the Golden Horde ([134], page 23). Apparently, “the eagle figure on the coinage of the Golden Horde is likely to be Oriental in origin and not a Byzantine import, as some of the researchers suggested. V. I. Savva came up with the theory that the bicephalous eagle on the Juchid coins had stood for the seal of some Khan of the Golden Horde” ([134], page 23). This idea corresponds with our reconstruction, according to which the bicephalous eagle of the Golden Horde had been a Russian symbol used in the Horde from the very beginning.

We must also recollect that the seal of Ivan III is very similar to that of Ivan IV, which is precisely how it should be, according to our reconstruction. Both seals are simply inscribed with the name Ivan; one obviously finds no “numbers” here (see figs. 7.6 and 7.8, as well as *Chron4*, Chapter 7:7).

Vilinbakhov’s book also tells us about the ancient Russian banners, that have apparently borne the “symbol of the sun and the crescent” ([134], page 31). It is very likely that in some of them at least the symbol was that of the star and crescent, well familiar to us from the Ottoman = Ataman Empire. It is odd that the publishers of the album ([134]) for some reason didn’t reproduce a single photograph or at least a drawing of some such
banner. Could it be due to the overly explicit representation of the star and crescent, perhaps? It is also said that the “sun symbol and the crescent” had once accompanied the imperial two-headed eagle ([134], page 31): “The composition consisting of a crowned bicephalous eagle with the sun and the moon to his sides had once been the crest on the banner given to Prince Grigoriy Cherkasskiy from Astrakhan by Czar Alexei Mikhailovich in 1662. A similar banner was received by Prince Boulat Cherkasskiy in 1675. On some of the banners, the sun and the moon can be to the left and right of the cross upon the Golgotha [sic! – Auth.]; we can also refer to a similar engraving dating from the late XVII – early XVIII century entitled ‘Our Lady and the Crucifix’, where the celestial luminaries are depicted on the sides of the cross with crucified Christ” ([134], page 31).

All of the above indicates that the Ottoman = Ataman symbols had still been rather common in the late XVII – early XVIII century.

Let us now ponder the reason why the imperial symbol is a two-headed bird – after all, such phenomena in nature are extremely rare and regarded as abnormalities. It is perfectly obvious that in case of the imperial bicephalous eagle the choice of symbol was dictated by special considerations of some sort that had nothing in common with biology.

What is the real reason? Although the issue is of no principal importance to us, it is rather curious in itself. Let us put forth a certain hypothesis in this respect.

We shall turn to the extremely rare and utterly fascinating engravings of Albrecht Dürer that comprise his famous “Glory Arch of Maximilian I” – the so-called Ehrenpforte ([1067]). In fig. 14.115 we see a detail of one such engraving that shows a coat of arms drawn by Dürer. It is perfectly obvious that we see a crescent here, with shining rays on its both sides that look remarkably like the feathers of the two raised bird’s wings formed by the crescent. There is no head here – however, it becomes obvious that the famous bicephalous eagle must really be another rendition of the same old star (or cross) and crescent symbol. The two heads of the eagle with their backs to each other can be regarded as yet another version of the star, or
the cross, that rests upon the crescent, or the eagle’s wings. Therefore, the bicephalous eagle with its wings raised is yet another version of the Christian cross (of six or eight points), or the Ottoman star and crescent, all of them ultimately standing for the same thing.

![Ehrenpforte](image)

Fig. 14.115. One of the crests on Dürer’s *Ehrenpforte*. Ottoman crescent emitting rays of light looks like the spread wings of an eagle. Taken from [1067], page 30.

In fig. 14.116 we reproduce another coat of arms from Dürer’s “Ehrenpforte” that depicts a bicephalous eagle, whose wings obviously form a crescent, whereas the body and the two heads are arranged as a part of the cross. What we have in front of us is therefore yet another form of the six-pointed or eight-pointed Christian cross. It also becomes clear why the initial version of the eagle had raised wings – they were representing the crescent. Folded wings are a result of later modifications introduced when the initial meaning of the symbol had already been perceived rather vaguely; eventually, it became forgotten for good. The eagle’s wings must have been folded in the epoch of the Reformation so as to get as far away as possible from the possible associations with the Christian cross, or the Ottoman star and crescent.
Fig. 14.116. One of the crests on Dürer’s *Ehrenpforte*. The bicephalous eagle is most likely to be a version of the star and crescent, or the combination of the cross and the crescent (octagonal or hexagonal Christian cross). Taken from [1067], page 30.

In fig. 14.117 we see another coat of arms taken from [1067], page 298. Here we see two eagles, each with a single head, with their wings raised, obviously symbolising crescents and stars (or Christian crosses).

Fig. 14.117. Coat of arms with two eagles (crosses or crescents). The spread wings form the actual crescent. Taken from [1067], page 298.
In fig. 14.118 we see four heraldic eagles with their wings raised and obviously representing crescents ([1067], Page 16). Here the crescents, or the wings, are drawn right on the body of the eagle. We see the same to be the case with the coats of arms reproduced in figs. 14.119-14.122. This effect is the most observable in fig. 14.122, where the crescent is perfectly blatant and instantly recognizable.

![Fig. 14.118. Four crests (eagles) from Dürer’s Ehrenpforte. We see a crescent on the chest of the eagle. Taken from [1067], page 16.](image1)

![Fig. 14.119. Coat of arms with two eagles (star and crescent symbols) from Dürer’s Ehrenpforte. Taken from [1067], page 24.](image2)

![Fig. 14.120. Coat of arms with two eagles = star and crescent symbols from Dürer’s Ehrenpforte.](image3)
Fig. 14.121. Coat of arms with the eagle (star and crescent symbol, or Christian cross) from Dürrer’s *Ehrenpforte*. Taken from [1067], page 25.

Fig. 14.122. Perfectly obvious shape of an eagle (cross with crescent). Taken from [1067], page 31.
9.
The genealogy of the Great Princes of Moscow as rewritten in the XVII century

It appears that the genealogy of the Muscovite Great Princes had been written anew in the XVII century, no less ([134], page 37). This is what we know about the matter at hand: “Around 1673 Emperor Leopold I had sent his heraldic expert, a Slav named Lavrentiy Khourelich (or Kourelich), to Moscow at the request of the Czar [Alexei Mikhailovich – Auth.]. In 1673 Lavrentiy Khourelich wrote a tractate entitled Genealogy of the Most Holy and Reverend Great Princes of Moscow et al... The Genealogy was sent to Moscow from Vienna in 1674 personally by the author, who had entrusted it to Paul Menesius for that end; this was recorded in the documents of the Posolskiy Prikaz [royal service in charge of foreign relations – Transl.] Apart from the actual genealogies of the Russian Czars, from Vladimir Svyatoslavich to Alexei Mikhailovich, and the description of the family ties between the Czar and the monarchs of nine other countries, the work of Khourelich contains portraits of the Czars and the Great Princes” ([134], page 37).

Therefore, historians themselves are telling us that some new version of the genealogy of the Russian Czars and Great Princes was written in Vienna in the second half of the XVII century, and then posted to the Czar in Moscow, apparently, as a reference manual for the “authorised version” of history – one that was meant to be followed obligatorily, perhaps?

A propos, the Genealogy (commonly referred to as the “Titular Book”) has never been published – it is still being kept in an archive, waiting to be destroyed in another “random conflagration.”
What mainstream historians say about the New Chronology?

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

The New Chronology also contains a *reconstruction*, an alternative chronology, radically shorter than the standard historical timeline, because all ancient history is “folded” onto the Middle Ages. According to Fomenko’s claims, the written history of humankind goes only as far back as AD 800, there is almost no information about events between AD 800–1000, and most known historical events took place in AD 1000–1500.

The New Chronology is rejected by mainstream historians and is inconsistent with absolute and relative dating techniques used in the wider scholarly community. The majority of scientific commentators consider the New Chronology to be pseudoscientific.
History of New Chronology

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

In 1887, Edwin Johnson expressed the opinion that early Christian history was largely invented or corrupted in the II and III centuries.

In 1909, Otto Rank made note of duplications in literary history of a variety of cultures:

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

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

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

**Fomenko’s claims**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

He claims that parallelism between John the Baptist, Jesus, and Old Testament prophets implies that the New Testament was written before the Old Testament. Fomenko claims that the Bible was being written until the Council of Trent (1545–1563), when the list of canonical books was established, and all apocryphal books were ordered to be destroyed. Fomenko also claims that Plato, Plotinus and Gemistus Pletho are one and the same person; according to him, some texts by or about Pletho were 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.**


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

**Book two, part two: Methods-2.**


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

**Book three: Methods-3.**


**BOOK FOUR: Russia, Britain and Rome.**


**BOOK FIVE: The Empire.**


**BOOK SIX: The Biblical Russia.**


**Book Seven: Reconstruction.**


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