

# HOW IT WAS IN REALITY

A.T.Fomenko , G.V.Nosovskiy

## PREFACE

### **1. THE UNIVERSALLY ACCEPTED VERSION OF WORLD HISTORY WAS CREATED ONLY IN THE XVII CENTURY. IT WAS REFINED UP UNTIL THE XIX CENTURY. THIS VERSION IS INCORRECT.**

The present book occupies a unique place among our publications on the New Chronology. It was written by popular demand of our readers. Many people tell us: "You criticized the currently accepted version of chronology and the version of the history based on it. You suggested your dating methods and pointed out many duplicates (repetitions), considerably 'shortening' the written history of mankind. Suppose you are right. But then an important question arises: What happened in reality? Could you write a 'concise guide' on your new chronology and the new version of history"?

We fragmentarily outlined our reconstruction several times. Now, when a vast amount of material has accumulated, there arrived a moment to put together the main findings and to reconstruct the actual past. In [1v] and [2v] we showed that the archaeological and physical methods of dating which exist today, including the famous radiocarbon method, are unfortunately poorly suited for the dating of artefacts 1-2 thousand years old. These methods produce errors comparable to the age of the samples.

We will rely on the new chronology which we established based on the mathematical, empirical and statistical results presented in the first three books of the 'Chronology' in seven volumes and also in [6v3], ch.2. The main chronological shifts – by approximately 333 years, 1050 years and 1800 years discovered by A.T.Fomenko in 'ancient' and mediaeval history are indicated in the Global Chronological Map (ГХК) created by A.T.Fomenko in 1975-1979. The main research on the New Chronology was carried out by A.T.Fomenko, G.V.Nosovskiy, V.V.Kalashnikov and T.N.Fomenko.

We do not substantiate our point of view in this book. This would in fact lead to an actual repetition of everything said before. That is why we are presenting just a summary of the reconstruction. To see the evidence please refer to our previous main books, of which there are 24. These are the books of the 'first wave', i.e. seven volume 'Chronology' followed by the 17 books of the 'second wave' which are sometimes called the 'Golden Series' (due to its golden cover), i.e. B-1,..., B-17, see the Bibliography. The important materials are also sited on our official website [www.chonologia.org](http://www.chonologia.org). Many things said in this book are still a hypothesis.

Here we usually leave out the references to the primary sources. You can find them in our previous books. We do not claim to be extremely precise in the suggested dating. A great deal of work will be required to refine the new chronology and some hypothesis. That is why we still reconstruct history just 'by the centuries', i.e. stating the century of a given event, but without specifying the date within the century.

We showed that at present there is no proof of the Scaligerian chronology which is widely accepted today. Such proof – as we state with full authority – was never there and is still absent. Therefore the history of antiquity should be re-written. We are compelled to take this difficult task upon ourselves.

The New Chronology started from the creation of the new mathematical, statistical and astronomical methods of dating the events described in the old sources. Based on these methods we reconstructed the correct chronology of antiquity. This is our main result. Here it would be appropriate to recall the name of one of the books by A.T.Fomenko – 'THE TRUTH CAN BE COMPUTED'.

Then, based on the new Chronology, we generally outlined the reconstruction of history up to the XVIII century inclusively. It was followed by the next stage. They started asking us: so what IN REALITY did the famous 'classical' authors – Herodotus, Thucydides, Titus Livius, Homer and the others tell us about? When answering the question we analysed practically all major 'classical' and mediaeval sources which form the foundation of the Scaligerian history of the antiquity, the building of which, as we found out, was rather late – in the XVII-XVIII cc.

In particular we thoroughly researched the following texts: the Bible (both the Old and the New Testaments), Talmud, Torah, the New and the Old Testaments 'Apocrypha', Koran, the Book of Mormon, Popol Vuh (the Sacred Book of the American K'iche Mayan people, Herodotus, Titus Livius, Claudius Ptolemy, Homer, Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus, Publius Cornelius Tacitus, Marcus Tullius Cicero, Plutarch, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, Aristophanes, Ovid, Polybius, Pausanias, Virgil, Seneca, Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, Ammianus Marcellinus, Josephus Flavius,

The Aggadah (Aramaic tales), Appian of Alexandria, Apollodorus, Eutropius, Sextus Aurelius Victor, Aelius Spartianus, Iulius Capitolinus, Aelius Lampridius, Paulus Orosius, John Malalas, Marco Polo, Giovanni da Pian del Carpine, the Epic of 'ancient' India 'Mahabharata', the Epic of the 'ancient' Persia 'Shahnameh' (Ferdowsi), the 'ancient' Germanic heroic verse, the 'ancient' Old Norse Edda 'Elder Edda', Geoffrey of Monmouth, Nennius, The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Raphael Holinshed, Saxo Grammaticus, The Legend of King Arthur, The Legends of Alexander the Great, The Legend of Troy, the old French Legends, some important Muslim sources, going further Niketas Choniates, Anna Komnene, Procopius of Caesarea (and some other Byzantine authors), Geoffrey of Villehardouin, Robert de Clari, 'The Primary Chronicle' (or 'Tale of Bygone Years') and the other major Russian chronicles (including the Siberian chronicles), the Russian epic multivolume 'The Illustrated Chronicle of Ivan the Terrible'(Litsevoy Svod) (not long ago finally published by the Moscow publishing house Akteon), Mavro Orbini, Philostratus (Life of Apollonius of Tyana), Iamblichus Chalcidensis, Diogenes Laertius, Porphyry of Tyre, Bartolomé de las Casas, Bernal Díaz del Castillo, the works by some of the Church Fathers, the old chronological works and tables (Joseph Juste Scaliger, Dionysius Petavius, Matthew Blastares and many other) ... We shall stop this listing and refer our readers to our books.

We have studied thousands of images: icons, paintings, drawings, etchings, frescos, mosaics, stained-glass art-works, tapestries, goblins, sculptures, bas-reliefs, gems, Cameos, coins, the images on the ceramics, enamel work, etc. Among other things there were discovered several dozens of the old zodiacs with some transcriptions of dates. Some of them were earlier unknown. We already dated over 40 zodiacs using the astronomic method and the effective computer generated algorithm of data analysis which we developed. It turned out that all these 'ancient' zodiacal dates fall into the epoch of the XI-XIX cc. and not at all into the 'distant past'. We actively continue this important work which greatly contributes to the 'backbone' of the New Chronology.

Here is another benefit of the new reading of the old texts. For instance, an interesting question: what were the old traditions in Russia earlier before the XVII century? It is not so easy to find an answer. As we already understand, that the chronicles of the Russian history in existence today were tendentiously edited and are distorting the true picture before the XVII century. So where should we derive the required information from? Apparently we should turn to the 'ancient' sources: Titus Levy, Herodotus, Tacitus and the others. They tell us a lot about 'Ancient Rome', i.e., as we showed, about Russia-Horde of the XIII-XVII cc. So this is where we should extract

the old testimonies about the Hordians, who in these sources are called the 'Ancient Romans' or the 'Ancient Scythians' or the 'Ancient Egyptians'. Roughly speaking, the 'ancient Roman' traditions are indeed the ancient Russian traditions of the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. Incidentally the very notion of 'nations' and 'nationalities' developed later, not earlier than the XVI-XVII cc.

But let's get back to our list of the old authors. It turns out that practically all of these surviving texts and chronicles (many of them are linked to each other) in fact tell us about the events of the XI-XVII cc. It was cast back into the distant (sometimes enormously distant) phantom past by the incorrect Scaligerian chronology.

Miscalculating it not just by the tens and hundreds, but even by thousands of years!

At the same time it turned out that there were not that many primary sources 'on antiquity'. They occupy just a few selves in the bookcase. And so we shouldn't think that in order to reconstruct the past a 'great deal' of sources are required. Apparently about seven - eight dozen is quite sufficient.

Besides the reputed chroniclers the accounts of the antiquity were given to us by the distinguished poets, dramatists and writers. For instance, Homer and Virgil, whose works proved to be extremely valuable for the reconstruction of the true history. Or the famous Shakespeare. The new chronology throws a bright and unexpected light on their writings. At last we can understand what in fact these great authors wrote about.

Before proceeding with the reconstruction which greatly differs from the version of Scaliger-Petavius familiar today [1v], [2v] we should give a summary of how the Scaligerian history came about. This was finally clarified only over the course of our research.

The historical primary sources accessible today which are published and available in the public archives are the comprising element of the Scaligerian version and were created along with it. Notably by way of distortion and purposeful editing of the truly old documents. The old texts themselves which gave the correct accounts of the history were mercilessly destroyed. All of this took place in the XVII-XVIII cc. over the course of the international European program of re-writing the ancient and mediaeval history. What and who was it necessary for, see [6v2], ch.1. The program had the state support both in Europe and in Romanov Russia. Then in the XVIII-XIX cc. The Scaligerian version was integrated in Asia and China. Based on it the Asian and the Chinese 'ancient' chronologies were constructed.

PRACTICALLY ALL THE EVENTS DESCRIBED IN THE OLD – EVEN EDITED – DOCUMENTS, TOOK PLACE. ANOTHER QUESTION IS – WHERE AND WHEN? This is where the chronological and geographical confusion occurred. Also the deliberate distortion led to the 'lengthening of the history'. There were of course some natural chronological mistakes. But the main role was paid by the tendentious editing.

In the epoch of the XVII-XVIII cc. to support the imbedded Scaligerian version nearly all the editions of the works by the 'classical' Greek and Roman authors, the Mediaeval chronicles and memoires published today, were consciously created.

The sources, which accidentally avoided censorship, were meticulously searched for over the two hundred years and either destroyed or eliminated from circulation. This also continued in the XIX century. The perfect example is the purposeful destruction of the Sulakedzev library [4v2], v.2:9. In the XIX century, all the more so today, such old surviving authentic texts were perceived as something ludicrous, not worthy of serious study. The historians immediately begin to argue about forgery or the ignorance of the chronicler.

It is important to understand that today when publishing the primary sources they undergo – whether consciously or subconsciously – a rigorous censorship of them corresponding to the Scaligerian version. Only the primary sources which fit the familiar picture are considered to be 'worthy of attention'. As a result only the texts which underwent the targeted editing of the XVII-XVIII cc. are introduced into circulation.

WE DISCOVERED THAT THERE IS A DISTINCTLY DEFINED BOUNDARY IN HISTORY – THE FIRST HALF OF THE XVII CENTURY. We know more or less what happened after this point, i.e. closer to our time. In any case, beginning with the end of the XVIII century. But we have a very poor knowledge of what took place prior to the middle of the XVII century. This border line appeared artificially. It is not a result of the natural forgetting the information. It separates the accurate chronology from the incorrect one.

Today it is accepted as an axiom that the Scaligerian version and the true history is the same thing. But it is not true. The historians who think that they study the 'ancient' and the mediaeval history in are fact analysing not the reality, but an artificial world, some fairy-tale phantom-mirage, created by the historians and editors of the XVII-XVIII cc. Today the historians use the distorted and edited texts from the XVII-XVIII mistakenly considering them as the 'authentic ancient primary sources'. The historians

are immersed in a fantasy world, spending their entire professional life in it. They have no idea that this 'virtual reality' was concocted by their recent predecessors.

The made up world turned out to be complex, intricate and at first glance gives the impression of something very solid and consistent. But it is not so. Unbiased outside perspective, based on the objective methods of dating, rather quickly detects all the tell-tale signs of the sandcastle in the fairy tale construction. Further analysis results in this building collapsing.

So why today do the historians work in the end only with those texts and their derivatives which were edited in the XVII-XVIII cc.? This is the pressure from a certain school and long standing beliefs. At some point they were imbedded by force, and now they have grown into the 'accepted facts'.

Of course, it was not possible to destroy all the pre-Scaligerian documents. Some of them must exist even today. But imagine that the expert on the 'Scaligerian mirage' came across an authentic document describing for instance the epoch of the XV-XVI cc. The difference between the true history of that epoch and its Scaligerian depiction is so great, that it would be difficult even to cross-reference this document with the familiar picture. Or even to understand what it is about. Not to mention that it would most likely be written with 'obscure hieroglyphs'. As the 'ancient calligraphy' familiar to us today is in fact the handwriting of the falsifiers - editors of the XVII-XVIII cc. Taken that, as a rule this scholar would have never come across the real handwriting and scripts of the XV-XVI cc., not to mention the earlier epochs.

That is why a random old authentic text they might come across fortuitously would be most likely declared 'unreadable'. Which incidentally, then happens. If they succeed in reading it they declare it 'a strange fruit of the mediaeval ignorance'.

The books which are marked as published in the XV-XVI cc. often turn out to be the XVII-XVIII cc. forgeries with the year of publication being backdated. Allegedly 'earlier'. The mass publication of such books in the XVII-XVIII cc. comprises an important part of the 'substantiation' of the Scaligerian version. The authentic books of the XV-XVI cc. were condemned and destroyed.

Many genuine official documents of Western Europe of the XVI century issued by the Imperial Hordian chancery were written, as we understand it now, in Slavic. Many books published then in the Western Europe were also Slavonic [6v1], ch.2. Incidentally, the fact of the wide publication of the Slavonic books in the XVI century Europe is known to the experts. In that epoch Slavonic was the international language. Later 'ancient' Latin was created on its foundation [7v2].

The transition from the Slavonic language to Latin as the international language in Europe took place only after the collapse of the Great Empire at the end of the XVI-XVII cc. Most likely Latin in its developed 'ancient' state emerged only in the XVI-XVII cc. That is why all the 'ancient' Latin texts, in the best case scenario, are the translations into the Latin designated as the 'ancient' language, carried out in the epoch of the XVI-XVIII cc. The Scaligerian version was immediately introduced into such translations.

The same can be said about the 'ancient' Greek language. It was also created together with all the 'ancient' Greek literature in the epoch of the XVI-XVIII cc. The 'ancient Greek primary sources' were immediately written, translated and edited in this language. The genuine ancient language is probably the Middle Greek, the Byzantine Greek. It's not a coincidence that it differs from the Modern Greek language, unlike the 'Ancient' Greek which is close to the Modern Greek. All the 'classical Greek' literature is also heavily edited XVI-XVIII cc. translations of the old texts into the recently invented 'classical' language.

The invention of the Scaligerian version of history was a consequence of the major political reconstruction of the world in the late XVI-early XVII cc. Following the collapse of the 'Mongol' Empire the new autonomous small states emerged from its fragments. The former imperial governors became the independent sovereigns. At first they feared the return of the old 'Mongol' order. That is why they strived to create the 'long standing ancient roots' of their authority in the historical past. The main purpose of the new historical version by Scaliger and Petavius was to distort the history of the XIV-XVI cc. in the required direction. It was falsified intentionally.

Only now we begin to understand the scale of the Global program of the XVII century of creating the fictitious history of the past. We should not be surprised at the coordination of action on falsifying history between different countries. Until the end of the XVI century nearly all the European and Asian countries were a part of the one united Empire. That is why all the governors were from one circle of imperial officials. At first, after the collapse of the Empire the ties between its former provinces were still strong.

Just the beginning of the 'historical reform' falls at the end of the XVI century. The main falsification, including the creation of the 'ancient sources' was carried out in the XVII-XVIII cc, when the Empire had already collapsed. I.e. after the Time of Troubles in Russia and the Romanovs' victory over Stepan Razin. There was also a lot done in this direction in the end of the XVIII century, particularly after the Romanovs' victory over Yemelyan 'Pugachev' in the war of the 1773-1775. ONLY

## BEGINNING WITH THE XIX CENTURY THE SCALIGERIAN VERSION OF HISTORY ACQUIRED ITS PRESENT DAY FORM.

To clarify, today we use an established 'new era' chronology. However, we should treat it only as a purely notional timeline. One of many possible. As it becomes clear, in the 'beginning of the new era', i.e. circa 2010 years ago, no significant event, the accounts of which survived, ever took place. Moreover, no data whatsoever survives from that distant epoch. More specifically it is incorrect to call this era as the Christian era, as we do today. As according to our results the Nativity of Christ took place nearly a thousand years later. Namely in the XII century according to the conditional 'new era'.

Usually, when formulating our hypothesis, we always use the words 'possibly', 'likely', etc. But as this book is entirely dedicated to our reconstruction we will not all the time repeat these words while constantly implying them. We do not insist on some of our observations. We would like you to remember this. As our reconstruction is unfamiliar to many readers, we sometimes repeat some of our conclusions for the better absorption.

IN VARIOUS ANCIENT TEXTS THE WORDS WERE WRITTEN DOWN USING ONLY CONSONANTS, WITHOUT VOWELS. Please see the details in the book by A.T.Fomenko [1v], ch.1:8. The vowels appeared later and pinpointed only one of many possible variants of the reading of the words. First of all it concerns the proper nouns and led to the significant ambiguity in the reading of the old names, geographical names etc. In the old text there was also no breakdown into separate words. Besides there could be confusion between the sounds L and R, F and T, B and V, etc. The Old Slavonic had multiple omissions of vowels and besides, it didn't have the separation into words. The 'Ancient' Egyptian texts were also written with the consonants only. 'The names of the (Egyptian – Author) kings... are given (in the modern literature – Author) in their conditional, ENTIRELY FREEFORM, so called CLASSROOM ... delivery customarily accepted in the textbooks ... These forms often significantly differ from each other and it is not possible to regulate them in any way, as they are all the result of the ARBITRARY READING (! – Author), which became traditional' [72], p.176. Also 'the Hebrew written language originally had neither vowels, nor any other symbols replacing them... The Books of the Old Testament were written using only consonants' [765], p.155.

We were able to discover the 'parallels' between the events within the different periods of the 'ancient' history only thanks to the new chronology. Without it, it would have been impossible to understand who should be compared to whom and what



should be compared to what? The bulk of the material is so vast, that it is practically impossible to fumble for the right parallels in it at random. But now, when we have reconstructed the chronological 'framework of history', a wonderful opportunity opens up to enrich this formal result with the 'content of the events'. This is the exact way to treat the 'biographical' matches which we present. They are not the strict proof on their own per se. But they logically arise from the new chronology established via the mathematical methods. First we calculate the dates and only then, based on them, read the old documents anew and begin to see the true essence. The fact is that the dates of the events strongly define the interpretation of history and allow us now to choose the correct interpretation of the sources from many possible ones.

## **2. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL NOTES.**

Today the word 'antiquity' is usually associated with the events earlier than the V century A.D., for instance. 'Deep antiquity' is earlier than, let's say, the X century B.C. 'Deepest antiquity' is as far back as the II millennium B.C. The custom, widely accepted today, for this particular time scale is one of the serious psychological obstructions in the way of the perception of the new short chronology. But this psychological interpretation of the word 'antiquity', which became familiar today, didn't appear all on its own. And not so long ago. It is a result of the artificial imbedding of the extremely prolonged chronology over the last 300 years. The very idea of the 'extremely long written history' lay on the fertile ground of the natural human respect towards the clan's remembrance of their own genealogical tree. You can understand the feelings of the people striving to glance into the distant past of their ancestors. The further they can see the higher is their personal self-esteem.

The new chronology dictates a different psychological picture of the perception of the past. Now the word 'antiquity' should be corresponding with the XV-XVII cc, i.e. with the events distant from us by 300-400 years. The expression 'high antiquity' means the XI-XII cc. EARLIER THE X-XI CC. COMES THE EPOCH OF THE SILENCE OF THE WRITTEN DOCUMENTS. No written evidence from those times whether on paper, parchment, papyrus or the stones – has survived. Thus the words 'antiquity', 'high antiquity' and 'extreme antiquity' stay in our lexicon. However they are imbued with a different meaning. These epochs are becoming significantly closer to us and the time scale greatly decreased. We should accept that based on the written sources we are able to peer into the past not as far as we thought we could yesterday. But everything we saw yesterday is visible today. Only closer.

To conclude: based on the mathematical and astronomical methods we have put forward, it is shown that the Scaligerian chronology and history are fundamentally wrong. History up until the beginning of the XVII century was falsified in the epoch of the XVII-XVIII cc. The falsification was accompanied with the search and annihilation of the documents which provided the true accounts of the past. Primarily it concerned the XV-XVI cc., the memory of which was destroyed with particular thoroughness. These activities relentlessly continued for nearly two hundred years. This is a sufficient amount of time to destroy all the major texts which could have told the truth. Therefore we cannot expect that some detailed factual chronicle written by an eyewitness of the events of the XVI century would fall into our hands.

Therefore the 'small details', the scraps of truth that were not cleared out and accidentally survived acquire a special importance. And taken together they allow us to restore the truth. The study of the Scaligerian history can be compared to the work of a detective exposing a criminal who had invented a plausible legend and took care of his alibi. That is why it is necessary to at first search for the true picture in the little things, which escaped the attention of the criminal, who was covering up his tracks. As it is difficult to take into account all the details when inventing a false version. And the experienced detective 'digs them up'. Getting hold of pieces of evidence gradually 'unfolds' all the circumstances of the crime.

We express our gratitude to T.N.Fomenko – the co-author of much our research on the chronology. We co-wrote a number of books with T.N.Fomenko.

# INTRODUCTION

## THE EPOCH BEFORE THE XI CENTURY

This section is very short. There is no information in surviving written sources about any events prior to the XI century. There was no writing at that time. It appeared only in the X-XI cc. According to Scaliger's history writing originated in ancient antiquity allegedly well before "the beginning of A.D."

In reality THE WRITTEN HISTORY of mankind first emerges from the gloom only in the X-XI cc. All surviving ancient documents, including those attributed to "deep antiquity", in reality describe the events of the XI-XVII cc. Many of them were forcibly consigned to the distant past by the erroneous chronology of Scaliger-Petavius.

The epoch prior to the XI century should be envisioned as "primeval", the dawn of civilization. Primitive tools from those times have survived to this day and are exhibited in museums and galleries dedicated to early man, who allegedly lived many-many centuries and even millennia B.C. Pottery fragments, bones, flint tools, stone knives and axes, scrapers, ashes of cave fires, bone and stone arrow-heads and spear-heads, ornaments made of mammoth bones and teeth of predators. It is these galleries of the modern museums that give us an accurate indication on human life up to the X-XI cc. During that time people still dwelt in caves and dug-outs. They didn't yet possess the know-how to build any significant structures, let alone any buildings of wood or stone.

But we shouldn't assume that the stone and bone implements and everyday objects became obsolete during the XI century. In reality they existed and were widely used significantly later, up until the XV-XVI cc. For example, in the XVI century the Germans came to build the Moscow Kremlin with their STONE AXES, which contemporary German historians tentatively date to the II century B.C., [fig.1](#) [IIIAX] ch.10:4. Thus the stone tools coexisted with the metal ones up until the XVI century. The construction of the Moscow Kremlin is dated by the historians as the end of the XV century, but in the New Chronology it is attributed to the second half of the XVI century.

It turns out that all such axes – and there are quite a few in Germany – are currently dated by the archaeologists to the deepest antiquity, the first half of the II century B.C. The scientists' and archaeologists' view, that the stone tools found in Europe are

exclusively tools of the prehistoric time, is flawed. As we can see the Germans in the XV-XVI cc. AD were still heavily reliant on the use of stone axes.

This incidentally implies a simple solution to a famous historical puzzle: how did the allegedly ancient cave people manage to make the round or oval holes of a **REGULAR SHAPE** in the stone tools? Here for example is 'most ancient' stone axe in the Ohrid archaeological museum in Macedonia [IIIAX] ch.10:4. A deep oblong hole with the even vertical walls was made from a hard stone. Could a cave man, who didn't have any tools make such a thing? Surely you cannot achieve such a regular shaped hole by simply scraping one stone against the other by hand. However now, when we understand, that the stone tools were used up until the XVI century everything fits together. The holes in the stone axes could be made using the mechanisms with rotating drills. Which could have been diamond-tipped for example. Or simply made out of hard rock.

Another example. We are told that in Russia, in 'Ancient' Rome and in England they were writing on birch-bark and it was a very-very long time ago. In fact, as it turns out, the birch-bark letters were in use up until the XIX century and in some places even until the XX century. The thing is that up until the XX century paper was not cheap. The birch-bark, particularly in the North, was much cheaper [4v1], ch.3:11-12. Thus, 'antiquity' becomes considerably closer to our time.

Contemporary textbooks tell us in a lot of detail about people's lives in the epoch allegedly earlier than the X century. Let us remember some 'ancient' cultures.

The legendary 'Sumerians'. The 'most ancient' civilizations of Mesopotamia and America. The powerful pharaohs of Egypt. The Trojan Kingdom and the notorious Trojan war of the allegedly XIII century B.C., lyricized by the blind poet Homer. The enlightened 'ancient' China. The mighty Etruscans. The great 'Ancient' Greek civilization. Even more 'Ancient' Rome which evolved from the Etruscan civilization. 'Ancient' Carthage and its wars with the mighty Rome. Mysterious 'ancient' India with its treasures. The mighty Early and Mediaeval Arab Caliphates. The 'earliest' Biblical kingdoms of Israel and Judaea. The 'ancient' Assyria, Syria and Persia. The Mediaeval European feudal lords in their mighty gloomy castles.

All of this, they tell us, existed before the X century A.D. It is not true. All of this did exist, **BUT IN A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT EPOCH, AND MOREOVER OFTEN IN A DIFFERENT LOCATION**. More specifically, after the X century A.D. I.e. in the last millennium. In other words, the dates of all the events of the 'classical antiquity' should be corrected, moved upwards to their true places in the interval between the X and the XVII cc.

Where were the first settlements situated before the X century? Presumably at first the majority of people lived in a warm zone, not far from the equator. In particular in the Mediterranean, India and Central America. The climate there was equable, there were a lot of fruit-bearing plants and enough drinking water. This promoted the fast procreation of people. There was enough food, there were no cold winters and it was easy to build dwellings. There were neither climate contrasts, nor substantial temperature differences.

But the rampant procreation could not last forever. Soon 'it became too congested'. The intertribal conflicts began, as well as the struggle for territory and food. A part of the population was driven out to the North and to the South. Having found themselves in the midland the people discovered that the climate there was much more severe. The winters were cold. Noticeably less food. It was necessary to build dwellings to survive in the bitter winter cold. The weak migrants perished, but those who survived did so only because they managed to adapt. The load on the intellect increased, it was necessary to create house building methods, agricultural tools and equipment for hunting and navigation on the rivers and the sea, etc.

In other words these people were compelled to develop a civilisation. Over the course of time the descendants of the first wave of migrants, having adapted to the new environment, created their own cultural centres, and after reproducing in large enough quantities began to widen the zone of their habitat. The colonization had begun, but on a higher technological level. It is possible, that is how the epoch of the XIII-XIV cc. began. But we'll talk about it later. And now let us go back in time.

To conclude, the epoch before than the XI century is immersed in darkness due to the virtually total absence of any surviving documents of that time. We will repeat that only in the X-XI cc. for the first time there was conceived the very idea of written language. Possibly, in Ancient Egypt originally in a form of hieroglyphs-pictures. The recording of thoughts in this way is primary, and only later evolved into the more contemporary forms.

# **Chapter 1. EPOCH OF THE XI CENTURY.**

## **1. THE FIRST ROMAN KINGDOM OF THE OLD ROME.**

This chapter is also brief, as very little data has survived. It appears that in the Mediterranean in the era of X-XI cc. a Kingdom emerged, which could provisionally be called Romaic or Roman, or 'The First Rome'. Its first capital was a city in the fertile Nile Valley in African Egypt. Here farming developed rapidly in order to feed the large population. Sciences and the first technologies originated here. Very little written evidence about this first Kingdom has survived.

It is possible that in addition to that Egypt was one of the main religious centres of both Romea of XI-XIII cc. and after that The Great='Mongol' Empire of XIV-XVI centuries. It was the focal point for the cult of the dead. Maybe this originated due to observations the ancient people made: that in that area, - due to the hot and dry climate, - a corpse left in the burning hot sand would not decompose. Hence they decided that this area would be most suitable as a burial site.

The capital of the ancient African Kingdom was not far from the mouth of the Nile and today is called Alexandria. It was here that the first writing originated – in the form of hieroglyphs, i.e. 'writing with symbols'. It is probable that this method of communication and transmission of thoughts was the first to appear. If a person wanted to communicate something to others, he would draw a variety of symbols representing different things.

There were as yet no monumental structures as we know them today in African Egypt - pyramids, sphinxes, temples or obelisks. They were to appear significantly later, in the epoch of the XI-XVI cc., when in African Egypt an imperial cemetery was founded for the czars-khans of Romea, and later of the Great ('Mongol') Russian-Horde Empire. The deceased czars-khans of the Great Empire and other important high ranking people were brought here. They were buried in luxurious tombs, sometimes with a large amount of gold and jewels.

Prior to a long transportation their bodies were embalmed to prevent decomposition during the journey. See an image from the 'ancient'- Egyptian 'Book of the Dead', [fig.2](#). It is possible that depicted here is ferrying of the dead across 'River Styx', i.e. Mediterranean Sea. 'Ancient' Greek myths tell us about Charon, the ferryman of the dead, who carried the deceased on his boat across the River Styx into the Kingdom of the Underworld, that is, as we understand it now, - to the Nile Valley,

Egypt. The name Charon probably originated from the Russian word CHORNIU, CHORONIT (which means 'to bury' – translator's note) [5v2], ch.7.

The extent of the burial construction in Egypt itself shows that the Nile's estuary became a part of the gigantic and powerful empire, which established its royal cemetery here. Oblivious to this scientists were compelled to paint a fantastic picture of 'ancient' Egyptians whose main if not exclusive occupation was purportedly the burial of their LOCAL pharaohs. This being true the volume of valuables (gold, etc.) which was buried here was supposedly only amounted to a fraction of the state treasury.

In the XI century the Kingdom's metropolis moved to the Bosphorus, where in a strategically advantageous location – the narrowest part of the Bosphorus – emerged a city of Yoros (Jerusalem), aka Czar-Grad (City of the Czar – translator's note), aka – Troy, approximately 30 kilometres north of modern Istanbul. It is here that the imposing ruins of this city and a fortress called Yoros survive to this day. Later, in the XIII-XIV cc, the Kingdom's capital moved slightly south, where a new city emerged under the same name of Jerusalem. Over the course of time it was called Constantinople, and later – Istanbul. The name of Jerusalem was floating and at different times was applied to different cities.

Various provinces, fema districts, were part of Romaic Kingdom. Rus (Russia) was one of them, and it was the largest, [fig.3](#).

In the era of the X-XI cc. for the first time Paschal cycle was calculated [6v3], ch.2. The first ecclesiastical calendar was created. Astronomy emerges, first intended to serve the ecclesiastical calendar and to observe seasonal changes in weather and climate.

We will show you astronomical dates of the early zodiacs calculated by us, which fall within the era of the XI century. Sometimes there are different solutions arising within the later epochs.

We would like to clarify that a horoscope is the position of the planets in a constellation. For example, Mars – in Virgo, Saturn – in Pisces, etc. The horoscopes are calculated in the following way: having located the position of the planets in their constellation at a certain moment in time, for example – today, and knowing the numerical value of planets' orbit periods around the Sun, by plotting backwards or forwards whole multiples of these periods, you can obtain the positions of the planets in their constellation in the past and in the future. Currently there are computer programs which allow us to date horoscopes found in the ancient manuscripts,

frescos, paintings, tombs, etc. We have created a program HOROS (XOPOC) designed specifically for the analyses of the ancient zodiacs and horoscopes which fully utilise all the astronomical data recorded in them (the principal horoscope, additional auxiliary horoscopes and so on.) [HXE]

## **2. ASTRONOMICAL DATING OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY**

1. (Years 969 or 1206) ZODIAC SP FROM THE TOMB OF PHARAOH SETI I. A coloured fresco on the arch of the burial chamber. 'Ancient' Egypt, Luxor, Valley of the Kings, allegedly 'deep antiquity'. In fact – the first variant: 14-16 August 969; the second variant: 5-7 August 1206 [HXE] and [3v2].
2. (Years 1007 or 1186) ZODIAC OF MITHRA OF GEDDERNHEIM. It is depicted on stone tablet, bas-relief. Europe, Germany, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact – the first variant: 14-15 October 1007; the second variant: 14-15 October 1186 [Д3EE]
3. (Year 1007) THE FIRST ZODIAC SN FROM THE TOMB OF SENEMUT. It is depicted on the arches of the tomb, but not in the burial chamber itself. 'Ancient' Egypt, Luxor, allegedly 'deep antiquity'. In fact: 14-16 August 1007 [HXE].
4. (Year 1007) ZODIAC OF MITHRA OF APULUM. It is depicted on the stone tablet, bas-relief. Europe, Dacia, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact: 14-16 August 1007 [Д3EE].
5. (Year 1007) ZODIAC MT ON THE METTERNICH STELA. It is depicted on the stone tablet found in Alexandria. 'Ancient' Egypt, allegedly 'deep antiquity'. In fact: 14-16 August 1007. See [Д3EE]
6. (Years 1071, 1189 or 1308) CONCISE ZODIAC KZ. Stone bas-relief on the ceiling of the temple in the city of Erment. 'Ancient' Egypt, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact - first variant: 15-16 May 1071; second variant: 30-31 May 1189. Third variant: 6-8 May 1308 [HXE].
7. Ptolemy's STAR CATALOGUE "Almagest", allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact: approximately not earlier than XI century [3v1].



# **Chapter 2. EPOCH OF THE XII CENTURY.**

## **1. THE SECOND ROME OR THE ROMAIC TSAR-GRAD EMPIRE. YOROS = JERUSALEM = TROY.**

As afore mentioned, the most ancient Kingdom, of which survive only the vaguest of records, is The Ancient First Rome or Old Rome in the Nile Valley. In the Scaliger's version of history, which was created in the XVII century, there was a kingdom in the Nile Valley which was called Egypt. This seems to be incorrect. The original Biblical Egypt bears no relation to this kingdom. The 'Egypt' of the Old Testament Pentateuch – is in fact the Rus'-Horde (the Russian-Horde Empire) of XIV-XVI cc. [6v1], ch.4. But hereafter the Biblical name Egypt=Gypt=Kipchak was ascribed to Africa and attributed to a truly ancient Kingdom in the Nile Valley. This resulted in confusion.

In the X-XI cc. the capital of this Kingdom moves to the city of Yoros on the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus. We will provisionally call it The Second Rome. Aka Jerusalem of the Gospels, aka 'ancient' Troy. Then the capital moved to Rus', to Yaroslavl – Veliky Novgorod, aka 'ancient' Rome. This in total was The Third Rome, which the majority of 'ancient authors' consider to be the first disregarding the previous incarnations. After a while the capital of the Empire returned to Bosphorus, but not to its former location, it moved to the other side of Bosphorus, to its European shore, not its Asiatic shore. It was there that medieval Constantinople emerged, aka medieval Tsar-Grad of the end of XIV-XV cc., subsequently - Turkish (Ottoman) Istanbul. Overall it was The Fourth Rome, or in a shorter count – the second. As we know Moscow was subsequently called the Third Rome (according to the short count). In some old texts Tsar-Grad was referred to as Kiev. That is why some of the significant historical events in 'Kiev' in fact unfolded in Tsar-Grad on the Bosphorus.

To summarise, 1st Rome: the Nile Valley (Alexandria, Cairo); 2nd Rome: Yoros = Jerusalem = Troy; 3rd Rome: Vladimir-Suzdal Rus' = Veliky Novgorod (Yaroslavl, Vladimir) = Rome of Enei-Rurik; 4th Rome; Constantinople; 5th Rome: Moscow.

But when in the XVI century Romes were counted, where Moscow was numbered as the Third Rome (and not the Fifth), they have clearly started counting not from the deep antiquity of African Egypt, but from Rome of Enei-Rurik, i.e. from Yaroslavl, from the Empire of the great conquest epoch: Veliky Novgorod – First Rome, Constantinople – Second Rome, Moscow – Third Rome. Hereafter the historians replaced Veliky Novgorod with Rome in Italy and the present picture panned was formed.

To repeat: the original Biblical Jerusalem (the city of Yoros) is situated on the eastern, Asiatic shore of Bosphorus, closer to the Black Sea, very near to the Beykoz mountain (Golgotha) [3И]

In 2006 in front of the entrance to the Yoros fortress there remained to this day a shield bearing a name: Fortress Yoros – in Turkish: Yoros kalesi [3И], ch.3. It is notable that you come across this name literally every step in the immediate vicinity of the fortress. For example, a street leading to the fortress, a restaurant situated close to the fortress, etc.- all bear the name Fortress Yoros. But YOROS (IROS) is a simple abbreviation of JERUSALEM. By the way, in Latin this word is also spelled with an 'o' - Hierosolyma.

[Fig.4](#) shows an old painting, apparently from the XVIII-XIX cc., depicting the Turks resting on Beykoz mountain close to 'the grave of holy Jesus (Yusha or Yusa)'. The undoubtable focal point of the whole composition is the picturesque remains of an imposing age-old fortress. It stands on the very shore of the Bosphorus on a hill next to Beykoz. The impressive ruins of the old Yoros fortress survive to this day [3И], ch.3.

Thus the Turkish name of this old fortress on the Bosphorus - Yoros (Ioros), precisely corresponds with the first half of the word IEROSALIM in its old pre-reform spelling. Moreover this fortress is located PRECISELY in the very place where the Biblical Jerusalem was supposed to be situated according to our research.

The fortifications of Yoros, the remains of which are visible today, were built in 1261 A.D. In fact, the distance from Yoros-Jerusalem to the top of Beykoz-Golgotha is about two hours walk, which corresponds well with the Gospels.

Surprisingly we could not find the name of 'Yoros' in the Bosphorus on any modern map which we have seen. On many maps the Yoros Fortress is not marked at all, despite its imposing size. On other maps it is marked under completely different names, not at all resembling the word 'Ierosalim'. However, when we asked an archaeologist from Istanbul if he knew of the fortress Yoros outside Istanbul, he replied that yes, he knew it, and that this old Christian fortress is well known to the regional historians and locals. It turns out that historians – cartographers are attempting to conceal important information, which can cause 'awkward' questions or plant the seeds of doubt about the validity of Scaliger's version of history.

We discovered that the same city on the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus (at its Northern exit into the Black Sea) was called by a number of names: 1) Yoros, i.e. Jerusalem. 2) Chrisople, i.e. City of Christ (City of Gold). 3) P+Christo (PChristo), meaning quite clearly: City of Christ (Polis + Christo). 4) Sanctuary of the god

Jupiter (Zeus), sending fair winds. 5) Simply 'Sanctuary'. We see one of these names on the old maps. [ГПК] ch.4:1.

Incidentally it is interesting to look carefully at the representation of the crucifixion. It appears that in many paintings, icons and frescoes Christ's crucifixion is shown with a background of either a big sea strait or a wide river. Besides the artists were painting in particular either a strait or a river, but by no means a sea, [fig.5](#). So, by depicting water, the opposite shore was always shown [5v1], ch.14. As we understand it now, it could not have been otherwise, as the Beykoz mountain is situated right on the shore of the wide Bosphorus. From there can be seen very clearly the European shore of the strait, where the centre of Constantinople is situated, which could have been also considered the Biblical Jerusalem later on, when the capital was relocated here from the city-fortress Yoros. Any artist, had a more or less accurate recollection of the original story, would have depicted the Bosphorus strait as a significant part of the landscape, which served as a backdrop to the site of Christ's crucifixion.

The strategic location of Yoros-Jerusalem is ideal. It controlled the narrowest part of the Bosphorus close to the entrance into the Black Sea. Subsequently, it is conceivable, that at the end of the XIV century, during the relocation of the Empire's capital from Ancient Rome (i.e. Vladimir-Suzdal Rus' of the XIII-XIV cc.) to New Rome = Constantinople by Dmitriy Donskoy=Constantine the Great, the location of the new capital was slightly moved in relation to ancient Troy-Jerusalem-Yoros towards the Marble Sea and relocated it to the European shore of the Bosphorus, where there was a flatter terrain [KR] .

But let's go back to the XII century. The power of Romea in the XI-XII cc. spreads over many regions in the West and the East, where the femas-provinces of Tsar-Grad are located. Generally speaking each fema was an independent state formation, but was headed by a Romaic legate - a king, a tsar or a duke. He was a vassal of Biblical Jerusalem = Tsar-Grad (Yoros) in the Bosphorus.

Among such femas-provinces were: African Egypt, Rus'-Horde, territories of Western Europe, where consequently (in the XVI-XVII cc.) there would emerge – Germany, Italy, England and Spain, etc. The subordination of these femas to the imperial centre was reasonably flexible. One of the characteristics of such vassal state was the payment of tax to Jerusalem = Tsar-Grad (Yoros). Besides, starting in the end of the XII century, the femas were united by shared Christian religion. Tsar-Grad – universally recognized as the religious centre of the Kingdom as a whole. It could be that the word 'fema' or 'TEMA' has a connection with a Horde-Tatar word 'Tumen', i.e. a Russian word 'T'MA', which denoted a military unit (t'ma = many).

Independent local history in femas was hardly recorded. Meanwhile chronicles are being written only in Tsar-Grad, as the capital of the Kingdom. They mainly reflect the events which interested Jerusalem=Troy in the Bosphorus. Copies of these chronicles sometimes emerge in some of the Romaic femas-provinces. But these texts mainly tell us about the events in the metropolis. And only fleetingly about local events.

Jerusalem = Tsar-Grad (Yoros) in the Bosphorus in the XI-XII cc. was the capital of a strong Romaic Kingdom. We should also note the brilliant strategic position of the later Istanbul as well, its formidable defences. The gigantic walls of Constantinople, which in places have several rows, were repeatedly rebuilt and reinforced [5v].Its impressive remains survive intact) to this day.

## **2. BIRTH OF CHRIST IN 1152 AND HIS CRUCIFIXION IN TSAR-GRAD IN 1185.**

In the XII century significant events take place, as described in the Gospels: the coming of Jesus Christ, his life and crucifixion, although the existing text of the Gospels was edited and most likely dates to the XIV-XV cc.

In the mid XII century, in the year 1152, Jesus Christ is born. In secular Byzantine history he is known as Emperor Andronicus and St. Andrew the Apostle the First-Called. In Russian history he was portrayed as the Great Prince Andrey Bogolyubsky. To be more specific, Andrey Bogolyubsky is a chronicular counterpart of Andronicus-Christ during his stay in Vladimir-Suzdal Rus' of the XII century, where he spent most of his life. In fact the [Star of Bethlehem](#) blazed in the middle of the XII century. This gives us an absolute astronomical dating of Christ's Life. [IIPC], ch.1. 'Star of Bethlehem' – is an explosion of a supernova, which at present is incorrectly dated to the middle of the XI century. The present-day Crab Nebula in the Taurus Constellation is the remnant of this explosion. [TsOS]

Could there be such a date amidst the absolute astronomic dating, which would accurately correspond to the crucifixion of Christ at the end of the XII century? After all, it is entirely possible that such a significant event would be immortalised in some astronomical image, let's say on a zodiac with a horoscope. For example, in 'Ancient' Egypt, near the Empire tsars' burial ground. Let us turn to the results for the dating of the 'ancient'-Egyptian zodiacs which we have previously calculated. You will recall, that the crucifixion of Jesus Christ took place during the days of Jewish Passover, not long from the first vernal full moon.>

CONCLUSION. Among the zodiacs dated by us, there is one, which gives the exact date of the Jewish Passover = the date of the first day of the vernal full moon. We are referring to a famous Circular Denderah zodiac or, as it is also called, Osiris Zodiac, [fig.6](#). This Zodiac gives us the date of the Passover – the morning of the 20<sup>th</sup> March 1185, and perfectly corresponds with the date of crucifixion of Jesus Christ in year 1185 [LPC], ch.1. Besides, the date of the Circular Zodiac corresponds well with the dating of the Star of Bethlehem, which appeared approximately around year 1150, as it allows for Christ's age to be approximately 33 years.

In fact 'Osiris Zodiac' means 'Zodiac of Christ', as, according to our research, the 'ancient'-Egyptian god Osiris represented Jesus Christ. [5v], [LPC].>

The Virgin Mary, the mother of Andronicus-Christ, was originally from Rus'. It's no coincidence that in the ancient documents Rus' was sometimes referred to as the House of Holy Mother of God. Afterwards Mary lived in Tsar-Grad = 'ancient' Troy. Andronicus-Christ and Mary spent a lot of time in Rus'. They fled there, i.e. return to their motherland, escaping persecution in Tsar-Grad. This event was described in the Gospels as the Escape of the Holy Family from King Herod to Egypt.

Biblical 'Egypt', - aka Egypt of the 'ancient' pharaohs – is Rus'-Horde of the XIII-XVI cc. In a well-known Gospel story, the details of Christ's life after the escape to Egypt, up to his return Jerusalem at the age of approximately 30 years old, are enshrouded in mystery. Most likely, the significant part of that time Andronicus-Christ and his mother spent in Rus'. Besides, the name 'India' referred to the whole of Rus'-Horde, and not just to the territory of modern Hindustan. It is possible that this is reason why some of the medieval texts, which are today deemed apocryphal, claim that Christ lived in 'India' for a long time.

Having then returned from Rus' back to Tsar-Grad (Yoros), the emperor Andronicus-Christ (according to the Russians chronicles – the Great Prince Andrey Bogolyubsky) implemented important state reforms, impeded corruption, made life easier for the common people. Trade and agriculture were booming. But the reforms raised the ire and hatred of the nobility. This resulted in a plot in the capital which led to a bloody rebellion. In 1185 the Emperor Andronicus-Christ was deposed and crucified in Tsar-Grad on the Beykoz mountain = Biblical Golgotha, on the Asiatic shore of the Bosphorus, close to Yoros.

Until now there remained an enormous 'grave', which is known as: 'a grave of Yusha (Jesus)'. Beykoz is the highest of the mountains of the Upper Bosphorus, 180 metres above sea level. It is situated close the ruins of the city and fortress of Yoros (Biblical

Jerusalem). ‘Yusha’s grave’ is not the real grave of Jesus Christ, but a large fenced off plot of land, approximately 3 by 17 metres, where Jesus was crucified, [fig.7](#), [fig.8](#). This is to say, they commemorated this sacred ‘location’ [6v2], ch.5.

Not far from the grave of holy Yusha – Jesus, at the foot of the Beykoz mountain, there are three other enormous graves nearly 7-8 metres long. These are the graves of Kirkklar Sultan, Uzun Elviya Leblebici Baba and Akbaba Sultan. On the other side of the Bosphorus, i.e. its European shore, there were, as the local legends say, several similar looking immense graves of the saints. They are, probably, symbolic resting places of the disciples of Jesus Christ.

So, on the Beykoz mountain of Tsar-Grad, near Yoros-Jerusalem, there is a miraculously well preserved memorial (possibly reconstructed) providing us with a tangible reminder of the crucifixion of Andronicus-Christ in this very place.

As a result of a coup and a bloody rebellion in 1185 a new dynasty of Angels came to power. It is considered that ‘Angel’ is in this case a family name. However, it is quite possible that in the times of Andronicus-Christ this word represented the Tsarist officials in general. Hence is derived angels, ‘[celestial hierarchy](#)’, i.e. God’s ministers, according to the Holy Bible. It is possible, that the well-known story in the Holy Bible about Satan – an evil angel, who rebelled against God and wished to usurp Him, originated from there.

Let’s refer to the Byzantine chronicler Niketas Choniates. In regards to Andronicus-Christ it says, that he was a foreigner, who lived for a long time amongst the barbarians (as we understand he meant - in Rus’). Having arrived to Tsar-Grad, he surrounded himself with a barbarian army and introduced barbaric customs into the country. For example, the Russian pantaloons [LPC], ch.2:61. Now the picture becomes clearer. Andronicus-Christ was the son of Virgin Mary, who was originally from Rus’. It was here in Rus’ where Andronicus-Christ spent his childhood. Later he lived in Tsar-Grad. Then he again returned to Rus’ and spent many of his adult years here. Perhaps Andronicus-Christ’s particular affection towards Rus’ wasn’t to everyone’s liking in Tsar-Grad. And during a tense period of political crisis and rebellion, the matter of Andronicus-Christ’s foreign roots surfaced. The rebels started using it to malign the Emperor.

Therefore, the events described in Gospels, took place in Yoros (Jerusalem) in Bosphorus during the second half of the XII century. And the city of modern Palestine, which today is referred to as Jerusalem, was in fact ‘fabricated’ from a small Arab settlement called Al-Quds in a rather desolate area in the Middle East not earlier than the XVII or even the XVIII century. It was declared a center of worship.

It bears no relation to the events in the Gospel. The falsifiers of the XVII-XIX cc. pursued a clear objective: to relocate – on paper! – The Gospel events far away from the real Jerusalem = Tsar-Grad, in order to cast into oblivion a significant part of authentic history.

To conclude, the emperor Andronicus-Christ, - aka the great Russian prince Andrey Bogolyubsky, aka apostle Andrey Pervozvanny (St. Andrew the First-Called),- was crucified in Tsar-Grad (Yoros) = Jerusalem in 1185.

The Gospel life of Jesus Christ in GALILEE represents Andronicus' stay in Vladimir-Suzdal Rus', in the suburbs of the city Galitch Kostromskoy, which in a local dialect was pronounced as GALION. Gospel city of CANA in Galilee, therefore, was a Canian or Khahnian settlement in Vladimir-Suzdal Rus'. Consequently, year zero of the era of the 'Year of Our Lord' (AD) was year 1152 AD.

Up until the epoch of the XVII century, when writing down the dates, the Roman numeral X, i.e. 'ten', in Latin denoting a century (for example, XI century), was simply the first letter X of the name of Jesus Christ (written in Cyrillic: Ch=X – translator's note). That is why initially an abbreviation: 'XI century' – meant 'Christ's First century', i.e.: First Century of Christ's Incarnation. Therefore, the letter 'X' was separated from the following numerals with a dot, i.e. they wrote X.I, X.II. etc. [1v.] That was the way the Christian calendar appeared. During that epoch all the dates were written down starting with the name of Jesus Christ, i.e. letter 'X' or letter 'I'. The fact is that the Roman numeral I, i.e. 'one', - in the Arabic representation of a year, for example year 1255, initially was the first letter I of the name Jesus. So the expression 'Year I.255' in those distant times meant: 'from Jesus year 255'. Up until the XVI-XVII cc. there remained the tradition of recording dates by the way of: either X. (followed by numerals), or I. (followed by numerals), in other words, by separating with a dot letters X and I from the other numerals which represented the date itself. Sometimes J was used instead of I. See multiple examples in the book by A.T.Fomenko [1v], ch.6:12-13

Over many centuries, in the XVII century to be precise, the creation of the 'reformed' version of history began. It aimed to distort the history of the XI-XVI cc. beyond recognition. In particular it was achieved by distorting the chronology. The first letter X (i.e. Christ) slyly declared to be the representation of 'ten centuries' in the dates, and the first letter I (i.e. Jesus) was purported to represent a 'thousand'. As the result of it the dates were artificially made older by approximately 1000 years. Massive blocks of events of the XI-XVII cc. 'slid down' by approximately a thousand years. Phantom 'antiquity' thus appeared.

Our conclusion perfectly corresponds with a well-known fact, that the medieval “Italians used hundreds to represent centuries: TRECENTE (i.e. YEARS - THREE HUNDREDS)- the XIV century, QUATTROCENTE (i.e. YEARS - FOUR HUNDREDS) – the XV century, CINQUECENTE (i.e. YEARS - FIVE HUNDREDS) – the XVI century” [242], p.25. But then such naming of the centuries INDICATES DIRECTLY THAT THE STARTING POINT FOR COUNTING COMMENCES EXACTLY FROM THE XI CENTURY, as it disregards today's conventional method of adding a ‘thousand years’. It turns out, that the medieval Italians didn't know any ‘thousand years’. As we understand it now, the reason for it was simply because, there was no ‘spare thousand years’.

We have described a mechanism of the way of one of the three principle chronological shifts originated, approximately by a thousand years. The causes for the other two shifts – approximately by 330 and 1800 years – are analogous and, besides, can be explained by the mistakes of the chronologists of the XIV-XV cc., who relied on the erroneous astronomical data and methods. In the book by A.T.Fomenko [1v] the chronological shifts were provisionally called the following: 1) The Roman-Byzantine shift by 330-360 years, 2) The Roman shift by either 1053 or 1153 years, 3) The Greek-Biblical shift by 1780-1880 years.

The Roman-Byzantine shift made the history of Rome-Byzantine longer by forcing it into the past. The Roman shift made the history of the Roman Empire ‘more ancient’. The Greek-Biblical shift made the history of Greece and all Biblical history far older by forcing it into the past.

### **3. CAESAREAN SECTION**

We are all familiar with the medical term ‘caesarean section’ or ‘caesarean’. In other words, when labour does not occur naturally, but by means of an incision in the abdomen. Why is this incision called ‘Caesarean’? Because, according to some sources, that was exactly the way Julius Caesar was delivered at birth. For example in an old Russian Palaea we read: “The original Roman kingdom of Iulii Kesar. In the third year of Cleopatra's reign Iulii Kesar named VYPOROTOK (meaning ‘ripped’ or ‘torn’ - translator's note) started his rule in Rome.” [625:1], page 254.

The nickname ‘vyporotok’ could perhaps mean, that he was ripped or torn out of his mother's womb. In other words he was removed by means of a medical procedure through an incision or section. This is the origin of the expression ‘caesarean section’.



But on the other hand, similar information has survived about Christ too. Though little known today, but clearly expressed in the canonical church service. For example in the old Church Slavonic triadic canon of the second mode, recited on Sundays midnight vespers. Irmos of the ninth song of this canon sounds like this: (in English translation) : “Him, who before the Sun – God’s lantern – shined, and in flesh came FROM VIRGIN’S SIDE, infinitely incarnated, blessed and pure, we praise You, Mother of God”. [537:2], p.66; [537:3], p.134.

The words : “(He) came in flesh from virgin’s side” are hard to interpret in any other way but as the birth of Christ via caesarean section by Virgin Mary Theotokos.

Jesus’ birth by the caesarean section left its imprint not only in the liturgical texts of the Orthodox Church. This event was much talked about in the Middle Ages and spawned a multitude of views, theories and myths. The first thing that should be noted is the claim of the orthodox doctrine, that Theotokos (the Birthgiver) REMAINED A VIRGIN AFTER CHRIST’S BIRTH. These words are directly present in the Orthodox sacred worship, see above. Besides, this theme is in detail discussed in so called Apocrypha.

To clarify, prior to the XVII century there were a lot of various pieces of writings about Christ. In the XVII century a new regime prohibited them and declared them to be ‘apocryphal’. At the same time many of them were considered canonical enough works even in the XVI century. They formed part of the authoritative canonical books, were copied in the monasteries along with the four canonical Gospels, creation of the holy fathers and Christian catechisms. One of the ways of disparaging the ‘inconvenient texts’ in the XVII century was the following: they started to name some of the ‘irritating sources’ - ‘Gospels’ (although they were not called that in the Church Slavonic tradition). For example they began to call the works attributed to Thomas the Apostle – ‘Gospel according to Thomas’. The idea is clear. The reformists were achieving the following goal: in the Christian world it was well known that in one of the Ecumenical Councils the four canonical Gospels, deemed appropriate for worship, were selected. The Gospels were the texts that ought to be read in the church. And, clearly, they ought to be officially approved. In this sense all the other Gospels were renounced But it didn’t mean that they were rejected entirely. They could remain as so called reference books. They could be kept at home and copied. But cunning reformists, by attaching the name ‘Gospel’ to any old text which displeased them, automatically labelled them as ‘incorrect, forbidden Gospels’.

Let’s refer to so called ‘Infancy Gospel of Thomas’ : “And found (Joseph – Ath.) a cave there... And appeared the new-born, emerged and took breast of his mother

Mary. And exclaimed and old woman... and she came out of the cave and met Salome, and said to her: Salome, Salome, I would like to tell you about a MIRACLE: A VIRGIN GAVE BIRTH AND KEPT HER VIRGINITY.” [307], p.217.

Here is another text called ‘Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew’. ‘And when Zeloma approached Mary...she cried out loudly: I have never thought or heard of anything like this: Her breast is full of milk and She has a baby boy, though SHE IS A VIRGIN. There was nothing impure at the conception and NO SICKNESS IN BIRTH. She conceived being a virgin, GAVE BIRTH AS A VIRGIN, AND REMAINS A VIRGIN’ [307], p.243.

Such an insistent claim in the sources, that Theotokos (Birthgiver) REMAINED A VIRGIN AFTER GIVING BIRTH corresponds perfectly with Christ’s birth via caesarean section.

As it happens, Christ is also mentioned in the Talmud. Although << the image of Jesus presented by the Talmud is a combination of various Judaic legends, rabbis’ commentaries and simply rumours... It is considered that Jesus appears in the Talmud under different names. The name of “JESUS, SON OF PANTERA (PANTIRA)” ... is mentioned several times... the origin of the name “son of Pantera” presents us with a conundrum>> [307], p.301-302.

In regards to PANTERA scholars write: <<The etymology of the non-Jewish name Pantera has for many years presented a challenge to researchers... A theory was put forward, that the name Pantera (Pantira) appeared as a result of a linguistic mistake in the form of an incorrect reproduction of a Greek word ‘parthenos’ (Παρθ?νος) – ‘virgin’>> [307], p.305.

In our opinion the Greek word PARTHENOS, i.e. VIRGIN (and this is exactly how the word VIRGIN sounds in the Greek Gospels) [307], p.305, has appeared in the Christian tradition as a recollection of the caesarean section of Christ’s birth. The word PARTHENOS originated from a Slavonic word POROT’, meaning ‘to rip open’, ‘to cut the body’ when performing the caesarean section. Furthermore, perhaps it contains a meaning of not only TO CUT OPEN, but also TO SEW UP, as PARTHENOS reminds us of a word PORTNOI (meaning A TAILOR), i.e. a person, who cuts and sews up. Naturally, after performing a caesarean section a doctor has to sew the wound up.

And Talmudic PANTERA (PANTIRA), most likely, originates (as does PARTHENOS) from the same Slavonic word POROT’(TO CUT OPEN), PORTNOI

(A TAILOR). That is why the authors of the XIX century, who associated this word with PARTHENOS, were correct.

But then immediately comes to mind a well-known myth about the birth of the ‘most ancient’ goddess Athena ‘via a cut in Zeus’ head’. Since long ago scientists became aware of the similarity between the ‘ancient’ Greek Athena Parthenos and medieval Christian Theotokos of Athenes. In the medieval times the famous Athenian Parthenon was nothing other than a Temple of the Virgin Mary Theotokos [2v1], ch.1. Besides, Athena was also called PALLAS. The word Pallas means A VIRGIN. The ‘ancient’ Greek myths constantly emphasise that Athena was A VIRGIN [196:1], p.60, 112, 114.

So the Christian origin of the myth about Athena’s birth is thus elucidated. ‘Zeus... swallowed whole his pregnant wife and afterwards with the help of [Hephaestus](#) (or [Prometheus](#)), who cleaved Zeus's head with the [axe](#), he sired Athena who leaped from Zeus's head, fully armed, with a warlike cry’ [533], v.1, p.126. Through these fantastical details can be dimly perceived the birth of Jesus by caesarean section from the Virgin Mary. Here Virgin = Athena ‘changes places’ with Jesus = Zeus: but the Virgin doesn’t give birth to Jesus, but Jesus (Zeus) gives birth to the Virgin. The incision in the ‘Greek’ myth wholly remains, but ‘moves’ to the god’s head. Incidentally, another character is also mentioned here – a doctor, who performed the incision. He was called [Prometheus](#) or [Hephaestus](#)

This most ‘ancient’ of Greek myths could have appeared while observing the Orthodox icon ‘The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary’ [fig.9](#) [IIPC], ch.2.

The Virgin Mary is on her deathbed, Christ stands above her and holds in his hands, at his shoulder level, a tiny figure of the Virgin Mary swaddled in a white piece of cloth. Surely, a person, who knows icon-painting well, understands that this small figure symbolises here The Virgin Mary’s soul. But a lay person and moreover a visitor from afar, who knows little about the tradition of icon-painting, could easily interpret such an image as the birth of a little maiden from an adult God. Next the imagination would take over. As a girl was painted close to Christ’s head it ‘therefore meant that she was born from the head’. And so on. Having returned home, to ‘ancient’ Greece of the XIV-XVI cc. from a distant capital of the Great = ‘Mongol’ Empire, the awed traveler would share with his fellow citizens is ‘deep knowledge’ about the life of the Olympian gods on faraway Olympus. That is how an ‘ancient’ myth could have been born. It was Rus’ that was considered to be “Virgin Mary’s Home’ as she had spent the significant part of her life in Rus’ and died there [XP]. That is why the images of ‘Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary’ originated

in Rus'. And later, as Christianity was progressing in Western Europe, the images, inspired by these Orthodox icons, appeared there as well.

But let us return to Zeus. It appears, that he gave birth not only to Athena, but also to Dionysus=Bacchus: <<Having disguised himself as a mortal, Zeus had a secret love affair with Semele ('Earth') ... Hera... advised Semele, who was already six months pregnant, to demand her of her mysterious lover to reveal his true form... He came to her wreathed in bolts of lightning and roars of thunder and incinerated her.

However, [Hermes](#)> managed to save her six months premature son. Hermes SEWED A BABY INTO ZEUS' THIGH, AND AFTER THREE MONTHS, IN DUE TIME ZEUS GAVE BIRTH TO HIM. Hence Dionysus is called 'twice-born' or 'a child of double doors'>>[196:1], p.69.

In this myth, as in the Judaic texts, Christ kind sort of gives birth to himself from his thigh. Here Zeus is Jesus, and Dio-nysus = Nicaean God is also Jesus. The commentators explained such parallels by purportedly adopting the doctrines of Christianity from the more archaic pagan beliefs. But in the new chronology the picture is reverse. Pagan cultures were variations of Christianity, common in the Middle Ages. Besides the mainstream of Christianity, there existed various sects and cults. They were later declared to be "the most 'ancient pagan' religions. And then, already in the XIX century, they were surprised to discover that they suspiciously resembled Christianity. A vast platform opened for the 'scientific explanation' of this phenomenon.

Given examples (many others are pointed out in our books of the 'golden series' B) illustrate how wide spread the myth of the birth of Jesus by caesarean section really is. This event generated a multitude of versions, notably in places of wide ranging geographic and linguistic diversity.

#### **4. THE BIBLICAL STORY OF THE MAGI REFLECTS THE ADORATION OF RUS'-HORDE TO ANDRONICUS-CHRIST IN THE XII CENTURY. THE INTRODUCTION OF CHRISTIANITY TO RUSSIA.**

In the epoch of Christ, in the second half of the XII century, Rus' adopted Christianity wholly and instantly, and did not wait for a thousand year as the Scaligerian-Romanovian history assures us. Russian Czar [Vladimir](#) = [Vladeyushyi Mirom](#) (meaning 'One Who Rules the World' – translator's note), Czaritsa (Queen) Malka and Cossak Military Commander Ataman ([military rank in Cossack regiments](#) – tr. note) all came to worship Christ. They are represented in the Gospel as The Magi or The

Three Kings, under the names of Balthazar, Melchior and Caspar [6v1], ch.3. Afterwards a magnificent Cologne Cathedral was erected in their honor, where the famous sarcophagus of the Three Kings was placed. The shrine could be symbolic, and the Kings themselves buried in the central Imperial Burial Ground of African Egypt.

Medieval images survive which depict the Adoration of the Biblical Magi to the infant Christ set against a background of banners displaying A CRESCENT AND A STAR [6v1], ch.3. This is a visual reminder that the Gospel events took place specifically in Czar-Grad (Yoros) = Biblical Jerusalem. It was still a recent memory for some of the artists of the XII-XVII cc. and when depicting the Gospel events they painted a crescent with a star, which was a widely recognised symbol of Czar-Grad.

Thus Cologne Cathedral was built not in honor of some obscure shepherds, but was dedicated to the powerful Czars Magi = 'Mongols', who were the first to greet Christ and accept him and spread Christianity in their country. It was Scythia-Horde-Rus' (modern day Russia – tr. note), which to our days is the largest country in the world, where Orthodox Christianity was established and remains until now. The important role attributed to the relics of the Magi-Czars in the medieval times now becomes clearer. They were not just common normal Czars, but rulers, who established Christianity as the STATE RELIGION OF THE GREATEST AND MOST POWERFUL EMPIRE OF THE MIDDLE AGES, i.e. 'The Mongolian' Empire. Incidentally, this has also included Germany, where Cologne Cathedral is situated. Having colonized Western Europe, The Russian Horde Empire – represented by the Emperor Barbarossa (Barbarian Ross) - could easily have created there a centre of worship for their Saintly Czars-Three Wise Men-Magi. Later, after the fall of the Empire, it was partly forgotten or intentionally obfuscated. The same purpose was served by the tendentious 'restorations' of the Shrine of Three Magi in the XVII-XVIII cc. [6v1], ch.3.

We have discovered a remarkable fact, which proves our identification of the 'Magus Melchior' with the Russian-Horde Queen Malka, mother to the prince Vladimir. In late Christian literature, art and sculptures, the three Magi are portrayed as MEN (MALE). However, in the Shrine the two Magi are portrayed as men with beards, but the third figure standing between them is CLEARLY FEMALE. See [fig.10](#).

Notably in many old depictions the Queen Melchior is presented as a white European woman, [fig. 11](#). In [6v1] we provide many similar examples. In some European cathedrals this tradition survived even up until the XIX century. But then, following changes in church policy and in compliance with the new views on history, the artists

started distorting the female features and turning the Slavic Queen into a Black Queen and then into a Black King.

Furthermore, it is curious, that some images of the Magi in Cologne Cathedral are of a strongly pronounced Slavic type, [fig.11](#). Now it becomes clear. Here are portrayed the King and the Queen from Rus'-Horde (Russia-Horde). Later on, following the changes in the situation in Europe in the XVII-XVIII cc., Western Europeans became hyper-sensitive to the Slavic origins of the Magi = 'Mongols'. In later depictions the Magi's Slavic facial type was beginning to be altered. The female Queen was being turned into a man. She was given moustache, for example in the Altar painting by Stefan Lochner allegedly of the XV century in Cologne Cathedral [6v1], ch.3.

Why did a fair-haired Slavic woman later turn into a Negro woman, i.e. BLACK woman? And then into a BLACK man. It is possible, that the Western Europeans mixed up two Russian words: CHERNYI (meaning BLACK) and CHERMNYI (meaning RED). In the Russian language there are well-known expressions: 'krasna devitsa' meaning a beautiful, fine girl; 'Red square' meaning a beautiful square. The chances are that the great queen was called 'beautiful'.

The Russian expression 'red, beautiful queen' could have been, quite possibly, misinterpreted by the foreigners, who by then couldn't remember Russian very well, and from CHERMNAYA TSARITSA (meaning BEAUTIFUL QUEEN) turned into CHERNAYA TSARITSA (meaning BLACK QUEEN). A black queen is of course, a negro – a notion assumed by medieval artists and confidently executed with their brushes... The transformation into a male remains on the conscience of recent commentators.

To conclude, the relics of the Three Magi-'Mongols' were originally kept in a magnificent golden sarcophagus in Cologne Cathedral: 1) the great Russian prince VLADIMIR (Balthazar), who introduced Russia to Christianity, 2) his mother the princess MALKA (Melchior), 3) his commander-khan, the Cossack ataman CASPAR = COSSAK. In the Old Testament he was called Assyrian Rabsak, i.e. the Russian Caspar, if read backwards.

They were among the first who visited and accepted Jesus Christ in the XII century and that is why they were respectably described as the Magi in the Gospels and partially in the Old Testament. They introduced Christianity to Rus'-Scythia. Afterwards they were sanctified. The famous Cologne Cathedral was erected purposefully as the shrine of these Magi - 'Mongols'. The foundation of Goth = 'gothic' Cologne House (as Cologne-Colony itself) was laid down during the 'Mongolian' conquest of Western Europe, aka the 'ancient Roman conquest of

Europe. The Magi's relics were brought to Cologne-Colony on the order of the Czar BARBARIAN-RUSSIAN OR BEARDED RUSSIAN, i.e. Barbarossa.

Then having 'consigned' Christ's life a thousand years into the past from the XII to the I century, Scaligerian history did its best to erase from the memory of the future generations the important fact, that The Kings-Magi in reality were the great='Mongolian' czars of Rus'-Scythia, who have baptized Russia.

## **5. THE CRUSADES AS REVENGE FOR CHRIST'S DEATH.**

Christ's execution in 1185 in Czar-Grad triggered a violent reaction in both the capital itself and in the regions-femas of the Romaic Empire. Especially – in Russia, the motherland of Mary Mother of God. At the end of the XII century it was Rus' who was at the lead the Crusades, which march to Czar-Grad in order to avenge Christ's execution and punish the perpetrators. A bitter war breaks out which was later multiplied in the Scaligerian version of history under a variety of names. In particular it is known to us as the famous 'ancient' Trojan war allegedly of the XIII century BC, and also as the Crusade of the XII-XIII cc. AD.

It appears, that 'IN THE END OF THE XI CENTURY THE CRUSADERS WERE CONVINCED THAT THEY WERE AVENGING NOT THE DESCENDANTS OF THE SAVIOR'S EXECUTIONERS, BUT THESE EXECUTIONERS THEMSELVES' [217],

P.117-118. This fact is of great significance. In reality the events took place a century later: at the end of the XII – beginning of the XIII century. The start of the so called First Crusade, i.e. Crusade 'to rescue the Holy Sepulchre', today is erroneously dated to year 1096 [455], instead of approximately year 1196. On the other hand, the medieval church sources, for example, 'Skazaniye o strasti Spasove' ('Passions of our Lord') and '[Pilate's Letter to Tiberius](#)', assert that immediately after Jesus' Resurrection, Pilate was summoned to Rome where he was executed. Caesar's army went on a Crusade to Jerusalem and seized it. It is considered today to be vapid medieval conjecture, as according to the Scaligerian chronology, there was no Roman Crusade to Jerusalem in the third decade of the I century. However, now the sources' testimony literally makes sense. They were referring to the Crusades of the late XII – early XIII cc. specifically the so called Forth Crusade in 1204, during which Czar-Grad (Yoros) was conquered.

Afterwards the later chronologists, misled by the centennial chronological shift, moved the Crusade to the end of the XI century. One of the many repercussions of

this was the appearance of a phantom Crusade of supposedly year 1096, when Jerusalem was conquered [455], [2v], [IIPC], [HOP].

## **6. Savior Not-Made-by-Hands, SUDARIUM AND THE TURIN SHROUD.**

In 1998 a report about the radiocarbon dating of the famous Christian relic, The Turin Shroud, resonated strongly with a public. It is considered that this fragment of cloth still bears some traces of crucified Christ, allegedly from the I century. HOWEVER, THE RADIO-CARBON DATING GAVE A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT DATE: APPROXIMATELY THE XI-XII cc. The radiocarbon analyses were conducted in three laboratories of – The Oxford University, Arizona State University and the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (Zurich) [IIPC], ch.1.

In [IIPC] we discuss in detail the radiocarbon dating of the Shroud. It appears that in fact the most probable date is the second half of the XII century.

The radiocarbon dating of the Shroud to the mid XII century corresponds well with other independent dates of Christ's life, arrived at by us. It should be said, that we have a rather critical attitude towards the results of radiocarbon dating [1v], ch.1. This method is still very inaccurate - dating of artefacts which are up to 2000 years old can give rise to unforeseeable mistakes, which correspond badly with the artefact's true age! Besides, when ordering a radiocarbon dating of any given artefact, the archaeologists often inform the laboratory beforehand of the estimated age of the sample, and physicists only 'specify' it, by selecting the 'desired date' from a spectrum of the obtained radiocarbon dates (which objectively have a broad range). However, the situation with the dating of The Shroud is somewhat different. The samples of its material were independently dated by several laboratories which allows reliance on their conclusions with a certain degree of confidence. Thus, it is most likely The Turin Shroud is an invaluable original of the XII century, which has fortuitously survived till nowadays.

From the point of view of the new chronology the story of the Turin Shroud, i.e. Acheiropoieta Image looks like this. The body of Christ was enwrapped in it in 1185. Then, after some time, it turned up in Russia. Here it was kept folded – so, that on the outside only The Holy Face, which was depicted on many Russian icons, was visible. As the Shroud remained in Russia, the icons of the Acheiropoieta Image were painted mainly by Russian artists. In the West such images were less wide spread. The Western artists imagined the story of the Shroud somewhat differently, [fig.12](#) [IIPC], ch.1. In Russia the icon The Image of the Savior Not-Made-By-Hands was also used



as a military banner and a holy banner. The Savior thus depicted embellished the banners of Yaroslavl, Tver' and Moscow Princes, acted as the defender of the Russian Soil and the protector of Russian armies. They fought under His banner during the Battle of Kulikovo [IIPC], ch.1.

Considering that The Shroud remained in Russia, it becomes clear why it is precisely here, where the special ceremony of The Adoration of the Shroud during the Holy Week originated. It doesn't exist at all in the Catholic Church. The Russian church service incorporates the carrying of The Shroud out of the church during the Procession of the Cross on Good Friday. But, most likely, the original Shroud was not usually disturbed. In place of the original one of its numerous replicas were used, which were kept in every church. The original, judging by the creases on it, was carefully kept folded, so that only the face of Christ could be seen. That is why it was called the Image Not-Made-By-Hands or the Sudarium. During The Great Revolt of the XVII century, many Moscow treasures, ransacked in the tumult of the rebellion and occupation, found the way to the West. It is probable, that it was in the XVII century when the Shroud was damaged by a fire and burnt in several places. These singes from the fire are still visible today. The Shroud found its way to Turin in Italy allegedly in 1578.

It is possible that even earlier there existed some other Shroud in Turin. As there are several allegedly authentic Shrouds known of in the West. But the original Shroud found itself in Turin, in our opinion, only in the XVII century. In fact, a special shrine was built for it and it was placed in Turin Cathedral only in the 1694 [IIPC], ch.1. According to the new chronology, such a date – the end of the XVII century – is very telling. It was then, after the crushing defeat of Razin and vanquishing of the Turks under Vienna, when it became clear that the era of the Great Empire was passing, and that Russia-Horde was no longer to be feared, and that at last, the seized treasures and relics of the Horde could be released from their chests, including the Shroud, without fearing that the former owners would return and reclaim them.

## **7. MARK THE EVANGELIST.**

The magnificent Saint Mark's Basilica in Venice is the adornment of the city and one of the most popular buildings in Italy. Its history is extremely interesting in the light of the new chronology.

It appears, that the first evangelist Mark lived in the XII century, died in its second half and was buried for the first and the last time in St. Mark's Basilica, which was specially erected in his honour [2v1], ch.1. This lavish burial of Mark allegedly in 1094 (most likely circa 1194) with the participation of the Doge, Patriarch and all of the people was later interpreted by the historians as supposedly 'the rediscovery' of his remains 'a millennium later' as Scaligerian chronology has already shifted the time of Mark's life to the I century.

There were no mysterious vanishing and miraculous reappearances of Mark's relics 'a thousand years later'. These cunning legends were made up later, when the historians had already started to coordinate Scaligerian chronology with the evidence of the old documents, that pointed to the XII-XIII cc. as the epoch of Mark the Evangelist's activity.

Saint Mark's Basilica in its modern state was completed significantly later than the XII century. Today we see the cathedral which was completed not earlier than XVI century [2v1], ch.1.

The rest of the evangelists also lived and wrote at the end of the XII – beginning of the XIII cc.

## **8. TWO BRANCHES OF THE ORIGINAL CHRISTIANITY.**

Following the crucifixion of Andronicus-Christ in Czar-Grad in Bosphorus two branches of Christianity emerged.

The first branch, which we will provisionally call 'royal or ancestral Christianity', was the religion of the RELATIVES OF ANDRONICUS-CHRIST. This was the Christianity of the royal family, the Empire's ruling ancestral clan, but not the religion of the common people. Inside the clan, as in any family, there were disputes. After the Crusade in 1204 those of his relatives who came to believe in Him as a God came to power. But they also regarded their own persona as holy given that God Andronicus-Christ was their relation. The 'ancient'-Egyptian artefacts and imagery convey to us the atmosphere of this ancestral Christianity, i.e. - the memorials of the royal family burial site. Egyptian Christ-Osiris, his worst enemy Set, his wife-mother Isida, etc. were close relatives. Occasionally they fought between themselves, killed and persecuted each other, but nonetheless their relationship remained ancestral.

We can see a similar picture in the 'ancient'-Greek pantheon of the Olympic Gods, where Zeus is another representation of Jesus Christ. The Olympic Gods were related,

though it still did not rule out wars between them, machination or conspiracies. But in the course of any clashes it was never forgotten that the conflicting sides were godly, which vastly differentiated them from the rest of the world. The same viewpoint was shared by the 'ancient'- Egyptian gods [486].

But Christ, aka Emperor Andronicus, bequeathed a school of his disciples-apostles. They have created a fundamentally different branch of the original Christianity, namely THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH. If we refer to modern Christianity, we will see that this is exactly what it's called. The Christian Church today and for a long time has stressed that it is specifically the APOSTOLIC CHURCH. The persistency of this claim itself makes one think, that at some point there also existed some other Christian Church. Why emphasise this fact so intensely and constantly, if no other movement apart from the Apostolic one existed?

The Apostolic movement, unlike the first one, ancestral one, was, so to say, of the people. It seems that the only representative of the royal family in the Apostolic Christianity was Our Lord's Brother Jacob. But he was soon murdered, after which the primacy passed on to the Apostles of the common descent – to Peter and Paul.

At first there were no fundamental differences between the two branches of Christianity, but they have soon appeared and it is clear why. The ancestral-royal branch of the Christianity was not large, but it commanded absolute power. At first, and for quite a long time, it reigned supremely over the Empire. The Christian Czars in the first centuries of Christianity perceived themselves as relations to God Andronicus-Christ and forced all of the people to venerate them as deities. 'In Paganism was established a system where there existed gods in the heavens and GODS ON EARTH, I.E. THE EMPERORS'[83], v.2, p.302. The Christians of the Apostolic Church were forced to offer sacrifices to the gods, i.e. to the living emperors. Many refused. It was they who were to become the first Christian martyrs. If the emperors demanded from the Christians 'the proper veneration', then it most likely meant that the emperors considered the Apostolic Christians to be of the same faith, but having strayed from the true path, which was punished.

To conclude, the Roman Emperors worshiped Christ, calling him Zeus and Jupiter, but at that considered themselves to be Gods too and persistently demanded to be worshiped. The second branch of Christianity – the Apostolic, branch of the people – regarded only Christ to be God and disagreed with the claims of the Royal family, from which Christ originated, to idolize the rulers. A conflict arose. The Royal Christianity began to persecute the Apostolic Christianity. This was the notorious

'Christian ostracism' allegedly in the first centuries AD, i.e. the epoch of the XIII-XIV cc.

The people's Apostolic Christianity, unlike the Ancestral Royal Christianity, was popular on the mass scale and, what's important, could organize itself and created a stable church, which was called Apostolic. In time it has evolved into a powerful organisation, put up a fight against the Royal Christianity, and in the end has won. Constantine the Great, aka, as we show it in [KP], czar-khan Dmitriy Donskoy, molds Apostolic Christianity into the state religion of the entire gigantic 'Mongol' Empire. Since then the czars-khans of the Empire ceased to be the Gods. This upheaval took place at the end of the XIV century and was far from painless. This matter was resolved in the major Kulikovo Battle in 1380. The great importance, which was given to the Kulikovo Battle and its numerous representations in world history, also becomes clear.

## **9. TWO WRITING TRADITIONS OF CHRISTIANITY – APOSTOLIC AND ANCESTRAL-ROYAL.**

There were many texts written in both of the branches of original Christianity. They varied. The people's Apostolic Church created the Gospels. We are very familiar with their spirit. The Gospels revere Andronicus-Christ and do not accept any equality with Him. This is a reverence of a disciple for his Teacher. Christ is the Sun, which is unblemished.

In the Ancestral-Royal circle they also were writing a lot (or used chroniclers and writers). Naturally they were writing a lot about their famous ancestor Lord Christ. But the flavour of these texts was essentially different. From them subsequently grew the 'ancient'-Greek myths about Zeus-Christ and his numerous relations – Olympian Gods, and also the 'ancient'-Greek legends about God Osiris-Christ and his nine closest gods. Modern commentators refer all such Christian testimonials to an historical period - 'paganism', naturally shifting it back to 'antiquity' and separating it from Christianity.

The differences between the texts of the apostolic tradition and Ancestral-Royal literature were so great, that today researchers have to explain with great difficulty vivid parallels and analogies between the Apostolic Christianity and 'paganism', which emerge repeatedly.

## **10. WHEN GOLD BECAME MONEY.**

A myth of the Argonauts probably tells us about Christ's and his disciples'-apostles' - voyage to the rich gold deposits in Russia. Gold is considered to be the symbol of Christ. Gold is constantly used in the Orthodox Church service. Iconostases, icons and the wooden carving in the cathedrals are gilded with it. The priests' clothings are lavishly embroidered with gold. Cups and icon covers are made of it. Orthodox Churches Domes and crosses on them are coated with gold.

It is possible, that it was exactly in the XII century, in the times of the Emperor Andronicus-Christ, when gold started widely being used as money. That is why it was gold that became the symbol for money. Argonauts, i.e. Christ's and the apostles' voyage to Russia for gold also becomes clear.

Initially, when people discovered gold, they didn't immediately think of using it as money. Gold doesn't rust. It is a very soft and yielding metal. At first they used to make houseware out of gold. But gold isn't suitable for all weaponry or tools – it is too soft. In the view of gold's rarity, its value and convenience in producing houseware, golden goods were extremely valued in ancient times. When the chronicles tell us about robberies or gifts, they often refer to golden vessels, cups, etc. Hence it is evident that in the ancient times it was initially exactly golden houseware which was used as common 'currency'.

Only in time, presumably in the XII-XIII cc., gold became money in the truest sense of the word – accounts were settled with pieces of gold. At first it was weighed, and then they started cutting pieces of a standard weight, which soon led to the appearance of golden and silver coins as a means of payment. And only later, out of poverty in places they started using copper and other inexpensive metals. Their value when re-melted would be negligible. Thus the copper money was nominal, its value was established only by law, which obliged people to accept it as a means of payment.

Wide coining of such 'conventional money', which did not have its own value, as opposed to gold and silver, began only in the XVII century, already after the collapse of the Great Empire. For example, the introduction of the first copper money in Russia in the time of the first Romanovs, in place of previous gold and silver ones, caused violent protests among the Russian population, who were used to REAL MONEY, i.e. golden and silver coins. The notorious 'copper revolts' broke out. Revolts were crushed by force and the new rules forcefully imposed on the people.

## **11. CHRIST WAS BORN IN CRIMEA. IN THE SAME PLACE MARY MOTHER OF GOD DIED.**

The question of where Christ was born preoccupies many people. Today we are assured that the place of His birth was modern Palestine where the city of Bethlehem is located. This name is taken from the Bible. Thus in the Gospels it named as the town where Christ was born. However, we discovered that this theory of historians is incorrect. Most likely The Virgin Mary originally came from Russia. Besides, many authors from 'antiquity' called Andronicus-Christ Etruscan, i.e. Russian [ЦРИМ]. Furthermore, in the Russian-Horde chronicles the Emperor Andronicus-Christ is described as the great prince Andrey Bogolyubskyi, who was born in Russia [ЦРК]. Therefore, Andronicus-Christ could have been born somewhere in Russia-Horde.

It turns out that Christ was born in Crimea, in the same place where Mother of God died [XP]. We were able 'to calculate' the exact location of Christ's birthplace. It is the famous cape Fiolent (aka the Bethlehem of the Gospels) in Southern Crimea. Crimean Karaites were convinced that the Cradle of the Savior of the World (Christ) is kept in Crimea. It appears that the famous Holy Grail is the Golden Cradle of the Baby Jesus. It remained in Crimea, where apparently it was searched for for a long time. The identification of the Holy Grail with the Golden Cradle of Jesus also has its origins in the legend of King Arthur. Cape Fiolent was visited by the Russian Emperors in order to bow down to this Holy site.

Moreover, we came across an important fact. It appears that an ancient CAVE temple of the Nativity of Christ was found on the Cape Fiolent. This temple as well as the St. George's Monastery has survived many events. It still exists today. A beautiful concurrence with the Gospels arises, according to which, the Nativity took place in a CAVE. It is absolutely clear that in this place there should have appeared a cave temple of the Nativity of Christ. In the whole world there are only a few cave churches of the Nativity of Christ. But it is only about one of them, namely the temple in Fiolent, that so much information, directly connecting it to the Gospel events, has been discovered. It is intriguingly, that in the XX century in the St. George's Monastery in Fiolent they wanted to restore the ancient rituals-performances in the memory of the Nativity of Christ [XP], ch.5.

Are there any references to Christ's Golden Cradle that survive in the history of Southern Crimea? After all we are beginning to understand that Jesus was born in Fiolent. That is why such a vivid detail as the Golden Cradle of Baby Jesus-Zeus should have been reflected in the legends of this region. It appears that such references not only exist, but are also well known. But unfortunately, today nobody

directly makes the connection to Christ, as the Romanovs enforced eradication of the true Crimean history [XP], ch.5.

For many centuries until the end of the XIX century there were stories about CRIMEAN PRINCES BEING NURSED IN THE HOLY GOLDEN CRADLE. The cradle was enveloped in incredible veneration; it was guarded and kept safe from the enemies. When the enemies were at close quarters, the holy golden cradle was concealed in the cave.

Everything is clear. The cradle in which was reared the Baby Jesus, who was born in Crimea in Crimea circa 1152, on cape Fiolent, became holy to all Christians, primarily to the Christians of Crimea. It's unlikely that the cradle was actually gold. Most likely this is a figment of people's imagination, as Christ was associated with the Sun and Gold. That is why the Cradle was depicted as gold in the icons. Please note, that the Golden Cradle eventually found itself once again in the cave inside the Crimean mountain. Originally, when Jesus-Zeus was born, it was in the mountain cave. And it is there it has returned according to folklore.

It is also clear why the successive Crimean princes and czars were nursed in this cradle. It was thought that the rulers of Crimea would receive some of the power and divinity of the Emperor Andronicus-Christ [XP], ch.5.

The stories of a Holy Golden Cradle were preserved by the Crimean Karaites. Here it is said directly, that the Savior of the world would grow up in it. Meaning Christ. Most likely, at first not the future, but the past was meant: in this cradle the Savior of the world (Jesus) GREW UP. Then He will appear again during the Last Judgment. The Karaites' legend clearly claims that the Holy Cradle was kept in Crimea and was hidden in the mountain, in its depths, i.e. in a cave. It perfectly corresponds with the fact the Andronicus-Christ was born in the cape Fiolent, in Crimea. Furthermore, Christ was born in a cave. Consequently at first his cradle was also in a cave. Later on as time went by it could have been hidden in a cave once again, as an object that acquired holy status.

There prevails a variety of opinions in the question of where exactly in Crimea the Golden Cradle was hidden. Around a dozen of places of the probable location of the Golden Cradle are known: Kaplu-Kaya, Basman Caves, Cross Mountain (Krestovaya Gora) on the South shore, Beshik-Tau (Mountain) near the cave town of Chufut-Kale ... Thus everybody pointed to the Southern Crimea, but the exact place was forgotten [XP],  
ch.5.

We have discovered the place of death and first burial site of Mary Mother of God. It is the famous ancient town of Chufut-Kale in Crimea, not far from Bakhchisaray. Moreover, the earlier correlation between Virgin Mary and the Empress Phaustina discovered by us, has immediately allowed us to identify the place of her death and burial. You will recall that Bakhchisaray is the 'Mongol' capital in Crimean Kanate.

Chufut-Kale is a Crimean cave town. It is closely associated with Virgin Mary. Here are situated the Valley of Mary, City of Mary, Christian necropolis and the remains of a Christian temple. The famous Assumption Monastery is situated near Chufut-Kale. The appearance of the 'live icon' of the Virgin Mary near Chufut-Kale is very well-known, in honour of which the Assumption Monastery was founded. The 'live icon' of the Mother of God is possibly a reminiscence of a personal appearance in Chufut-Kale of Mary Mother of God herself. According to Life of Mary the Mother God, she was buried in the cave. The Assumption Monastery in Chufut-Kale is indeed a cave-monastery.

There are several Assumption Monasteries in Russia. They are dedicated to the Assumption of Mary the Mother of God. But the most famous of them, steeped in numerous legends, is unquestionably the Crimean Assumption Monastery. It is situated in direct proximity to Chufut-Kale. For hundreds of years thousands of pilgrims from different countries have been coming here. As commentators observe, millions of feet have walked the road to the Assumption Monastery [164], p.5-6. It's all true. As Virgin Mary passed away, we now understand, in Chufut-Kale, it is exactly here where the most cherished main Assumption Monastery should have appeared. And so it did.

Furthermore, the well-known Golden-Horde (Tatar) story of the Queen Dzanike-Khanym is a story of the life, death and Ascension of the Virgin Mary in Chufut-Kale. Today Queen Dzanike-Khanym is ascribed to the XIV-XV cc. The historians are mistaken. Later authors were confusing the events of the end of the XII century and the end of the XIII century. That is the Church of Christ and the epoch of Constantine the Great.

A remarkable fact stands out, that throughout the centuries The Russian Emperors and the members of their families came to Chufut-Kale, to the Assumption Monastery and Bakhchisaray to worship. Foreign rulers also visited. Now we understand why. The august persons would come here in order to pay reverence to the places, where Mary the Mother of God had lived and died. Of course over time the heart of the matter was forgotten. However a longstanding tradition to visit these holy places



remained unchanged. The people of the XVIII-XIX cc. had already forgotten the root of this tradition, but they unswervingly obeyed the ancient custom.

Please note, that none of the Russian crown bearers travelled to Palestinian Jerusalem to worship. They probably well understood that there is nothing to worship there. Most likely they still remembered that not so long ago a shameless modern replica was fabricated there (on the initiative of, among others, the first Romanovs). But they constantly travelled to the ancient Chufut-Kale. The flow of the visitors of the highest rank, including the emperors and empresses, didn't wane until the beginning of the XX century. After the 1917 revolution the legendary holy places of Crimea suffered a long period of oblivion. The memory of The Mother of God spending her last days here practically vanished. And only now, relying on the New Chronology we are reviving this remarkable historical information. Hence the role of significant sites in Chufut-Kale and its surroundings multiplies endlessly.

The famous 'ancient' story of Orestes and Iphigenia is another Act of Christ and The Mother of God. The old sources tell us about Iphigenia's (i.e. Virgin Mary's) stay in Tavrida = Crimea. Flight of Iphigenia, Orestes and Pylades is The Flight of the Holy Family into Egypt. In Crimea a special adoration of The Virgin Mary was spread. In fact it becomes clear why the Church of the Virgin Mary at Ayu-Dag Mountain was situated on the cape which was called PARTENIT. The simple reason was that Virgin Mary was called PARTHENOS, meaning Virgin. 'Ancient' names still point directly to the fact, that it was A Virgin, i.e. Virgin Mary, who the Crimean Tauroscythians worshiped.

Incidentally, the phrase 'Greek faith' earlier used to mean 'Christian faith', and the CHRISTIANS were once called GREEK (GREEK was used for CHRISTIANS).

At the end of the XVIII century Romanov with the support of the Western European military forces was able to defeat both the troops of Tartaria Moscovite (the war with 'Pugachev') and the Crimean Khanate. As we show in [4v1], ch.10:4, after invading Crimea the Romanovs carried out a real pogrom, destroying the rich legacy of Russia-Horde. It is especially vivid in the example of the Assumption Monastery. The monks were evicted, a long 'quarantine' was laid on the monastery, the monastery's library was relocated somewhere and its fate is unknown.

The Khan palace in Bakhchisaray was destroyed. Little was left from its original look and décor [XP], ch.4. It seems likely that the Romanovs were finishing in Crimea the last remains of the Horde in the South. Besides, there were probably apprehensive of documents and books which were kept there, coming to light, which gave an account

of the history of Russia and Crimea of the XV and the XVII cc.; historical accounts which were at great variance to the Romanov historians' enthusiastic versions.

The Romanovs' incredible campaign of wiping out any historical memory gives food for serious thought. In the centre of Russia they destroy documents and chronicles and efface frescos in the central cathedrals of Russia. [4v]. In the remote regions of the Empire they simply banish from the homes those, who could still tell the truth about the former life and history of Russia-Horde. Needless to say there are no traces of the old frescos, inscriptions or paintings left in the Assumption Monastery. The destruction has been wholesale and thorough.

The town of Chufut-Kale was earlier called THE JEWELLED FORTRESS. Chufut-Kale enchanted many travellers. Evliya Chelebi wrote: 'IN THOSE TIMES ALL THE PORTALS, WALLS AND GATES WERE DECORATED WITH PRECIOUS STONES' [164], p.6.

Maybe he is referring to opulent mosaics. But it's quite possible, that something more luxuriant was meant here. As we now understand, that it was Chufut-Kale where Mary the Mother of God had died. Numerous pilgrims could have brought here generous offerings in the form of precious stones. They could have also decorated some of the buildings in Chufut-Kale, which would still cherish the memory of Mary. As it was a holy and sacred place the treasures could have been displayed not only inside the temples, but also on the outer walls. It is probable, that the pilgrims hung the decorations devoted to the Virgin Mary straight onto the railing of the mausoleum or the church dedicated to her. The Roman historian Iulius Capitolinus reports that in a settlement of Galal (i.e. Kale= Chufut-Kale) there was erected a temple dedicated to the Empress Faustina (aka Mary The Mother of God), who had died there. It's not difficult to imagine that not only the inside of the church, but also the walls surrounding it, could have been decorated with the luxurious gifts bestowed by the faithful. In that epoch no one would have touched them, the people regarded The Mother of God with such reverence.

But with time the tradition of bringing precious things here was forgotten. The memory of the first ceremonies and customs of the XIII century became a thing in the past. Bloody wars and pogroms tore through Crimea. Many things were eviscerated.

The well-known Iosafatova valley near Chufut-Kale well corresponds the Biblical tradition. There are: a valley with an old name 'Iosafatova valley', a famous old cemetery steeped in adoration for many centuries. The historians themselves mention the 'Biblical appearance' of the necropolis. It is fascinating that burials in the Iosafatova valley began since XIII century. It is all correct. The relatives of

Andronicus-Christ died in the beginning of XIII century. Virgin Mary came to Crimea and died at the end of XII – beginning of the XIII cc. Exactly at this moment a cemetery appeared and began to expand in the 'Iosafatova valley' near Chufut-Kale. So it is for a reason that in Life of Mary Mother of God it is said that Mary was buried near the Iosafatova valley. As we have shown, Mary Mother of God was indeed buried either on the territory of Chufut-Kale or in the cave church of the Assumption Monastery, i.e. in close proximity to the in the Iosafatova valley ch.4.

## **12. THE HOLY GRAIL – IS THE GOLDEN CRADLE OF CHRIST.**

The legend of the Holy Grail is widely known. In the Scaligerian history its essence is obscured. It is not known what the Grail actually is. Allegedly it is a cup into which Joseph of Arimathea collected Jesus' blood during His crucifixion. At the same time it is considered that the Holy Grail is related to the Last Supper and is linked with the communion cup in which wine symbolizes Christ's blood. The Western sources get confused about the location of the Holy Grail. They position it sometimes in France, in Britain and sometimes in the East. The Modern Christian Church doesn't officially speak out on the subject of what is the Holy Grail exactly. The legends of the Holy Grail appear both in the West and in the East starting with the XII-XIII cc. The aforementioned hazy interpretations of the Holy Grail most likely appeared quite late, not earlier than XV-XVI cc. The true story is forgotten and replaced with vague theories and philosophical speculations.

Presumably The Golden Cradle of Christ is in fact The Holy Grail. We have discovered that the later chroniclers would sometimes mix up Christ's Nativity with the crucifixion. In some legends [XP], ch.5, the Infant Jesus is killed with a small spear, by piercing His body. Evidently this is a mix up of the caesarean section with Jesus' execution. Christ was born as the result of a medical procedure: the Virgin Mary was given a small incision with a knife ('a small spear') in her body and the Baby was delivered. During the crucifixion Christ suffered the blow of a spear in His side. These two events have intertwined. In both cases blood was flowing. It could have (both factually and symbolically) coloured Christ's cradle and His body during the crucifixion (and at his birth). That is why they starting saying later that several drops of Christ's blood got into the Holy Grail. The same cup started to be called Joseph of Arimathea's sacred cup. So the commentators quite rightfully note that in some ancient texts the Infant Jesus and crucified Christ become victims. In other

words the act of birth and the act of death become identified with each other. The cradle coloured with Christ's blood is on the whole the same thing as the Cup containing His blood. Christ was lying in the Cradle; His blood was in the Cup (Grail).

So, Christ's Cradle was situated in Crimea which has become a holy relic which received the following names 'the Golden Cradle' and 'The Golden Holy Grail'. For some time people knew where it was situated. Then the memory of it began to fade. But the tradition of connecting the Grail with Crimea lived on and had longevity. Consequently at some point the search for Grail was to start exactly here. And so it did. In [XP], ch.5, we tell about numerous attempts to find the Holy Grail in Crimea, which were undertaken in the XX century, as an example. Not only Russian archaeologists and enthusiasts were looking for it, but also many Western Europeans. This once again emphasizes a wide spreading of the information about the Golden Cradle.

It becomes clear why Mary Mother of God at the end of Her life came exactly to Southern Crimea. For some time She lived either in Chufut-Kale or somewhere near it. The choice of the place was not random and was a very natural one as on the Fiolent Cape not that far from Bakhchisaray and Chufut-Kale Mary gave birth to Andronicus-Christ. Therefore in the end She returned to the birthplace of Her famous son, and lived here until Her death. When a person specifically chooses a place as their final resting place, such a choice is not usually a random one.

### **13. TO CONCLUDE: CAPE FIOLENT IS THE BIRTHPLACE OF CHRIST, MOUNTAIN BEYKOZ IS THE PLACE OF HIS CRUCIFIXION, CHUFUT-KALE IS THE PLACE OF DEATH AND FIRST BURIAL OF MARY MOTHER OF GOD.**

To conclude, we were able to discover three geographical points, where the important events of the XII century took place. In the XIX –XX cc. nobody anymore made a direct connection between the places identified by us and the story of Andronicus-Christ and Mary Mother of God (this connection was forgotten in the epoch of the XVII-XVIII cc.)

- 1) Andronicus-Christ was born in the Cape Fiolent in Crimea, circa 1152.
- 2) He was crucified on Beykoz Mountain = Golgotha in 1185, on the Asian shore of the Bosphorus. Nearby are situated ruins of the original, i.e. Biblical Jerusalem,

which was also called Yoros. On the shore of the strait, slightly to the south, is situated modern Istanbul.

3) The Virgin Mary, Mother of Christ for some time lived and then died and was buried in Crimea in the cave town of Chufut-Kale. These events took place at the end of the XII century.

In the XII-XIII cc. all three places enjoyed great respect. Here numerous pilgrims used to arrive. It was the time of Royal Christianity. Christ was worshiped and was called Zeus, Dionysus, Apollo, etc. Mary Mother of God was also referred to by different 'ancient' names. In Jerusalem = Czar-Grad, in Beykoz-Golgotha and also in Crimea the 'ancient' temples and shrines dedicated to Andronicus–Christ were erected. Bloody sacrifices would take place there, among them, quite possibly, human ones. Such was the character of Royal Christianity of that time. After the victory of the Apostles' Christianity, Royal Christianity began to be called the primal Judaism and 'paganism'.

At the end of the XIV century after the Battle of Kulikovo, in the Great = 'Mongol' Empire the Apostles' Christianity was adopted as the state religion. The bloody sacrifices were banned. From the end of the XIV century Royal Christianity was declared as 'paganism' (primal Judaism), that is to say 'a false cult'. Hostility to it began, which also affected the attitude to the former relics. The places of worship themselves were preserved because they were Christian. But terminology, ritualism and many other things which create the 'external appearance', as well as the form of customs, changed. As before the faithful would arrive to visit the Holy places, however by then they would generally be the Apostles' Christians. The former 'pagan' past of the relics had begun to be forgotten and turned into a well-respected, but none the less 'someone else's' past, 'antiquity'. The new priests would slightly change the old names, which would compound the confusion in people's minds. Eventually the Christians were made to think that Zeus, Apollo, Dionysus were some ancient deities and that the deep past of Beykoz, Chufut-Kale and Fiolent was by no means Christian, but in fact, 'pagan'.

A particularly severe distortion was created in the XVI-XVIII cc., when the false Scaligerian history was invented and implanted by force. It confused the picture even more. While combatting the memory of the Great Empire, they did their best to consign to oblivion the former 'Mongol' relics, including the older places of worship. To a large extent it was successful. However, 'success of the reformers' was far from complete. As not so long ago, in the XVII-XVIII cc. many could still remember the true history. Of course the younger upcoming generations were soon re-educated,

however, a firm tradition had already been developed and established. That is why until now many come to Beykoz Mountain, Cape Fiolent and the City of Chufut-Kale to worship, though not longer fully aware of the true meaning of these holy places.

## **14. King Arthur.**

# The Horde wars and the conquests of a latter epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. were falsely inserted into the Life of Arthur-Christ. For example the story of the Battle of Kulikovo has been inserted. In it Arthur is identified with Khan Dmitry Donskoy (Emperor Constantine) and also with the Biblical David. The well-known battle of Arthur with a fierce giant is David fighting Goliath. That is once again the Battle of Kulikovo.

# The well-known wizard Merlin is a magus-sorcerer and also the Holy Spirit of the Gospels, and also (in some of the fragments of chronicles) the Emperor Andronicus-Christ himself.

# King Uhter is King Herod, and in other fragments it is the Holy Spirit who procreated Christ (Arthur).

# The story of Arthur's birth is the Gospel story of the Immaculate Conception and the Nativity of Christ.

# In the Life of Arthur the story of John the Baptist is inserted.

# The notorious traitor Modred or Mordred who rebelled against Arthur is the reflection of the Gospel King Herod and also to a greater degree - Judas Iscariot. The scheming Judas is also reflected in the image of King's Arthur 'unfaithful wife Guinevere'.

# The cycle of legends of King Arthur was created quite late, in the epoch of the XVI-XVII cc. The story of Christ is fantastically entwined here with much later events, mainly of the military history of the Horde. It's no coincidence that the name ARTHUR coincides with the word ARTA or HORDE.

# The famous Round Table of King Arthur and the meeting of twelve of his best knights at the Round Table is a recollection of Christ's famous Last Supper, when at the same table not long before Christ's death all 12 of Jesus' apostles gathered together [XP], ch.7.

A great deal is written about King Arthur and the Holy Grail. The literature dedicated to the Arthurian legends and their reflection in the fictional literature of different

epochs and different people is truly vast. Now such a keen interest towards the persona of Arthur makes perfect sense.

## 15. HERACLES

Heracles (Hercules) is a famous hero from 'deep antiquity'. Numerous 'ancient' authors have written about him. The theme of Heracles resonates continually and loudly at the beginning with the XV century. 'Heracleian' statues, paintings, frescos and mosaics were being created, literary works, operas, symphonic poems and musicals were being written. A list of the prominent authors who created works in honor of Heracles occupies a considerable amount of space in the encyclopedia [533]. Here is the result of our research of Heracles' life story [ГПК] It appears to resemble King Arthur's 'biography'. The first and the last thirds of the life story are the phantom reflections of the story of Andronicus-Christ. The first third tells us about birth and adolescence. The last third is dedicated to the final stage of his life, including crucifixion. The middle of the 'biography' is of a completely different nature. In Arthur's case it concerns the epoch of the Ataman (Ottoman) conquest of the XV-XVI cc., the jousting contests (i.e. 'ancient' gladiators' tournaments). In the case of Heracles the picture is similar. The middle of his 'biography' is the 12 famous heroic deeds. They are identical to the tilting matches. Heracles battles against various characters and monsters, besides this there is some mention of 'fair ladies'. The 'ancient' Heracles behaves like a medieval knight.

We discovered that the 12 heroic deeds of Heracles correspond with the zodiacal constellations. Furthermore, it turned out that in some of the constellations the planets were specified. Therefore the description of Heracles' heroic deeds is an encrypted zodiac. We have dated it. It turned out that the astronomical solution exists (which at first glance was far from obvious). More than that, as a result there was a single digit date, i.e. year 1513, [ГПК] ch.2.

Thus, the beginning and the end of Heracles' 'biography' is one of an early description of the life of Andronicus-Christ. The middle was made up of the events of the XV-XVI cc. The image of Andronicus-Christ was strongly reflected in both Royal, Ancestral and the Apostles' people's Christianity. In the Royal Christianity he was described in particular as the hero and demi god Heracles (and also as Zeus, Apollo-Apollonius, Dionysus, etc.). It was Royal Christianity which yielded an offshoot called Judaism with its sceptical attitude towards Christ.

Furthermore, it turned out the 'biography' of the famous 'antique' hero Theseus (Theos = God) consists of the events of both the XII and the XVI cc. Incidentally, this is

already familiar to us from the life story of Heracles, which consists of two layers – the story of Andronicus-Christ of the XII century and the events of the XV-XVI cc.

## **16. CHRISTIAN CROSS AND CRESCENT MOON WITH A STAR.**

In the epoch of the XII-XVI cc. the following two well-known symbols effectively signified the same thing. It is a crescent moon with a star and a Christian cross adjacent to a crescent moon, [fig.13](#) [KP], ch.5. Today a crescent moon with a star is considered to be exclusively a symbol of Islam, of the Muslim faith, and a cross, at the base of which there is a crescent is regarded purely as a Christian symbol.

However, Christianity of the XII-XVI cc. was one entity, and it was only at the end of the XVI century that a split began to appear, which led in the XVII century to the division of Christianity into several denominations – Orthodox Christianity, Islam, Catholicism, Judaism, Buddhism, etc. A formerly united Christian symbol – a crescent moon and a star=cross – possibly first symbolised the Star of Bethlehem, which lit up at Christ's birth in year 1152, and also the solar eclipse, associated with the crucifixion of Christ in year 1185. You may recall that during the solar eclipse the sun initially turns into a half crescent. The crescent may also symbolise the Moon, which blocks the Sun. The star (cross) inscribed inside the crescent was depicted in various ways four-pointed, five-pointed, six-pointed and eight-pointed.

After the division of the churches in the XVII century the symbol of the star-cross has 'multiplied' and gradually turned into its modern versions, including that of a crescent and a star (today, as a rule, five-pointed) and also into a cross, adjacent to a crescent, etc., [fig.13](#). A six-pointed star (= 6-pointed cross), which has 'separated' from the crescent began to be called the 'star of David', which, by the way, is not surprising, as a significant part of the legends of Biblical David refer to Andronicus-Christ [LPC] Christ was always associated with the Star of Bethlehem. So the 'star of David', which today is considered exclusively to be a Judaic symbol, most likely symbolizes The Star of Bethlehem of the XII century.

The fact, that on the domes of many Russian churches and cathedrals there is towering a Christian cross and a crescent, attracts our attention. Historians and members of clergy are often asked a question: what does it mean? As today a crescent is considered to be a symbol of Islam, distant from Christianity. So why then a crescent can be seen together with a cross? Usually the answer is as follows: purportedly, in the epoch of the religious wars Christianity in Europe defeated Islam. So they put an Ottoman crescent at the base of the Christian a cross as a symbol of



victory, so that the people always remembered of the' triumph of the cross over the crescent'.

But such 'explanations' are invented post factum and do not represent the facts. The true meaning we have made clear above.

In some places in Russia there have survived old depictions of a Christian cross and a crescent, where the crescent is not situated below, BUT IN THE VERY CENTRE OF THE CROSS, [fig. 14](#) AND EVEN ON TOP OF THE CROSS, ABOVE IT, [fig.15](#) [KP] ch.5. So it is completely impossible to say, that here is depicted 'victory of the cross over the crescent'. If we follow the 'logic' of the historians, then we'll have the opposite: the crescent, placed ABOVE the cross should have been symbolizing the victory of Islam over Christianity. But how could a symbol like that appear in the Christian Orthodox cathedrals?!

## **17. THE OLYMPIC GAMES.**

It is possible, that the first 100-200 years after Christ's crucifixion up until the adoption of Christianity in the XIV century after the holy Battle of Kulikovo, the Olympic Games in memory of Christ were held in the Empire every four years. At first it was a commemorative celebration in the memory of Christ according to the laws of the 'Ancestral' Royal Christianity. Following the adoption of the Apostles' Christianity at the end of the XIV-XV cc. this custom was abolished and declared to be 'pagan'. On our suggestion the history of the Olympic Games was subject to a further deep analysis by Kurinnoy I.I. and the interesting results he arrived at are described in his book [455:3].

## **18. ONE HUNDRED AND FIVE REFLECTIONS OF ANDRONICUS-CHRIST = ANDREY BOGOLIUBSKY WE HAVE DISCOVERED IN THE SCALIGARIAN HISTORY**

[Fig.16](#) shows the erroneous Scaligerian dating of the main multiple reflections (altogether there are already 113 of them) of Emperor Andronicus-Christ, aka the Great Prince Andrey Bogoliubsky, that we discovered. It resulted in an impressive list of 'phantoms'.

'Chronicle biographies' of Czar-Grad's Emperor Andronicus and the Great Russian Prince Andrey Bogoliubsky are the most complete surviving SECULAR testimonies about Jesus Christ, who lived according to the new chronology, in the XII century.

a) ANDRONICUS COMNENUS, Czar-Grad, 'Byzantine' emperor, 1115-1185 [IIPC]ch.1-2.

b) ANDREY BOGOLIUBSKY, the Great Russian Prince of the XII century [IIPC]ch.3.

Some of the 'reflections' of Andronicus-Christ are partial. These biographies are comprised of several strands among which there is a prominent 'strand of Andronicus-Christ'. Sometimes it is the principle strand, sometimes not. In the latter case fragments of Christ's life are heavily intertwined with the information about other people from the epoch of the XII-XV cc. So here is a complete list of the reflections of Andronicus-Christ we have discovered:

1) GREGORY VII HILDEBRAND, allegedly the XI century, in Rome [2v1], ch.4.

2) RUDOLF OF SWABIA, anti-king, allegedly the XI century, in Rome [KP] ch.1:9.

3) EDWARD THE CONFESSOR, English king, allegedly the XI century [KP] ch.1:9.

4) ROMANOS DIOGENES, allegedly years 1068-1071, in Byzantium [IIPC] Appendix 1.

5) ISAAK KOMNENOS (COMNENUS), allegedly years 1057-1059, in Byzantium [IIPC], Appendix 1.

6) MICHAEL KALAFAT, allegedly years 1041-1042, in Byzantium, [IIPC] Appendix 1.

7) ROMAN ARGIR, Byzantine Emperor, allegedly years 1028-1034 [IIPC] Appendix 1.

8) Death of a Russian prince OLEG, allegedly the X century [HOP] ch.1.

9) IGOR, a Russian prince, allegedly the X century [HOP] ch.1.

10) ASKOLD (Asa-Kolyada), a Russian prince, allegedly the IX century [HOP] ch.1.

11) FOKA, Byzantine Emperor, allegedly years 602-610 [IIPC] Appendix 1.

12) VASILY THE GREAT – a famous Saint, allegedly the IV century [2v1], ch.3:6.

13) VASILY - a famous Christian evangelist, allegedly the IV century [XP] ch.5:14.

14) DOMITIAN (partial), an 'ancient' Roman emperor, ruling allegedly in years 81-96 [PI] ch.12.

15) HADRIAN, an 'ancient' Roman emperor, ruling allegedly in years 117-138 [XP] ch.1. Overall the biography of Hadrian is cast in a favourable light. However in the

end of the story told by historian Aelius Spartianus a theme of 'cruel and bad' Hadrian unexpectedly emerges. What is it all about? Why is there such an abrupt change in attitude towards the wonderful Hadrian, moreover, within just one fragment, one which is clearly at odds with the overall the sympathetic tone of the description? Surely, the most contradictory qualities can reside in one person. However in this case an idea occurs, that we yet again come across a widely spread opinion in the 'antiquity' of the XIII-XVI cc. that Andronicus-Christ was an 'evil person', 'mamzer', 'cruel monster'.

Byzantine Nikita Choniates, acknowledging the altogether outstanding role of Andronicus in History, talks a lot about his negative characteristics. He veraciously accuses him of a number of 'evil deeds'. We (can also see the same in the rabbinical Judaic version which presents Jesus as a negative character [307]. Similar sceptical overtones also can be heard in works of the 'ancient' Titus Livius (Livy), when he described some of the duplicates of Andronicus-Christ. At the same time the other duplicates of Jesus are described in a positive way [ЦРИМ] Such contrasts are not surprising. The persona of Andronicus-Christ caused turbulent disputes and polarised opinion. The emperor died in 1185 as a result of the bloody revolt in Czar-Grad. It was followed by the revenge from Russia-Horde: the perpetrators of Andronicus-Christ's crucifixion were violently executed. All of this led to the sharply divided opinion.

16) AELIUS VERUS – (the Elder, the father), 'ancient' Roman personage allegedly of the first half of the II century (under Hadrian) [XP] ch.1.

17) AELIUS VERUS (the Younger, the son) – 'ancient' Roman Caesar, who ruled in Rome allegedly in years 161-169 [XP] ch.1. (Lucius Aelius Verus Caesar)

18) COMMODUS, 'ancient' Roman Emperor, ruled allegedly in years 180-193 [XP] ch.2. We cannot ignore a colourful plot which reveals the rebellious atmosphere simmering around the figure of Andronicus-Christ in the year 1185. We are specifically talking about the Senate Decree dedicated to Commodus-Christ [140:1], p.71-72. Each of its lines is infused with hatred. The text was written by people clearly not under control and openly spilling their emotions onto paper. Harsh negative comments about Jesus on the pages of the rabbinical Judaic texts [307] pale in comparison with this scandalous Decree. The senate's decree probably came about amidst Czar-Grad scribes (Pharisees) and high priests who fiercely hated Jesus, according to the Gospels, and who made every effort to bring about His demise.

The true meaning of the senate's document becomes clear only now, after our research. This is the voice of Christ's enemies, surviving until today on the pages of

'ancient authors'. The latter editors forgot that it was Jesus who they were talking about here. If they knew, they would have destroyed the document.

No documents of such a strikingly critical nature have survived about any other Roman emperor. Of course, plenty negative things were written about Nero, Caligula and others. But in all those cases the emotions were much more restrained. There was no such fierce personal hatred towards a ruler. In Commodus' case the senators lost any control of themselves. Such fanaticism probably had a religious foundation. As Commodus is a reflection of Christ, the picture becomes clearer. The sympathisers and adversaries were split down religious lines.

Commodus-Christ was constantly called a GLADIATOR in the senate's decree (see next chapter). Repeated exhortations to 'pull' His body 'by a hook' were frequently made. They demanded to tear Commodus' corpse to pieces. Each sentence ends with an exclamation mark. Most likely, the document absorbed the cries of the mob, which, according to the Gospels, demanded Jesus' execution. In the Gospels this scene is described sparingly, but this 'ancient' text is much more detailed. In this way we can penetrate the events, briefly described in the Gospels, in more depth [XP] ch.2.

19) KOLYADA, god of the medieval Slavs, and also the Middle Ages West European SANTA CLAUS (SANTA CRUZ) [IIPC]ch.6.

20) ODIN, a Germanic and Norse medieval god, but allegedly 'very-very' ancient [HOP] ch.5.

21) JESUS CHRIST, allegedly the I century [IIPC] ch.1-2.

22) APOLLONIUS OF TYANA, 'ancient' miracle maker, allegedly the I century [ΠΕ] ch.1.

23) ANDREW THE FIRST CALLED, THE APOSTLE, allegedly the I century [IIPC] ch.4.

The Scaligerian-Romanov dating of Baptism of Russia by Apostle Andrew allegedly in the X-XI cc. radically differs BY A THOUSAND YEARS from the same Scaligerian dating of the life time of Apostle Andrew as the I century. However the Baptism of Russia by Andrew himself ideally corresponds with the New Chronology and the shift to years 1053 or 1153. By retrieving the Gospel events from the phantom I century into the realistic XII century, we put everything in its place. It becomes clear, why it was exactly in the XII-XIII cc. when we see the 'explosion of Evangelism' and the blossoming of Christianity. It becomes clear that Russia 'didn't wait' for a whole THOUSAND YEARS to 'finally' adopt Christianity, but effectively

adopted it immediately after the emergence of the new religion in the XII century. In the XVI century Ivan IV the Terrible, not knowing yet of the Scaligerian chronology, which was introduced well AFTER HIM, 'pointed out that the RUSSIANS ADOPTED CHRISTIANITY NOT FROM THE GREEK, BUT FROM APOSTLE ANDREW HIMSELF. The same fact was pointed out to the Greeks a century later by the monk-priest Arseny Sukhanov who was sent to ... Greece' [208], p. 121.

24) GAIUS JULIUS CAESAR, the Roman Emperor, allegedly I century BC [ЦПК]ch.2:51.

25) MARK ANTONY, 'ancient' Roman military commander, allegedly the I century BC [HOP] ch.1.

26) Death of the Egyptian Queen CLEOPATRA, allegedly the I century BC [HOP] ch.1.

27) SALMOXIS, a divinity of the 'ancient' Thracians, allegedly 'very-very ancient' [ГП] Appendix 1:1.

28) EUCLID, a famous mathematician, geometrician, allegedly years 315-255 BC [ЦПК] ch.8:5. Thus, among the numerous reflections of Jesus Christ there is a fairly unexpected one. Christ is described in some of the 'ancient' sources as the 'ancient' Greek mathematician Euclid, to whom 'Elements', a famous book on geometry, is attributed. Presumably, the Emperor Andronicus-Christ was a patron of science, was interested in mathematics and by his order and maybe even under his supervision, the definitive work 'Elements' was created. By the way, the name Euclid is just a slight variation on the word KOLIADA – one of Christ's names.

29) HANNON, Carthaginian hero, allegedly the IV century BC [ЦПИМ] ch.3:2. Ancient Carthage is Czar-Grad, aka the 'New City', aka Biblical Jerusalem, aka 'ancient' Troy. The famous Punic wars between Rome and Carthage are the internecine feuds between Russia-Horde and Czar-Grad, and also the reflection of the Ataman (Ottoman) conquest in the XV-XVI cc, [fig.17](#) [ЦПИМ] ch.3.

Scaligerian historians assure us that the Carthage of the chronicles is situated in Africa. However there are no archeological remains here of the powerful Carthage and the great Carthaginian Kingdom, worthy of exuberant chronicle descriptions. Several dilapidating brick columns were presented and declared without any proof to be the remains of 'that very' temple of Baal which stood in 'that very' Carthage of the chronicles. But such crumbling remains of the medieval foundations can be pointed out practically anywhere. In Africa, Europe, Asia, America... Identification of these

bricks and stones with the 'annalistic Carthaginian' ones are entirely based on the erroneous Scaligerian geography and chronology.

It appears that not so long ago the archeologists took a textbook of the Scaligerian history and read in it that Carthage 'must be in Africa'. Having arrived to the North of Africa and having looked around, they saw nearby some dusty ruins. Rejoicing they said: There, we have found 'Carthage'. They found some inscriptions which were loosely interpreted as connected to Carthage. However such inscriptions do not at all prove that the METROPOLIS of Carthage was situated there. The city of Carthage, i.e. Czar-Grad, had many colonies scattered around the world. In each of them were kept the Czar-Grad documents, correspondence, etc. So the unearthing of Carthaginian coins in North Africa or say, in America, is not conclusive prove that 'the metropolis is found at last'.

Later, already in the XIX-XX cc., looking at a long and barren line of the North-African shore, in the very centre of which the historians have pointed out a small fertile valley and erroneously 'marked' here (on a map) the capital of the Carthaginian Kingdom, commentators were compelled to explain to themselves and to the public, how a generally fruitless land could feed such a large and powerful state, AS DESCRIBED IN THE CHRONICLES. But as no logical explanation was possible to find, they began to persistently repeat: 'Yes, it's infertile, but ... productive' [ЦПММ] ch.3.

Nevertheless, let's assume for a moment that historians are right and that in fact it was here in Africa, where the majestic capital of the mighty Carthaginian Kingdom was situated. But then it should be expected that in the 'most fertile valley' there survived some visible remains of the big city, etc... But no! There is nothing of the sort there. The Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedia melancholically informs us: 'NOTHING HAS SURVIVED of the famous Carthaginian temples' [988:00]. Of Carthage itself – also nothing. Here they hastily concocted an explanation: Carthage was, purportedly, 'mercilessly destroyed so many times over'. That is why no traces have survived of it.

THUS, THERE ARE NO TRACES OF THE FORMER GRANDEUR OF CARTHAGE OF THE CHRONICLES LEFT IN NORTH AFRICA. In a more or less reliable history starting with the XVII century, we discover here only a small town. Just several hundred inhabitants. One mosque. No convenient harbours. Only 25-30 dwellings. Poor living conditions. Three scanty Arabic villages. One church [988:00]. A museum, organised here by the Europeans in the XIX century in honour of the allegedly great 'ancient' past of these desolate places. Cardinal Lavigerie studied Scaligerian history well and decided to 'revive' the memory of Carthage here. He built

a museum. But the cardinal made a mistake. He should have built it in a different place: in Czar-Grad. Admittedly there are enough museums in Istanbul without it.

Archeological works in place of the 'great African Carthage' began only in 1817 [988:00]. They were leisurely digging in the XX century as well. Nothing remarkable was discovered until now [ЦПММ] ch.3.

30) ISOCRATES, the Athenian orator and writer, allegedly years 436-338 BC [ГП] ch.1:6.

31) SOCRATES, Greek philosopher and thinker, allegedly years 469-399 BC. In the famous drama by Aristophanes 'The Clouds', which tells us about Socrates-Christ, a Gospel story is described: a story of a greedy traitor Judas Iscariot and the execution of Jesus. 'The Clouds' is considered as originating from a secular source. But Scaligerian history assures us that the life of Jesus is described exclusively in the religious original sources. As we can see it is not true.

It is possible that at the heart of 'The Clouds' was an old text, which was later lost. It was Christian and described the story of Judas Iscariot and the execution of Jesus. However, in the epoch of the Reformation, the dram was tendentiously rewritten. The derisive remarks addressed at Socrates-Christ and His mentees disciples are scattered about all of the text. They created an overall tone of mockery of Christianity. Later the Christian content of the play was forgotten altogether, and it began to be considered as just some 'tale from ancient life'.

Now when a true essence of many old texts becomes clearer, they begin to be much more interesting. For example, Aristophanes' "The Clouds" is usually considered to be a tedious epic poem. Indeed, primitive jokes and scoffs scattered about the text can hardly captivate a modern reader. But as soon as we discovered that all of this anti-Christian 'humour' was added on to it by more recent editors, and as soon as it becomes clear, that 'The Clouds' is an old text of the New Testament, telling us about Christ and Judas Iscariot, then the interest towards the play immediately increases. The same sort of thing happens to a number of other old sources. A new view perspective transforms them from half-forgotten and supposedly bleak texts into gripping accounts of the past.

32) LYSANDER, Spartan king, allegedly the V-IV cc. BC [ГП] Appendix 1:2.

33) NICIAS, Athenian commander, the ruler of Athens, allegedly the V century BC [ГП] ch.5.

35) PAUSANIAS, Spartan king, allegedly the V century BC [ГП] ch.4:6.

35) ANDROCLES, leader of the Athenian radical democrats, allegedly the V century BC [ГП] ch.5:8.

37) ANDOKIDES, Athenian orator and public figure, allegedly the V century BC [ГП] ch.5:7-8.

37) CYRUS THE YOUNGER, a Persian Prince, allegedly the V century BC, died allegedly in year 401 BC [ГП] ch.2.

38) TIMOCREON, Athenian, allegedly the V century BC [ГП] ch.4:7.

39) PHRYNICHUS, Athenian strategist, allegedly the V century BC [ГП] Appendix 1:3.

40) POLYCRATES, the tyrant of Samos, allegedly the VI century BC [ГП] ch.6.

41) ZOPYRUS, a Persian nobleman, organised the regaining of control over Babylon under the rule of king Darius, allegedly the VI century BC [ГП] ch.6:14.

42) CYRUS THE ELDER, Persian king, allegedly years 559-530 BC [ГП] ch.3.

43) CROESUS, King of Lydia, allegedly years 560-546 or 590-545 BC [ГП] ch.3:3-5.

44) SERVIUS TULLIUS (MASTARNA in Etruscan) the penultimate king of the Royal Rome, allegedly years 578-535 BC. 'Ancient' historians spoke about his Etruscan origin [ЦПММ] ch.2. But in the epoch of the XVII century Reformation rebellion the information about the Etruscan, aka Russian, origin of Servius Tullius began to be considered 'exceptionally detrimental', 'very much incorrect'. Having grown to hate Russia-Horde, the former metropolis of the Empire, the reformers started declaring the Slavs, and especially the Russians, to be second rate people. That is why in some chronicles the words SLAV, SLAVONIAN surreptitiously were emended to SLAVE. Titus Livy probably acted in similar way, or it could have been his editors. It was decided that was better to declare Servius Tullius, aka Christ, to be a SLAVE, rather than continue to consider him to be ET-RUSCAN, Russian. Having confused the others, in the end, they got confused themselves. After which they began to authoritatively speculate – sometimes patronisingly, and sometimes assertively and aggressively – about the 'slave origin' of Christ. Like, he was a 'bad bastard'. His mother Mary was purportedly a slave too, moreover, a defiled one [307], p.358. Or else even worse – a lewd whore [ЦПММ] ch.2. Various theories have blossomed around this theme.

The 'Theory' about Servius Tullius' = Christ's supposedly slave background was being forced into the minds of people of the Reformation epoch with difficulty. Not so many were ready to accept it and forget the true history. It is known, that 'THE



ROMAN SCIENTISTS ANNALISTS STRUGGLE WITH THIS TRADITION of biasedly labelling Servius Tullius and his mother as 'slaves' – Author) can also be seen in the narration of Livy, who, incidentally himself eulogised her' [483], v.1, p.515, commentary 131. This 'ancient' struggle unfolded most likely in the epoch of the XVI-XVII cc. when the rebels-reformers began to enforce the Scaligerian version of history. The uprising opposition was overpowered, though with some effort. However, as we can see, many traces of the real history have survived [ЦРИМ] ch.2.

45) PYTHAGORAS, a famous 'ancient' philosopher and mathematician, allegedly the VI century BC [ПЕ] ch.2.

46) CYLON, Athenian, Olympic champion, allegedly the VII century BC [ГР] ch.4:4-5.

47) ROMULUS, the first king of 'ancient' Royal Rome, allegedly the VIII century BC [ЦРИМ] ch.1.

48) ISAIAH, messiah in the Old Testament, allegedly the VIII century BC [ПЕ] ch.4.

49) DAVID, Biblical king in the Old Testament, allegedly the XI century BC [ЦРС] ch.8.

50) OSIRIS, an 'ancient' Egyptian god, and also an Egyptian deity HORUS, allegedly 'gargantuan antiquity' [ЦРС] ch.5.

51) SVYATOGOR, Russian Hero, allegedly 'very ancient' [ЦРС] ch.5:11.

52) DIONISUS, an 'ancient' god, allegedly 'gargantuan antiquity'. Also god ADONISUS [ЦРС] ch.5:7; [ГРК] ch.2.

53) ORPHEUS, 'ancient' god, allegedly 'gargantuan antiquity' [ЦРС]ch.8:7.

54) ZEUS, supreme 'ancient' god, allegedly 'gargantuan antiquity' [ЦРС]ch.2:53.

55) PRIXUS (or FRIXOS), an 'ancient' hero, allegedly 'gargantuan antiquity' [HOP] ch.2.

56) JASON, an 'ancient' hero, who procured the Golden Fleece. Allegedly, 'gargantuan antiquity' [HOP] ch.2. The voyage of the Argonauts to Colchis for the Golden Fleece is Andronicus-Christ's voyage to the goldfields in Russia. First twelve Argonauts are Christ's 12 Apostles. It is generally thought that the Argonauts invented the sail. The invention of sails in the XII century corresponds quite well with the new chronology. In those times navigation was still coastal and didn't require complicated sails. The Empire of that time was colonising mainly only the coasts of the Mediterranean and Black Seas. Only later with the invention of the fully-fledged

sails, the ships started venturing into the open sea and were capable of sailing upwind. Later, with the emergence of the horse cavalry, The Empire colonised vast spaces of Eurasia. But this took place as late as in the XIII-XIV cc.

57) APOLLO, an 'ancient' god, allegedly 'gargantuan antiquity' [ΠΕ] ch.1.

58) MARCYAS, a silenus, an 'ancient' character, allegedly 'gargantuan antiquity' [ΠΕ] ch.1.

59) JOB, an Old Testament character, allegedly 'gargantuan antiquity' [ΠΕ] ch.3:9.

60) ESAU (a partial duplicate), an Old Testament patriarch, allegedly 'gargantuan antiquity' [ΠΕ] ch.3.

61) JACOB (a partial duplicate), an Old Testament patriarch, allegedly 'gargantuan antiquity' [ΠΕ] ch.3. Biblical Esau and Jacob are the intertwined reflections of Andronicus-Christ, John the Baptist and Judas Iscariot. The fifth lost Gospel is a story of Esau and Jacob in the Old Testament.

62) ORESTES, a famous 'ancient' hero, brother of Iphigenia [XP] ch.6.

63) RHADAMANTHYS, an 'ancient' god [ΓΡ] Appendix 1:2.8.

64) ASCLEPIUS (AESCULAPIUS) – an 'ancient' god [ΓΡ] ch.1:2.13.

65) HERACLES (or HERCULES) (partial duplicate), an 'ancient' hero [ΓΡΚ] CH.1-2.

66) ARTHUR (partial), an well-known Medieval English king, allegedly the VI century [XP] ch.7.

67) MERLIN, a wizard, a close associate of King Arthur [XP] ch.7.

68) HELIOGABALUS (or ELAGABALUS), a Roman emperor of allegedly the III century BC [XP] ch.2.

Andronicus-Christ, having arrived from Russia to Czar-Grad, introduced new customs, including those in clothing. For instance, it was thanks to him that the people of Czar-Grad started wearing trousers [IIPC] ch.2:61. Some opposed such innovations adamantly and accused the Emperor of adherence to the 'barbaric' customs. Similar events also occur under Heliogabalus.

Hence an intriguing story emerges. Heliogabalus-Andronicus has arrived, as it turns out, from Russia (Syria) to New Rome (Czar-Grad) in finery, in the description of which we can recognize the rich garments of the Russian-Hordian czars. Gold, purple, precious stones... Russia-Horde was a rich country. Contrary to that, proud Romans and Greeks dressed, as we were told, considerably more modest. The

provinces of the Empire were clearly poorer. That is why the wealth of the newly arrived czar-khan and his entourage annoyed them. Moreover they did not like the introduction of the new Scythian clothing. For example, trousers.

An observation that garments made entirely of silk were also introduced by Heliogabalus becomes clear. Previously the Russian warriors specially dressed in silk, so that during their campaigns, when it is difficult to bathe, the bad bugs would not nest. Silk repel pests [v.4]. Heliogabalus 'was the first to acquire silver self-cooking vessel' [140:1], p.142. Here we recognise the famous Russian samovars. Some of the noble-men of Czar-Grad were looking on with envy and discontent at the riches of the Hordian Czar who arrived from Russia. They could not accept that the Hordian czars wore not only expensive garments, but also luxurious footwear with precious stones, as well as opulent diadems. It is curious that Heliogabalus-Andrey would sometimes organise snowy hilltops in the garden during the summer, by delivering the snow.

It was probably a commemoration of the snowy Russian winters, which never occurred in Czar-Grad.

69) THESEUS, an 'ancient' hero [ГПК] ch.3.

70) BACCHUS, an 'ancient' deity [ЛІРС]ch.2:52 and ch.5:7, and also [ГПК] ch.2.

71) PROPHET MUHAMMAD (partial), a famous figure allegedly of the VII century AD [ІІРРК]

72) ALEXANDER OF MACEDON (Alexander the Great) (partial), a famous ruler allegedly of years 356-323 BC [ІІІАХ] ch.8.

73) ABU-MANSUR IBN-MUHAMMAD, an 'ancient' Iranian sheikh, allegedly the X century [ShAH)], ch.2

74) KEYUMARS – an 'ancient' Iranian king whose dates of birth and death are considered to be unknown. Suggesting that it is a very, very ancient character [ІІІАХ] ch.2.

75) SIYAMAK, a son of king Keyumars, an 'ancient' Iranian prince, whose dates of birth and death are considered to be unknown. Suggesting that it is a very, very ancient character [ІІІАХ] ch.2.

76) JEMSHID, an 'Ancient' Iranian king, allegedly 'very ancient' [ІІІАХ] ch.2.

77) MERDAS, an 'ancient' Iranian king, allegedly 'from deep antiquity' [ІІІАХ] ch.2.

- 78) ZOHAK (partial), an 'ancient' Iranian king. Dates of life are considered to be unknown [IIIAX] ch.2.
- 78) FEREDUN, an 'ancient' Iranian king. Dates of his life are considered to be unknown [IIIAX] ch.2.
- 80) ZAL-DESTAN (partial), an 'ancient' Iranian hero [IIIAX] ch.4.
- 81) ROSTAM or RUSTAM (partial). A famous 'ancient' Iranian hero [IIIAX] ch.4.
- 82) KAI-KHOSROW (partial), a famous 'ancient' Iranian king [IIIAX] ch.5.
- 83) ZOROASTER or ZARATHUSTRA, ZARANTUSTRA, ZARADUSHT, ZARDOST (partial), a famous Persian (Iranian) sage, prophet, saint; allegedly 'deepest antiquity' [IIIAX] ch.7.
- 84) EUSTRATE (OR EUSTRATES) PECHERSKY, holy martyr, crucified in Kiev allegedly in year 1096 [IIIAX] ch.10.
- 85) HAMLET, prince of Denmark. He was described in 'The Life of Amleth' by Saxo Grammaticus allegedly of the XII century and in tragedy by Shakespeare ('s tragedy) 'Hamlet' [III EK] ch.2.
- 86) MACDUFF, a Scottish Thane, allegedly the XI century. He is described in Holinshed's Chronicles and 'Macbeth', a tragedy by Shakespeare [III EK] ch.3.
- 87) APEMANTUS, a cynical philosopher, a contemporary of Alcibiades, allegedly the V century BC. He was described in Shakespeare's drama 'Timon of Athens' [III EK] ch.4.
- 88) APOLLONIUS OF TYRE (partial), a famous 'ancient' character, a hero of a rather famous 'novel' of allegedly the III century. He was described in Shakespeare's play 'Pericles' [III EK] ch.6.
- 89) TITUS ANDRONICUS, an 'ancient' Roman character described in the texts of the XVI century, in particular in Shakespeare's tragedy 'Titus Andronicus' [III EK] ch.6.
- 90) POLYDORUS, described in Virgil's 'Aeneid' [HOP] ch.3.
- 91) ALCIBIADES (partial) – a famous 'ancient' Athenian [ГР] ch.5.
- 92) MILTIADIS (partial), a famous 'ancient' character allegedly of the V century BC [3A], ch.1.
- 93) GUINEVERE (partial) – King Arthur's wife (Christ's) [XP], ch.7. Chroniclers sometimes mixed up a man and a woman.
- 94) THE PHOENIX – a mythical creature that dies and is reborn. [PI] ch.3.

- 95) 'A CERTAIN MAN', outwardly of human form, but godlike in deeds'. Thus Flavius Josephus begins his accounts of Christ, though in this part of his book he doesn't mention His name [PII] ch.11.
- 96) MITHRA (or Mithra–Attis), an 'ancient' Aryan god, and also an 'ancient' Persian god [2v1], ch.1.
- 97) BUDDHA and KRISHNA, famous Eastern deities [2v1], ch.1.
- 98) CAESAR OCTAVIAN AUGUSTUS (partial), a Roman Emperor allegedly of the I century BC – the I century AD [HOP] ch.1.
- 99) IGOR OLGOVITCH, a great Russian Prince of Kiev, martyr, allegedly the XII century [HOP] ch.1.
- 100) JOHN LAGOS (partial), described by a Byzantine author Nikita Choniates, the XII century [IIPC]ch.2.
- 101) PATROCLUS (PARTASIS), an 'ancient' Greek hero, who fell in the Trojan War, and is described by Homer in his Iliad [HOP] ch.2.
- 102) ARISTIDES of Proconnesus described by Plutarch [IIPC]ch.1.
- 103) CLEOMEDES of Astypalaea, described by Plutarch [IIPC]ch.1.
- 104) A number of other ancient heroes and characters delivered by caesarean section. Emperor Andronicus-Christ came into this world in this way. So: there's Typhon and Seth of 'ancient' Egyptian. Let's remember a Biblical story about the creation of Eve from Adam's rib. 'And God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam (a man), and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; And the rib, which God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man' (Genesis 2:21–22). If we refer to the Medieval depictions of the given subject-matter, then on some of them we will see a picture rather resembling the birth by the caesarean section, [fig.18](#) [HOP] ch.6. See the details in our books of the 'Golden Series' B ('Zolotaya Seriya').
- 105) IGOR OLGOVICH, Prince of Novgorod and Seversk and the Grand Prince of Kiev (Holy Martyr Blessed Prince Igor Chernigovsky), executed in the XII century, allegedly in year 1147.

Hence, the life story of Andronicus-Christ (Andrey Bogolyubsky) as reconstructed by us, is becoming enriched with many new interesting episodes. Previously the historians erroneously dated them as 'completely different personas' and ascribed them 'to the 'deep past'.

## **19. FIFTY NINE REFLECTIONS OF VIRGIN MARY = MARY THE BIRTH GIVER OF GOD**

As we have shown in [LPC], the Virgin Mary, Birthgiver of God, lived in the XII century. She was born in Russia, probably in Rostov or nearby. For some time she lived in Czar-Grad, died and was originally buried in Crimea, in the cave town of Chufut-Cale. Throughout Christianity the attitude towards the Birthgiver of God is particularly respectful. However in the rabbinical-Judaic version, and also clearly apparent the writings by the 'ancient' authors (like Titus Livy), the Virgin Mary, as well as Christ, are on the contrary portrayed negatively. Mary was accused of fornication with a Roman soldier. They also allege she was raped. According to another version, a soldier secretly entered Mary's place at night in the guise of her husband. On that basis Jesus was called a 'pitiful mamzer', a bastard, i.e. born to Mary and Joseph out of wedlock [307]. As we discover further, in a Roman version by Titus Livy, the Birthgiver of God is described as a famous 'Roman She-Wolf' ('The Capitoline Wolf'), and also as a promiscuous Larentia cheating on her husband with strangers. Similarly critical view of the Virgin Mary can be found in the works of other chroniclers. The picture is clear: many disputed the Christian idea of the Immaculate Conception and tried to belittle and to distort this motif, tirelessly conjecturing about the debauchery, a Roman soldier, rape, etc.

The following characters are the phantom reflections of Mary the Birthgiver of God in the Scaligerian 'History textbook':

- 1) VIRGIN MARY, allegedly the I century.
- 2) PALLAS ATHENA PARTHENOS – A FAMOUS 'ancient' Greek goddess [2v2], ch.1:15.
- 3) MAIA (MAYA), MAIESTAS, MARIAMMA (MAARIAMMA), MARIANNE, MARITALA, MANDANE (OF MEDIA) – mother of 'messiah' Cyrus, THE 'GREAT MOTHER' of Pessinunt, MARIAM, MARYIAM (MIRIAM), MERIDA, MYRRHA, MAIRA (MAERA), MUT-EM-WIA – 'most ancient' Indian, Asian and Egyptian goddesses-mothers [2v1], ch.1:6.
- 4) Goddess LATONA or LETO, mother of the famous 'ancient' god Apollo [IIE], ch.1.
- 5) ISIDA (ISIS or IZIDA) – 'ancient' Egyptian goddess, sister or wife of god Horus (duplicate of Christ) [v2] [LPC].
- 6) DEMETER – 'ancient' Greek goddess.

- 7) NEPHELE – first wife of Athamas and mother of the 'ancient' hero Phrixus (=Christ) [ HOP], ch.2.
- 8) CREUSA (or KREOUSA) – wife of the 'ancient' hero Aeneas [ HOP], ch.3.
- 9) DAUGHTER of Tarchetius, King of Albania, described by Plutarch [ЦРИМ], ch.1.
- 10) ROMAN SHE-WOLF, who reared the royal brothers Romulus and Remus. Allegedly 'deep antiquity' [ЦРИМ], ch.1. Various early authors talked about a Dog or a Lioness, but not about the She-Wolf [ПЕ], ch.1.
- 11) LARENTIA, a wife of the 'shepherd' who brought up the Roman infants Romulus and Remus [ЦРИМ], ch.1.
- 12) THE 'SECOND' LARENTIA described by Plutarch [ЦРИМ], ch.1.
- 13) VESTAL VIRGIN described by the 'ancient' Roman historian Sextus Aurelius Victor in a legend of Romulus' and Remus' birth [ЦРИМ], ch.1
- 14) RHEA (or REA) SILVIA, THE VESTAL VIRGIN, MOTHER OF ROMULUS AND REMUS, the famous 'ancient' Roman kings [ЦРИМ], ch.1, 2.
- 15) In various texts VIRGIN MARY was confused with (partially) MARY MAGDALENE [ЦРИМ], ch.1.
- 16) MOTHER of the 'ancient' Roman king Servius Tullius. She was described, in particular, by Titus Livy [ЦРИМ], ch.2.
- 17) LUCRETIA, the famous 'ancient' Roman, raped by Sextas Tarquinius. Described, for example, by Titus Livy [ ЦРИМ], ch.2.
- 18) PATRICIAN VIRGINIA, who erected a new holy altar. Described by Titus Livy [ЦРИМ], ch.3.
- 19) HELEN OF TROY - 'ancient Greek' abducted by Trojan Paris. The Trojan War started because of her. Described in particular by Homer [ЦРИМ], ch.2.
- 20) MAIDEN (QUEEN) KUNTI, mother of Yudhisthira (duplicate of Christ), described in the 'ancient' Indian epic Mahabharata. In the Indian sources Virgin Mary reflected also as the Goddess MAYA, who suckled Buddha (another duplicate of Christ) [KA3], ch.1.
- 21) DRAUPADI KRISHNAA, Indian princess, consort of Yudhisthira, Christ's duplicate. Described in the 'ancient' Indian epic Mahabharata [KA3].
- 22) GODDESS PARVATI (partially), described in the old Indian sources [KA3], ch.1.

- 23) MYRTO, the second wife of the philosopher Socrates (duplicate of Christ) [ГР], ch.1.
- 24) PARYSATIS, mother of 'ancient' kings of Persia Artaxerxes (Herod's duplicate) and Cyrus (duplicate of Christ). Described by Plutarch and Xenophon [ГР], ch.2.
- 25) MANDANA OF MEDIA (Persian Queen, Persian Princess), mother of the 'ancient' king Cyrus (duplicate of Christ). Described in particular by Herodotus and in the Tale of Aphroditian [ГР], ch.3.
- 26) UMILA, the middle daughter of King Gostomysl (duplicate of King Astyages, father of Mandana), corresponds to the daughter of King Astuages of Persia. A story about her is in the Russian Ioakim ( Russian version of the name Joachim) Chronicle, for example [ГР], ch.3.
- 27) Cult of the GOLDEN WOMAN (ZOLOTAYA BABA) in Siberia [3A], ch.8.
- 28) MYLITTA or MYLITA – an 'ancient' Great Assyrian Goddess [3A], ch.8.
- 29) Mother of 'ancient' hero Apollonius (of Tyana) (duplicate of Christ). Her name is not mentioned here [ΠΕ], ch.1.
- 30) Philosopher DEMETRIUS- DEMETRA, a friend of Apollonius (of Tyana) described by Philostratus. A 'male-female' confusion [ΠΕ], ch.1.
- 31) A noble woman – CAESARISSA PORPHYROGENITUS MARIA, who has played a big role in Andronicus-Christ's life. She set him on a throne. Described, for example, by a famous Byzantine author Niketas Choniates [ЦРИМ], ch.2.
- 32) Parthenia (Pythais) , mother of 'ancient' Pythagoras (duplicate of Christ). Described by Yamvlikh, in particular [ΠΕ], ch.2.
- 33) PLOTINA, 'ancient' Empress, enthroned Roman Emperor Hadrian, i.e. King Servius Tullius, i.e. Andronicus-Christ [XP] ch.1.
- 34) SEMIAMIRA or (JULIA) SOAEMIAS mother of 'ancient' Emperor Heliogabalus (duplicate of Christ). Described by various Roman authors as the 'most virtueless woman'. So here Mary Theotokos (the Birthgiver of God) is represented in the critical rabbinic version [XP] ch.2.
- 35) ANNIA FAUSTINA 'THE ELDER', wife of 'ancient' Roman Emperor Antoninus Pius [XP] ch.3.
- 36) FAUSTINA 'THE YOUNGER' (Faustina Minor), wife of 'ancient' Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius. She is mother of Emperor Commodus (duplicate of Christ) [XP] ch.3. We have analysed biographies of the 'two Faustinas' – Faustina The



Elder and Faustina the Younger. It emerged that 'both' Empresses are the phantom reflections of the Virgin Mary from the XII century. Consequently, using the information about Empress Faustina, we considerably widen our knowledge about Theotokos (The Holy Mother of God). For example, OF THE PLACE OF HER DEATH AND ORIGINAL BURIAL. For many years this subject has given rise to much discussion. But nevertheless the disputers rely on the same primary sources known before. Commentators just reinterpret time and time again the well-known testimonies of the ancient writers, while trying unsuccessfully to derive 'new knowledge' out of them.

Unlike this 'walking in circles', we rely on the New Chronology and on the NEW TESTIMONIES discovered with its help. Now it is possible to bring in some facts which were erroneously attributed to the different characters and to the different epochs. In particular, we could use the biography of the Empress Faustina. Before us no one considered these testimonies to be a reference to the Holy Mother of God. They were attributed to some little known ancient queen. That is why no one paid any particular attention to these documents. It turns out that they are exceptionally valuable.

As a result we made an important discovery. There was enough new data in order to suggest and prove the hypothesis that Theotokos died and was originally buried in Crimea, in the cave town of Chufut-Kale [XP] ch.4.

37) 'LIVE ICON' of MOTHER OF GOD, which appeared near Crimean cave town Chufut-Kale [XP] ch.4.

38) MIRACLE-WORKING ICON OF MOTHER OF GOD which accompanied Russian Prince Andrei Bogolyubskiy (Christ) circa 1164-1169,[XP] ch.4.

39) JANICKE-KHANYM (partial), a great khan queen, allegedly the daughter of Tokhtamysh-Khan of the Golden Horde. Her mausoleum is situated in the Crimean cave town of Chufut-Kale [XP] ch.4.

40) Legendary Maria, in whose memory a famous fountain of tears was erected in the Bakhchisaray Palace [XP] ch.4.

Until the present day a Christian cross inserted inside a crescent has survived on it, [fig.19](#). In time, it was probably a decision to invent something in order to cast into obscurity the memory of the original Christian meaning of the monument dedicated to the Virgin Mary. That is why the legend was told with enthusiasm, that the Fountain was erected in memory of a CHRISTIAN girl – either some Georgian girl, or some Greek Dinorah Khionis, or maybe it was a Polish MARIA Potocka [XP]

ch.4. Purporting that as the girl was a Christian, a Muslim Star inside a crescent was depicted in the form of a Christian Cross. So, there, you have an explanation of the Christian symbol on the 'Muslim' monument.

The publishers of the books about Bakhchisaray photograph the monument in such a way that the Christian Cross on its top is cut out of the shot. So there are fewer questions, to which they don't have the answers.

Thus, the famous Bakhchisaray Fountain of Tears and Bakhchisaray tomb of the 'Beautiful Princess' were erected most likely as memorial monuments to the Virgin Mary, Mother of Christ. She died in Chufut-Kale, near Bakhchisaray at the end of the XII – beginning of the XIII cc. Chufut-Kale became a holy city and turned into the main residency of the Crimean khans. Then, after transferal of the khan's capital from Chufut-Kale to Bakhchisaray, the memory of Mary Mother of God was also transferred, having in particular built a magnificent marble Fountain of Tears (Mary's Fountain), which became a pilgrimage destination, as well as Dilara Bikech durbe (which in translation means: a tomb of a Beautiful Princess). It is most likely that this tomb is symbolic.

41) IPHIGENIA, ARTEMIS, DIANA (partial) – 'ancient' goddesses of 'Ancient' Greece [XP] ch.5.

42) SAINT THEODORA – a prominent Crimean Medieval Queen. The capital of her principality was a famous Crimean cave city of Mangup [XP] ch.5.

43) ELEKTRA (partial), sister of the famous 'ancient' Greek hero Orestes (Christ) [XP] ch.6.

44) KLYTAEMNESTRA (partial), mother of 'ancient' Orestes (Christ) [XP], гл.6.

45) IGRAINE – Duchess, wife of Medieval Duke Gorlois of Tintagel and mother of famous 'English' king Arthur. She was described, for example, by Thomas Malory in his 'History of King Arthur' (Le Morte d'Arthur) [XP] ch.7.

46) ALCMENA, wife of 'ancient' Amphitryon and mother of famous hero Heracles (duplicate of Christ) [ГПК] ch.1.

47) AYE-MARY (MARIAN, MYRINE, MARIAMNA, MARIENNA, MARIANDINA) – 'ancient' queen of Amazons [ГПК] ch.2.

48) AETHRA, mother of Theseus (duplicate of Christ) [XP] ch.3.

49) AMINAH, wife of Abd Allah, mother of Prophet Muhammad [IIPPK] ch.1.

50) MOTHER of Persian shah-king Fereydun (duplicate of Christ). She is not named here [IIIAX] ch.2.

51) SIMURGH BIRD (SIMORGH BIRD) (partial) (a legendary supernatural creature in the famous Iranian Epic the Shahnameh [IIIAX] ch.4.

52) RUDABA (or ROODABEH) – 'ancient' Persian princess, who fell in love with Zal (duplicate of Holy Spirit) [IIIAX] ch.4.

53) FARANGIS – 'ancient' Persian (Turanian) Princess, mother of King Kai Khosrow (duplicate of Christ) [IIIAX] ch.5.

54) NAHID – 'ancient' Persian Queen, wife of ruler Darab. Nahid is mother of Iskender=Iskander (partial duplicate of Christ) [IIIAX] ch.8.

55) OLYMPIAS – a famous 'ancient' queen, mother of Alexander the Great (Alexander III of Macedon). Alexander is a partial duplicate of Christ [IIIAX] ch.8.

56) GERTRUDE (partial) – mother of 'Danish' prince Hamlet. She was described in particular by Saxo Grammaticus and William Shakespeare [IIIEK] ch.2.

57) DAUGHTER of king Antioch (partial). She was described, for example, in the play 'Pericles' by Shakespeare, ch.6.

58) LAVINIA, daughter of 'ancient' Roman hero Titus Andronicus. She was described, in particular, by Shakespeare in his tragedy 'Titus Andronicus' [IIIEK] ch.6.

59) MAGIC, MARVELLOUS (ENCHANTING) 'COW', who nourished Infant Fereydun (Christ) with her milk [IIIAX] ch.2.

## **20. THIRTY NINE REFLECTIONS OF JOHN THE BAPTIST.**

As we have shown in [IIPC], John The Baptist lived in the XII century. The main contribution to his life story was made by the following real characters of the XII century.

a) LEONTIUS, Bishop of Rostov, who lived in Russia.

b) Saint THEODOR of Suzdal (Rostov), who lived in Vladimir.

c) Byzantian JOHN (IOAN) KOMNENOS, who lived in Czar-Grad and was described by Nikita Khoniat in particular.

d) Byzantian ALEXIOS (or ALEXIUS) BRANAS or VRANAS, who lived in Czar-Grad and was described by Nicetas Choniates for example.

The following characters in the 'Scaligerian textbook' are the phantom reflections of John the Baptist.

1) JOHN THE BAPTIST, allegedly the I century. Some ancient authors confused Christ and John the Baptist [IIPC].

2) ST. VLADIMIR glorified among the saints as EQUAL APOSTLES, Vladimir The Red Sun (partial), Russian Prince allegedly of the X century [IIPC], Appendix 2.

3) YAROPOLK (partial), Russian Prince allegedly of the X century.

4) JOHN CRESCENTIUS I – Medieval Roman hero allegedly of the X century, predecessor of Pope Gregory VII Hildebrand of the XI century, - one of the reflections of Andronicus-Christ [2v1], ch.4.

5) JOHN CRESCENTIUS II It appears, that there is another Crescentius (Crescentii) in the Scaligerian history of Rome. Allegedly he was the son of the 'John Crescentius I' (991-998). It is considered that the 'son' also ruled Rome from 1002 to 1012. Very little is known of him. Only that 'he continued his father's work'. Could it be, that this 'John Crescentius', the son of John Crescentius, is a second version of the same legend about John Crescentius 'The First' [2v1], ch.4.

6) MARCUS TULLIUS CICERO (partial), famous 'ancient' hero, public figure, orator [HOP], ch.1.

7) PUBLIUS CLODIUS PULCHER – initially a close friend of 'ancient' Cicero, and later his staunch adversary. He was described, for example, by Plutarch [HOP], ch.1.

8) ISAIAH (partial), the Biblical prophet [HOP], ch.1.

9) THE ERYTHRAEN SIBYL, a legendary 'ancient' prophetess [HOP], ch.1. Most likely, the famous old testament Sibylline Oracles were written by the Christians of the epoch of the XII-XIII cc – contemporaries of Christ and his followers. These remarkable works were created within the framework of the same literary school as the canonical Gospels and the Old Testament prophecies included in the modern Bible. It appears that among the originators of these creations was John the Baptist = Cicero = Sibyl, and also Christ's Apostles. It was they who wrote the first versions of the Gospels, Apocalypse and Biblical prophecies. Later these books were amended. All of the Christian texts of the XII-XIII cc. branched out and became more complex. As a result there survived a multitude of books whose subject is closely related. In the XVI-XVII cc. the Scaligerian history artificially 'dispersed' them both

chronologically and physically. Some of these texts were declared to be authentic, others – to be apocryphal. After that began a deliberate desk bound 'scientific work' on interpretation and clarification of why the pre-Christian Sibylline Oracles speak so much and so loudly about Christ.

10) JASON (partially) - 'ancient' hero [ЦPC] ch.2.

11) AENEAS (partial) – 'ancient' Trojan hero [ЦPC], ch.3.

12) AQUARIUS, including constellation of Aquarius on the old star maps [KP], ch.1.

13) REMUS, brother of the 'ancient' king Romulus [KP], ch.1.

14) CELI VIVENNA (IVAN, IOANN) – 'ancient' Et-ruscan (Russian) hero [ЦРИМ], ch.2.

15) SERVIUS TULLIUS (partial) – 'ancient' Roman king. In particular, execution of the Roman king SERVIUS TULLIUS – is a (partial) reflection of the execution of John The Baptist. Some authors confused Christ and John the Baptist [ЦРИМ], ch. 2.

16) CYRUS (partial) – 'ancient' king [ГP], ch.1.

17) CLEON, son of Cleaenetus, 'ancient' character, 'ancient' Greek contemporary of Nicias (Christ) and Alcibiades (Judas) [ГP], ch.5.

18) APOLLONIUS OF TYANNA (partial), and also 'bad EUNUCH'. Described by Flavius Philostratus. To reiterate, some ancient authors confused Christ and John the Baptist [ПЕ], ch.1.

19) UNRULY BROTHER OF APOLLONIUS OF TYANNA- 'ancient' character [ПЕ], ch.1.

20) ABARIS, defended 'ancient' Pythagoras (Christ). Described by Yamvlikh [ПЕ], ch.2.

21) THE OLD TESTAMENT (GENESIS) ESAU. In particular, hairiness of Esau, and also animal skin into which Rebekah wraps Jacob – these are the animal skins which the Prophet John The Baptist wore.

22) SABINUS, 'ancient' character under the Roman Emperor Domitianus (Herod), mentioned by Flavius Philostratus in his Life of Apollonius of Tyana [ ПЕ], ch.1; [PI], ch.12.

23) ANTINOUS – the most faithful companion of the 'ancient' Emperor Hadrian [XP] ch.1

- 24) ANTONINUS, twin-brother of the 'ancient' Roman Emperor Commodus (Christ) [XP] ch.2.
- 25) AGAMEMNON (partial) – the famous 'ancient' Greek king killed by his wife Clytemnestra [XP] ch.6.
- 26) PYLADES – a friend of 'ancient' Orestes (Christ) [XP] ch.6.
- 27) KAY – foster brother of the 'English' king Arthur, practically the same age. Described, in particular, by Thomas Malory [XP] ch.7.
- 28) MAIDEN OF THE LAKE (partial), WALKING ON WATER, in the story of King Arthur [XP] ch.7.
- 29) BALIN – a poor, but noble knight in the story of King Arthur [XP] ch.7.
- 30) ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY, categorically opposed Mordred marrying Guinevere. Described in the story of King Arthur [XP] ch.7.
- 31) SAINT GERMANUS, who condemned King Vortegirn's marriage as incest [XP] ch.7.
- 32) HERCULES IN LION SKIN (partial) [ГПК] ch.1. Also HERCULES (performing, during) his fifth labour (cleaning up of the Augean stables with water [ГПК] ch.2.
- 33) IBN HAYABAN – prophet who proclaimed to the Jews the impending arrival of the more powerful Prophet Mohammed [IIPPK] ch.1.
- 34) SERGIY – a Christian Arian, who baptised Prophet Mohammed with water according to the Christian ordinance [IIPPK] ch.1.
- 35) VENERABLE ANTHONY OF KIEV NEAR CAVES (ANTHONY OF THE CAVES) – spiritual guide to (Martyr) Eustratius Of Kiev Near Caves (duplicate of Christ). Allegedly the XI century, Kiev [IIIAX] ch.10.
- 36) HAMLET SENIOR (KING HAMLET) – murdered father of Prince Hamlet. Described by Saxo Grammaticus and William Shakespeare [III EK] ch.2.
- 37) HAMLET JUNIOR, i.e the actual Prince Hamlet (partial). Time and again we have noted that some authors have confused Christ and John The Baptist (incidentally, they were second cousins) [III EK] ch.2.
- 38) DUNCAN and BANQUO – two rulers lords described, in particular, by Holinshed and Shakespeare in his tragedy 'Macbeth' [III EK] ch.3.

39) KING DUFF, described, in particular, by Holinshed and Shakespeare in his tragedy 'Macbeth' [III EK] ch.3.

## **21. SIXTY ONE REFLECTION OF JUDAS ISCARIOT.**

As we have shown in [IIPC], Judas Iscariot lived in the XII century. The main contribution into his life story was made by the following characters of the XII century:

a) ISAAC ANGELOS – Byzantine ruler.

b) THE WIFE of Andrei Bogolyubskiy (Christ), a sister of the Kuchkovivhi (we have already seen that some ancient authors confused male and female).

c) YAKIM KUCHKOVICH, Andrei Bogolyubskiy's first wife's brother who was taking revenge on the Prince for his brother's execution; PETER, YAKIM'S SON-IN-LAW and the steward ANBAL, YASSIN by birth (from the Caucasus).

The Phantom reflections of Judas Iscariot are the following characters from the 'Scaligerian textbook'.

1) PROCONSUL EGEAT (partial) or STRATOKLY, brother of EGEAT, described in the Life of Apostle St. Andrew The First-called (Protocletos) (duplicate of Christ) [IIPC], ch.4.

2) CHENCIO (also Cencius or Centius) - a Roman nobleman, who allegedly plotted (organised a plot) against Pope Gregory Hildebrand VII (duplicate of Christ) [2v1], ch.4.

3) TYPHON and SETH – 'ancient' Egyptian characters, enemies of god Osiris (duplicate of Christ) [IIPC], ch.5.

4) MICHAEL IV THE PAPHLAGONIAN (partial) – Byzantine Emperor, succeeding Romanos III Argyros (duplicate of Christ) allegedly in the XI century [IIPC], Appendix 1.

5) OLEG, Russian Prince (partial), who killed Askold (duplicate of Christ) and Dir [HOP], ch.1.

6) SNAKE or SERPENT, who slyly bit Prince Oleg (duplicate of Christ). On the pages of the ancient chronicles Judas Iscariot was sometimes described as a cunning snake who's bitten Jesus. In the Gospels – it is Judas's notorious kiss [HOP], ch.1.

7) ASP, which bit 'ancient' Egyptian Queen Cleopatra. In the apocryphal Gospels it is said that Judas has bitten Jesus on his 'right side' [HOP], ch.1.

8) TIMON THE MISANTHROPE described by 'ancient' Plutarch [HOP], ch.1. It is the very same Timon ('The Dark') described by Shakespeare in his 'Timon of Athens' [SkAK]. Ch.4.

9) INHABITANTS OF THE CITY OF ISCOROSTEN, THE DREVLKYANE (or the Derevlians, Drevlianians), who attacked the Russian Prince Igor (duplicate of Christ) [HOP], ch.1.

10) SULLEN TELAMON, 'who saw everything in gloomy light'. It is one of the twelve 'ancient' Argonauts (apostles of Christ, i.e. of Jason) (NOR), ch.2.

11) THE SLY KING OF THRACE (or KING OF THRACIANS), who betrayed Polydorus (duplicate of Christ) because of his greed. Described in 'The Aeneid' by Virgil [HOP], ch.3.

12) PHILOLOGUS, a traitor, who received a noble upbringing and education from Cicero, a freed slave of his brother Quintus [HOP], Appendix.

13) ENEMIES of philosopher Socrates (duplicate of Christ), who received 30 silver minae (30 pieces of silver) for him [ГП], ch.1.

14) XANTIPPE, argumentative and bad-tempered wife of Socrates [ГП], ch.1.

15) STREPSIADES, greedy and cunning enemy of Socrates (Christ), described in particular by Aristophanes [ГП], ch.1.

16) TISSAPHERNES, former friend of Cyrus the Younger (duplicate of Christ), who slandered him. Described for example by Xenophon [ГП], ch.2.

17) CLEARCHUS, son of Rhamphias – a Spartan general, mentioned by the Greek historians: Thucydides, Xenophon, Diodorus and others. Betrayed prince Cyrus The Younger (duplicate of Christ) [ГП], ch.2.

18) A certain 'MONEY BUSINESS' in Czar-Grad, which was the reason for some Scythian deaths. The Russian princes Ascold and Dir attacked Czar-Grad in order to avenge [ГП], ch.2.

19) MARD GIREAD and a 'careless defender' of the city of Sardis described by Herodotus. It was on their account that the inhabitants of Sardis were defeated and King Croesus (duplicate of Christ) was captured [ГП], ch.3.



20) THE ALCMAEONIDS - blasphemous perpetrators (those responsible for) of Cylon's death (duplicate of Christ). Described by Thucydides and Herodotus [ΓP], ch.4.

21) ALCMAEON – the founder of the Athenian family of the Alcmaeonids [ΓP], ch.5. It was in the XVII - XVIII cc. that the story of 'ancient' Alcmaeon-Judas became especially popular [ΓP], ch.5. It means that for the people of that epoch 'antiquity' was not at all so ancient. On the contrary it was rather of current interest. It was vigorously disputed. The fact is 'antiquity' is the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc immediately before the XVII-XVIII cc.

Scaligerian editing of ancient sources falls exactly on the epoch of the XVII-XVIII cc. The reformers without any reservations were altering the evaluation of the events of the recent past, unashamedly recolouring black into white and vice versa. It's no coincidence that it was at that time an noticeable increasing interest towards Alcmaeon-Judas started in Western European society. From a sinister character and greedy traitor there was 'created' – on paper – an attractive image of a tragic, somewhat messed up, but on the whole a 'very good hero'. It is true, he stabbed to death his own mother, deceived his wife, fell into incestuous relationship with his daughter [533], v.1, p.60. But on the whole, they say he was a wonderful person, deserving the deepest sympathy. He is exemplary. Thirty operas were composed about him. For soloists, chorus, ballet and orchestra [ΓP], ch.5. The opera-houses were packed with enthusiastic listeners-reformers.

In the East – in particular in the Russian Orthodox Church – the persona of Judas Iscariot was always evaluated extremely negatively. Beautiful operas were not composed in his honour. He was not exhibited as an exemplary figure. There were no eulogies, his praises were not sung.

22) MESSENGER-INFORMER, who betrayed the Spartan King PAUSANIAS (duplicate of Christ). Described for example by Thucydides.

23) THEMISTOCLES – renowned 'ancient' Athenian. Described by Thucydides, Plutarch and other authors [ΓP], ch.4.

24) ALCIBIADES (partial) – renowned 'ancient' Athenian of the Alcmaeonidae family (the Achaemenids) (see above). Some authors confused Christ with Judas Iscariot [ΓP], ch.5.

25) TIMAEUS, a cunning friend of Andokid (duplicate of Christ), described by Plutarch [ΓP], ch.5.

- 26) HERMOCRATES - Syracusan, who betrayed commander Nicias (duplicate of Christ), described, for example, by Thucydides [ΓP], ch.5.
- 27) GYLIPPUS (partial) – a Spartan commander, participated in Nicias' war, stole 30 talents of money [ΓP], ch.5 and Appendix.
- 28) OROETES – 'ancient' Greek satrap, enemy of king Polycrates (duplicate) of Christ. Described by Herodotus [ΓP], ch.6.
- 29) MAEANDRIUS – King Polycrates of Samos' secretary. Described by Herodotus [ΓP], ch.6.
- 30) ACTOR – a cowardly accomplice of Spartan King Lysandros' plot (duplicate of Christ) [ΓP], Appendix.
- 31) SNAKE, dangerous for the Spartan King Lysander [ΓP], Appendix.
- 32) PROVOCATOR, who accused Apollonius of Tyana (duplicate of Christ) and his companions of offending Roman Emperor, by mocking his godlike voice [ΠE], ch.1.
- 33) PROSECUTOR, who 'made up' a denunciation of Apollonius. He personally spewed charges at Apollonius (Christ), in an attempt to ruin him [ΠE], ch.1.
- 34) EUPHRATES - supposedly a friend in the beginning, but in reality a secret envier and opponent of Apollonius of Tyana (duplicate of Christ) [ΠE], ch.1.
- 35) MARSYAS (partial) – 'ancient' Silenus. He loses a 'contest' with the god Apollo (duplicate of Christ). Partially Marsyas is also a reflection of Christ Himself [ΠE], ch.1.
- 36) CYLON, a wealthy nobleman, who attempted to become student of Pythagoras (duplicate of Christ) [ΠE], ch.2.
- 37) JACOB (partial) – a character from The Old Testament, who bought his birthright from Esau (here Esau is Christ). But in the other episodes of the Old Testament, on the contrary, Jacob is Christ, and Esau is Judas Iscariot [ΠE], ch.3.
- 38) Valkerie - false prophet, contemporary of the Biblical prophet Isaiah (i.e. Jesus) [ΠE], ch.4.
- 39) STEPHANUS – a traitor, who offered his advice and help to the conspirators, in order to assassinate Roman Emperor Domitian (partial duplicate of Christ) [ΠI], ch.12.
- 40) CLODIANUS – a conspirator, who participated in the assassination of Emperor Domitian (here – Christ) [ΠI], ch.12.

- 41) AVIDIUS CASSIUS – 'ancient' Roman general of the epoch of the Emperors Aelius Verus father and Aelius Verus son (both are the reflections of Christ), and also of Aelius Hadrianus (Christ) and Commodus Antoninus (Christ) [XP] ch.1,3.
- 42) PREFECT in Rome under Emperor Hadrian, who deceived the Emperor. Received payment of three hundred million [XP] ch.1.
- 43) AEGISTHUS (partial) - enemy of Orestes (Christ), lover of Queen Clytemnestra, Agamemnon's wife [XP] ch.6.
- 44) SNAKE, who bit Orestes (Christ) and destroyed him [XP] ch.6.
- 45) ERIGONE – Erinyes, the main accuser of Orestes (Christ), committed suicide (she hanged herself) [XP] ch.6.
- 46) MODRED or MORDRED - a notorious traitor, who rebelled against King Arthur (here - Christ) [XP] ch.7.
- 47) GUINEVERE (partial) – the 'unfaithful' wife of King Arthur. Chroniclers sometimes confused Christ and Judas [XP] ch.7.
- 48) SNAKES, who attacked a young Hercules-Christ [ГПК] ch.1.
- 49) DEIANIRA – wife of the 'ancient' hero Hercules (Christ). It is a duplicate of the cunning wife of Andrei Bogolyubskiy [ГПК] ch.1.
- 50) DIOSKURI – 'ancient'-Greek characters [ГПК] ch.3.
- 51) MENESTHEUS, protégé of the DIOSCURI, 'ancient' Greek character [ГПК] ch.3.
- 52) LYCOMEDES – 'ancient' Greek king, who killed Theseus (Christ) treacherously on the island of Scyros [ГПК] ch.3.
- 53) AHRIMAN – demon, embodiment of evil in the 'ancient' Iranian mythology. Ahriman or its malicious son DIV or BLACK DIV opposes Siyamak (Christ) [IIIAX] ch.2.
- 54) ZOHAK (partial) – malicious, dragonlike character, enemy of the good king Jemshid (Christ). Described in the Iranian epic Shah Nameh. At the same time the 'good part of Zohak' is the reflection of Christ. Sometimes Judas was confused with Christ [IIIAX] ch.2.
- 55) KORSUN JEW, who sold the martyr Eustrate Pechersky (duplicate of Christ). Allegedly the XI century, Kiev [IIIAX] ch.10.

- 56) ROSENCRANTZ AND GUILDENSTERN – two characters from Shakespeare's tragedy 'Hamlet'[III EK] ch.2.
- 57) LAERTES, son of Polonius and brother of Ophelia – characters from Shakespeare's tragedy 'Hamlet' [III EK] ch.2.
- 58) SATURNINUS (partial) – an 'Ancient' Roman ruler, duplicate of Isaak Angelos, a relative of Titus Andronicus, whom he dethroned. Described by Shakespeare in his tragedy 'Titus Andronicus' [III EK] ch.6.
- 59) MOOR AARON – scheming and greedy lover of Queen Tamora, enemy of Titus Andronicus. Described by Shakespeare in his tragedy 'Titus Andronicus' [III EK] ch.6.
- 60) TAMORA - Queen of the Goths, enemy of Titus Andronicus. Duplicate of the malicious wife of Prince Andrei Bogolyubskiy, she conspired in the plot against him. Described in Shakespeare's tragedy 'Titus Andronicus' [III EK] ch.6.
- 61) DOMITIA LONGINA – malicious wife of Emperor Dimitian (partial duplicate of Christ) [PI], ch.12.

Now we are presented with a wonderful opportunity to learn many new things about the life of Andronicus-Christ, Apostle Judas Iscariot and on the whole about the events of the distant XII century. The books by Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon and other 'classics' inform us about the events dimly reflected or not at all described in the canonical Gospels and in the New Testament Literature. Based on the 'ancient' authors we are writing much more detailed life descriptions of the famous Gospel characters.

## **22. ASTRONOMICAL DATING OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY.**

We will list the exact astronomical dates from the ancient zodiacs which point themselves into the XII century and are included in the 'framework' of the new chronology along with some other data.

1. (Years 1146 or 1325) ZODIAC RC FROM THE TOMB OF PHARAOH RAMESSES IV. An image on the ceiling of the burial chamber. 'Ancient' Egypt, Luxor, Valley of the Kings, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact – the first variant: 15-16 April 1146; the second variant: 10-17 April 1325 [HXE].

2. (Year 1148) SECOND ZODIAC SX FROM THE TOMB OF SENENMUT. It is depicted on the arches of the tomb. 'Ancient' Egypt, Luxor, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact: 17-18 June 1148 года [HXE].
3. (Year 1148) ZODIAC RD OF RAMSES IX. Frescos on plaster on the arches of the burial chamber. 'Ancient' Egypt, Luxor, Valley of the Kings, allegedly 'Antiquity'. In fact: 17 June 1148 [ЕПИЗ].
4. (Year 1151) ZODIAC AE of NATIVITY, allegedly the I century. Depicted in the old book of Ebenezer Sybli. In reality his dating is as follows: 25th December 1151. So in fact the zodiac is dedicated to the birth of Andronicus–Christ (Andrei Bogolyubskiy) [ЕПИЗ].
5. (Year 1166) ZODIAC RG ON THE GOLDEN HORN (OF GALLEHUS) FROM COPENHAGEN. The engraving on the horn made of gold. Denmark, allegedly the V century. In fact: 17-28 May 1166 [ДЗЕЕ].
6. (Year 1168) LONG DENDERA ZODIAC DL. Depicted on the stone slabs on the ceiling of a temple, bas-relief. 'Ancient' Egypt, Dendera, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact: 22-26 April 1168 [HXE].
7. (Year 1182) ZODIAC OF RAMSES VII = THEBES COLOUR ZODIAC OU. Colour fresco on the tomb ceiling. 'Ancient' Egypt, Luxor, Valley of the Kings, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact: 5-8 September 1182 [HXE].
8. (Year 1185) THE CIRCULAR ZODIAC OF DENDERA DR. Depicted on a large stone slab, bas-relief. 'Ancient' Egypt, Dendera, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact: morning of the 20th March 1185. It appears that this well-known Zodiac was dedicated to the crucifixion of Andronicus-Christ in 1185 [HXE].

We are being assured that it was the French who dismantled The Circular Zodiac of Dendera in the epoch of Napoleon and moved it to Paris. For example in the book 'Ancient Egypt. History and archaeology'(Whitestar Publishers, Italy, 2001) it says: "In 1820 Sébastien-Louis Saulnier, a member of French parliament, commissioned Jean Baptiste Lelorraine, a master mason, to remove the zodiac, which he succeeded to complete in four weeks. Zodiac arrived to Paris in January 1822 and was acquired by the king for his library" (p.107).

However other sources inform us rather differently. "Senkovskii O.I., a famous Russian Orientalist, Arabist, an educated man of his time... together with his servant without any qualms cut out a part depicting the zodiac from the ceiling of the Denedera Temple. In 1821 the most intriguing ancient Egyptian monument was put

aboard a bark, sailing to Russia, however the breakdown of diplomatic relations with Porte forced Senkovskii to suspend the registration of the unusual baggage. Later the zodiac removed by him emerged in Paris [59:0], p.13-14.

It turns out that the French somehow intercepted the most valuable stone slab with a Circular Zodiac from the Russians. As we see, the role of the Russian explorers of Egypt, including the outstanding Egyptologist Golenishev V.C., was later on deliberately played down. The Germans and the French were declared the 'principal Egyptologists'. It is worth mentioning that on the frontispiece of the FIRST edition of the Napoleon album 'Description of Egypt' which appeared in 1809-1828 in France, the stone slab with a Circular Zodiac, as a separate unit separated from the ceiling of the temple, was not yet depicted [1458:1], p.38. It was added only IN THE SECOND French edition of the work [1458:1], p.38. In other words – post factum [HOP], ch.6.

9. (Years 1186 or 1007) ZODIAC OF MITHRA OF GEDDERNHEIM. Stone bas-relief. Europe, Germany, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact – the first variant: 14-15 October 1007; the second variant: 14-15 October 1186 [Д3EE]

10. (Years 1189 or 1071 or 1308) CONCISE ZODIAC KZ. Stone bas-relief on the ceiling of the temple in the city of Erment. 'Ancient' Egypt, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact – the first variant: 15-16 May 1071; the second variant: 30-31 May 1189; the third variant: 6-8 May 1308 [HXE].

11. (Circa 1150) The famous supernova explosion which today is dated to year 1150, in fact it took place a century later, circa 1150. It was this star that was reflected in the Gospels as the Star of Bethlehem [2v1], [IIPC].

12. (Year 1185) According to the church tradition it is the solar eclipse that is connected with the crucifixion of Jesus. Whereas the evangelists didn't call the duration of the 'fall of darkness' at a point on the earth surface acting as the THREE hours of darkness, but THE FULL TRAVEL TIME OF THE MOON'S UMBRAL SHADOW ALONG THE EARTH SURFACE. In other words – the duration of eclipse from the beginning to the end. The evangelists had a good reason to use here the expression 'all over the world'. The full solar eclipse of the 1st May 1185 occurred the same year that Christ was crucified [IIPC], ch.1. A crescent with a star became an ancient symbol of Czar-Grad. It appears that it symbolized the Moon eclipsing the Sun in the year of the crucifixion of Andronicus-Christ, and the Star of Bethlehem, blazing up circa 1150 (and later on erroneously moved to year 1054). The crescent could have depicted both the Moon and the disc of the Sun at the moment of a near full eclipse forming a sickle shape.

# **Chapter 3. THE EPOCH OF THE XIII CENTURY**

## **1. THE MIGHTY TROJAN WAR AS A REVENGE FOR CHRIST. RUSSIA-HORDE LAUNCHES CRUSADES TO CZAR-GRAD, AND WITHIN A SHORT TIME THE CENTRE OF THE EMPIRE IS TRANSFERRED TO VLADIMIR-SUZDAL RUSSIA.**

In 1185 on the Beykoz mountain near Yoros the Emperor Andronicus-Christ was crucified. The outraged provinces, led by the Russia-Horde, started a war the goal of which was vengeance and 'the liberation of the Holy Sepulchre', i.e. capture of Czar-Grad = Jerusalem, the Empire's capital. This was the Trojan War also reflected in various documents under the names of: the Tarquinian War in 'ancient' Rome (allegedly in the VI century BC), the Gothic War in Italy (allegedly of the VI century), the Nika revolt in Czar-Grad (allegedly of the VI century), etc. See [2v].

The Trojan War was one of the biggest events in the history of Europe and Asia. The war was described by Homer, Herodotus and other 'ancient' classical authors, as well as by the Mediaeval Dare, Dictys, etc. 'Ancient' Titus Livy describes it under the name of 'Tarquinian War. While Prokopi Caesarian uses the names 'War with the Goths' and 'the Nika revolt', for example.

The same war is well known under the collective name of the Crusades of the XIII century, seizure of Czar-Grad in 1204, and then the fall of Czar-Grad in 1261. The Trojan War was essentially represented in a series of bloody battles. And as such it was described by 'ancient' Homer who lived in the epoch of the XV-XVI cc. Today in place of 'ancient' Czar-Grad = Troy there survive the ruins of the Yoros fortress on the Bosphorus, where the strait enters the Black Sea, 35 kilometres from Istanbul [3И].

Czar-Grad was captured in 1204 during the Crusade which today is erroneously called the Fourth. The city was ransacked and burnt by the Horde-Cossacks crusaders and their allies. They are the same 'ancient' Achaeans-Greeks described by Homer in 'The Iliad'. The Achaeans were led by 'ancient' Achilles, aka Russian-Horde prince Svyatoslav [HOP]. Those responsible for Andronicus-Christ's crucifixion were captured by the Hordians and were brutally executed. The fall of Czar-Grad was reflected in many chronicles as the fall of 'ancient' Troy allegedly in the XIII century

BC; also as the seizure of the biblical Jerusalem by the Roman army allegedly in the I century; and as the seizure of 'most ancient' Babylon, etc.

Modern history attaches a great importance to the Crusades. In our reconstruction their role will grow in significance. The Trojan War of the XIII century was the FIRST WORLD WAR OF THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES. Its outcome predetermined several centuries of the course of world history.

## **2. THE CRUSADES ADVANCED ON TO JERUSALEM = CZAR-GRAD NOT FROM THE WEST, AS WE ARE BEING TOLD TODAY, BUT FROM THE EAST.**

In [LPC] we quote the Church-Slavonic book 'The Passion of the Christ'. As it happens, according to church tradition in order to capture Jerusalem the armies marched not from the WEST, but from the EAST. In other words, from Russia-Horde. Also the fact, that the great = 'Mongolian' conquest started shortly after, supports this view. The Scaligerian history later began to claim that The Crusades allegedly advanced to the Holy Land from the West. This is just another distortion of the true history and geography. In [v1] and [v2] there are given many examples when the ancient maps were turned upside down, i.e. North was drawn in the bottom and South - on the top. Consequently East and West were changed places. It is quite possible that on account of this confusion Eastern crusades 'turned into' Western ones and vice versa.

## **3. HELEN OF TROY AND MARY MOTHER OF GOD.**

Everyone knows the legend of Helen of Troy, wife of Menelaus. She is one of the main characters in the Trojan War. Between the three 'ancient' goddesses a dispute breaks out – which of them is most beautiful. Each of them praises herself [851], p.71. This seemingly innocent dispute gives rise to the vicious Trojan War. The chronicles tell us that in the forest of Mount Ida (the forest of Judaeen mountains?) the famous Judgement of Paris took place. Paris, a son of a Trojan King, judges the contest of 'beauty' between three goddesses presenting a prize of an 'golden apple' to Aphrodite, the goddess of love, who promised him the hand in marriage of the world's most beautiful woman Helen of Sparta [851], p.93. A war breaks out. We would like to point out that the Bible often identifies 'wives' with different types of RELIGIONS [544], v.1. It is possible that the legend of the Judgement of Paris



describes a dispute between several religions, which were nominally called 'women-goddesses'. The Trojans chose a Bacchic 'ancient' religion. From three wives-religions they chose the religion of love, Aphrodite.

So here 'ancient' Paris is possibly medieval Paris (Paris, francs, France) and chooses for himself the most 'pleasant' goddess-religion Aphrodite. It's worth remembering the erotic cult of the Western European Bacchic Christianity, which blossomed particularly in France in the XII-XV cc. This adoration of the 'Christian Aphrodite' was depicted in various erotic sculptures and drawings which adorned Christian French temples [2v1], ch.1.

Something similar to the 'religious choice' of Paris is also known to us from the history of the Ancient Russia. Prince Vladimir who baptised Russia also listened to the representatives of several religions and chose Orthodox Christianity to be the state religion of Russia. Was this choice of Vladimir not reflected in the 'ancient myth' of the choice of Paris, in other words 'Prus' (which means P-russian) ? Possibly it's not a coincidence that it concerns Aphrodite, whose unvowelled name FRDT or TRDT could have originated from the word Tartars, Tartar.

The following famous storylines are the phantom-duplicates. 1) 'Ancient' Greek Paris and Helen or Venus. 2) Biblical Adam and Eve (and the sly serpent). 3) 'Ancient' Perseus and Andromeda (and the sly serpent /sea monster). 4) 'Ancient' Jason and Medea (and the sly serpent (sleepless dragon) 5) Medieval St. George and the Princess (and the serpent/dragon of the sea).

At the same time, the Trojan War and all its duplicates (Tarquinian War, Gothic War...) are described as the 'wars to avenge the dishonouring of a woman' [2v]. But is it possible, that because of a woman, even one as distinguished and beautiful as this, that such a vicious war could break out? Here quite naturally occurs a thought which puts many things in their place. As there existed a medieval tradition to nominally call different religions 'wives', i.e. women, then the cause of the Trojan = Tarquinian = Gothic war could have been a RELIGIOUS DISPUTE: whose religion or 'wife', was better. The grounds to war was the offence to a religion or 'wife'. There survive sculptural depictions of Religion in the form of a woman, and also Christian Faith is represented in the female form [2v1], ch.5.

Our reconstruction corresponds well to the essence of the Crusades, which primarily and officially, were RELIGIOUSLY MOTIVATED ACTIONS – TO AVENGE THE OFFENCE GIVEN TO THE RELIGION. In other words – revenge for insulting the Mother of God – for the execution of her Son Jesus Christ. Then the Trojan myth

acquires a natural explanation – it tells us about an important religious Cross bearing war.

So, the central narrative of the Trojan War is a legend about the offence given to some distinguished woman, which resulted in either a war, or a state coup. The Trojan version tells us about the abduction of the Greek Helen of Sparta, the Tarquinian version of Titus Livy – about the rape of the Roman Lucretia, the Gothic version – about the murder of the Gothic queen Amalasueta. An equivalent story we find in the description of events allegedly of the VI century B.C. told by 'ancient' Herodotus. King Candaules, tyrant of Sardes, 'argues' with Gyges claiming that his wife is the most beautiful woman in the world. A conflict erupts.

On account of Herodotus' [163] famous 'Story' we say the following: this work, as the works by other 'ancient' authors, is by no means a falsification. Herodotus describes the real events of the XII-XVI cc. He himself lived in the epoch of the XVI-XVII cc. Then the later chroniclers erroneously cast him and his writing many centuries back. However, Herodotus' writing was 'carefully edited' according to the recently introduced Scaligerian history. The same was done with the other 'classics'.

#### **4. THE TROJAN HORSE.**

A famous legend about The Trojan Horse is associated with the Trojan War. For the seizure of Troy the Greeks used 'something resembling a grey horse' [851], p.76. Different chronicles describe the 'horse' in different ways. For example: 'The magi proclaimed that it is impossible to seize Troy in a battle, but to conquer it only with subterfuge. So the Greeks constructed a wooden horse (?–Author) of UNPRECEDENTED SIZE and hid brave warriors in its womb... The Trojans decided to 'DRAG THE HORSE INTO THE CITY (?-Author). Having dragged the horse in, they indulged in a joyous feast... and then fell asleep... Meanwhile the warriors, hidden inside the horse, quietly crept out and set fire to the Trojans' houses... Countless myriads of Greek forces flooded through the gates which had been open by their comrades who were already inside Troy.... Thus fell strong-towered Troy. [851], p.76.' So:

1) For the seizure of Troy the Greeks used a GREY LIKENESS OF A HORSE. 2) The gigantic size of this 'horse likeness' is mentioned. 3) Inside a few hundred soldiers could have been placed. 4) The 'horse' stands on enormous legs, on wheels and it's been wheeled. 5) According to some chroniclers the 'horse' is wooden; the others think it was made of brass. Alternatively it was made of glass, wax, etc. [2v].

There is clearly an obvious variety of opinions here. 6) The 'horse' somehow 'entered the city'.

The chroniclers of the Gothic war, allegedly of the VI century, make no mention of a horse. They inform us about the following: during the military assault of the New City (Naples, duplicate of New Rome = Czar-Grad) the general Belisarius used a cunning strategy indeed [196], v.1. Naples' thick walls were penetrated from outside by an old half destroyed AQUEDUCT, i.e. an enormous stone pipe. At some point the aqueduct delivered water to Naples. An opening of the mouth of this water-pipe was sealed off with a stone plug at the walls' level. The aqueduct was inactive for a long time [196], v.1.

A Greek-Romans squadron of several hundred soldiers secretly infiltrates the enormous pipe from outside of the city. Having walked through it up to the wall the Greeks unseal the plug and make their way at night into the New City = Naples. Early the next morning the Greeks emerge from the aqueduct, signal to the main body of the troops outside and open the gates from the inside. Belisarius' troops burst into Naples. A massacre ensues. Half-sleeping defenders don't have enough time to even reach for their weapons. This is how Naples = the New City falls.

It is possible that the half-destroyed aqueduct 'entering' Czar-Grad was poetically perceived as a 'huge animal'. The famous Trojan Horse is a poetic image of an enormous construction of stone – aqueduct-water pipe, successfully used by the Greeks for the seizure of the New City.

Besides, in Latin the word 'horse', 'mare' is spelled EQUA (equae). And the word 'water' is spelled AQUA (aquae) [2v1], ch.5. In other words WATER and HORSE are spelled practically the same! That is why, WATER-PIPE – AQUEDUCT (aquae-duct = channelling water, aquae-ductio) could have turned into HORSE by the later authors who could have mixed up one vowel. That could have become the birth of a bouquet of legends of an 'enormous likeness of a GREY horse'. Its grey colour could have been explained by the colour of an aqueduct covered in dust.

Or it could be that the question at hand concerned a portable siege tower on wheels covered with wet skins to render it inflammable from the fire missiles launched by the besieged. Such medieval wooden towers were indeed mounted on wheels and pushed towards the walls of the town under the siege. It is for a reason the horse was often depicted standing on wheels and was referred to as wooden. It was called a 'horse' because the tower was moving. It is quite possible that such a siege construction was first used in the XIII century and contributed to whole host of legends about the Trojan Horse [HOP] ch.1.

## 5. SCHLIEMANN'S FALSE TROY.

Here it is relevant to mention the ruins of a poor medieval fortification (approximately 120 by 120 metres) on the mound at Hissarlik in Turkey, which Heinrich Schliemann mistakenly declared to be the 'remains of Homeric Troy'. The truth is that 'having lost' 'ancient Greece' in the epoch of the XVI-XVII cc. the historians started to look for it all over again [2v1], ch.5.

Why did they start searching for 'Homeric Troy' in that exact area? The matter is, as it seems, that there still remains a vague memory of Troy situated somewhere 'near the Bosphorus'. But the historians of the XVIII century could no longer point New Rome out directly in Bosphorus, i.e. Czar-Grad, as it was safely forgotten that Czar-Grad was exactly 'ancient' Troy. In fact the Scaligerian history as early as in the XVII century altogether 'forbade' even thinking of Czar-Grad as 'Homeric Troy'. However there remained all kinds of medieval records which have luckily escaped destruction, and persistently suggested that 'ancient' Troy is situated 'somewhere near the Bosphorus'. That is why the historians and enthusiasts started searching for the 'lost Troy' near Istanbul.

Turkey is awash with ruins of medieval settlements, military fortifications, etc. It was not difficult to 'pick out appropriate ruins'. The ruins on the mound at Hissarlik were also considered as one of the possible candidates. But both historians and archaeologists alike understood very well that it was necessary to dig up some kind of 'proof' that it was indeed 'Homeric Troy'. This task was 'successfully fulfilled' by H.Schliemann. He started excavation on the mound at Hissarlik.

The ruins that were unearthed showed that there indeed used to be some kind of settlement [2v1], ch.5:11. There was nothing "Homeric" of any kind here of course. Such ruins in Turkey can be seen at every step of the way. It is most likely that here used to be a small Ottoman fortification. Presumably, Mr.Schliemann understood that something outstanding was required to draw the public's attention towards these scant remains. So in May 1873 he 'unexpectedly finds' a cache of gold, which he immediately publicly declares to be 'Priam's ancient treasure. Purportedly 'the very same' Homer speaks of.

# However, Schliemann did not specify the place, the date and the circumstances of the 'discovery of Priam's treasure', bringing a peculiar ambiguity into this matter. Schliemann never presented any conclusive, proof of his discovery of 'Homeric Troy'.

# There are grounds to suspect that Schliemann simply ordered Parisian jewellers to fabricate 'ancient golden jewellery'. Schliemann was an extremely wealthy man.

# It is quite possible that after that Schliemann secretly brought the jewels to Turkey and announced that he 'found' them in the ruins in the mound at Hissarlik. In other words, exactly in the place where a little earlier some enthusiasts 'had located ancient Troy'. Schliemann didn't even trouble himself with searching for Troy. Backed up by his gold he simply 'substantiate' a hypothesis previously put forward by Choiseul-Gouffier and Frank Calvert.

# Many skeptics as early as in the XIX century didn't believe a word he was saying. But the Scaligerian historians remained satisfied overall. At last, they said in discordant chorus, we have found legendary Troy.

# The historians decided to deal with 'Priam's treasure' the following way: to affirm that it was indeed the treasures of Homeric Priam would have been careless. As a retort the sceptics immediately asked: 'But, how do they know?' They had no answer. Everyone concerned with 'Schliemann's Troy' understood that very well. On reflection, they found an elegant way out. They said this, without any proof: True, it is not Priam's treasure. But it is much more ancient than Schliemann himself had previously thought.

# But what if Schliemann didn't deceive us and in fact did find at Hissarlik some ancient golden jewels? It still remains completely unclear why this treasure should be considered proof of 'ancient Troy' and be situated exactly in this spot? As the golden objects 'found' by Schliemann do not bare ANY LETTERS OR SYMBOLS [2v1], ch.5:11.

# After some time when the sceptics got tired of pointing out the obvious inconsistencies in the 'discovery of Troy', eventually an 'orderly scientific stage' began. Serious scientific journals 'about Troy' started to appear and were regularly published. Numerous articles and dissertations sprang up. However nothing from 'Homeric Troy' on the mound at Hissarlik was ever found to this day of course.

## **6. EXODUS OF TROJANS FROM TROY = CZAR-GRAD.**

With the fall of Jerusalem = Troy and downfall of the Romaic Empire, the exodus-flight of various groups of people from the capital began. The diagram of Romaic femas are nominally shown in [fig.3](#). In hot pursuit of the fugitives follow the avenging Horde-Crusaders seizing and colonizing new territories. They settle in different

countries of Europe and Asia. This picture is well-known from the Scaligerian 'ancient' history of 'transmigration of peoples'. The fugitives from Romea are called Trojans, i.e. descendants from Troy = Czar-Grad. They were also confused with the Argonauts (i.e. cossacks-Hordians), who, according to the 'ancient' Greek myths, after the Trojan War embark on a voyage, seizing and colonizing various lands.

## **7. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF RUSSIA AS THE CENTRE OF A NEW EMPIRE, SUCCESSOR OF THE PREVIOUS ONE.**

As a result of the decline of the old regime and the capture of Czar-Grad by the Horde-Crusaders in 1204, Russia-Horde, which used to be one of the provinces of the Romaic Empire, comes to the fore. It takes an active part in the Trojan War.

After the collapse of Romea the representatives of the Royal dynasty flee to the provinces. Some of them didn't want to accept the loss of supreme power and began their battle for world domination. According to the Romaic kings' beliefs, which were based on firmly rooted religious principles, the right to possess the world belonged to their Royal family. And not only the lands already known, but also all of those yet to be discovered. This right they regarded as the sacred ancient legacy belonging to them, which under some temporary circumstances happened to be unlawfully taken away from them. Therefore it was imperative to retrieve it.

As a consequence there appeared several states which considered themselves the legal successors of Romea. For example, Empire of Nicaea. Ancient Nicaea is the modern town of Iznik in Turkey. Other kingdoms also appeared. One of them was Vladimir and Suzdal Russia with its capital Rostov Velikii (Rostov the Great), and later in Yaroslavl = Novgorod. Here arrived the Trojan king Aeneas, whose ancestors, as it happens, originally came from Russia. In the Russian chronicles king Aeneas reflected as the famous 'variag' ('Varangian') Rurik. He unites isolated Russian dominions into a united kingdom [HOP] Thus the first czars of Vladimir and Suzdal (at first Rostov and Novgorod ones) were the heirs of the Romaic dynasty driven out of Czar-Grad in the beginning of the XIII century. They began their fight to restore the Empire. Aeneas-Rurik succeeded in creating a powerful multinational state, which initially included encompassed the Volga Region and North Black Sea Region. Ample manpower, horse and economic resources proved to be sufficient to achieve the world dominance by military means.

In the XIV century Ivan Daniilovich Kalita started the Western campaign, i.e. 'Mongolian' = great conquest. It is possible that the name 'Kalita' is one of forms of a famous title of Calif or Khalif.

## **8. UNIFICATION OF SLAVIC AND TURK PEOPLES UNDER THE HORDE RULE.**

Hereafter turbulent political and military events take place. The 'Mongol' invasion from Vladimir and Suzdal Russia begins. The success of the occupation-colonization was based on the unification of numerous peoples on the territory of Russia-Horde into one sole state under the military, i.e. Horde rule. In the late XIII – early XIV cc. For more than three centuries Russia-Horde establishes its domination over the West, Eurasia, Africa and eventually its complete world domination including, across the ocean, America.

The czars of Russia-Horde, who were also called Khans, Khagans, Grand Princes of all Russia, by virtue of dynastic reasons considered themselves the sole rightful heirs of the Romaic Empire, ENTITLED TO ABSOLUTE RIGHT OF SUCCESSION TO OWN POSSESSION THE ENTIRE WORLD. From the surviving odd bits of information we can see that they regarded all the other rulers not yet subjected, as unlawful, temporary usurpers of various territories of the world which belonged to them. THE OPENLY DECLARED AIM, THE MILITARY DOCTRINE OF THE RUSSIAN-HORDE CZARS-KHANS WAS THE SUBJUGATION OF THE ENTIRE WORLD BY MILITARY FORCE. In other words, the retrieval of the ancient legacy. See the diagram of the history of the main empires - The Czar-Grad Empire and the Russian-Horde Empire on [fig.20](#) [7v1], ch.1.

Thus after the fall of Troy = Czar-Grad one of the representatives of the Romaic dynasty – 'antic' king Aeneas-John, the disciple and comrade of Andronicus-Christ, one of his apostles, leaves the destroyed Czar-Grad = Jerusalem and heads with his companions to Russia. His royal ancestors originally came from Russia. This journey was described in particular by 'ancient' Virgil in his famous epic poem 'The Aeneid'.

Having arrived to Russia king Aeneas-John finds here a powerful and rich wealthy kingdom which however is split into principalities ruled by rival princes-khans. Being the descendant of the esteemed Russian people, Aeneas-John takes power in his own hands and establishes a new dynasty in Russia. He unites the Russian lands under one rule. This most important event reflected in our chronicles as 'invitation of variag Rurik', and the foundation of Veliky Novgorod (Great Novgorod) allegedly in

the IX century. It concerned turning the city of Yaroslavl on the river Volga into a capital. In the Latin literature these events were reflected in 'Books since the city's founding' ('Ab urbe condita libri') by Titus Livy as the founding of the city of Rome and the state with the same name in the land of Latinia=Ruthenia by Romulus and Remus (the descendants of Aeneas = Ryurik). Thus famous Royal Rome appeared in the interfluvium of Oka and Volga rivers (the land between the meeting point of these two rivers) in the XIII century [ЦРИМ]

By the end of the XIII century a strong czarist reign arises based on the vast natural wealth and resources of the country, and also on the strong and large army - Horde, the backbone of which was made up of the horse cavalry – Cossaks. The word HORDE is, probably, a variation of a modified Russian word RAT', meaning army. The 'ancient' and Medieval word RUTHENIA, which Rus' (Russia) was called, meant RATNAYA – MILITARY country. Some sources call RUTHENIA LATINIA by way of confusing letters 'R and 'L'. The name LATINIA could have also originated from a Russian word 'LYUDNAYA' meaning 'POPULOUS' (country). The advantageous strategic location of Russia played a significant role. Thus in Vladimir-Suzdal Russia there emerged the metropolis of a new Empire, heiress to the Roman Empire. We call it Russia-Horde or Great = 'Mongolian' Empire.

What did this word 'MONGOLIA' mean? It probably originated from a Russian word 'MNOGO' meaning MANY, many (people), MULTItudinous army, and also from the Russian words MOSH' meaning STRENGTH, MOG meaning CAN, CAPABLE or ABLE, MOGUSHESTVO meaning MIGHT or POWER (hence Magog), MNOGO meaning MANY. N.M.Karamzin and various other authors thought that MONGOLIA is simply a Greek word MEGALION, i.e. GREAT. But the word MEGALION itself most probably also originated from the Slavonic word MOG (i.e. CAN), MNOGO (i.e. MANY). In [4v1], Introduction, we cite the photographs of old mosaics in the Chora Church in Istanbul. Here the word MONGOLIA is spelled as MUGULION, i.e. virtually the same as MEGALION. Until now East Russia is called Veliko-Rossia, i.e. Velikorossia meaning Great Russia. So the "Mongolian' Empire is the Great Empire. In the Russian sources the word Mongolia or Mogolia does not occur. On the other hand the GREAT Russia does come up. The foreigners would call Russia Mongolia. This name is an equivalent of the Russian word VELIKII meaning GREAT.

## **9. RUSSIA-HORDE BECOMES A POWERFUL EMPIRE.**



At the end of the XIII – the beginning of the XIV cc. the great Slavic conquest of the world begins. The historians call it 'Mongolian' and date it in the XIII century, a hundred years earlier. The conquest originates in Russia and is carried out by the Russian czars-khans, direct descendants of king Aeneas.

Aeneas was a relative and a follower of the czar Andronicus-Christ (Andrey Bogolyubskiy). In the Gospels Aeneas-Ryurik is presented as John, Christ's favourite disciple, whom he chose as a son to Mary Mother of God in his place: 'Near the cross of Jesus stood his mother, his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene. 26 When Jesus saw his mother there, and the disciple whom he loved standing nearby, he said to her, "Woman, here is your son," and to the disciple, "Here is your mother." From that time on, this disciple took her into his home.' (John 25:25-27). According to the biblical legend this disciple's name was John. We will note that Aeneas and John is intrinsically the same name.

Let us look at the matter of Russia-Horde rise in more detail. As we said earlier, after the victory in the Trojan War the leaders of the Crusaders entered the struggle amongst themselves for power. Aeneas-John, who didn't take part in the Crusade of 1204 and fought on the losers' side (although he was a Christian), could not stay in conquered Czar-Grad. He fled to Vladimir-Suzdal Russia, which was, most likely, the motherland of Mary Mother of God, who at the wish of Christ himself became the adoptive mother to Aeneas-John. Hence – the 'ancient' legend that Aeneas' mother was the GODDESS Venus. The capital of Vladimir-Suzdal Russia at the time was Galitch Kostromskoi. Neither Vladimir, nor Suzdal, or any other ancient Russian cities were yet to be built.

Aeneas-Ryurik establishes a new Royal dynasty and builds a new fortified capital – Yaroslavl on the Volga, described in the chronicles as Novgorod Veliky (Novgorod the Great). To be more precise, the city of Yaroslavl was a famous YAROSLAVOVO DVORISHE (YAROSLAV'S COURT) OF VELIKY NOVGOROD. Veliky Novgorod was the name used in its broadest sense for the entire Vladimir-Suzdal Russia.

Present day Novgorod on the Volkhov River was cunningly given this famous name much later, in the course of the distortion of the Russian history at the time of the first Romanovs. It bears no relation to the Veliky Novgorod of the Chronicles [4v].

Rostov Veliky (Rostov the Great) became the royal headquarters of Aeneas-Ryurik. This place was not chosen coincidentally. Rostov Veliky was situated in a place hard to access upstream of the river Kotorosl, the turn into which from the Volga was protected by the fortifications of Yaroslavl.

The descendants of Rurik-Aeneas correctly evaluated the advantages of Russia compared to the old imperial centres in the Mediterranean. In the XIII century they carried out the most important reforms in Russia which turned it into a world power and prepared it for the great Slavic conquest of the world in the XIV century. The reforms were as follows.

1) In the XIII-XIV cc. Rurik-Aeneas and his successors introduce in Russia 'slash and burn' agriculture, based on the cutting down ('slash') or burning down the forests followed by turning them into the agricultural land. Such methods allowed MASS HARVEST WITHOUT FERTILIZATION for the first several decades. This caused an explosive increase in the population of Russia in the XII-XIV cc, which in its turn allowed the new state to have the advantage in military confrontations.

To clarify. It is well-known that in Russia prior to the XV century 'the original and predominant agricultural system was slash and burn. To break new ground, plot, parch and INCINERATE THE FORESTS was largely customary in Russia as early as in the XIV and XV cc'. [988:00], article - 'Agriculture'. Such a method could not last indefinitely, as it was based on the VAST DEFORESTATION AND IRRETRIEVABLE EXPLOITATION OF THE BENIGN LAYER OF SOIL ACCUMULATED OVER CENTURIES. When the forests began to run out, and the soil in their place started to run dry this method ceased to be effective...

We know that the first agricultural tools in Russia were designed particularly for the 'slash and burn' farming on the site of the burned out forests. 'In Russia such tools were soha (Russian plough) and borona (harrow made of chipping of the tree trunks with the branches 35 to 50 cm long) - two kinds of tools adapted to the stony fields and adapted to the Northern region of Russia, to the REGION OF SLASH AND BURN FARMING' [988:00], article - 'Agricultural equipment and machinery'.

It was for a reason that in Ancient Russia there were so called OGNISHANYE, i.e. the proponents of the 'slash and burn' farming, WHO BURNT THE FORESTS DOWN AND PLOUGHED UP THE BURNT SITES (OGNISHA) WHICH EMERGED IN THEIR PLACE [988:00], article - 'Ognishanye'.

Only in the XV century, approximately 200 years after the burning of the forests started, they began to think, for the first time, about the necessity of LETTING THE LAND REST. 'The three-field system WAS ALMOST NON EXISTENT BEFORE THE XV CENTURY, the first allusion to it occurs in one judicial scroll of 1503. It became significantly widespread by the middle of the XVI century [988:00], article - 'Agriculture'.

Thus the necessity of the multiple field system (when a part of the land was left fallow) appears in Russia only in the XV century and becomes ubiquitous in the XVI century.

The initial stage, which consisted of TOTAL DEFORESTATION AND CONVERSION INTO PLOUGHLAND, had to be swift, as while huge harvests were gathered the population grew fast, spread out in all directions and consumed more and more forests. It is known that the speed of such processes is exponential, i.e. alike to an explosion. That is why it cannot be sustained. The time, spent on burning the forests out in Central Russia and then turning them from the solid wild forest into an agricultural country with vast fields and meadows, amounted to approximately 200 years. Tentatively speaking, from the mid of the XIII to the mid of the XV cc.

The ability of gathering large harvests from the vast spaces WITHOUT CARING TO FERTILISE OR WATER THE FIELDS (in contrast to many Southern regions, in Central Russia the fields are watered by the rain, with no human intervention), which gave the new state a huge advantage over its enemies. It was possible to raise a strong and healthy population. All of which made it possible to create a huge army – Horde, and what's more important, allowed them to constantly nourish it. Such a 'slow start' at the beginning of Horde Russia took around a hundred years: from the beginning to the end of the XIII century.

2) The Russian Horde was an army of a completely new fashion. Unlike all the previous armies Horde was predominantly HORSE CAVALRY.

Most likely the horses were tamed by humans and for the first time were used by the military in the XII century, as early as in the times of the Roman Empire. Originally the horse cavalry didn't exist. Only noble and wealthy people could afford a war horse. A horse was considered to be a precious commodity. The great majority of the ordinary soldiers were foot soldiers. In order to supply an ordinary soldier with a horse it was necessary to have many herds of horses. For that you would need vast steps, where these herds could graze. There are no steps like that in the Mediterranean. In Russia they do exist. It was the Southern-Russian steps between the Volga and Don rivers which served as a basis for the creation of an enormous army of a completely new kind – horse Horde in the XIII-XIV cc, where each warrior-Cossack would have not one, but several horses, which would allow the Horde to accomplish long-distance marches over the endless vast lands of Eurasia. Moreover it allowed them to move quite fast. As the horses needed pasture, the army was nomadic out of necessity. It would constantly move from place to place.

Before the creation of the horse Horde in the ancient Romaic Empire the mode of travel was predominantly aquatic. That is why the expansion of Romea on the X-XII cc. was carried out mainly by water. In the first place the shores of the Mediterranean and Black seas were dominated. Later – the banks of the big rivers running into these seas: rivers Danube, Dnieper and Don. From the Don River they would haul over to Volga river and end up in Russia, and also in the Caspian Sea and Iran. Thus the ancient Mediterranean community and the Romaic culture appeared. At its heart were the coasts of the Mediterranean Sea. All the capitals were here in the Mediterranean. At first – in the lower reaches of the Nile in African Egypt. Later the capital moved closer to the Black Sea, to the Bosphorus, to Czar-Grad.

Without the sufficient means of transportation on land the ancient Romaic Empire could not develop the inland territories of Eurasia. The vast spaces of the continent distant from the waterways remained inaccessible and unexplored. Only with the advent of the Russian Horde in the XIII-XIV cc., they began to be gradually explored.

Unlike ancient Romea, The Russian-Horde Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. became mainly a land state with ground communications. Naturally, the aquatic means of transportation were also used, but overall the Empire was expanding along the land routs which it created itself.

3) In the XIII-XIV cc. in Russia for that time unprecedented PRODUCTION OF IRON AND IRON WEAPONRY was up and running.

Iron ore can also be found in the South, not exclusively in Central Russia. However smelting of iron requires a lot of fuel. In those times only firewood and charcoal were used for fuel. Black coal and oil (petroleum) were yet to be discovered. That is why Central Russia had an important advantage over the South. There were forests and consequently firewood and charcoal in greater quantity than in the Mediterranean. Let alone that exactly at that time in Russia the TOTAL BURNING OUT OF FORESTS was taking place, please see above. This as a matter of fact was providing an unlimited amount of charcoal, which most likely, allowed Russia-Horde to quickly take the lead in the field of iron smelting and the manufacture of the iron weapons. The Russian czars-khans were able to equip the Horde with iron weapons, which in the Mediterranean were quite expensive and unaffordable to many.

This also gave a huge advantage to the Russian Horde over its enemies.

4) Ryurik-Aeneas and his successors, the Russian czars-khans, skilfully used the GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION OF VLADIMIR-SUZDAL RUSSIA, I.E.

INBETWEEN THE RIVERS OKA AND VOLGA, as an enormous natural fortification. From the North, West and East it was parted off by the swamps and harsh woods. Besides from the West the wide Oka River served as a natural barrier. There was one other significant factor. At that time there was a big difference between the rout from Russia to the Mediterranean and the way back – from the Mediterranean to Russia. They were not completely the same.

The route from Vladimir-Suzdal Russia to the Mediterranean ran alongside the Volga River, then they went by traction (carried or pulled the boats over ground) onto the Don River, and then along the Don River to the Azov and Black Seas. This was the ancient and the only direct route from Russia to Czar-Grad and back. This is the route well-known from the historical sources. There was also a different route to Vladimir-Suzdal Russia – up the river Dnieper and then East by land. But prior to the Russian forest clearing it was not suitable for the troops to march through, as they couldn't move through the virgin forests.

The Russian czars-khans quickly understood the GREAT ADVANTAGE OF THE GEOGRAPHICAL POSITION OF VLADIMIR-SUZDAL RUSSIA IN ANY MILITARY CONFRONTATION WITH THE SOUTH. Please see the map. If a Russian army set out on the march to the South it would move along the Volga and Don rivers DOWNSTREAM. By doing so the warriors could conserve their energy and increase their speed of movement. Having reached their destination quickly, the soldiers would enter the battle and in the case of victory and destruction of the enemy, they could comfortably in the leisurely manner return back home, now moving upstream. Quite the opposite with the enemies' army, who, if marching from the Mediterranean towards Russia, FROM THE VERY START WOULD HAVE TO MOVE UPSTREAM ALONG THE DON AND VOLGA RIVERS AGAINST THE CURRENT, which dramatically decreased their speed and allowed the Russian troops time to prepare.

It is not surprising that from the chronicles we know of MULTIPLE CRUSADES BY THE RUSSIAN PRINCES IN CZAR-GRAD, MANY OF WHICH WERE SUCCESSFUL, BUT WE DON'T KNOW ANY OPPOSITE EXAMPLES – A MILITARY CAMPAIGN FROM CZAR-GRAD TO RUSSIA WHICH ACHIEVED ITS AIM.

5) Ryurik-Aeneas and his successors established in Russia an order aimed at world domination. The state was divided into two parts – civil and military. A social class of Cossacks was created, who were picked for military service in their childhood. They

were never to return home. Those Cossacks who lived to a certain age would either retire to the monastery or, if they managed to serve until achieving a high enough rank, would leave the Horde to become civil dukes.

Prior to the XVII century the Cossacks didn't engage in farming, it was strictly forbidden to them. They were fed by the rural peasant population who were paying taxes. The peasants also provided manpower to resupply the Horde: the children of the peasants were drafted into the army as Cossacks. The Cossacks themselves at that time neither married, nor raised children. They knew only how to fight. They did not do anything else. But they fought very well.

Only eventually, after the collapse of the Great Russian Empire in the XVII century the Cossacks were left to their own devices and were forced to begin to independently cultivate farm land, set up a household, marry and raise children. Only then the Cossack states started to emerge, and the Cossacks started turning into a self-reproducing independent social class distinct from the peasant one. But all this would take place in the XVIII century, much later than the events we are describing here.

In the latter chronicles, written in Western Europe after the great Slavic conquest, the creation by Rurik-Aeneas and his descendants in the XIII-XIV cc. of the Old Russian State – RUSSIA-HORDE, was called THE CREATION OF ANCIENT ROME BY THE DESCENDANTS OF AENEAS – ROMULUS AND REMUS, and was incorrectly dated to many hundreds of years B.C.

In the Middle Ages the epic poems by Virgil and, in particular, The Aeneid, were considered as CHRISTIAN WRITING. It is all correct. Virgil most likely was creating his work in the epoch of the XVI-XVII cc. and described the events which took place after the crucifixion of Christ in 1185. However the commentators prefer to talk about Virgil's Christianity as a 'Christian-allegorical interpretation', purporting that Virgil himself was certainly not a Christian, but he is interpreted in 'that way'. It is clear why they keep repeating it. The reason is that the Scaligerian chronology erroneously referred Virgil and his work to the I century B.C., i.e. allegedly before the birth of Christ. It resulted in the artificial contradiction, which has been tirelessly researched, by several generations of historians since the XVIII century.

Everyone is familiar with a legend of the foundation of Rome by the descendants of Aeneas - Romulus and Remus. As we now understand this means the rise of Russia-Horde in the end of the XIII – the beginning of the XIV cc and the emergence of the 'Mongolian' Empire. The famous she-wolf who suckled Romulus and Remus, is a partial and symbolic reflection of the Russian river Volga which 'raised' the brothers Ivan and Georgiy Danilovichi, the founders of the Great Empire. At the same time the

image of the Roman she-wolf is also a partial reflection of Mary Mother of God who raised baby Jesus next to whom on the icons is often depicted baby John the Baptist [ЦРИМ]

Two brothers who found Rome are Georgiy and Ivan Danilovich. Georgiy Danilovich is also known as Genghis Khan and Ivan Danilovich – as Batu-Khan. Genghis Khan is also known as Georgiy the Victory-bearer (The Conqueror) and Ryurik. It turns out that Georgiy and Ivan, i.e. Romulus and Remus, were the descendants of the Royal dynasty which emerged on the shores of Volga River after the fall of Troy and who moved the metropolis of the Empire to Russia-Horde. We would like to repeat that Aeneas journey to Russia was not accidental. His royal ancestors originated in Russia – DARDAN, i.e. Horde-Don; then JASIUS (or IASIUS) i.e. Jesus Christ; and ASSARACUS, i.e. Russian.

## **10. VIRGIN MARY, MOTHER OF CHRIST = 'ANCIENT' ROMULUS, DESCRIBED BY LIVY AS LARENTIA, A WOMAN BY THE NAME OF 'SHE-WOLF'.**

The infants Romulus (partially Christ) and Remus (partially John the Baptist) having happily escaped death, despite the order of the 'evil king', live alone, secluded from the rest of the world, suckled by the she-wolf. Sometime later a certain shepherd finds and rescues Romulus and Remus. Titus Livy communicates the opinion of the ancient authors that 'THE SHE-WOLF WAS IN FACT A WOMAN'. A shepherd 'brought the children home and LET HIS WIFE LARENTIA RAISE THEM UP. Others think that Larentia was called a 'SHE-WOLF' amongst the shepherds.'"[483], v.1, p.13. A historian Sextus Aurelius Victor says that the twins were given to 'a woman Acca Larentia, and this WOMAN was called SHE-WOLF for selling her body... Thus are called the women who sell themselves for profit, that is why a place where they live is called LUPANAR' [726:1], p.176.

Baby Jesus, aka Romulus, was but of course suckled not by a she-wolf, but a woman Mary, his mother. Only the later authors began to be confused in the description of the biblical events.

Why was the story of a she-Wolf, suckling the infants Romulus and Remus, so popular? The she-Wolf with two infants even became in a sense a symbol of 'ancient' Rome.

In the book [HOP] we have analysed a famous 'ancient' story-king Aeneas carries out on his back his father Anchises, holding a relic, and leads his son Ascanius by the hand from burning Troy. His wife Creusa is walking by Aeneas'

side. In fact this is a vague reflection of the biblical flight into Egypt of Joseph with his wife Mary and the Baby Jesus. Notably Jesus and Mary were traveling on donkey's back. It appears that later writers called Mary Mother of God Anchises. A man Joseph was recast as a woman Creusa. The biblical donkey was renamed Aeneas. At that the total number of characters was left unchanged. There were four of them originally, and four of them remained. But the writers mistakenly mixed up their names.

The 'most ancient' Roman story of the Capitoline Wolf (i.e. a woman called Larentia), her husband and two babies (Romulus and Remus) – is another distorted version of the same biblical story of the flight into Egypt of Joseph with Mary and Jesus travelling on donkey's back. Except that the biblical donkey was transferred under Titus Livy's pen into the Roman SHE-WOLF.

The later 'ancient' authors heatedly discussed the reason A WOMAN Larentia, i.e. Virgin Mary, as we understand now, was called A SHE-WOLF. They purported that in Latin LUPA means a she-wolf, and in common parlance it also meant 'a whore' [483], v.1, p.507, meaning a woman who according to Titus Livy 'gave herself to anyone' [483], v.1, p.13. However, it is possible that the Latin LUPA originated from the Slavonic LEPO, LEPYI, LYUBO, meaning BEAUTIFUL. Then everything becomes clear. The Virgin Mary was called BEAUTIFUL, i.e. LEPAYA, LEPO. Later, when the core of this matter was forgotten, the 'ancient' authors of the XVI-XVII cc. tendentiously changed the respectful Slavonic LEPAYA, LEPO into 'Latin' = a she-wolf, a whore, after which they began to seriously analyse the 'transformation' of a woman into a she-wolf. The fact that in Russian the word LEPO, if read backwards (from the right to the left), as do the Arabs or Jews, for example, could have been confused with a word LECHERY, and could have led one to believe that the subject they referred to was a wanton and immoral woman, could have played its part in the cunning blackening of the woman's reputation.

Titus Livy's 'story' in its spirit turns out to be rather close to the style of the Old Testament [2v]. But then it is worth remembering that in the Judaic version of the biblical events it was insistently repeated that Mary Mother of God was a victim of rape. Many authors discussed 'the Jewish version of the illegitimate birth of Jesus from a certain philanderer' [307], p.302. Generally the Judaic tradition cast Christ and Virgin Mary in a negative light [307], [IIPC] So Titus Livy's words that a woman Larentia = She-Wolf, who suckled Romulus (and Remus) was a whore giving herself to anyone, fit the negative Judaic reflection of the biblical events well.



The Roman legends of Romulus and Remus partially absorbed the biblical details about Christ and John the Baptist. According to the Gospels they were second cousins [298:1], p.14, were childhood friends, grew up and were raised together. They were often depicted in the Mediaeval paintings next to each other in the form of two infants [ЦПММ] ch.1. On many old pictures apart from Virgin Mary and the two infants next to her (i.e. Jesus Christ and John the Baptist) – THERE IS NO ONE ELSE THERE [ЦПММ] ch.1. Possibly that is why an 'ancient' myth about a 'She-Wolf' and the infants – Romulus and Remus - raised by her, has emerged. The Virgin Mary was symbolically presented as a 'She-Wolf'. Romulus is the reflection of Christ, Remus is the reflection of John the Baptist.

In [HOP] we suggested that a legend of a 'She Wolf' absorbed into itself an image of the Russian Volga River which 'nursed' Romulus and Remus, the founders of Rome ('with its own milk'). In a figurative, but very clear sense. As Volga 'nursed' Yaroslavl, a new capital of Russia-Horde on its banks, and also it 'raised' two of its founders. It is also appropriate to remember a famous Biblical expression: 'a river flowing with MILK and Honey' (The Exodus 3:8). In the Russian fairy tales 'land of MILK and honey' (MILKY rivers – Land of Milk and Honey) is often mentioned. For a good reason it is said in the Christian tradition: 'The Blessed Virgin Mary, who brought forth for us the bread of life, is the true promised land, FROM WHICH FLOW HONEY AND MILK' [298:1], p.9.

So there prevailed an image of a river flowing with milk. From this image it is not too far to arrive at the 'river feeding with milk'.

At the beginning of the XIII century Ioann-Aeneas fled to Russia, the motherland of his ancestors. During the same epoch Andronicus-Christ (aka Romulus or Remus, aka Andrey Bogolyubskiy) repeatedly stayed in Russia with his mother Mary Mother of God, the symbol of whom was a 'She-Wolf'. Mary originated from Russia, that is why in times of danger she and her son returned there, to her motherland, possibly with a young John the Baptist = Remus. Mary could have also been called the 'She-Wolf' because in the Russian language the words 'VOLGA=VLAGA' meaning (VOLGA RIVER = MOISTURE or WATER) and VOLK (meaning WOLF) sound similar and could have been confused.

On [fig.21](#). it is shown a famous sculpture of the Capitoline Wolf. In [5v2], ch.3:9, we explore when this Et-ruscan stature was made. The historians refer it to the V century B.C. Under the she-wolf there are bronze figurines of the two twins Romulus and Remus sucking her milk. But such depiction could have not appeared earlier than the XV century. It turns out, as the historians acknowledge themselves, that the figurines

of the twins are made between the years 1471 and 1509! So the She-Wolf, most likely, is also made in the XV century. At the same time as the figurines of the children, and not two thousand years before they were made.

## **11. THE TREE OF JESSE (ESHAI, YISHAI OR YISAY) IN THE RUSSIAN PRE-ROMANOV'S CHURCHES.**

After the Romanovs assumed power they destroyed almost all the frescos, having replaced them with new ones. In those rare cases where the old frescos survived, they reveal incredible things. For example, 'the tree of Jesse', the depictions of which have survived in the Annunciation Cathedral of the Moscow Kremlin and partially in the Aleksandrova Sloboda (Aleksandrov Village) [4v], [HOP], ch.4. In the time of the Romanovs these frescos were painted over with some other ones, but they were uncovered later. 'The Tree of Jesse' represents THE ANCIENT RUSSIAN PRINCES AS THE RELATIVES OF CHRIST. On the walls are depicted the 'ancient' philosophers and poets.

'It is very interesting that THE RUSSIAN GRAND PRINCES: DANIIL ALEKSANDROVICH, DMITRY DONSKOI AND VASILIIY I were included in the frescos. It is a kind of a genealogical tree of Moscow rulers interweaved into the branches of the tree of Christ' [107], p.148-149.

Thus, the Russian princes are shown descending from the family line of Christ, and the 'ancient' philosophers – as associated with Christianity. Everything is correct. Aeneas, a relative of Christ, founded the Russian Horde dynasty. We spoke about Virgil and Homer above. They wrote about the events in the times of Christ and the subsequent Trojan War of the XIII century, i.e. the events having a direct bearing on the history of Christianity.

## **12. THERE WAS NO FOREIGN 'TATAR-MONGOLIAN' CONQUEST OF RUSSIA.**

The Medieval Mongolia and Russia is simply the same thing. No foreigners conquered Russia. Russia was originally populated by the peoples who lived on their land from the time immemorial – the Russians, the Tatars, etc.

The so called 'Tatar-Mongolian Yoke' is simply a specific period in the history of our state. In that time the population of our country was divided into two parts. One part

– a peaceful civil population ruled by the princes. The other part – a regular army-Horde under the leadership of military commanders, who could have been Russian, Tatar, etc. At the head of the Horde-Army was a czar or a khan. The supreme power belonged to him. In this way the two administrations acted hand in hand: military – in the Horde and civilian – in towns and villages.

We all know that Russia paid taxes to the Horde – a tenth of its property and a tenth of its population. Today it is considered to be a testimony of the Tatar Yoke and the slavish subordination of Russia. However, we refer to the tax that existed in reality - 'TAX FOR THE UPKEEP OF ITS OWN REGULAR RUSSIAN ARMY – HORDE, AND ALSO ABOUT CONSCRIPTION OF YOUNG PEOPLE INTO MILITARY SERVICE. In that time they drafted the children into the Horde before adulthood. The recruited warriors - Cossacks did not return home. It was this military conscription, that 'tagma', blood tribute, which the Russians allegedly paid to the Tatars. Such an order, by the way, also existed in Turkey, at least up until the XVII century. But this was not at all the 'tribute paid by the enslaved people to their evil conquerors', but 'THE STATE PRACTICE OF COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE. For refusal to render the tribute the military administration would punish the population with a punitive expedition to the offending regions. These are the operations which are presented by the historians allegedly as 'Tatar raids' on the Russian territories.

There was no so called 'Tatar-Mongolian' conquest. I.e. there was no foreign invasion to Russia. What today is declared as the 'Tatar-Mongolian conquest of Russia' was an internal unification of the principalities and the reinforcement of the czar-khan power.

The remainders of the Russian forces-Horde survived until now. They are the Cossack forces. The new chronology greatly alters the history of the Cossacks. The historians assure us that the Cossacks are the descendants of the 'fugitive serfs', who have fled to the Don River (or were forced to flee in the XVI-XVII cc.) and other remote areas in order to lead there a 'free and easy life'. In other words, that they were, allegedly, the descendants of criminal gangs. This is not true. As early as in the XVII century the Cossacks were spread throughout THE ENTIRE TERRITORY OF RUSSIA. The sources of that time speak of the Cossacks OF YAIK, DON, VOLGA, TEREK, DNEPER, ZAPOROZHIA, MESHERIA, PSKOV, RYAZAN, and also URBAN COSSACKS, i.e. situated in TOWNS. They also mention the Cossacks of HORDE (ORDYNSKI), AZOV, NOGAI, etc. See [4v].

It turns out that DNEPER or ZAPOROZHIAN COSSACKS until the XVI century were called HORDE (ORDYNSKIYE) COSSACKS. More than that Zaporozhian Base was considered to be a yurt (meaning 'homeland') of the Crimean Cossacks [4v].

This proves our point once more that the COSSACKS (from the word 'skok', 'skakat'? – in Russian meaning 'hop', 'skip', 'gallop') – WERE THE TROOPS OF THE MONGOLIAN HORDE-ARMY. That is the exact reason why the Cossacks were spread all over the Empire, and not just along its borders, as it was from XVIII-XIX cc. With the change of the state structure the Cossack regions of the Empire to a greater degree kept their original military order. For example, the samurais in Japan, Mamelukes (or Mamluks) in Egypt, etc.

The Royal dynasty of Ivan Kalita=Khalif of the XIV-XVI cc. is the dynasty of the khans-czars of the Horde. That is why it can be tentatively called the Horde dynasty. This it is our term. We would like to repeat that this was RUSSIAN, not some foreign dynasty.

The unique Horde period in the history of Russia spans over the XIII-XVI cc. It ends with the famous Great Strife of the early XVII century. The last ruler of the Horde dynasty was the czar-khan Boris 'Godunov'.

The Great Strife and the Civil War of the early XVII century ended with accession of a fundamentally new Romanov dynasty, which originated in West Russia, allegedly in Pskov. THE HORDE DYNASTY WAS HEAVILY DEFEATED in the Civil War of the XVII century. The Horde epoch ended. However, the independent Horde states continued to exist up until the end of the XVIII century. A new stage in the history of Russia began. Thus the end of the epoch, which was later declared 'the famous Tatar-Mongolian Yoke' – was in the beginning of the XVII century, but not anywhere near the end of the XV century, as it is considered today.

The new Romanov dynasty had to strengthen its position on the throne, as at that time the surviving descendants of the former Horde czars still existed. They made claims the throne. Most likely both the Crimean khans and some of the Cossack tribes were amongst them. That is why it was so important for the Romanovs to present the khans as the long-standing enemies of Russia. To this effect the theory of the military conflict between Russia and Horde, the Russians and the Tatars, was created. The Romanovs and their historians called the preceding Russian Horde dynasty 'Tatar'. Having attached a completely different interpretation to the ancient Russian history, the Romanovs introduced a concept of an 'enemy', whom it was necessary to fight. Without intrinsically changing the historical facts, they massively distorted the entire meaning of the history of Russia-Horde.

Of course then, as is now, there were the Tatars living in the country. However the opposition of the Tatars and the Russians, the depiction of some as the conquerors and others as the conquered, is the 'invention' of the historians of the XVII-XVIII cc.

It was them who distorted the Russian history and presented it in such a way as if in the Middle Ages there existed two opposing forces – 'the Russian Rus' and 'the Tatar Horde' and that allegedly Russia (Rus') was conquered by the Horde.

The division of Russia and Mongolia into the three kingdoms, referred to in the chronicles, is in essence the same sort of division.

Specifically:

1) Velikaya Rus' (Great Russia) = Golden Horde including Siberia = Tobol (capital of this province was Tobolsk) aka the Biblical Thubal and Volga Kingdom = Vladimir and Suzdal Russia. In the 'Mongolian' terminology it is probably Novyi Sarai (New Sarai) = Veliky Novgorod = Yaroslavl.

2) Malaya Rus' (Minor Russia) = the Blue (Kok) Horde = Severkaya Zemlia = Malorossiya (Small Russia), i.e. modern Ukraine = Biblical Rosh, i.e. Rus'(Russia) or Kiev Rus' (Kiev Russia). The Russian sources often called Chernigov as its capital, or Novgorod Seversky [161], p.140, and the Western sources name Kiev. The name BLUE came from The Blue Waters. For example, the Synjucha River, the left tributary of the Southern Bug was previously called THE BLUE WATERS [4v].

3) White Rus' = White (Ak) Horde = Lithuania = Smolensk principality = North-West Rus' (Polotsk, Pskov, Smolensk, Minsk) = Biblical Meshech. Today's Belorussia comprises only the Western part of this mediaeval state, and the latter day Catholic Lithuania is a part of old White Russia. The LITHUANIANS of the Russian chronicles are simply latinyane (latini), i.e. the RUSSIAN CATHOLICS. In the 'Mongolian' terminology it is, most likely, Sarai Berke, i.e. Sarai Belyi (meaning 'White' in Russian) as the sounds R and L often interchanged.

The border between Velikaya Rus' (Great Russia) and Malaya Rus' (Little Russia) was probably passing approximately in the same place as today, between Russia and Ukraine = Malorossiya (Little Russia). The border between Belorussia = Lithuania and Velikaya Rus' (Great Russia) ran in the mediaeval times much more to the East, between Moscow and Vladimir to be more precise. I.e. Moscow belonged to White Rus' = Lithuania. They remembered that even in the XVII century, in the times of the Great Strife [4v1]. It is quite possible that this border survived until now in the form sub dialects of the Russian language still in existence today (retaining the unstressed 'o' and failing to differentiate unstressed vowels. In Great Russia = Golden Horde they pronounced 'o' whereas in White Rus' they would pronounce 'a').

In the process of the distortion of the ancient Russian history some geographical shifts of various names known in the mediaeval times took place. The name

Mongolia 'moved' far away to the East and overlapped the territory which today is known to us by this name. The peoples who lived there were effectively 'designated to be called the Mongols'. On paper. The historians are still convinced that the ancestors of the modern Mongols are those very 'Mongols' who in the mediaeval times conquered Europe and Egypt. However on the territory of the modern Mongolia was not found even one ancient chronicle which would tell us about Batu-Khan's campaign to a faraway country Rus' (Russia) and about its conquest. Following the name MONGOLIA = GREAT the name SIBERIA also shifted to the East.

The geographical names in the Middle Ages were shifting around the map due to various reasons. With the beginning of the epoch of book printing the drift of the names stopped with the emergence of maps and books which were multiplied on a mass scale and which fixed the geography and the names of the peoples, cities, rivers and mountains. Only then in the XVII-XVIII cc. the geographical names were generally consolidated. In this way they became part of the textbooks.

### **13. WHEN THE 'ANCIENT' ECLIPSES TOOK PLACE AND WHEN THE ASTRONOMICAL ZODIACS-HOROSCOPES WERE CREATED.**

The ancient chronicles contain many descriptions of the Solar and Lunar eclipses. It became clear that being under pressure from the pre-existing Scaligerian chronology, the astronomers of the XVII-XIX cc. were compelled, while dating the eclipses (and the chronicles), to consider not all the results of the astronomical dates, but only those that fell into the interval of time which was designated in advance by the Scaligerian chronology for the eclipse that was being researched and the events connected to it. As a result, in many cases, the astronomers did not find any eclipses 'in the required century', which would accurately correspond with the description in the chronicle and were compelled, without questioning the Scaligerian chronology – to resort to stretching the facts. For example, they would point out an eclipse which would only partially match the description in the chronicles.

Further still, there are obvious signs of the fact, that some eclipses in the chronicles were calculated post factum i.e. calculated backwards, into the past, by the mediaeval chroniclers of the XVI-XVII cc. in order to support the Scaligerian chronology which they were creating at the time. Having calculated into the past some Lunar eclipses,

for example, the chroniclers of the XVI-XVII cc. would then insert them into the 'ancient' chronicles created by them to 'firmly substantiate' the erroneous chronology.

Our research has shown that all the eclipses, which were thoroughly and well described, when celestially dated in an unbiased way, would date far from the Scaligerian ones (situated in the interval between year 1000 BC and the year 1000 AD), but considerably later (sometimes even by many centuries). In fact all of these new exact solutions fall into the interval between the years 900-1700 AD.

So, the effect of shifting the dates of the annalistic eclipses, discovered by N.A.Morozov in [544] for the 'ancient' eclipses, also refers to the eclipses which are usually dated as the years 400-1000 AD. It means that either there are many equal celestial solutions and as a result the dating is multiple-valued, or there are only a few solutions – one or two. But then all of them fall in the interval of the years 900-1700 AD. Commencing only approximately from year 1000 AD, but not far from the year 400 AD, as suggested by N.A.Morozov in [544], the congruence between the Scaligerian eclipses dates, which were listed in the celestial canon by Gintzel for example, and the results of the modern methodology becomes satisfactory. And only since 1300 AD it becomes – more or less reliable.

We will give an example: the three eclipses (two Solar and one Lunar) described by 'ancient' Thukydydys as taking place during the epoch of the famous Peloponnesian War. Traditionally they are referred to the distant V century BC. However the unbiased astronomical dating reveals that the true dates are entirely different, where there are only two exact solutions. The first one was discovered by N.A.Morozov in [544], v.4, p.509, and the second one was discovered by A.T.Fomenko during re-analysis of the 'ancient' mediaeval eclipses. [1v], ch.2.

The first resolution: the 2nd August 1133 AD (full Solar); the 20th March 1140 AD (full Solar); the 28th August 1151 AD (Lunar).

The second resolution: the 22nd August 1039 AD (full Solar); the 9th April 1046 AD (partially Solar); the 15th September 1057 AD (Lunar).

We will point out that the first part of the Peloponnesian War narrated by Thukydydys includes, as it happens, the story of Andronicus-Christ and the events of the XII-XIII century which followed it. I.e. the Crusades which were the revenge for the crucifixion of Christ. Whereupon in the Thukydydys' version he describes mainly Czar-Grad under the name of Athens, aka 'ancient' Troy, Jerusalem [GR]. Russia-Horde and its allies are mainly described under the name of Sparta. In [GR] we show that Thukydydys' description of the allegedly second phase of the Peloponnesian War

= Sicilian Battle – are much later events of the end of the XIV century, namely the Battle of Kulikovo.

The 'Ancient' city of ATHENS is denoted as various cities in different ancient texts. In the history of the 'ancient' Battle of Marathon by the name of ATHENS the chroniclers meant the city of TANA, the city of DON, i.e. the city which stood on the river DON. We would like to remind that the name of DON earlier was referring to any river in general – from a Russian word DNO, DONNY (meaning 'bottom' or 'bed' of the river or ocean). Most likely in this given place in the 'History' by Thukydydys the 'city of Tana'= Athens is understood to be Moscow situated on the Moscow river. In [4v1], ch.6, we showed that the Moscow river in those times was called DON. The words 'TANA' and 'ATHENS' are close as the letter Fita was pronounced both as F and as T. On the 'ancient' maps the region of modern river Don in Russia (Rus') sometimes was denoted as the 'country of TANA' [5v]. Besides, the old NAME FOR THE RIVER Don is TANAI. A slight distortion of these names is the 'ancient' ATHENS. In particular the ATHENIANS are, at least in some old texts, the DONTSI, i.e. inhabitants of the DON river.

But let us return to the astronomy. The analogous picture of the shifting of the dates was discovered when dating the ancient horoscopes. It turned out that all the ancient zodiacs known today as a result of the unbiased celestial analyses are dated to the epoch of the X-XIX cc [1v], [HXE] [ДЗЕЕ] [ЕПИЗ] At the end of each chapter of this book we quote such dating.

## **14. ASTRONOMICAL DATING OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY.**

1. (Years 1206 or 969) ZODIAC SP FROM THE TOMB OF FARAHO SETI I. A coloured fresco on the arch of the burial chamber. 'Ancient' Egypt, Luxor, Valley of the Kings, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact – the first variant: 14-16 August 969; the second variant: 5-7 August 1206 [HXE]
2. (Year 1221) ZODIAC LK 'LEO OF COMMAGENE'. A stone relief in a form of a lion embedded with stars and inscriptions. Turkey, mountain range Nemrut Dagi, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact the 14th 1221 [ДЗЕЕ]
3. (Years 1227 or 1667) ZODIAC P1 FROM THE PETOSIRIS TOMB, THE OUTER CHAMBER. The coloured depiction on the tomb's ceiling. 'Ancient' Egypt, Dakhla Oasis, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact – the first variant: the 5th August 1227; the second variant: the 2nd August 1667 (12 August in modern calendar) [HXE]



4. (Year 1228) ZODIAC BG, 'ASTROLOGY' (the invention of the Ptolemy's system of the world). Italy, Vatican. The Frescos of the XV century on the vaulted ceiling of the 'Hall of the Sybils' in the chambers of the Borgia Apartments. Ptolemy's system is dated to the II century. In fact it is: the 28th August 1228. The Zodiac was created not earlier than the XV century, by the way of 'calculations into the past [VAT].
5. (Year 1230) FLINDERS PETRIE'S UPPER ATHRIBIS ZODIAC. A coloured painting on the ceiling of the burial tomb. 'Ancient' Egypt, Athribis (Wannina), allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact: the 15-16th May 1230 [HXE]
6. (Years 1240 or 1714) ZODIAC P2 FROM THE TOMB OF PETOSIRIS, THE INNER CHAMBER. The coloured painting on the ceiling of the tomb. 'Ancient' Egypt, The Dahla Oasis, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact – the first variant: the 24-25th March 1240; the second variant: the 2nd April 1714 (13 April in modern calendar) [HXE]
7. (Year 1268) FLINDERS PETRIE'S LOWER ARTHRIBIS ZODIAC AN. The picture painted in colour on the ceiling of the burial cave. 'Ancient' Egypt, Athribis (Wannina), allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact: the 9-10th February 1268 [HXE]
8. (Year 1284) THE ROMAN ZODIAC GA THE GEMMA AUGUSTEA. Europe. Allegedly 'ancient' double relief cameo gem. In fact: the 8th December 1284 [EPI3]
9. (Years 1285 or 1345) ZODIAC NB WITH 'CLOTHED NUT'. Possibly painted on the lid of a wooden coffin. "Ancient' Egypt, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact – the first variant: the 31st January – the 1st February 1285; the second variant: the 29th -31st January 1345 [Д3EE]
10. (Years 1289 or 1586) ZODIAC RS FROM THE TOMB OF PHARAOH RAMESSES IV. An image on the ceiling of the burial chamber. 'Ancient' Egypt, Luxor, Valley of the Kings, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact – the first variant: 4-5 April 1289; the second variant: 20-21 February April old style 1586 [HXE]

# **Chapter 4. THE EPOCH OF THE XIV CENTURY**

## **1. THE CREATION OF THE RUSSIAN STATE = RUSSIA-HORDE UNDER THE MILITARY, NAMELY THE HORDIAN RULE**

We will reiterate some elements of our reconstruction. At the end of the XIII – beginning of the XIV cc. a final unification of the diverse peoples of Russia, instigated by Aeneas-Ryurik, took place. Partly peacefully, partly through military means, the people of Povolzhye (Volga Region) and Severnoye Prichernomor'ye (The Northern Black Sea Area) merged into a centralized state under the military = Hordian rule. It was fully realised under the Grand prince – khan, Khagan (Kagan) Georgii Danilovich, aka Genghis Khan or Gurkhan in the foreign sources. A vast and powerful state falls under his power.

At the head of the state was a czar, an 'autocrat', who had absolute power. Vladimir and Suzdal Rus' (Russia) was the capital region, which at that time was called VELIKII NOVGOROD (Great Novgorod). It has entered the chronicles under this name. Yaroslavl became the centre of the administrative governance. It was reflected in the chronicles as 'Yaroslavovo Dvorishe (Yaroslav's Court) of Velikii Novgorod'. The fortified czarist headquarters were situated at different times in different cities: in Rostov Velikii, in Kostroma, in Vladimir, in Suzdal (= 'ancient' Suzy) and in some other centres of Vladimir and Suzdal Rus' (Russia).

In the chronicles the term LORD NOVGOROD THE GREAT (Gospodin Velikiy Novgorod) defined not just one particular city, Yaroslavl, for example, but an entire region, which was a property bestowed upon the Grand-Prince in the epoch which spanned Ivan Kalita=Khalif to Ivan III. This was a capital district up until the XVI century when the capital was transferred to Moscow.

Lord Novgorod the Great, the Grand-Prince capital region comprised of the following cities: Yaroslavl, Rostov, Kostroma, Pereyasavl, Mologa, Vladimir and Suzdal [362], v.4; v.5, column 21.

It is known that the Scandinavian sources called Velikiy Novgorod a LAND OF CITIES [523], p.47. It means that they clearly considered it to be a COMMUNITY OF THE CITIES [5v2], ch.9. The Russian sources also tell us about the INDEPENDENT ENDS OF NOVGOROD, which occasionally would even fight

against each other. These ENDS (KONTSI – boroughs) were independent of each other, and each of them had its own chief and its own seal. Each 'konets' ('end') owned particular regions in the Novgorodian land. The entire Novgorodian land was divided between them. Besides, SEVERAL SEALS FROM EACH END (KONETS) were SIMULTANEOUSLY attached to the Novgorodian state charter. For example, one of the oldest Novgorodian charters has EIGHT such seals [5v2]. When deciding on the matters of great importance the representatives of the ENDS would meet at one of the public assemblies called Veche (the highest legislature and judicial authority in the Republic of Novgorod –Tr.). There were at least two Veche: one – 'at Yaroslav's Court' as they wrote in the charters, and the other - 'Sofiiskoye veche' (which took place in front of the Cathedral of Holy Wisdom). The Veche 'AT YAROSLAV'S COURT' was considered to be the main one. Presumably, the representatives of the cities from the entire Grand-Princedom would gather in Yaroslavl and from there would give out the charters in the name of the 'Lord Novgorod the Great' at the Yaroslav's Court.

Based on the new empirical/statistical dating techniques, we have discovered 'authentication' of the ancient and mediaeval dynasties. A certain chain emerges, 'at the head' of which, i.e. the closest to us in time, happens to be a dynasty of the Russian–Hordian czars-khans of the years 1273-1600. All the rest of the main ancient dynasties turn out to be its phantom reflections, dated back into the past [1v], [2v]. It means that the main ancient and mediaeval kingdoms reflected in the ancient chronicles to some extent are the descriptions generally speaking of the same Empire of the XIV-XVI cc.

In particular all three famous 'ancient' Roman Empires: the Royal Rome of Titus Livy (or the First Roman Empire) allegedly of the VIII-VI cc. BC, then the Second Roman Empire allegedly of the I-III cc., then the Third Roman Empire allegedly of the III-VI cc., then the mediaeval Holy Roman Empire allegedly of the X-XIII cc. – they are all the phantom reflections of the same Habsburg Empire = of the Novgorodians of the XIV-XVII cc., i.e. the reflection of the Great Empire. In other words, the 'ancient' Royal Rome founded by Romulus, perceived as the City and as the Kingdom – is the 'Mongolian' Empire [1v], [2v],[7v1].

The famous 'ancient' historian Titus Livy, the author of the definitive 'Books from the foundation of the city' was in fact a chronicler of the 'Mongolian' Empire of the XIII-XVI cc. Most likely he lived in Western Europe in the XVI-XVII cc. As it happens in many places in his book Titus Livy displays a view point which today is called

Judaic. However, at the same time, he most likely is Christian. But not in the modern sense of this word, but in the sense of the epoch of the XV-XVII cc.

## **2. THE INVASION OF THE 'MONGOLS' INTO WESTERN AND SOUTHERN EUROPE, ASIA AND AFRICA. THE RISE OF THE HORDIAN EMPIRE.**

By the end of the first half of the XIV century the restoration of the Empire commences under the rule of Ivan Danilovich Kalita = Caliph = Khalif. The Russian cavalry = 'Mongolian' hordes invade Europe, Africa and India, [fig.22](#) in a wide reaching offensive. The 'Mongol' = great invasion begins.

As a result a considerable part of Eurasia was colonized. The rest were forced to accept – to varying degrees – their vassal dependency from Russia-Horde, possibly only in the form of paying the tax.

The conquests of the Prince Georgiy Danilovich (Genghis Khan) followed by his brother Ivan Danilovich Kalita (Batu-Khan) resulted in the rise in the first half of the XIV century of the Great = 'Mongol' Empire with its centre in Vladimir and Suzdal Russia.

A new political force began its supreme reign in the historical arena. You can call it the Russian-Horde Empire as its centre was situated in Vladimir and Suzdal Russia = Velikiy Novgorod, and its military forces were called the Horde = Rat' (Russian for 'army') = Rodom (Russian for 'by birth'). The Empire was also called Israel.

In the XIV-XVI cc. the Russian-Horde Empire spread its power over Eurasia, Northern Africa and a significant part of America. Generally it was not a conquest, but a colonization, as the local population, which consisted of separate small ethnic groups, could not raise any significant military resistance to the Imperial army = Cossacks = Israelites. The new large colonies emerged on the colonized lands with the advent of the 'Mongolian' administration. Among them were the regions of Western Europe, the Great Mogul in India, the 'Mongolian' state in China, samurais (i.e. Samaritans - natives of Samaria), Samaritans (from Samara), natives of Samara) in Japan, Mamelukes in Egypt, the Maya and Inca state in America, [fig.23](#) [7v1],ch.1.

In the Russian sources the world Empire was called ALL RUS' (ALL RUSSIA) or the Russian Kingdom. In the foreign sources - the 'Mongol', i.e. the 'Great' Empire. According to S.Herberstein the word RUSSIA was then understood as 'Diaspora',

'proliferation' and the name 'ALL RUS' (ALL RUSSIA) meant simply 'all the proliferation' [161], p.58.

In the Western European sources Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc. was reflected as the Habsburg Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. In the name Habsburg the second part - BURG – means CITY. The first part is possibly a Latinized reading of a Slavonic word HAB (pronounced NAV) written in Cyrillic. It means NEW. In Latin H is spelled like a Slavonic N = H. And Latin B = Slavonic V=B. In this case HABSBUURG is simply NEW CITY, NOVGOROD. Such a name carried a reminiscence of the capital of Russia-Horde – Velikiy Novgorod = Yaroslavl. Incidentally the name of the capital of the later Habsburgs of the XVII-XVIII cc. itself – VIENNA in Austria, possibly originates from the Russian word VENETS meaning wreath or crown, i.e. CROWNED, or ROYAL city. Further down the line the Hordian origin of the Habsburgs was forgotten. After the split of the Empire in the XVI-XVII cc. the Western Europeans started composing their 'correct history' anew, where there was no longer a place for Russia-Horde. The name VIENNA is close to VENETI, i.e the name of Slavic people, See a book by Orbini [617] and [5v].

About the Czarist Headquarters. In the Great Empire starting with Ryurik-Aeneas and ending with the middle of the XVI century the Imperial headquarters was always separate from the capital. The capital remained an open city where there were situated the state offices and embassies, and international trade took place. The Imperial headquarters was a completely closed city. No outsiders were admitted. Starting with Ryurik-Aeneas and up to the middle of the XVI century the city of Yaroslavl on Volga (the chronicles' Velikiy Novgorod) was the Russian capital. The Imperial headquarters changed its location several times. At first it was situated in Rostov Velikiy (Rostov the Great), then later in Vladimir, Suzdal, Aleksandrova Sloboda, etc. Something similar was taking place in Italy, when the Russian (Etruscan) invaders came there. They turned Florence into the capital of Italy. The Imperial headquarters was established by them in a different place – in the future Italian Rome.

### **3. THE EMPERORS OF THE GREAT EMPIRE = THE RUSSIAN CZARS-KHANS OF THE XIV CENTURY.**

Little is known about the history of the czars-khans of the Great Empire up until the XIV century. On the whole the XIII century is a dark and deep antiquity. Only since the 'Mongol' conquest the picture becomes clearer. With the emergence of a vast Empire the chronicle writing became more orderly and detailed. There appeared the imperial libraries which survived until the XVI century. After the schism of the

Empire in the XVII century they were destroyed by the rebel reformists. Nevertheless a large amount of information has survived, although it is quite distorted and edited. The great conquest, which led to the emergence of the Horde Empire, was started by Georgiy Danilovich Moskovskii (Grand Prince of Moscow), aka Genghis Khan.

&& GEORGIY = YURY (YURIY)= GIURGII DANILOVICH 'MOSKOVSKII' (OF MOSCOW) = GENGHIS KHAN.

He reigned in 1319-1325. Aka Holy Georgiy Pobedonosets (St.George the Victorious). In the Western European chronicles he was reflected as Habsburg, i.e. Novgorodets meaning 'of Novgorod' (of the New City), 'Henry VII of Luxembourg' 1309-1314 according to [76] or 1308-1313 according to [304], v.2, p.406. We all know of the Tomb of Henry VII which in present day is situated in Pisa. It is very recent; it is a part of the 'material proof' specially created in the XVIII-XIX cc. to substantiate the Scaligerian history. However, there still remains the identity traces between 'Henry VII' and Georgiy of Moscow on the tomb-newly made. Oskar Jäger informs us that 'the inscription... says... that the emperor's remains are preserved in the tomb incorruptible' [304], v.2, p.411. The Incorruptible remains or relics are a sign of holiness. Indeed, Georgiy Pobedonosets (George the Victorious) is consecrated a saint. So into the West-European 'Henry's tomb' the relics of some other saint were placed. But of course they were not George's.

According to our results czar-khan Georgiy Danilovich, like the other khans of the Great Empire, was buried in the old imperial cemetery in Egypt [5v2], ch.7:5.

Georgiy united the Russian lands under the rule of the 'Lord Novgorod the Great', as in that time Vladimir and Suzdal Russia was called. He started the great conquest the aim of which was subjecting the entire known world under the rule of the Great princes-khans of Vladimir and Suzdal.

At first the capital was situated in Rostov Velikii (Rostov the Great). Georgiy founded a new capital for the Grand Princes – the city of Vladimir, which means: one who rules the world, the capital of the world. He also founded Nizhny Novgorod. He was killed at an early age. The circumstances of his death are not clear. According to some reports he was murdered by the conspirators.

He was consecrated a saint and canonised under several names several times: 1) as Holy Great-Martyr George (April 23, O.S); 2) as the Martyr Holy Blessed Grand Prince Georgy Vsevolodovich the miracle worker of Vladimir is commemorated on February 17 (February 4, O.S.)

Due to the mistakes of the recent chroniclers, the Grand Prince-Khan Georgiy is described in the Russian and 'Mongolian' history (which is one and the same thing) several times under different names. Specifying them we indicate the century into which the historians erroneously dated the original. So:

a) Ryurik – the founder of the Russian dynasty of Grand Princes, erroneously dated to the IX century. The figure of Ryurik is multi-layered. His first layer is the Trojan King, 'variag' Aeneas ('Varangian') who came to Rus' in the XIII century. b) Mstislav Vladimirovich 'The Brave', erroneously was dated to the XI century; c) Georgiy Vsevolodovich, erroneously dated to the XIII century; d) Genghis Khan, or in the other more correct variant of this name, Caesar-Khan, erroneously dated to the XIII century.

So in 1318 Georgiy Danilovich = Genghis Khan begins the conquest. The details of the colonization - unification are not known well. The historians extended this period over several decades. In reality it is shorter. We learned it at school as 'the beginning of Tatar-Mongol invasion from the EAST'. For the Western-Russian chroniclers that was what did happen. The ancient Ukrainian or Polish chronicles laid the foundation of some of the Russian chronicles which came down to us. It is not a coincidence that the Radzivilovskaya letopis (Radzivilovsky chronicle) was found in Kenigsberg.

The Old Russian coat of arms was Georgiy Pobedonosets (George the Victorious). It is not surprising. Georgiy = Genghis Khan was in fact the founder of the Russian 'Mongol' Empire.

The Radzivilovskaya letopis (Radzivilovsky chronicle) begins the story of the 'epoch of Ryurik from the Great strife, the war between the different regions of the state. This is the strife of the late XIII - early XIV cc. in Russia, already familiar to us. It concludes with the unification under the rule of the 'house of Kalita', Genghis Khan = Yuriy = Ryurik (king Aeneas). This is the result of the famous plea 'Come and reign and have authority over us!'. The chronicle rightfully informs us of the emergence of a new state.

The name Georgiy = Giurgii or Yuriy is the name of the famous annalistic Ryurik. Ryurik is just a different form of an Old Russian name Giurgii, i.e. Georgiy = Yuriy. There is no separate name Ryurik in Russia today. It does not exist in the church calendar either. But not because this famous name is forgotten. It's just it is being used in a different form – Yuriy or Georgiy. The names Yuriy or Georgiy are considered to be different names only in present day. In the Old Russian language they were the same.

So the annalistic 'The Calling On the Princes (Varangians)' is the unification of Russia by Yuriy = Genghis Khan, started by the king Aeneas – Noah - Rurik.

&& IVAN DANILOVICH KALITA = KHALIF = BATU KHAN

Ivan Danilovich Kalita 1328-1340 according to [362]. Two versions of the beginning of his reign are indicated in [145], which are year 1322 or year 1328. The beginning of the Prince's reign is indicated for the second time under the year 1328.

In the Western European sources Ivan Kalita = Khalif was reflected as Habsburg 'Ludwig der Bayer' 1314-1347 according to [76] or 1313-1347 according to [304], v.2, p.414. 'Ludwig der Bayer' is a reflection of the following three Russian czars-khans: Ivan I Danilovich Kalita 1328-1340 according to [362] + his son Simeon Gordyi (Simeon the Proud) 1340-1353 + his son Ivan II Krotkii Krasnyi (Ivan II the Meek, the Fair of Moscow) 1353-1359 according to [36], [362].

Ivan Kalita continued uniting the lands under the rule of the Lord Novgorod the Great, which was started by his brother Georgiy = Genghis Khan. During his time the 'Mongol' conquest spread far to the West and to the South. He finally has subjected the Western Europe, in the XIV century he FOUNDED THE VATICAN AND ROME IN ITALY as a centre of the social and religious power in the West. The word VATICAN itself probably originated from the name of khan Batu. To be exact VATICAN is BATU KHAN or BATYA KHAN. In the Western sources he is reflected as 'Pope' Innocent III. He simultaneously was both a social and a spiritual ruler = khalif. He founded the institution of the Popes in Italy [4v2], ch.2:22.

Kalita=Khalif expanded the city of Yaroslavl or, as they used to call it, 'Yaroslavov Dvorishe of Velikiy Novgorod (Yaroslav's Court of Novgorod the Great) at the intersection of the Volga and Northern Dvina rivers' trade routes.

Ivan Kalita was the czar and the pontiff simultaneously. In the West his memory lived on long after him, which in time became the stuff of myth and legend: of an 'ancient' god or king Cron, of a mediaeval king-priest John the Presbyter, etc. [4v].

He died in the West, probably in Italy. He left behind two branches of government: the czarist in Russia and the pope's in Italy, which was also claiming the social power. These two branches were locked in battle long after his death.

Due to the mistakes of the recent chronologists, the Grand Prince-Khan Ivan Kalita is described in World History several times under various names: a) Cronus, a legendary king of Assyria. The Chronographia by John Malalas tells us about it. In various 'ancient' Greek myths Cronos is a progenitor of the Olympian gods. b)



Yaroslav Vsevolodovich, was erroneously dated to the XIII century. c) Batu Khan, was erroneously dated to the XIII century.

He died of a sudden illness. It is quite possible that he was poisoned. He was buried, most likely, in Egypt [4v2], ch.2:22.

&& SIMEON GORDYI (SIMEON THE PROUD), AKA ALEKSANDR NEVSKY.

Simeon Gordyi 1340-1353 according to [362], [36], [145], aka Aleksandr Nevsky. In the Western European sources he was reflected as the Habsburg 'Ludwig der Bayer'. i.e. – the 'Novgorodians Barbaric People'. Also the biography of 'Ludwig der Bayer' was contributed by the Grand Prince-Khan Simeon the Proud along with Ivan Kalita.

He reigned over the Empire from Veliky Novgorod. In Yaroslavl he established a centre of the international trade between the East and the West. He created a court of governors of Veliky Novgorod as a centre of the administrative control of the Empire. Under his rule and his successors' rule such remote regions as Egypt and China were assimilated into the Great Empire [5v].

On account of mistakes made by the recent chroniclers, the Grand Prince-Khan Simeon the Proud is described in World history a number of times under various names: a) Aleksandr Yaroslavich Nevsky, erroneously was dated to the XIII century; b) Menke Khan, erroneously dated to the XIII century; c) Berke or Birkai Khan, erroneously dated to the XIII century; d) Khan Chanikbek.

&& IVAN THE MEEK (THE FAIR).

Ivan the Meek (the Fair) 1353-1359 according to [36], [362] or 1354-1359 according to [145]. In Western European sources he was reflected as the very same 'Habsburg (Habsburger) Ludwig der Bayer'. I.e. the 'Novgorodians Barbaric People'. He ruled the Empire from Veliky Novgorod and continued to build the Empire: transport routes, the monetary system, the international trade between the East and the West in Yaroslavl. After his death his son, Dmitry Ivanovich, who was still a minor, remained to become the future Donskoi.

Ivan the Meek is also known in history under the name of Yaroslav Tverskoi, who erroneously was dated to the XIII century.

The distant travels became possible only with the appearance of the vast Empire and its safeguarded caravan trails. Before then nothing of the kind existed. Travelling over the long distances was extremely dangerous. Even at such close proximity to one's home, one could find oneself in an alien environment with a different language and customs, falling easy prey to highwaymen or rogues. Only a powerful Empire

was able to provide relatively secure transport routes, along which immediately set forth not only the military forces and merchants, but travellers too.

#### && DMITRY OF SUZDAL.

Dmitry of Suzdal 1359-1363 according to [362], or 1360-1362 according to [36], [145]. In the Western European chronicles he was reflected as 'Karol IV Habsburg' 1347-1378 according to [76]. We would like to point out that "Karol IV" means just the 'Fourth King'. He is the reflection of a 'sum' of the following two Russian czars-khans: Dmitry of Suzdal and Dmitry Ivanovich Donskoi 1363-1389.

Very little is known of Dmitry of Suzdal. After the death of Ivan Ivanovich the Fair an uprising begins within the state and a struggle for power with Prince Dmitry, the minor, the future 'Donskoi'. Dmitry of Suzdal is also known in history under the name of Vassily of Kostroma and erroneously dated to the XIII century.

#### && DMITRY DONSKOI.

Dmitry Ivanovich Donskoi 1363-1389 according to [362] or 1362-1389 according to [36], [145]. In the Western European chronicles he is reflected as 'Karol IV Habsburg'. Some facts of Dmitry Donskoi's biography also found their way into the history of Habsburg Venceslav following Karol IV.

Dmitry Donskoi is also known in history under the names of a) Svyatoslav Igorevich, erroneously dated to the X century; b) Dmitry of Pereyaslavl, erroneously dated to the XIII century; c) Tokhta Khan, erroneously dated to the XIII century; d) Khan Tokhtamysh; e) the Roman Emperor Constantine the Great, erroneously dated to the IV century.

At the end of the XIV century the Great Strife begins in Russia-Horde. In 1380 a bloody religious battle takes place between the army of Dmitry Donskoi and Velyaminov-Mamai the temnik (Russian for the rank of army commander, and translates as "leader of thousands"). The Battle of Kulikovo is considered to be major in the history of mediaeval Russia. According to our results, the battle took place in the territory of modern Moscow, where the Yauza River enters the Moscow River [4v1], ch.6. At that time there was no city of Moscow there. The place of the battle up until now is called in Moscow the KULISHKI FIELD, i.e. the Kulikovo field. The mass burials of the soldiers fallen in the Battle of Kulikovo, survive in Moscow in the Old Simonov Monastery and in the Andronikov Monastery. Today the historians are either reluctant to speak of them or are simply ignorant about them.

Dmitriy Donskoi laid down the foundation of the city of Moscow in the place of the Battle of Kulikovo. The capital, the czarist headquarters of Dmitriy Donskoi was the city of Kostroma.

In Western European sources the battle is reflected as a famous battle allegedly of the year 1386 near the Lucerne city of Sempach [304], v.2, p.446. As we have shown in [KA3] the Battle of Kulikovo also forms the backbone to the main plot of the great 'ancient' Indian epic Sanskrit poem 'Mahabharata'. Here it is described as a famous battle in the field of the Kurus (Kurukshetra). It is also reflected in Titus Livy's 'The History of Rome' and in the Old Testament (in particular, as the battle between David and Goliath). The Battle of Kulikovo's significant role can be explained by the fact that it was a religious battle for the adoption of the Apostles' Christianity as an official religion over the entire 'Mongol' Empire. The very same battle is described on the pages of the 'ancient' sources as a battle of the Emperor Constantine with Maxentius [KP] Thus Dmitriy Donskoi=Constantine the Great has baptised all of the Horde Empire by the end of the XIV century.

It turns out that the 'ancient' Roman sources described in detail the situation preceding the Battle of Kulikovo of 1380. The opposition between the former HEREDITARY, ROYAL Christianity and PEOPLE'S APOSTLES' Christianity becomes acute. A religious war approaches. Dmitriy Donskoi stands at the head of the Apostles' Christians, and Khan Mamai = Ivan Velyaminov leads the supporters of the Royal Christianity. The religious antagonism discrepancies become insuperable. The dispute escalates towards military conflict. At stake – which religion will be adopted as the state religion in this vast Empire? It becomes clear that reconciliation is impossible. No one is willing to yield.

Following the adoption of the Apostles' Christianity by the Empire the defeated Royal Christianity was declared by the victors as 'foul paganism'. At that time such a stigma reflected irreconcilable differences between the two branches of the old Christianity. Later this conflict subsided. The Apostles' Christianity prevailed, and the Hereditary Christianity was consigned to history. But the pernicious stigma on the pages of the original sources remained. Subsequent historians naively interpreted it all too literally. They concluded that 'the foul pagans' didn't believe in Christ at all. The historians were mistaken. The 'pagans' did believe, but in a different way. They called Him not only Christ, but also the other names, which are forgotten today. For example: Hors, Thor, Kolyada, Rod, Zeus, Dionysus, Osiris, Theseus, Heracles, etc.

#### **4. THE EXPANTION OF THE EMPIRE.**

So, in the beginning of the XIV century the two brothers – Ivan (Batu Khan) and Georgiy (Genghis Khan) Danilovichi – were the czars-khans of the Great Empire. The creation of the empire was reflected in various 'ancient' documents of the 'antiquity'. In particular, it contributed to the legend of the foundation of the famous 'ancient' Rome, allegedly in the VIII century BC by the brothers Romulus and Remus, descendants of king Aeneas.

The most important political aim for the czars-khans of Russia-Horde of the XIII-XIV cc. – aka the 'ancient' Roman Empire – becomes the reinstatement and the significant expansion of the Czar-Grad Empire of the XI-XII cc. Russia-Horde was naturally considered by the people as the successor to Ancient Romea, because it was Russia, where king Aeneas-John = Ryurik, the representative of the former Czar-Grad = Trojan = Jerusalem dynasty, arrived to. The other parts of the former Romaic Kingdom in the XIII century were engulfed in the strife.

As we already said, at the end of the XIII – beginning of the XIV cc. the conquest of the world instigates from Russia-Horde. We call it the 'first wave'. It was not so much a question of military occupation of distant realms, populated mainly by isolated tribes or entirely undeveloped, but more akin to the reclaiming and absorbing of them into the Empire. Various ancient authors – for example, John Malalas or Mauro Orbini – inform us that the MAJORITY OF THE REGIONS OF EURASIA AND AFRICA DURING THAT EPOCH WERE STILL SCARCELY POPULATED. That is why the armies of the Russia-Horde, which were irrevocably spreading out in different directions from the Volga River, would settle in as yet undeveloped territories and establish new cities and new civilisations there. We would like to repeat that it was a rather peaceful colonization, including that of the vacant territories of Western Europe. A large part of the settlers-Cossacks was sent to Africa and Asia, including India and China. The Horde reclamation of India of that epoch is known to us from the ancient sources as the appearance of the famous 'Aryans' and the creation of the Aryan-Indian civilization in Hindustan. The Cossacks (i.e. the Israelites), who came to Egypt, here established the Mamelukes dynasty, described later in the history of 'Ancient' Egypt under the name of the 'ancient' Hyksos. This migration from the centre of the Horde Empire in all different directions was later described in various chronicles as DIASPORA or THE GREAT TRANSMIGRATION OF PEOPLES, as the great Slavic conquest, as the rise of Babylon, etc. In the Bible Russia-Horde (Israel) is also described as militant Assyria. Titus Livy and the other 'ancient' authors describe the same events as the rise of Royal Rome and the conquest of the world.

In the epoch of the XIV century the firearms were invented, which provided the armies of Russia-Horde with an overwhelming military advantage for a long time. Sergiy Radonezhskii (Sergey Radonezhsky) (aka Berthold Schwarz) was the inventor of the canon. For the first time canons were used on a large scale in the Battle of Kulikovo in 1380 [KP]

The Empire encompassed practically the entire Eurasia and a great part of Africa, including South Africa, African Egypt, and the Nile Valley, where traditionally the Empire's ancestral Royal cemetery was situated. As we have said earlier, the choice of location, among other things was also due to the unique conditions in Egypt. A dry and hot climate facilitated a good preservation of the remains. Here – the embalmed Hordian czars-khans, their relatives, court nobility, governors, etc.- were transported post-mortem on the Hordian ships (called strugi)- across the Mediterranean Sea = the 'ancient river Styx'. The embalming itself was invented to preserve the bodies of the deceased during a lengthy transportation from the locations situated far from the African Egypt. Those who died in Egypt did not necessarily have to be embalmed. There, in the white-hot sands, the mummification takes place without any embalment.

In other words, various famous Egyptian burials of pharaohs and other burials in Egypt (in Luxor for example) which are known today, are the graves of the eminent and distinguished people of the Horde Empire.

By contrast, the burials of the 'Russian czars and czaritsas', allegedly of the pre-Romanovs epoch, which today are on display in Arkhangelsky Monastery of Moscow Kremlin, are forged, created by order of the Romanovs in the course of them re-score the Russian history in the 'correct' key [4v.2)].

## **5. SCYTHIA WAS CALLED SCOTIA, I.E. SCOTLAND.**

The spelling of SCYTHIA was also used for SCOTLAND, as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle tells us [4v2], ch.3, ch.6:11. The words SCYTHIA and SCOTIA are almost identical.

We attribute the origin of the name SCOTLAND from SCYTHIA by the fact that the 'Mongol' conquest also swept through the insular England. Here arrived the Scythians and founded the cities and the state. This is the genesis of the name Scotland.

Let's address the mediaeval ENGLISH sources. What did they call Scotland? It turns out - SCOTIA and GUTLONDE, i.e. a COUNTRY OF GOTHES = GUT-LONDE [517], [4v2], ch.3:1.5. It corresponds wonderfully with our reconstruction.

We have to add almost nothing ourselves. It is enough simply to quote the source materials accurately. We suggest taking a look at the mediaeval records from the perspective of the common sense and the new chronology.

## **6. A WONDERFUL CONSISTENCY IN THE LOCATIONS OF THE OLD CAPITALS.**

If the Horde = 'Roman' colonization of Europe, Asia and Africa took place so recently and systematically enough, then some consistency in the location of the imperial colonial centres = the future capitals, should have manifested itself. Let us imagine ourselves in the place of a khan-czar who has to swiftly and sensibly organize the effective ruling over recently conquered vast territories. Many of them, according to Mauro Orbini [617], 'WERE YET TO BE DEVELOPED AT THAT TIME [5v1], ch.9. There were a few locals there. For example, Orbini claims that when the Slavic army arrived to Holland for the first time IT WAS STILL A DESOLATE UNDEVELOPED COUNTRY [617].

Most likely the command outposts – vicariates - were set up along the trade routes of the empire. Not randomly, but in the same specific distances. Naturally, the location didn't always allow for this, but something like it was aimed for. What was the benefit of that? At the very least such system would introduce some logical order for trading, postal and courier services. The Khan was able to approximately know how long it would take the couriers to deliver an order from the capital of the Empire to any given region. Long distances were measured by, let's say, thousands of versts (versta - a Russian unit of distance equal to 1.067 kilometres (0.6629 mile)). It was, for example, one thousand versts to the 'closest' colonial centres. To the next ones – two thousand. And so on. It is a simple and naturally-occurring idea for the Empire which was rapidly extending its boundaries towards little developed territories. Thus acted 'ancient Rome' in the Scaligerian history. Meaning, that was the way the "Mongol" Empire acted. It would cast something like a web over the geographical map, in the intersections of which, along the rays emanating from the centre, would appear the local command outposts [fig.24](#) [4v2], ch.2. Of course over time some of them would make way for other outposts, which would appear later and for other reasons. Besides, this pattern was also affected by geography – seas, mountains, rivers and wetlands.

It would be interesting to see if any, even vague traces of such a regular pattern still remain. If our hypothesis is correct, then many of the present day capitals should be broadly situated on a number of peripheries with the same centre, fig 24. The location of the centre would point us to where the capital of the Empire, which at some point colonized and developed Eurasia, was situated. Could it happen to be the Italian Rome? It is difficult to foresee. Only the calculations can provide us with the answer.

Let us take a modern globe. Specifically, a globe and not a flat map, which distorts the actual distances. Let us mark the present day European and Asian capitals on the globe: Amman, Amsterdam, Ankara, Athens, Baghdad, Beirut, Belgrade, Berlin, Bern, Bratislava, Brussels, Budapest, Bucharest, Warsaw, Vienna, Damascus, Dublin, Geneva, Jerusalem, Kabul, Copenhagen, Lisbon, London, Luxembourg, Madrid, Moscow, Nicosia, Oslo, Paris, Prague, Rome, Sofia, Istanbul, Stockholm, Tehran, Tirana, Helsinki. Let us choose on a map an arbitrary point, which we will be changing later, and calculate the distance between this point and all the 37 capitals. We will get 37 numbers. We would like to stress that the distances are being measured on the globe, i.e. the earth surface, and not the flat distorting map.

Let us see, if the set point could be the centre of a number of circumferences, along which all, or nearly all the specified cities are situated. If not, let us set a different point. This way we can try to search through different points on the globe. It is clear that if the capitals are scattered randomly, i.e. they were emerging independently from each other, then there will be no central point. But if the capital were emerging the way we have described it, then the central point might occur. It is interesting to see where it might be. Could it be the Italian Rome? That would be natural for the Scaligerian history. Or could it be Istanbul? Which would mean that it was the Romaic Kingdom which at some point developed and populated Europe. Or maybe the centre was situated in Vladimir and Suzdal Russia? This is what our reconstruction claims. The only thing which remains to be done is to conduct technically uncomplicated, though cumbersome calculations.

The answer is as follows. Indeed, there exists a centre, respective of which nearly all the indicated capitals line-up around two peripheries of circles in the best possible way. This point is the city of Vladimir in Russia, [fig.25](#). Incidentally, isn't it the reason why it is called Vladimir, meaning The Master of the World? This work was conducted by A.U. Ryabtsev - a professional cartographer (city of Moscow).

So, the result demonstrates that THE GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATION OF THE MAJORITY OF THE EUROPEAN AND ASIAN CAPITAL BARES TRACES OF A CERTAIN ANCIENT ORDER. It manifests itself in the concentric pattern of most of

the capitals around a single centre – the Russian city of Vladimir. Of course, such a pattern could have occurred accidentally. Nevertheless, our findings provide a perfect justification of the location of the capitals. The vast territories of Eurasia were developed and populated during the 'Mongol' conquest of the XIV century. Vladimir and Suzdal Russia was at its centre. The civilization encompassed the vast territories while creating the Eurasian Empire with transport routs, central government and strong administration. The future local capitals began to emerge in the intersections of the system of transport routs created according to a strict scheme, along the concentric circles around the centre - at approximately equal distance from it [4v2], ch.2:18.

## **7. THE STRUCTURE OF THE HORDE EMPIRE.**

In the XIV–XVI cc. all the regions of the Empire – including areas at a considerable distance from the Russia-Horde - were ruled by the governors subjected to the supreme Hordian czar-khan. The Western European chronicles called him the Emperor, deeming him to be the only one in the world. They are quite correct about that. The attitude of the Empire's provinces towards Russia-Horde and its czars was very respectful and sometimes would verge on idolatry. For instance, in the Mediterranean resorts there would appear some myths and legends about the mighty and ubiquitous gods, feasting on the distant and unreachable Olympus. Some of these legends found their way onto the pages of the chronicles. Later they were declared by the historians to be 'very ancient'.

The reasons for Russia-Horde becoming the metropolitan country of the Great Empire are clear. A significant portion of the wealth and natural resources of the entire planet are concentrated there. Being well aware of it, the khans-czars of Russia-Horde created a powerful army not so much as to guard the wealth, but to build a large and well organized Kingdom based on it. Since then it was the military power that became the most important characteristic of Russia-Horde = the biblical Assyria (Syria) = Israel. Given that, in the provinces of the Empire in Western Europe for example, a particular attention was paid to the production of 'consumer goods'. The products of this labour were distributed throughout the entire Empire. Something or other was supplied to Russia-Horde.

In that distant epoch there were no nations or ethnic groups that exist in our time. They formed only in the XVII-XVIII cc. after the schism of the Empire. During its existence the Empire created a number of 'sacred' languages for both writing down Holy Scripture and for the national documentation. They were – the Egyptian



hieroglyphs = ancient 'Jewish' hieratical language of priests; then Arabic; Mediaeval Greek; the Church Slavonic. The 'ancient' Latin and 'ancient' Greek languages were created later, in the epoch of the dissolution of the Empire, based mainly on the Church Slavonic language. The spoken languages in Russia were Russian (i.e. the simplified Church Slavonic language) and the Turkic (Tatar) languages. In the presence of a strong autocratic power the fundamental idea of the 'Mongol' Kingdom was the unity of the countries and nations which were a part of it.

In the vast territories of the Empire – in Egypt, Northern Africa, Europe, America, Asia – in the XIII-XVI cc. there spread a megalithic style of gigantic structures, made of synthetic stone. In particular - geopolymer concrete, imitating natural granite, diorite and other igneous rocks. This includes the colossal pyramids and temples of Egypt, the enormous American Maya pyramids, grandiose constructions and castles of the Middle East, imposing structures like Stonehenge in England, France, etc. The rapturous speculations of the historians about the supposedly many thousands of slaves, who allegedly for decades toiled at the erection of the Egyptian pyramids, for example – these are the fantasies of the XVII-XX cc. The pyramids and many other enormous structures of 'antiquity' were made of concrete. Building them was certainly not a simple matter, but it was carried out by a comparatively small amount of qualified labourers in a fairly short amount of time.

After the Trojan War of the XIII century, in the epoch of the 'first wave' of the great conquest the 'Mongols' = the great ones create powerful fortification systems all over the Empire. For example, a network of the famous castles of 'Qatar' = Scythian castles in Western Europe. In particular a great number of them survive in France: fortress of Montsegur, Carcassonne and many more. Similar fortresses-castles were erected in the Middle East, in particular on the territory of modern Syria. The historians consider them to be the work of the Crusaders. On the whole they are right. But it is necessary to clarify that they are referring to the Horde-crusaders of the XIII-XIV cc., who came from Russia-Horde and who were spreading the Christian faith in all directions. Among the Crusaders' castles of the Middle East you can see some really enormous constructions, like the famous castles Krak (des Chevaliers) and Macabre, the might and the ingenious engineering solution of which still impress today, despite the fact, that in the epoch of the Ataman (Ottoman) conquest, i.e. the 'second wave', many of these fortresses were badly damaged. However, their main disintegration fell in the times of the Reformation of the XVI-XVII cc, when the raging rioters were wrecking crushing the Horde-'Mongolian' castles in the provinces of the Empire which had broken away from the metropolitan country.

In the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. the network of fortifications built throughout the entire Empire provided strict order. The Cossack-Horde military camps (including cavalry) were stationed within the castles, they controlled the vast territories and collected taxes.

Many of the castles were built on the top of the hills, mountains, rocky ridge for the visibility range and control over the transport routs. The soldiers, who served in these fortresses all over the Great Empire, began to be known as the Greben Cossacks, which meant: those sitting on the 'edge of the mountain'.

In the metropolitan country of the Empire, i.e. in Russia-Horde, a czar and the princes usually resided in the centre of the city, among their fellow citizens. For themselves personally the rulers would build a kremlin, surrounded with a motte-and-bailey. Moscow is such an example. There were no separate military castles built outside of the Russian-Horde cities.

An entirely different story unfolded in various lands colonized by the Horde. There the arriving Cossacks found themselves among the local foreign population. To control the vast territories the remote castles-fortresses were built, i.e. situated outside of the settlements and cities. In these mighty fortifications, usually on top of hills and mountains, the Hordian military camps were situated with their cavalry, ammunition, weaponry, etc. Hence the Hordian governors ruled the occupied regions. Thus the 'Mongol' elite and military would initially settle, on the whole, separately from the locals, not mixing with them. Of course in the future they would integrate and the original customs would be forgotten. So it was the necessity of the control over the Imperial provinces which would explain the presence of the considerable amount of the remote castles in Western Europe, in Syria, etc. and the absence of them in Russia, where the surrounding population was native.

In the XIII-XIV cc. the ruling establishment of the Empire professed the Royal, Hereditary Christianity. The regime of the czars-khans was indisputable and absolute. There were no rivals or competitors. The ruling class did not fear anybody. Alongside the military style of the castles-fortresses an opulent architectural style blossomed, known as the 'classical'. The massive circus-amphitheatres, temples with tall colonnades, gigantic palatial complexes, such as the legendary Palmyra and Apameia on the territory of Syria. There public worship took place, to here both the 'Mongol' czars-khans themselves and their numerous governors with their courts would arrive for celebrations.

In the XV century the Great Empire enveloped practically the entire populated world of that time. This empire is known to us from the Scaligerian history as the

worldwide Empire of Karol V, i.e. the Fifth King. For a reason it was said in the old chronicles that 'the sun never sets on' his Empire. The chroniclers were not mistaken here. Having set on Asia and Europe, the sun would rise in America.

Some chronicles called the metropolitan country of the Empire, i.e. Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc. - Israel. A czar-khan ruled over the kingdom from Vladimir and Suzdal Russia. The other part of the Empire allied to Russia, which appeared as a result of the conquest of the XV century, was The Ottoman Empire-Ottomania.

Czar-Grad became its capital in 1453. The Ottoman Empire-Ottomania was called Judaea. It was under these names - Israel and Judaea – that the two main parts of the 'Mongol' Empire are reflected in the pages of the Bible. The Ottoman Empire-Ottomania was called Judaea also because Czar-Grad = Biblical Jerusalem was its capital. According to the Bible, Jerusalem was situated in Judaea and was its capital.

Despite its vast territories, the 'Mongol' Empire for a long time existed as a single state. Since the XIII century Christianity was the doctrine of the Empire. However, Christianity in its modern sense, i.e. - the Apostles' Christianity – was adopted as a state religion only after the dramatic Battle of Kulikovo in 1380. In this battle the Russian-Hordian prince Dmitriy Donskoy – the Roman Emperor Constantine I the Great defeated the followers of the other Christian branch with khan Mamai, aka Ivan Velyaminov of the Russian chronicles, at the head of it.

In the Apostles' monasteries in Russia gunpowder and cannons were invented. The first cannons were wooden and were made of the oak trunks. The inventor of cannons is Holy Sergii Radonezhsky (the Western chroniclers called him Berthold Schwarz). The invention of this new incredible weapon was used intelligently by the Apostles' Christians in their fight against the emperors-'heretics'. In a critical moment the Battle of Kulikovo, the canons were put at the disposal of Dmitriy Donskoy = Constantine the Great, who acted in support of the Apostles' Christianity. His opponents, the believers in the 'Royal' Christianity united under the banners of khan Mamai = Ivan Veliaminov. The main military forces of the Empire were on their side. They didn't have a slightest doubt in their victory. On Dmitriy's = Constantine the Great's side only the militia assembled. But at the same time they had fire arms – cannons, which the enemy did not know about. It was those cannons = the 'Christian weapon' – which decided the battle. They possibly not so much defeated as inspired terror in the enemy. Dmitriy's victory was perceived by his contemporaries as a miracle. Having won, he made the Apostles' Christianity the state religion of the entire Empire [4v1], ch.6.

As we have said earlier, the Battle of Kulikovo by no means took place in the suburbs of the city of Tula, as think the historians, but in the location of present day Moscow, the future capital of the great Empire. In 1380 Moscow was still a small settlement. The field of Kulikovo was situated near the Moscow River, between the rivers Yauza and Neglinka, close to the present day Slavyanskaya square. See our reconstruction of Dmitriy Donskoy's (Constantine the Great) and Khan Mamai's (Maxentius = Licinius = Ivan Velyaminov) troops' movement in [fig.26](#), [fig.27](#).

The structure of the Christian Great Empire was very flexible due to the lack of an efficient communications infrastructure. The Hordian governors ruled in the provinces. In particular their responsibilities included the tax collection and prompt shipment of it to the metropolitan country. The Hordian Cossack military camps were stationed in the main cities and settlements and ensured order and the smooth collection of tax. The steady trade was running smoothly between various regions of the Empire. That is why in the provinces there evolved different areas of specialism – some countries had better developed agriculture (for example – Southern and Central Europe), some were good at ship building (for example, England and Spain), in some - blossomed medicine, literature and the arts on the whole (for example, in Italy), and in other there emerged 'resort' leisure zone (for example, in the South of France), etc. However, the accomplishments of all the regions of the Empire steadily contributed to the common 'Imperial piggy bank'.

The Czar-khan Dmitriy Donskoy = the Emperor Constantine the Great in the end of the XIV century moves the capital of the Empire from Russia to the Bosphorus, to the suburbs of Czar-Grad = Biblical Jerusalem, where Andronicus-Christ was crucified. A new city - Constantinople - is being built here, and thus emerges the second capital of the Great Russian Mediaeval Empire. A part of the Royal court and a great number of people left for the new place with the czar. This event is known from the history text books as Constantine the Great moving the capital from the 'Old Rome' in the IV century (i.e. from Vladimir and Suzdal Russia, as we understand it now) to the 'New Rome' in the Bosphorus, to the city of Byzantium. In Russia, in the first capital, there remained its own rulers. In the beginning the relations between those who stayed and those who left were peaceful. The main military forces of the Empire as before were situated in Russia, known as Israel. Czar-Grad became a new religious centre of the Empire. The area around it was referred to as Judaea. This prevailed for approximately 50-70 years. However, soon a new occurrence presented itself, without precedent. We will talk about it later.

## **8. FLORENCE, ROME, VATICAN.**

In the end of the great Slavic conquest of the XIV century, the Russian czars-khans established their domination over Western Europe. In particular, Horde has occupied and populated Italy. The Russians make Florence their capital in Italy. Thus in the first half of the XIV century in Italy there appear the Etruscan (the Russians). Among other things, they laid a foundation of a small town in Italian Lazio, which will later be called by the great name of Rome. Incidentally, it is deemed that 'the name of the new city itself – 'Roma' – is Etruscan in its origin [106], p.46. I.e. – Russian.

In the XIV century there were no popes in Italy yet. They appeared there much later, in the middle of the XV century [BAT] Possibly, Ivan Kalita had his field headquarters at the site of the future Italian Rome.

As the Slavic conquest of the XIV century took place as early as in the epoch of the Royal Christianity, the rulers of the Empire were deified. In particular, Ivan Kalita (Khalif), aka the legendary Pop Ivan or Prester John, was a czar-god. The czars-gods of that time were the supreme rulers of the state and the church simultaneously. I.E. THEY WERE KHALIFS or POPES. That is why the royal headquarters were, among other things, of utmost ecclesiastical importance. But when the czar was leaving it, the quarters would lose its significance. Nevertheless, in the place of the Royal quarters, as a rule, there would emerge the significant cities, proud of their history. Thus it was with the Italian Rome.

At first after the conquest of the early XIV century there could be no dispute between Florence and future Italian Rome. A small town left by the czar could not compete with a large and wealthy capital – Florence.

The situation took a twist in the middle of the XV century, when after the fall of Constantinople in 1453 the Italian Rome became a refuge for a part of the Constantinople's nobility fleeing the Ottoman conquest. The boyars from the immediate Royal entourage brought with them great wealth and kept their heads down for a while waiting for a right moment to begin their fight for the lost world domination. Since they needed to have some kind of plausible facade under which they could have existed for the time being, they seized the Vatican episcopal see and called their leaders popes. Though, up till the middle of the XVI century those popes were purely military people. They called the city where they settled Rome, as their old homeland was The New Rome – Constantinople. However, the fortification which they built for themselves, they called by the city's old name – Vatican.

Thus in the middle of the XV century a new history of the Italian Rome and Vatican began. In the XVI-XVII cc. the popes overcame the opposition of the rest of the Italian cities, including Florence. Rome became Italy's main city.

With the ascent of the popes in the XVI century in Italy there ended the Etruscan epoch and commenced a New-Roman epoch. Later all of this was deliberately dated (on paper) to deep antiquity. It was in the XVI-XVII cc. at the popes' court that the false version of history started to be created [BAT]

So, there were several 'foundations of Rome', and they were all in different locations. As a reminder, the first is the founding of the Old Rome circa X century in the African Egypt in the Nile Delta. The second Rome was founded in the Bosphorus circa the XI century. The third kingdom of Rome of Romulus and Remus (i.e. the famous 'ancient' Royal Rome, described by Titus Livy) was founded by Aeneas and his descendants in Russia-Horde of the XIII century [HOP] The Italian Rome was founded circa 1380.

## **9. TIN, COPPER, BRONZE.**

It is well known that the manufacture of tin is more complex than that of copper. That is why bronze, as alloy of copper and tin, must have appeared LATER than the invention of tin. In the Scaligerian history the situation is a completely the reverse. At first, allegedly, there was the invention of bronze. That is how the Bronze Age 'came about'. And supposedly only later tin, which is much more complex to produce, was invented. A contradiction occurred in the Scaligerian history. As a result, the 'ancient' Greek heroes strike each other with bronze swords, the production of which would require the 'yet to be invented' tin. The present day chemists are certainly surprised by such Scaligerian fantasies and are sincerely trying to guess the reasons for such oddities. In fact, the bronze century falls within the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc., when the production of tin was already invented. Certainly, after copper [1v], ch.1.

## **10. WHY THE RECURRING NAMES APPEARED ON THE MAPS OF THE XIV-XVI CC.**

The 'Mongol' conquest of Eurasia transferred many Russian-Turkic and Ataman (Ottoman) names of the cities, rivers and regions in all kinds of directions. The conquerors would arrive to the undeveloped lands, settle there and often call the new places with the traditional names, in memory of the homeland that they have left. For example, the name Horde, which appeared in England, in Spain and in many

locations in Western Europe, Asia and America, multiplied a number of times. The name of COSSACKS also multiplied, turning into the names of various regions, separated from each other by thousands of kilometres. For example - in Spain and in Japan [4v]. The same thing happened to a name RUS' (RUSSIA): there appeared P-Russia or Prussia, Persia, Paris, etc. The names of TATARS and TIRKOMEN (TURKI) also spread and gave birth to the name of the Francs in the West, the Turks in Asia, and also such names as Thrace, Africa, etc. [CTKP]

The natural transfer of the names along the routes of conquest in the XIV-XVI cc. overlapped later, in the XVII-XVIII cc. with another effect, which also led to the proliferation of the geographical names. One of the main results that we achieved is that the majority of the surviving ancient chronicles are LAYERED, as in their final form they were created or edited in the XVII-XVIII cc. The original chronicle would be overlaid with its duplicates, moreover, sometimes - with a chronological shift. It resulted with an elongated layered chronicle. This could recur several times. As a result, the events were doubled, the geography shifted, the dates were changed.

Something similar was happening in the XVII-XVIII cc. with the geographical descriptions.

# The first such descriptions were not the maps in the modern sense of this word, but just brief LISTS OF COUNTRIES AND NATIONS.

# Later the maps were depicted in the form of a circle divided into three sectors – Europe, Asia and Africa. These sections were defined by the form of a Christian T-shaped cross. Inside each sector the corresponding countries and nations were listed. This is exactly what the old Scandinavian maps look like in the geographical tracts [5v1], ch.11.

# With the development of the coastwise navigation, i.e. along the coasts, the maps with the rough contours of the countries appeared. The first navigators, constrained to keep to the shore, represented the seas as long rivers. It was as yet difficult for them to appreciate the scope of the seas and the oceans due to lack of a mariner's compass [1v], ch.5:11.

# Only later, with the beginning of the epoch of the Great geographical discoveries of the XV-XVI cc, with the invention of the compass, we see, that the countries and the seas on the maps of the XVI-XVIII cc. started to acquire much more credible contours and the geographical descriptions became more detailed. In the XIV-XVI cc. many geographical names multiplied, being transferred by the Hordian conquerors to the various regions of the world colonized by them.

# In the XVII-XVIII cc. a new Scaligerian history and a 'new geography' started being created and adopted. As the original geographical maps had an appearance of texts and lists of names, they unavoidably were subjected to the 'Scaligerian duplication', in a similar way to the chronicles.

In the XVII-XVIII cc. the historians began to wipe out the Great Empire from the chronicles. Besides, many imperial names were removed from the maps and replaced with different ones. They could also be relocated. A number of the geographical shifts-relocations were made. For example, it was declared that the Biblical Jerusalem 'was always situated' in present day Palestine, but it 'was never situated' in the Bosphorus. The Romanovs' historians began to claim, that the chronicle history of Velikii Novgorod unfolded on the swampy desolate banks of the Volkhov River, but not at all on the banks of the Volga River, in the famous Yaroslavl and around it. And so on and so forth.

All the activities on the remaking of the geographical maps were purely office work i.e. was carried out on paper. Some famous 'Mongol' names were given to 'still vacant' spots on Earth. Then, the imperial names, which were transferred over there, were 'stuck' to the real nations, who lived there, and embedded into their conscience, writing system, geography and science along with the bits of the former history of Russia-Horde and The Atamania (Ottoman Empire), which were confiscated by force and replanted into the new places. The events which took place, for example, in Russia, were transferred - on paper - to the territory of modern China.

The missionaries, already with the Scaligerian maps in their hands, arrived, for instance, to Africa or China and announced to the natives what their country and they themselves were called in the 'ancient times'. And also what deeds their ancestors committed. At first the natives were baffled and shrugged their shoulders, but then agreed contentedly.

Thus, the geographical names of the various regions of the 'Mongol' Empire began to wander at first on paper, and later across the world. This process concluded only in the XVIII-XIX cc.

## **11. THE RIDDLE OF THE ETRUSCANS.**

Let us look at the history of the Etruscans in more detail. To recap, in the XIII century the Trojan War takes place, as the result of which the GOTHs – TATARS – TARQUINII – 'MONGOLS' – RUSSIANS – seize Czar-Grad. After a while the



'MONGOLS'= THE GREAT ONES, aka the Tarquini = the Tatar Khans invade the West. This is at the very beginning of the XIV century.

Specifically they colonize Italy and are firmly established in Florence. At the end of the XIV century the Etruscans (the Russians) lay the foundation of a small fortification, calling it Rome. The word ROME could have originated from a Russian word RAMO = a shoulder, an arm, a part of an arm up to an elbow. The plural - is RAMENA, in Russian. This is an old form. Hence the word RAMA (meaning a 'frame' in Russian), as a space restricted by something. The Russian word ARMIYA (meaning ARMY) and the English ARMOUR, also originate from here. The Greek ROMEA could have also come from here. The current belief that ROME is an 'ancient', purely Latin word is a consequence of inaccurate chronology.

The name Rome was also considered to be a reference to THE ENTIRE STATE (denomination of the state as the whole). The Latini used the word Urbis = City for Rome, and Orbis – world, universe. A corresponding Russian word is MIR (meaning WORLD in Russian). Many times we came across the backwards reading of names in the multilingual chronicles. For example, the Arabs and the Jews read from the right to the left; the Europeans read from the left to the right. That is why the words MIR (WORLD in Russian) and RIM (ROME in Russian) could have turned into each other when read by the peoples of different nationalities. Thus the MONGOLIAN WORLD would turn into the GREAT ROME and vice versa.

There is as yet an unsolved puzzle in Scaligerian history. Namely – THE ETRUSCANS. The people, who allegedly, even before the founding of Rome in the VIII century BC, appeared in Italy, created a wonderful culture there and then mysteriously vanished leaving behind numerous artefacts covered with incomprehensible writings, which are indecipherable to many generations of the scientists despite their strenuous efforts.

In our concept the 'riddle of the Etruscans' is resolved. It turns out that in the XIX century the scientists A.D.Chertkov and F.Volansky proposed their solution. They discovered the method of decoding and reading the Etruscan inscriptions. According to them THESE INSCRIPTIONS WERE SLAVONIC. THEREFORE THE ETRUSCANS WERE SLAVS. It became clear why the Etruscans called themselves 'Rasenna', i.e. the Rasens, the Russians [106], p.72.

However, the solution of the Etruscan riddle, put forward by these scientists, despite the indisputable interpretation of at least several Etruscan texts, conflicted with the spirit of Scaligerian history entirely. This was enough TO UNDERMINE BELIEF in A.D. Chertkov and F.Volansky, despite the fact that nobody could contest their theory.

It seems there was nothing to object to – as A.D. Chertkov and F.Volansky in fact had successfully read many Etruscan inscriptions. Until today, for over a hundred years, the Etruscologists kept quiet about the findings of these scientists.

Furthermore, probably not being able to find other ways to oppose A.D.Chertkov and F.Volansky, some people began to deliberately mock them by earnestly publishing the 'research' with supposedly similar, but obviously meaningless 'decoding' (for example S.Grinevich, V.A.Chudinov). Substituting the opponents' arguments with other meaningless arguments is a dishonest, but, unfortunately, prevailing method of 'scientific warfare'.

This position is understandable. On one hand, what retort can one have if many Etruscan inscriptions indeed – as A.D.Chertkov and F.Volansky show us – can be read and understood based on use of Slavonic languages. You cannot really say that 'it is a coincidence'. On the other hand it is impossible to concur with it. If the Etruscans were Slavs, than it immediately follows, that they must have been Russian!

So what does it mean then? – Can it be that it was the Russians who founded the Italian Etruria? – the 'centre of the most ancient civilization in Italy and the eternal patroness and protector of religions' – according to the cardinal Egidio da Viterbo [106], p.4.

So what then? – The Russians lived in Italy before the founding of Rome. In Scaligerian history this would be inconceivable. But in the new chronology all obstacles to the acceptance of A.D. Chertkov and F.Volansky's results are removed. Furthermore, it would be extremely odd if the Russian-Turk conquest left no traces in the Italy of the XIV-XVI cc. As it was Etruscan 'Mongols' = the Mighty who arrived there in the XIII-XIV cc., prior to the founding of Italian Rome in the XIV-XV cc.

Some scientists are trying to comprehend the obvious traces of the wide spreading of the old Slavic objects and inscriptions found all over Eurasia, and are doing their best to find a place in Scaligerian chronology, where they could insert all of this prolific Slavic material. But as all of the Middle Ages 'was full up', they have to go into a distant past and come up with theories of certain 'most ancient' Proto-Slavic people. In our view all such findings relate not to the Protoslavs (who, indeed existed at some point, but about whom we know nothing of today), but to the Mediaeval Slavs. It was they who in the XIV century conquered Eurasia and North Africa, and in the XV century – America too.

For the first time the theory of the Etruscan language being Slavonic was expressed not by Chertkov, but by the Italian scientist Etruscan scholar Sebastiano Ciampi with whom Chertkov was personally acquainted. It was Ciampi who we can credit with

the idea that the Etruscans were Slavic. However, not meeting with any approval in the scientific community, he did not follow through with his research. Chertkov developed Ciampi's theory, scientifically tested it and gave a definitive proof that the language of the Etruscans is indeed Slavonic [5v2].

I would like to draw your attention to an interesting fact. Here, for example, one of the Etruscan inscriptions, cited by Volansky [5v2], ch.3. How did the 'Etruscan specialists' manage to avoid reading this inscription?! IT WAS WRITTEN WITH REGULAR SLAVONIC LETTERS. And, moreover from left to right. What difficulties could prevent them from reading this text? We think, that the explanation is as follows. They consciously didn't want to. But why? Here is the answer.

In the West all the traces of the fact, that the great conquest of the XIV century and the conquest of the XV-XVI cc. were in fact Slavic and Russian-Turkic, were being destroyed. After the Reformation, in the XVII-XVIII cc., there arose an UNSPOKEN BAN ON ANY REFERENCE TO THE FORMER RUSSIAN PRESENCE IN THE WESTERN EUROPE. It found its expression in, particularly, a virtual ban on even trying to use any Slavonic languages to read so called 'illegible' inscriptions from Western Europe.

A new perception of the Etruscan history leads to a new approach to ancient Russian history of the XIV-XVI cc. Since the XVI century it was persistently impressed upon us that the Russian culture prior to the XVII century was of a very low level compared to the Western-European culture. And after the XVII century even more so. So, without trying to touch upon all the aspects of Etruscan life, i.e. a life of the Russians and Turks in Western Europe, let us see what the Etruscans achieved in the arts, medicine, etc. and how they did it. It becomes clear that they were able to do quite a lot. Here, for instance, are the words of the 'ancient' Diodorus Siculus (most likely a XVI-XVII cc. author), informing us of the high achievements of the Etruscans in science, culture and military arts. Many 'ancient' authors tell us about it.

The 'Etruscans', notable for their energy from time immemorial, conquered a vast territory and founded a great many cities. They created a mighty fleet and were the masters of the seas for a very long time... improved on the regulation of the army... They introduced writing, zealously studied the science of the Deities and mastered the observation of lightening. That is why until now they inspire awe in us ...' Diodorus Siculus. XIV, 113. Quote according to [574], the back cover.

## **12. ANCIENT EGYPT.**

We have decoded a number of dates recorded on the zodiacs of ancient Egypt. It was achieved by means of a radically new method of a complete decoding of the zodiacs developed by A.T.Fomenko and G.V.Nosovskiy [HXE] [3v2].

Thanks to the resources available to us for the first time and vast computer-generated astronomical calculations it has become possible to determine dozens of dates recorded on the ancient zodiacs. All of these dates fell into the same epoch – not earlier than the XI century. The newly discovered astronomical findings proved to be unique for the vast majority of the Egyptian zodiacs. The complete decoding of the horoscopes on the Egyptian zodiacs determined by A.T.Fomenko and G.V.Nosovsky included some partial decoding by N.A.Morozov and T.N.Fomenko suggested earlier. However it differs from them in some details.

Based on the received data we can claim that the 'pharaonic' history of Egypt by no means unfolded over hundreds and thousands of years BC, as it is commonly thought, but in the epoch of the XI-XVI cc. AD.

The dates on the Egyptian wooden coffin-sarcophagi are interesting. They can be found in the illustrated books on Ancient Egypt and are considered to be 'very ancient'. But now it has become possible to establish precisely their true age in some instances. The fact is that on coffin lids there are sometimes depicted zodiacs with the date of death encoded in them. For example, the decoding of one of them - the Brugsch zodiac - gave us the middle of the XIX century! In other words, the 'ancient' Egyptians (aka, possibly, mamelukes) even 150 years ago were making such coffins and buried their dead in them. And now they are exhibited in many museums as alleged artifacts of the 'most ancient' history. Let us turn our attention to the history of Egypt in more detail.

# The history of Egypt gradually steps out of obscurity only from the XI-XII cc.

# The Egyptian history from the XI to the XIII cc. is very poorly covered in the documents which survive today.

# The history of Ancient Russia and the history of African Egypt are closely intertwined. The written and archaeological history of African 'Ancient' Egypt known to us today – is, essentially, its history as a part of the Horde Empire of the XIV-XVI cc.

We certainly shouldn't think, that the 'mongols' = the mighty, who invaded Egypt in the XIV century, left the Russian-Turkic people unaltered over subsequent centuries. They settled in the lands of Central and North-African, mixed with the local

population and soon forgot their origins. But they made a notable contribution to the history and culture of Egypt.

# The famous 30 dynasties of the Egyptian pharaohs are on the whole the phantom reflections of the dynasties of the czar-khans of the XIII-XVI cc.

# The 'ancient' pharaohs of Egypt were the Russian-Turkic czars-khans of Russia-Horde and The Atamania (Ottoman Empire). They ruled the Empire. During their life time they appeared in African Egypt very rarely. However after their death they were undoubtedly brought here for their burial in the Central 'Mongolian' cemetery. In particular, to Giza and Luxor.

# The country of Egypt described in the Bible, is Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc. [6v1], ch.4.

# The period from the first half of the XIV century to the end of the XVI century contributed the most into the history of 'Ancient' Egypt. Here many of the famous Egyptian events were focused. In this respect the Egyptian history is not an exception. In documents that survive today the history of the other regions of the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. weighs heavily the history of the preceding epochs.

This is the epoch of the Great Empire. The conquest of the XIV century is reflected in the history of 'Ancient' Egypt as the so called the 14th dynasty of pharaohs – the Hyksos (the Mamelukes). The Egyptologists erroneously dated them to the years 1786-1570 BC. Incidentally, with remarkable accuracy – accurate, purportedly, to within one year!

The Mamelukes formed an exclusive ruling military caste in Egypt, similar to the samurai in Japan, for example. They hardly ever mixed with the rest of the population and were the Cossack-Hordian rulers of the Empire. They guarded the central imperial cemetery and oversaw the construction of the burial complexes. The social class of the Mamelukes was annihilated in the XIX century, after Napoleon. Later on the reign in Egypt was passed on to the Europeans. The local population was indoctrinated with the belief that their former rulers, the Mamelukes were evil.

The events following the 'Mongol' conquest of the XIV century date to the 18th dynasty of the pharaohs. The Egyptologists erroneously date it to the years 1570-1342 BC.

# The period of time from the end of the XVI century to year 1798. At first - the ruling of the Atamans (Ottomans) until 1585, followed by the second dynasty of the Mamelukes. It concludes with Napoleon's invasion of Egypt in 1798.

# Egypt was the religious and cultural centre of Romea of the XI-XIII centuries, and then – of the 'Mongol' Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. Here were written the chronicles including those on the stone monuments, describing not African Egypt itself as such, but the entire Great Empire, widespread over the vast territories. All the way to the Far East and America. By no means are all the hieroglyphic texts of 'Ancient' Egypt read and translated today [4v2], ch.8:3.

The African-Egyptian priests recorded the deeds of the distant Hordian czars-khans and Ottoman sultans. Later after the creation of Scaligerian history it was cunningly declared that the Egyptian chronicles exclusively describe African Egypt and its surroundings. In doing so the historians of the XVII-XIX cc. severely diminished the true scale of the 'Egyptian' events. The history of the entire vast 'Mongol' Empire was squeezed into small territorial size, 'replanted' to Africa and sent back into the remote past. So that it didn't interfere with the manufacture of the Scaligerian myth.

There are many riddles in the history of Egypt. Now they disappear. It becomes clear that Ancient Egypt, as in fact the other ancient civilizations, is just a few hundred years before us. In the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. Egypt was only a small part of the Great Empire, although it is possible that it was Egypt which was the motherland of its czarist dynasty. Here the necropolis of the royal family was situated. That is precisely why nearly all the 'ancient' Egyptian inscriptions describe exclusively the burial rites. The Egyptian population was assigned the role of labourers and guardians of this cemetery. The czars-pharaohs didn't live themselves in Egypt. They were brought here posthumously.

The Egyptians built and decorated the royal tombs, temples and other burial constructions. All of this was carried out not by local means, but based on the resources of the entire Empire.

According to some scientists, the imposing Great Sphinx, which is situated close to the pyramids, 'represented four elements, in the form of a bull, an eagle, a lion and a human'. See [5v2], ch.6. The Great Sphinx is considered to be the most ancient structure in Egypt. The builders constructed an enormous rock and covered it... with stone blocks in order to give it the form of a Sphinx. But the symbols of a Bull, an Eagle, a Lion and a Man are considered to be the symbols of the evangelists [936], v.1, p.513.

It turns out that the Great Sphinx of Giza simply combines these Christian symbols into one monumental sculpture. So what is this symbol? It is a very familiar Christian Cherubim. It is he who has the four faces of a lion, a man, an eagle and a bull. That is what the ecclesiastical legends tell us [5v2], ch.6. Therefore it is A CHRISTIAN

SYMBOL – A CHERUBIM which overlooks the field of the pyramids in Giza. Not far from it are situated numerous other cherub-sphinxes. They form the Valley of the Sphinxes.

The Circassians, i.e. the Cossacks, the Mamelukes, who assumed power in Egypt purportedly in the middle of the XIII century – are those famous Hyksos of 'Ancient' Egyptian history. The Hyksos invasion is one of the reflections of the 'Mongol' invasion of the XIV century. It was at that time when the Great Sphinx was erected by the Hyksos-Cossacks in Christian Giza, i.e. Cossack pyramid field in Giza as a Cherubic symbol. Here emerged the central burial complex of the entire 'Mongol' Empire.

### **13. THE PYRAMIDS AND THE BURIAL MOUNDS.**

The Great Pyramid was erected not earlier than the XIV century, in the epoch of the Great Empire. There survive some information about only one of the rulers, who built the Great Pyramid. It is Khufu or Kun-Aten.

Herodotus tells us that while constructing the Great Pyramid IRON TOOLS were used [163], p.119, book II Euterpe, paragraph 125. For the XIV-XV cc. it is not only unsurprising, but absolutely typical. It is clear why also a STEEL chisel was found set within the masonry of the Khufu Pyramid [1v], ch.1.

The Egyptian pyramids are just one form of the Scythian mounds. In the modern Egyptology 'a question about the origins of the word 'pyramid' remains unsolved. Many people think...that the word 'PYRAMID' originates from the Greek PYRAMIS (from PYROS) meaning 'A SWEET CAKE MADE FROM HONEY AND WHEAT'. This cake had a shape of a cone, and Greek pilgrims compared it with a pyramid' [464], p.49.

Still in existence today is a well-known Christian Orthodox symbol called PASKHA (meaning Easter cake). It has the shape of a PYRAMID on the sides of which are usually depicted an egg and some steps, Cyrillic letters XB = Christ is Risen, i.e. the symbols of Christ's Resurrection. Today the Easter cake is made out of curd, but earlier it could have possibly been made as a cake, i.e. – baked.

It is possible, that the Egyptian pyramid-mounds are the depiction of the Christian Easter cake. And today on the edges of the 'Easter' cake-pyramid there are depicted Christian symbols. So what was carved out on the gigantic stone edges of the

Egyptian pyramids? Weren't they those very symbols? Following the religious schism of the XVII century all such Christian imagery was obliterated.

Our idea is directly supported by the 'ancient' Egyptian customs and images. In 'Ancient' Egypt there were wide spread pyramidia (plural form of pyramidion) – small pyramids varying in size from several centimetres to several dozens of centimetres. They were used to decorate buildings with. They prepared festive food for holidays in the shape of small pyramids. The pyramidions 'were often painted WHITE' [1360], p.44 And furthermore: 'The pyramidions made of stone were regarded as the objects in which the 'SUN GOD' lived [1360], p.45. But it was Christ who was called the Sun! So here it is said practically directly, that 'the 'ancient' Egyptians were making the pyramid shaped Easter cakes (Easter pyramidions) in honour of Christ.

The Great Pyramids naturally fit in the epoch of the monumental constructions, which blossomed in the XIV-XVI cc. all over the Empire. They are: 1) The Great Wall of China, 2) the magnificent cathedrals of Western Europe, 3) the indomitable Kremllins and fortifications in Russia-Horde, 4) the massive Hagia Sophia in Istanbul, aka (according to our reconstruction) – The Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem = Czar-Grad, 5) the Great Sphinx, 6) the Great Pyramids and temples of Egypt 7) the great pyramids and temples of Central America, in particular Mexico, 8) gigantic constructions of Baalbeck (Lebanon). [Fig. 28](#) shows an interesting image (from an old Japanese book) of the pyramids with crosses on the top and statues of angels on the side.

It is plausible that the three Egyptian pyramids depicted the Christian Holy Trinity. It is possible that is exactly why one of the three pyramids – Khufu Pyramid = Got – is noticeably bigger than the other two. It represented the Father. Pharaoh Khufu = Got in 'ancient times' was called SAOFIS [5v2], ch.7. Could it be – a distortion of ZEBATH = The Father? The Great Pyramid and the Great Sphinx in front of it were built probably as a symbol of God 'bestriding' the Cherubim.

Alternatively there could also be another explanation. The Great Pyramid symbolized The Holy Sepulchre, i.e. Christ's coffin. The colossal scale of the monument emphasized the might of the Horde Empire which created it. This could only be within the power of a rich state. Only a wealthy state could afford to make something like that.

The three large pyramids were hardly used for the burials. There are no inscriptions or images on the sarcophagus in the Great Pyramid of Cheops. It more likely resembles a treasure chest. There could have been a lot of such 'chests' there before.



Here a part of the Empire's treasury was kept, as an 'emergency reserve stock'. A passage inside the chamber was covered with an enormous stone slab, which was propped up from underneath. After the attendants left the chamber, the prop was kicked out, the stone slab came crushing down the stone runners and walled up the chamber. Sometime later it was opened and the treasures were taken. The old texts say quite justly that allegedly inside the pyramid a reservoir of embossed gold coins was discovered; there were about 1000 denarii, each weighing an ounce. Al Mamoun admired the purity of this gold. Al Mamoun ordered to transfer it (the pool, - Author's note) into his treasury [464], p.39.

It is generally thought that the Egyptian pyramids are something unique. Purporting that at the very least there are no pyramids and there never were any, neither in Europe nor in Asia. But it is not so! Pyramids are well known in Eurasia, particularly in Russia. THEY ARE – KURGANS. Besides it is evident that it is not the pyramids that preceded the mounds, but the other way round. The Great Egyptian Pyramids are in a certain sense the pinnacle of the 'mound architecture'.

It is wrong to think that the mounds should always automatically be burial mounds. The mounds were also used as the civic buildings. For example – they were used as churches. An enormous 'Tsarsky Kurgan' (Royal Mound) not far from the city of Kerch in Crimea, IN THE MIDDLE AGES WAS A CHRISTIAN CHURCH. It is a well-known fact, the explanation of which is given on the sign at the entrance to the mound [5v2], ch.7.

Tsarsky Kurgan is built as a Christian church. There is an altar with wonderful acoustics, Holy doors and a prayer area for the congregation. Three steps lead up to the amvon, to the altar, as befits a Christian church.

Moreover, the Kurgan structure was laid out in the form of a church FROM THE OUTSET. It is impossible to rebuild it without destroying the entire kurgan. Which means that we are dealing here not with a burial site, which was robbed and later adapted as a church, but with an original Christian church. Kurgan or a pyramid is a stone structure built without any binding solution. To protect from the rain penetrating such a house-kurgan, it was covered up with soil. The main difference between the Egyptian pyramids and the kurgans is only in the fact that they are not covered with soil. But this can be explained by the particular qualities of the climate in Egypt. It hardly ever rains there.

## **14. EGYPT – THE LAND OF CROSSES.**

The idea that the religion of 'Ancient' Egypt is not connected with Christianity has been instilled in us. However, when liberated from the trappings of Scaligerian chronology, a different picture emerges. For example, 'Ancient' Egypt is considered to be a classic 'land of crosses'. Many Egyptian deities featured on the drawings and the bass-reliefs hold in their hands a mediaeval symbol (anagram) for Christ – a cross with a loop (the Ankh Cross). For example, the gods Re-Herakhte, [fig.29](#), the goddess of moisture Tefnut, the sacred lions of Shu and Tefnut, etc. [2v1], ch.1. On the backs of the thrones of both Egyptian statues, known today as the Colossi of Memnon, there survive enormous wide Orthodox crosses, [fig.30](#) [5v2], ch.7. Here is another example of an impressive 'ancient' Egyptian sculpture of a pharaoh, on the back of the throne of which an Orthodox Christian cross is carved out, [fig.31](#). It could not have been otherwise, as Egypt of the Pharaohs was a Christian country of the epoch of the XIII-XVI cc.

Similar Christian crosses often can be seen in 'ancient' India, Mesopotamia and Persia. There is a simple explanation to this. All over the 'Mongol' Empire in the XIII-XVI cc. Christianity was the state religion. At first – Royal Christianity, and then – the Apostles' Christianity. That is why people worshiped Christ and used a cross and the other Christian symbols in the religious symbolism.

## **15. THE SARCOPHAGI AND THE RUSSIAN DOLLS.**

We know that the Egyptian sarcophagi with mummies are arranged in a remarkable manner. The coffins are enclosed within each other in order of decreasing size. Only the last one contained a mummy itself. Each coffin represented a HOLLOW FIGURE OF A PERSON - with a face, wearing the robes and a head-dress, and displaying the symbols of authority. For example, the scheme of the sarcophagus of Tutankhamun, See [fig.32](#).

Does it remind you of anything familiar? Well, of course, the famous Russian dolls (matryoshka)! Several interleaved hollow figurines, resembling each other, becoming progressively smaller, only the last of which is solid. Each one of them is painted and represents a person. As far as we know this symbol – a doll - existed only in Russia. And, as we can see, in 'Ancient' Egypt as well!

It is probable that in the Russian folk art there survives a memory of the ANCIENT RUSSIAN-HORDIAN CUSTOM – to bury the czars in coffins – matryoshka. The Hordian czars and sultans atamans (ottomans) of the XIV-XVI cc. were buried in the Imperial cemetery in African Egypt according to the Russian tradition.

Earlier, before the Romanovs, Christian burial methods were prevalent in Russia, which was unusual from a modern perspective. In particular, the ANTHROPOMORPHIC SARCOPHAGI, i.e. tombs made in the form of a human body [5v2], ch.7. Just like in 'Ancient' Egypt! These customs were especially significant in Vladimir and Suzdal Russia.

Some scientists point out the correlation between these Russian tombs, Byzantian and the 'ancient' Egyptian tombs, but presume that the RUSSIAN ANTHROPOMORPHIC SARCOPHAGI were adopted from the Egyptian ones. However, most likely it was the other way round, such a type of sarcophagus came to 'Ancient' Egypt from Vladimir and Suzdal Russia together with the 'Mongol' conquest of the XIV century.

The anthropomorphic sarcophagi are constantly being found in Moscow during excavations. For instance, in a former Bogoyavlensky Monastery (Epiphany Monastery) close to the Kremlin [62], p.79. These Russian sarcophagi are made in the form of the human body, with a head and shoulders.

In the Kremlin's Arckhangelsky Cathedral at least some of the tombs of the Russian princes (most likely symbolic) were made in the following way: a wooden coffin was enclosed inside a stone sarcophagus. Thus the 'matryoska-like' burials were indubitably made in Russia. Today's Russian doll souvenirs are reminiscent of this custom from our ancient past. In [4v2], ch.2:6, we have shown that between 1632 and 1636 the Romanovs reformed the Church, in particular they dramatically changed the burial customs in Russia. Then a wave of the Romanov 'pogroms' swept through the Russian cemeteries.

In the new chronology the history of ancient Egypt of the XI-XVI cc. as before occupies the place of the most ancient ones. But some of the 'most ancient' customs survived until the middle of the XIX century.

## **16. TUTANKHAMUN AND CZAREVICH DMITRY.**

By calling a young pharaoh Tutankhamun, we rely on the reading of the hieroglyphs with which he is so named in his tomb and, possibly, in some texts. In reality most likely, he had a different name. As the royal cemetery of the Horde Empire was situated in Egypt. Consequently Tutankhamun was one of the czareviches (princes) of the Empire. You will recall that HE DIED VERY YOUNG [1366], p.24, 117.

It is hard to say who Tutankhamun actually was. However, the fact that he was a CHILD, and there were DAGGERS attached to the belt of his mummy (most likely

there was a particular importance placed on them), suggests that Tutankhamun is czarévich Dmitry. Dmitry died in the end of the XVI century in Uglich, allegedly by accidentally stabbing himself with a dagger whilst playing a game. This is one version of the story.

In this context the following fact acquires a particular tone. On the left side of Tutankhamun's mummy there was discovered a cut in an unusual place. Experts believe it to be an embalming incision whilst acknowledging its 'unusual' location [1366], p.117. However, it is quite possible that a cut in such an unusual place appeared not during the embalming process, but whilst the czar was still alive. Could it be the deadly cut of a knife with which Czarévich Dmitry 'stabbed' himself? Therefore this wound could have been used during the embalming. Furthermore, a splinter was embedded in Tutankhamun's skull, which is said to be a possible cause of his death [1366], p.118. Here is the medical professionals' opinion: 'The fact, that the czar (Tutankhamun - author's note) was murdered, however, appears increasingly plausible' [1366], p.118. See [5v2], ch.7.

There were two daggers discovered on Tutankhamun's mummy – one iron, the other – made of gold. It is possible that the grieving relatives put them there as a sign of czarévich Dmitry having been murdered by the blows of several knives or daggers. The 'classical authors' Suetonius and Flavius write about several swords, when telling us about Caligula = Czarévich Dmitry [PI]. A first-hand account survives to this day, that the relatives of murdered czarévich Dmitry in fact did put the assassin's knife on him: 'There (in the church – author's note) still rested Dmitry's body stained with blood, and ON TOP OF THE BODY – THE ASSASSINS' KNIFE... having seen this angelic peaceful face, blood and the KNIFE, he shuddered' [362], v.10, ch.2, column 80. So, it was like this - with a dagger (or two) on his body Dmitry-Tutankhamun-Caligula was buried.

To conclude, it is plausible, that from the remote XVI century the original mummy of czarévich Dmitry, aka the 'ancient' emperor Gaius Caligula, aka young pharaoh Tutankhamun survives to this day. But 'czarévich Dmitry's tomb', which today is situated in the Cathedral of the Archangel in Moscow's Kremlin, is merely symbolic.

## **17. PHARAOHS' BOATS–STRUGI.**

The 'Pharaohs of Egypt' were the czars-khans of the Great Empire. They by no means lived on the territory of modern Egypt, but far from Africa. After they died their bodies were embalmed and transported to Africa by large boats-strugi.

By such oared boats (strugi) it was possibly to travel both on rivers and by sea along the shore. According to chronicles, the Russians went to sea by strugi as far as Constantinople. Cossacks' strugi went to sea as early as in the XVII century. The longer such boats were, the easier they endured sea waves. It is possible that this particular fact explains the large dimension of the two 'ancient' Egyptian pharaohs' boats – approximately 40 metres long, found in the underground chambers close to the Pyramid of Cheops in Egypt. [Fig.33a](#) shows the front part of the pharaoh's ship in an assembled state. See also [fig.33b](#), [fig.33c](#). Below you can see displayed the layout of the boat-strug's parts in the underground storage chamber. The images of the Russian strugi [5v2], ch.7 bear a close resemblance to the pharaohs' boats, [fig.2](#).

The 'Mongolian' burial strugi-boats transporting the body of a czar-khan would arrive to the sea port of Alexandria at the mouth of Nile, go up the Nile and reach Cairo with its royal cemetery in Giza. After this the strugi-boats were buried close to the pharaohs.

The pharaohs' boats were made of the long wooden planks, [fig.33a](#), [fig.33b](#), [fig.33c](#). The edges of the planks were very smooth and fitted together very well. The boards of the ship's body curved and were also very well adjusted. The technology of curving the boards is quite complex and indicates an advanced level of ship building expertise. The 'ancient' craftsmen evidently used saws. It would be difficult to build such a boat with a common axe. Provided, that the saws should be made of iron or steel. Most likely, in front of us are the strugi-boats of the XIV-XVII cc. They can hardly be four thousand six hundred years old. As we are lead to believe that allegedly Ancient Egypt had no knowledge of iron or steel saws. This is the exact reason why the iron objects occasionally found in the pharaohs' tombs are declared to be rare and unique, or 'by chance' placed there during the later epochs.

[Fig. 34](#) [HOP] ch.6, presents the scenes from life in 'Ancient' Egypt on the Rekhmire tomb's frescos in the Valley of the Kings in Luxor. At the top on the right and at the bottom on the left we can see the builders sawing wooden joists and planks with hack saws. You can see the teeth of the blades very well. Therefore steel was used in 'Ancient' Egypt. It is impossible to make a hack saw out of copper or bronze. Copper is too soft, and bronze is too fragile. The teeth of the bronze hack saw would break straight away.

## **18. CONCRETE AND THE PHILOSOPHERS STONE.**

In [5v2], ch.7, we are, among other things, trying to deal with the issue of the pyramids' construction. The Egyptologists paint beautiful, but fantastical pictures on

this subject for us. And it is not just about the pyramids, but also about other colossal constructions of Ancient Egypt. We are told about vast crowds of 'ancient Egyptian slaves' who allegedly cut blocks of stone weighting up to 200-500 tons in the mountains, moreover, supposedly with copper hack saws (?!). Then these monstrous blocks were allegedly dragged across the sand, in some mysterious way ferried across the Nile, and eventually from them, like from some little blocks, allegedly the pyramids were assembled. This being said, the height of the Great Pyramid of Cheops (Khufu) is approximately 140 metres.

Up until now they have come up with some fairy tale notions – how the enormous blocks were transported and supposedly lifted. On paper they draw some ingenious elevating machinery or gigantic sand ramps by which allegedly large-tonnage blocks were dragged up to the height of tens of metres. And to think that some of these blocks weigh several hundred tons! See [464], p.189.

In fact there are no puzzles there. There is only one puzzle: how could the Egyptologists 'not see', that the great majority of the blocks of the big pyramids, apart from the veneer and some internal constructions, WERE MADE OF CONCRETE.

The problem of rock and ore fragmentation in antiquity was solved after a sort of shattering of grain – mortars, attrition mills, grindstones. In the region of the gold Gebeit minefield in the Red Sea mountains, Doctor of Geological Science A.V.Razvaliaev examined dozens of grindstones with a diameter of up to 50-60 cm for splitting gold ore. The primary rock was ground with millstones and carried to the river bank for tossing (the washing process). There are smaller breaking devices known to us – grating machines, discovered in the Egyptian desert [5v2], ch.7.

This simple technology quickly resulted in the invention of concrete. What is concrete? In order to make it you need to grind down primary rocks into a dust-like powder. It's easiest to use soft formations. For example limestone, the sources of which are situated in the pyramids field in Egypt. In order for the powder to turn into dry cement it is necessary to thoroughly dry it or bake it in a fire for the moisture to evaporate. But in Egypt's arid and hot conditions, where rain falls sometimes only every five years [5v2], ch.7, the special dehumidifying of the powder was unnecessary. The thin dry powder is then sifted into a kind of mould and then into an encasement. This is then filled with water and mixed together. The solution solidifies and turns into stone. I.e. into concrete. Sometimes powder was mixed up with small finely broken stones. In this case there were fine little stones embedded in the final block.

After some time it becomes difficult to distinguish such concrete blocks apart from those carved out of the same rock, as they disintegrate and take the form of the 'natural stones'.

Many years ago a French chemistry professor of the University of Bern Joseph Davidovits put forward an interesting hypothesis [1092]. Analysing the chemical make-up of the 'monoliths' of which the pyramids are made of, he suggested that they were comprised of concrete and determined 13 components of which it could have been made. Just several crews of the 'ancient' Egyptian concrete stone layers could have easily erected a pyramid 100-150 metres high. And moreover, in a rather short amount of time. In any case not dozens of years.

J.Davidovits founded a new branch of applied chemistry called geopolymer chemistry. 'Any rock can be used in a finely fragmented state, and geopolymer cement made of it is practically indistinguishable from the natural stone. Geologists who are unfamiliar with the possibilities of geopolymer chemistry... mistake geopolymer cement for natural stone... Neither high temperatures, nor high pressure are required to produce such artificial stone. Geopolymer concrete quickly sets under the room temperature and turns into a beautiful artificial stone' [1092], p.69.

To invent geopolymer cement the only thing necessary was many years of observations and experiments. The alchemists could have done this perfectly well. The geopolymer cement of the pyramids, statues and obelisks of Egypt was in fact invented by the alchemists, however not 'ancient' alchemists, but mediaeval ones. In the Middle Ages alchemy was one of the principal sciences.

So now the multiple riddles of the 'ancient' Egyptian stone masonry can be explained. The puzzles appeared from not understanding that in the majority of cases it was geopolymer cement. The statues, mysterious vessels-amphoras, and also the pyramids' blocks were made of it. In each case the master-builders selected a special artificial stone. In some cases they made artificial limestone, in other – artificial granite, synthetic basalt or synthetic diorite.

Here for example are numerous stone amphoras. They are made of the hard type of stone, diorite. Some of them are harder than iron. 'Diorite is considered to be one of the hardest stones. Modern sculptors don't even try using these types of stone.' [1092], p.8. So what do we see in 'Ancient' Egypt? **THE DIORITE AMPHORAS HAVE NARROW HIGH NECKS AND BECOME WIDER TOWARDS THE BOTTOM. AT THAT THE WIDTH OF VASE'S WALL IS PRACTICALLY THE SAME EVERYWHERE.** Archaeologists are trying to convince us that the amphoras are supposedly carved out. The question is how is it possible to carve out an amphora

from exceptionally hard diorite via a narrow neck so that the width of its wall is the same all around? So that on the inside surface of the wall no carving marks remained! Egyptologists cannot explain this. [1092], p.119. In fact the vessels are made of the artificial stone on a regular potter's wheel. Still unset geopolymer cement was processed like soft clay. The walls were made to be the same width. It is easy to do on the potter's wheel. After the setting the amphoras of the hardest diorite or quartzite were produced as a result.

After the collapse of the Great Empire and the wars of the XVII century some of the significant mediaeval technologies were forgotten. As usual they were kept secret. The secrets of the production of damask steel, golden filigree work, granulation and the geopolymer cement were not divulged. These were secrets of state importance. In the atmosphere of chaos many things were lost. It was extremely difficult to recover them. It would have been necessary to conduct numerous experiments all over again. After the arrival of the conquerors, in Egypt for example, after the invasion of Napoleon, scientists and artisans were either killed or didn't want to reveal their secrets to the enemy. Today they try to reconstruct some of these secrets with the aid of modern technology. Sometimes successfully, sometime not very. As it becomes clear now, the geopolymer cement is among those lost secrets.

The main aim of alchemy, which by the way appeared in Egypt (where the geopolymer cement was used the most) was to produce THE PHILOSOPHER'S STONE. I.e. 'scientific stone' as the word PHILOSOPHY earlier used to mean science in general. Today the historians think that the mysterious philosopher's stone purportedly was for turning iron into gold. I.e. they are suggesting to us to think that the alchemists were wasting their time in the pursuit of nonsense. And only from time to time, at odd moments they would stumble upon something useful.

But now we understand that 'scientific (philosopher's) stone' is the geopolymer cement. It is most likely that many 'mysterious' stone monoliths of incredible sizes – in England (Stonehenge), in Lebanon (Baalbeck) and in other places – are made of the geopolymer cement in the epoch of the Horde Empire. When the Empire collapsed a desire grew in rebellious Western Europe to uncover the secret of the philosopher's stone. They failed. Hence appeared the legend about eternal and fruitless attempts to find the philosopher's stone. In the end the experiments ceased and the words the 'philosopher's stone' became magically endowed with fantastical meaning. Incidentally, in the history of alchemy it is considered that 'THE PHILOSOPHER'S STONE WAS KNOWN IN EGYPT, BUT LATER THE SECRET OF ITS PRODUCTION WAS LOST [5v2], ch.7.



## 19. BAALBEK.

Baalbek 'platform' in Lebanon is amazing. It consists of a stack of enormous blocks. The weight of some of them exceeds EIGHT HUNDRED tons [1065]. Nearby rests a colossal block of weighing A THOUSAND TONS. [Fig.35](#) shows a part of the Baalbek platform. You can see several rows of the enormous blocks-parallelepipeds laid into the foundation of the temple's complex. Above the tower are the remains of the 'very ancient' temple of Jupiter. The size of the blocks can be appreciated by considering a tiny figure of a person bottom left. The above mentioned one thousand ton block could have possibly chipped off some structure during an earthquake or during a deliberate demolition. Most likely it was blown up with gunpowder. It is possible that to the side of Baalbek they started building another temple, but ran out of time. One of the gigantic cement blocks was still cast, but that was all [ΠΕ] ch.6:2.

Vague arguments that allegedly 'ancient' master-builders could move such boulders at least by one centimetre are absurd. To cast of cement – possible. To move and moreover to lift even by millimetre – impossible.

Some historians possibly feel the embarrassment of the situation in which they were put by the chronologists of the XVI-XVII cc., making such megalithic constructions so 'ancient'. But profound speculations about the 'very intelligent ancient' master-builders, who allegedly knew how to do things, which the modern builders don't know, convince very few.

In fact Baalbek was built in the 'ancient' epoch of the XV-XVI cc. by the Horde craftsmen. Aka the 'ancient Roman' master-builders. At that time all similar constructions were erected by the 'Mongol' Empire. It was only within capability of a mighty and wealthy kingdom to carry out such megalithic construction. From Asia to Europe and across the ocean to America.

On the territory of Palmyra in Syria also survive some 'means of the cement production'. Here and there (in year 2005) we came across some old grinder-mills with the help of which the soft formations were grounded and produced cement flour. Practically the same stone mills were discovered in 'ancient' Pompeii in Italy, [fig.36](#). You can see how one of such mill-grinders worked. Circular grind stones were put on a spindle. When rolling hemispheric stones along the inside of a vessel, the rock or grain could be milled [ΠΕ] ch.6.

## **20. WHERE AND WHEN ROMAN NUMERALS WERE INVENTED.**

It is considered that Roman numerals appeared long before AD. In the times of the 'ancient Romans'. At which time the numerals less than fifty were written with three signs: I, V, X. Why precisely these and only these signs were used for small numbers? At first people operated in small values. Only later big numbers came into general use – hundreds, etc. At that time came the need for some new signs like L, C, D, M. So the signs for the small numbers were the original and the oldest.

We suggest the following hypothesis. When the carpenters build using timber and then move it to a new place, they mark the logs with their axes. The marks are necessary in order to put the logs together in the same order after moving them, as they have already been adjusted to fit each other precisely. Nowadays the marks are made with oil paint using Roman or Arabic numerals. But before the carpenters' marks were made only with an axe and only with Roman numerals. Indeed you cannot cut the Arabic numerals with an axe. It is terribly awkward. But Roman numerals seemed especially designed for effortlessly inscribing with an axe on a round log. Let us explain.

A carpenter marking a log with an axe has to do so with dawks. It is easy to do it either against the grain of the logs, or at a comparatively small angle to them. To cut a dawk with the grain is very awkward.

It means that a carpenter has only three easily distinguishable signs which he can make. They are: a vertical cut, i.e. a Latin letter I. Then two interconnected side cuts, i.e. a Latin letter V. An upside-down letter V cannot be considered as a separate symbol, as a carpenter could have approached the log from a different side and a mix-up could occur. And lastly are two cuts crossing each other, i.e. a Latin letter X. All the symbols made by an axe should comprise of these signs. Or be close to them.

So, the three main Roman numerals should have appeared exactly so in the carpeting business. It appears that the ancient Romans for some reason allegedly invented the very same symbols, which should have come about as a result of people who build a lot of wooden log structures (notably with the steel axes). But in Italy the main ancient building activity was from masonry and bricks. Wooden log structures were a rarity there. There are not so many forests there. Especially not of the timber variety.

It's hard to believe that Russian carpenters, who in the old days were largely uneducated, studied 'ancient', allegedly Italian numerals. Nevertheless the carpenters in Russia marked logs with the very same "Roman numerals". But with one provision.

They did not share the rule, that the numeral on the left is deducted from the numeral on the right. As the carpenter did not employ such terms as 'right' and 'left', as you can approach a log from either side. That is why the numeral 9 was written as VIII, and not as IX.

Most likely the Roman numerals originated in Russia, and not among the scholarly circles, but among the builders. They were doing a lot of construction in Russia, mainly of timber. There were many carpenters, and this sphere of activity was considered to be important.

Later when the Empire expanded to the West the 'Roman joinery numerals' were brought there, to Italy in particular. At first there were also some forests there, and timber building started. But soon the Italian woods were cut down to a large degree. As Italy is comparatively small. But there was a large quantity of stone. As there is in the South in general. And the Russian joinery numerals transgressed to the sphere of scholars and were called 'ancient Greek'. And this is correct. They were invented by the Russians who had colonized Europe. As from the view point of the XVII century Western Europeans they were those very ancient Romans who had founded the Roman = Horde Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. But in the XV-XVI cc. The Ottoman Conquest commenced, which also originated in Russia. The Western Europeans perceived it as the collapse of Ancient Rome and stopped associating Rome with Russia. A false theory has emerged that Ancient Rome came into existence in the deep antiquity in Italy. And 'consequently' it was Italy where allegedly Roman numerals were invented.

Later, when they started to write Roman numerals down on paper with a quill, of course the L, M, C and D signs, which were necessary to denote large numbers, appeared. By the way, if Roman numerals were written on paper from the very beginning, then together with a 'five' = V, most likely there should have also appeared a 'tick', i.e. an 'upside down' V. These two symbols are easily told apart, providing that the terms 'top' and 'bottom' are determined.

## **21. THE MONASTERIES.**

It is possible that the monasteries of the Empire were created as places where the retired Cossack=Tatars were sent to, i.e. the Hordians who had completed their service. As we said before [4v1], ch.4:1., recruiting children for the military service was a 'tagma'=blood-tribute, well-known in Russia. It was recruiting for the army. The matter of military conscription was decided in childhood, thereafter a person would serve for the rest of his life. During this period they didn't start a family. They

dedicated themselves completely to the Rat'(army)=Horde. In the XIV-XVI cc. the troops would depart to destinations as far as thousands of kilometres away, even to different continents. Few would come back. The family ties would be severed forever, home was just a dim memory.

Only the young men were able to serve in the Hordian army. As soon as a Cossack-Tatar reached advanced years military service became impossible. The czars-khans became aware of this problem – where to place a large number of still capable men. They may not be able to fight any more, but former soldiers were not old yet. To bring them back home? Except that after the decades that passed by the notion of home itself had dissolved, became a mere word. No wife, no children, no family. Not many could build a family at this age. Then an intelligent solution to this problem was found. All over the Horde Empire, - not Just in Russia, but also in Europe, Africa, Asia, etc., male monasteries were created where the retired Hordian soldiers were sent to. They started to call them monks. There they were occupied by civil activities and also, if necessary, military activities familiar to them. To the best of their ability they grew wheat and made bread, fished, worked on the undeveloped land, amassed riches, wrote and preserved books, built up the famous monastic libraries, studied science and defended themselves against the enemy.

The monasteries grew richer, turning into the centres which the surrounding civil communities gravitated to. The monasteries were well fortified. Behind their walls not only the monks, but the local residents too could find security. The word MONASTERY itself (MONASTERIUM in Latin) probably originated from MONKS - TATARS and point to a place where the retired MONGOLS=TATARS lived, where there were MANY TATARS. It is also clear that convents for women were created as well. The Empire engaged in many wars, producing many widows. So they were gathered together in nunneries. Originally only the elderly widows, who were incapable of bearing children any longer, were sent there. Thus the emergence of both monasteries and nunneries was a result of the expansion of the Empire and of the conquest and colonization of vast territories. Later in the XVII-XIX cc., the original intended purpose of the monasteries and nunneries was forgotten.

## **26. 'THE APPEARANCE OF THE CROSS' WHICH BROUGHT VICTORY TO CONSTANTINE THE GREAT AND DMITRY DONSKOY'S VICTORY 'WITH THE AID OF THE CROSS'. CANNONS ARE 'THE SCHEMAS WITH CROSSES' IN THE ARMY OF DMITRY DONSKOY.**

In the Battle of Kulikovo Dmitry Donskoy's army used cannons [4v1], ch.6. It seems that in the army of Mamai there were either no cannons or there were significantly less of them. On some of the old Russian icons a range of cannons were depicted in Dmitry's army firing at Khan Mamai's troops, [fig.38](#). Each cannon is depicted here as a stretched forward arm with a nimbus enshrouded with smoke. As we show in [KP] one of the symbols of the fire arm was Constantine's Labarum. It is thought that cannons appeared in the battle fields precisely in the middle of the XIV century. This is the time when gunpowder was invented.

There were no cannons in the army of Mamai depicted in the icon. It is probable, that it is due to the advantage in the artillery Dmitry was able to defeat Mamai. Mind you, Mamai's army was a professional one, and Dmitry's troops were more like a people's militia [4v1], ch.6. It is feasible that cannons were used for the first time on such a large scale in the Battle of Kulikovo [KA3] [KP] ch.3.

Before the battle Sergiy Radonezhsky blessed Dmitry and handed over some 'secret weapon', which in the later sources was called 'THE SIGN OF THE SCHEMA CROSS' (a special embassy cross paramand - part of monastic robes – schema – translator's note). It is said: 'Sergiy presented him with a sign of the Schema cross and said: 'HERE IS THE WEAPON IMPERISHABLE! LET IT SERVE YOU INSTEAD OF THE HELMETS!' [362], v.5, ch.1, column 36.

Nikonovskaya Letopis' (Chronicle) informs us : "The Venerable Sergiy commanded them (Peresvet and Oslyabya – Author's note) to prepare for an imminent battle ... HE GAVE THEM WEAPONS ("Behold a weapon which faileth never!", CHRIST'S CROSS SOWN ONTO SCHEMA (VESTMENTS), and commanded them INSTEAD OF THE HELMETS to put those on their heads' [586:1], v/11, p.53.

So, Sergiy Radonezhsky handed Peresvet and Oslyabya some new weapon – SCHEMA, instead of conventional armour – helmets, etc.

Commentators assure us that allegedly under the word SCHEMA or SCHEME was meant a head-dress made of fabric with a cross sown onto it. However, it is quite possible that behind the editorial term SCHEMA or SCHEME is concealed the word MUSKET (MASQUET) or MUSHKA (MUZZLE-SIGHT or BEAD in Russian) read backwards, as in Arabic: MUSHKA = MSHK --> SHKM = SHKM = SKHIMA (SCHEMA), when SH turns into --> S. See [6v1], ch.4:9.

Why is a word MUSKET usually derived from the word MUKHA (a fly – in Russian)? A direct link between a Latin MUSCA and Slavonic MOSHKA (midge in Russian) is noted by Max Vasmer [866], v.2, p.667. The word musca = mukha ('fly' in Russian) most likely entered Latin from the Russian language. Then everything falls into place. As the Russian word MUSHKA means not only a fly, but also a RIFLE SIGHT! It is not surprising that in Russia, where there are so many midges, the aiming device was compared to a midge (a fly) which came in sight). So they called the aiming sight MUSHKA (A FLY). That is why a new weapon with an aiming device (mushka) was called MUSKET in Russian. The invented aim caught the imagination of the warriors and gave name to the whole gun itself. Incidentally the Russian writers of the XVIII century called the musketeers MUSHKATERY, clearly deriving it from the word MUSHKA [866], v.3, p.20.

The parchment passed on by Sergiy Radonezhsky to Dmitry Donskoy said: 'Help us with this HOLY WEAPON to bring down our foe'. See the details in [KP] ch.3, p.20. Let us turn to the 'Ancient' Roman history now. There is a famous event in it – the vision of the Cross to the Emperor Constantine the Great on the eve of his battle with Maxentius. Constantine wins with the help of the CROSS. The 'Ancient Roman' story is a reflection of Dmitry's victory over Mamai. Also 'with the help of the Cross'. Dmitry Donskoy is described by the 'Ancient classics' as Constantine I the Great, and khan Mamai – as Maxentius, Constantine's co-ruler.

What is said about Constantine's victory over Maxentius with the help of the Cross? Though the essence of the event was described by the different authors similarly, however, there prevailed a strange variety of opinions in the question of

what was exactly 'The Cross of Constantine'. At first Constantine beheld a gleaming apparition in the sky, various authors are saying different things about its shape. Constantine ordered to make 'labarum', on which he placed the sign he saw in the sky. The labarum with Chi Rho (the sign of the Cross) helped him to achieve victory. Once again however, there are various opinions on the question of what labarum was made of and what was depicted on it – and whether it was a banner in the sense of a flag at all or it was something else.

The story of Eusebius about Constantine reminds of the famous Biblical story of Moses who made 'a serpent of brass' and PUT IT ON THE POLE, by doing so he saved his people from 'the venomous serpents' (Numbers 2:1, 8-9).

What else is said about the serpents in the Bible? It turns out, 'in Numbers 21:6 the venomous snakes refers to the 'serpents' attacking (those who fight for God) = the Israelites in the desert – Author's note) are called in Hebrew SERAPHIM (NEKHUSTAN), THE FIERY ONE [845], commentaries to 4 Kingdoms 18:1-8. And the Biblical Encyclopaedia translates a word SERAPHIM, in particular as FLAME, FIRE. In [6v1], ch.4:10-11, we showed that here in the Bible we are given a description of the firing cannons. There is an old Ataman (Ottoman) banner of huge dimensions which survives today, on which there is depicted a cannon firing cannon balls, [fig.39](#). This banner is kept in a museum in Vienna. It is not impossible, that this Ataman (Ottoman) banner is made following the design of the famous banner of Moses and labarum of Constantine. It is possible that on Moses' and Constantine's old banners there was depicted a cannon in the form of a 'cross'.

## **27. WHY THE CHRONICLES MISTOOK A CANNON FOR A CROSS.**

It is likely, that the first cannons invented by Sergiy Radonezhsky were wooden and not metallic. The production of metallic cannons requires complex procedures. On the other hand the inventors of the first gunpowder hardly waited for the cannons' casting method to be invented. Most likely they tried to make use of the new invention for military purposes straight away. For that a solid pipe closed-ended on one side was needed. Then it is stuffed with gun powder and a closing plug applied and then filled with stones. That's it, the weapon is ready.

But it was not easy to make such a pipe. Oak, being an exceptionally strong type of

wood, has a wonderful quality. Its core approximately 10 centimetres in diameter under certain conditions can separate itself from the rest of the trunk. Several wooden layers surrounding the core rot and turn into dust. The rest of the wood remains hard and whole. The core begins to dangle around inside of the developed wooden pipe, and it is not difficult to remove it with a long chisel. Or to split and scorch it out. You will get a strong oak pipe. If you bind it with iron rods like a barrel, an oak mortar cannon like this can withstand several shots. Particularly that the first gun-powder was far less powerful than later on. Only with the refinement of the gun-powder it was necessary to switch to the cast metallic cannons.

Direct indications survive that in the XV century in Russia they indeed used the wooden cannons [KP]. It is interesting that they were used until comparatively recent time. Such a cannon is exhibited for example in the Nuremburg museum [ЦРИМ] ch.4.

How would the people perceive such new weapon when they beheld the terrible 'firing logs' on the battle field for the first time? Besides knowing that they were invented by the Christians. The wooden cannons could have been described for example like this: 'Christian trees which brought victory to the Christian Czar'. But the Christian cross is also often called 'a tree'. In the canonical sources the expression 'tree of cross' means a cross on which Christ was crucified.

That is why it is not surprising that the 'Christian tree which brought victory to the Czar Constantine could have turned under chroniclers' quill into 'the Christian tree of cross which brought victory to the Czar Constantine'. I.e. to the Russian Prince Dmitry.

The first Russian wooden cannons which provided Russia-Horde the undeniable advantage in the epoch of the 'Mongol' conquest of the XIV century, soon gave way to the metallic ones. However, the wooden cannons had one important quality, which ensured their long standing inclusion in the armament. The simplicity in their manufacture was very appealing. Besides, it was not obligatory to carry them during the campaign. It was sufficient to bring just the gun-powder. Having arrived at the battle place they would find the oak trees and quickly make the cannons and fire buckshot from them. Of course, you cannot fire a lot of shots from wooden cannon. But it is not necessary. If needed, they could always make new ones. The main thing



was to have gun-powder. After the victory they left the wooden cannons on the battlefield and moved on. It is clear why they almost entirely didn't stand the test of time. After being thrown away they rotted. That is why in the museums you can see only some rare examples which have survived.

While the cannons were a new weapon, never-before-seen by most, the effect of this gun on the enemy was overwhelming. The 'Christian tree' spitting fire and bringing death, inspired panic and fear. The cannons were reflected in various 'ancient' myths and legends. Later, when the concept of a cannon was adopted by many, there began a competition in precision and range. The wooden artillery gave way to a metallic one.

## **28. THE OUTSTANDING CZAR-KHAN CONSTANTINE I = DMITRY IVANOVICH.**

In the 'ancient' biography of Constantine-Dmitry there is included another reflection of the Battle of Kulikoivo. It is Constantine's second famous battle, this time with his co-ruler Licinius. Instead of adversaries, Constantine – Maxentius, here it concerns the pair of Constantine – Licinius. Constantine's battles with Maxentius and Licinius are considered to be the two main military combats in his biography.

Constantine's final victory over his co-rulers and opponents – is the execution of Licinius. He was decapitated. In the Russian chronicles it is the execution of Ivan Velyaminov, the son of tysiatsky (dux, Heerzog, captain of the thousand - a military leader in Ancient Rus, who commanded a people's volunteer army called 'tysyacha', or a thousand – Translator's note) by Dmitry's order. The tysiatskies were effectively the co-rulers of Grand Princes. Having abolished this post, Dmitry became the mogul. But to achieve this he had to dispose of the son of the last tysiatsky – Ivan Velyaminov. On the whole it is the same picture as under Constantine the Great. According to the old law there were several co-rulers reigning in the Empire. In Rome there were several august figures and Caesars ruling simultaneously. In Russia there was a Grand Prince and tysiatskies. And then one of the co-rulers removes the others, becomes the sole czar and changes the political system. From that moment the Czardom is controlled autocratically and the reign is passed on to the son of a deceased czar. Prior to that it was different. In both Rome and Russia. In the Roman history before Constantine becoming the emperor was not hereditary, and only after Constantine the succession to the throne from father to son was established.

The primary sources unanimously stress the role of victory of Constantine = khan Dmitry over 'paganism'. It indeed concerned an enormous event – the adoption of the Apostolic Christianity throughout the entire 'Mongol' Empire. The words by Eusebius of Caesarea in his Ecclesiastical History on Constantine's victory are imbued with a new meaning now.

'His enemy Licinius lay there prostrate, the mighty victor Constantine... won back their own Eastern provinces and COMBINED THE ROMAN EMPIRE INTO A SINGLE WHOLE, as in former days. BRINGING IT ALL UNDER THEIR PEACEFUL RULE, FROM THE RISING SUN TO THE FARTHEST DUSK, IN A WIDE CIRCLE FROM NORTH TO SOUTH. People now lost all fear of their former oppressors'. Quotation from [140], p.120-121.

In honour of this event there were erected the monumental constructions, paintings were created and literary works were written. Some of them have survived. For example, Constantine Arch in Italian Rome. To remind you, Vatican (Batu-Khan) was the Western-European mission of the Catholic 'Mongol' church in Italy. To this day the Vatican memorialises the stormy religious events of the late XIV century. For example, the frescos in the Hall of Constantine in Vatican. The famous Raphael was appointed to paint them.

## **29. THE TRANSFER OF THE CAPITAL.**

The transfer of the capital of the Roman Empire to New Rome is an event of the late XIV century. The emperor Constantine I, aka Russian-Horde czar-khan Dmitry Donskoy after the victory in the Kulikovo Battle in 1380 arrived to Czar-Grad and proclaimed it the second capital of the Empire. It became the second metropoly after the main one in Vladimir and Suzdal Rus'. Having made the Apostolic Christianity the religion of the entire Empire, Constantine = Dmitry most likely decided to place the spiritual and religious centre into the old Czar-Grad = evangelical Yoros=Jerusalem, where in 1185 Christ was crucified. Thus, not far from Yoros, a little to the South, Constantinople emerged. The military and administrative centre of Empire Constantine kept in Russia-Horde = Israel. i.e. in the biblical Assyria-Syria (in Egypt).

Hence you can see that the chroniclers could confuse OLD ROME and NEW

ROME. As is shown in [1v], the confusion reflected in several versions of transfer of the Roman Empire capital. In some versions it was transferred from Old Rome into New Rome. And other claim the opposite – transfer from New Rome to the Old one.

The comparison of the locations of Yoros-Jerusalem and Istanbul-Constantinople, situated close to it, shows that Constantinople is a later capital. Why didn't Constantine = Dmitry transfer his capital unchanged to the holy city of Yoros, but founded a new centre on the other side of Bosphorus 30 kilometres from Yoros? This is our hypothesis.

Constantinople's location itself indicates that the city was built quite late, when people have already invented the cannons capable of firing long distances and learnt to build large ships with the deep draught for open sea navigation. Istanbul is located in the Bosphorus' wide point, by the Sea of Marmara. Being in such a location the absence of cannons would have made it impossible to control the Bosphorus and to prevent foreign water crafts pass through into the Black Sea and back. That is why in the earlier times when there were no cannons it would have been much better to position the city in the Bosphorus' narrow point, which would provide full control over the strait. THAT IS EXACTLY WHERE YOROS WAS LOCATED.

A big advantage of the location of Istanbul-Constantinople was The Golden Horn – harbour-cleft, capable of receiving large naval vessels with a deep draught at its cliffy shores. But in the epoch of the XII-XIII cc. there were yet no such ships. That is why there was no need for such a harbour. Small ships of that time navigated along the coast and had comparatively shallow draught. It was quite possible to keep them immediately in the Bosphorus, in the harbour between Yoros and Beykoz. The sea storms do not penetrate there. For the epoch of the XII-XII cc. it was a fairly ample harbour.

So the location of the Yoros fortification – evangelical Jerusalem was ideal for the capital of the XII-XIII cc., but in the end of the XIV century it no longer satisfied the requirements of that time. That is why Constantine = Dmitry founded New Rome, Constantinople – not in the place of Jerusalem, but approximately 30 kilometres from it. However – not very far. It is likely that he none the less wanted to establish the capital as close as possible to holy Jerusalem.

### **30. 'ANCIENT' PERSEUS AND DMITRY DONSKOY. MEDUSA GORGON – IS A FIRE ARM.**

[Fig.40](#) represents a coin of Dmitry Donskoy depicting his victory over Ivan Velyaminov. Dmitry with a shield makes a strike with his sword to behead his kneeling enemy. At the same spot, as it was often done in the old miniatures, the body of his enemy is depicted prostrate and already beheaded. There is a human face depicted on Dmitry's shield. But a shield with a face or a head on it is very well known in the 'ancient' mythology. It is Perseus' shield with the head of the Medusa Gorgon. So, Perseus' shield was known in Russia and was attributed to Dmitry Donskoy. A shield with a head was depicted not just on the coins, but also on the miniatures of the Russian chronicles [KP], ch.3.

Let us recall that Constantine the Great and his army also (see above) carried 'signs' on their shields. The latter brought them victory. As we understand it now, they were cannons. The idea that the victory was brought by a symbol on a shield only came to mind of later chroniclers. But the same idea is also expressed in the legend of Perseus. Perseus cuts off Medusa Gorgon's head and secures it on his shield. This head becomes a terrifying weapon: it turned everything alive into stone.

In the legend of Perseus a head on the shield is given the name of GUARDIAN (SUPPORT) by which they meant the head on the shield. In the history of Constantine the word GUARDIAN (SUPPORT) was also used to denote a banner [83], v.3, p.13. Everything becomes clear. In particular, why Medusa Gorgon has snakes instead of hair. We have already pointed out that by SNAKES (SERPENTS) the old sources, the Bible, in particular, meant CANNONS. The idea is clear: a snake, or as is, cannon – is some kind of 'stinging pipe'. It is becoming clear that 'ancient' Constantine and Perseus are the reflections of the czar-khan Dmitry Donskoy.

It is clear why the people 'who looked in the face' of Medusa Gorgon died, 'turned into stone'. They fell victim to the artillery and buckshot fire. The image of Medusa is a symbol of a cannon. That being said, 'Medusa Gorgon' probably meant 'Brazen Throat (Funnel)', [KP], ch.3.

The Horde Cossacks mainly fired buckshot from heavy mortar guns. A salvo of several mortars inflicted great casualties upon the enemy. By the way, the famous Czar Cannon which is situated in the Kremlin is a mortar. That being said, it is not of

the heaviest calibre, which was in standard ammunition in the Russian-Horde army of the XV-XVI cc [6v], ch.4:16.

Cannons were often depicted on the 'ancient' monuments. In particular, in the form of torches, from which the fire bursts out 'in a straight line', i.e. along the direction of the flare stack, even if it is downward sloping [KP]. It is clear why there are so many of such images. Cannons were invented in the epoch of the adoption of the Christianity, and in the XV century they were still something of a novelty. The legends of the new weapon spread around exactly in the epoch of the XV-XVI cc – the golden age of 'antiquity'. That is why the 'ancient' monuments and myths overflow with allegoric representations of cannons. For example, of the 'ancient' Greek characters – Pan, Pandora, Prometheus, Medusa Gorgon [KP], ch.3.

### **31. THE BATTLE OF KULIKOVO ON THE PAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.**

The Battle of Kulikovo is reflected in the Bible several times. Our method of dynasty identification immediately indicates the dating of the ruling of Samuel, Saul and David. These biblical events should be looked for in the XIV century. That being said, geographically – in the metropoly of the Great Empire, in Russia Horde. In particular, the Battle of Kulikovo reflected in the Old Testament as the battle of David with Goliath [KP], ch.4.

It turns out, that under the names of the famous czars of the Old Testament Samuel, Saul and David were depicted as the following rulers of Russia Horde, i.e. Israel, of the XIV century:

Mikhail Aleksandrovich Tverskoy = Samuel;

Khan Mamai (+ Ivan Velyaminov) = Saul (+ his son/double Jonathan);

Dmitry Ivanovich Donskoy = David.

Of course here the equal sign should not be taken literally. This refers to the fact, that the significant part of the 'biographies' of these three specified biblical rulers is

comprised of the life descriptions of Mikhail, Mamai and Dmitry. That being said, in King David's case, only the first half of his 'biography', represented in The Book 1 of The Kingdoms and part one, Book 1, Paralipomenon, is the reflection of Dmitry Donskoy's life description. The second part of David's 'biography', described in The Book 2 of The Kingdoms and second part of Book 1, Paralipomenon, is composed of later events which took place after Dmitry's death in 1389. Besides, the legends about David included some information about Andronicus-Christ from the XII century [TPLQ].

The surviving 'biographies' of ancient characters, are mainly layered. The chroniclers erroneously combined the descriptions from different epochs.

Thus the Battle of Kulikovo is described in the Old Testament twice. The first time as a hard-fought battle of the Israelites with Philistines, immediately following which King Saul was killed. The second time, as a famous battle of David with the giant Goliath [KP].

To remind you of the biblical story (1 Kings 17). The Philistines and the Israelites met on the battle field and prepared to fight. The Philistines set forth against the giant Goliath. He began to challenge the Israelites calling someone to fight him. Young David with a staff and a sling stepped out from the Israelite army. Goliath came forward heavily armoured and started taunting David. David struck Goliath in the forehead with a stone from his sling. Goliath fell dead. After that David beheaded him. Then a great battle began and the Israelites defeated the Philistines. This story inspired many painters, sculptors, writers and musicians.

The crux of the duplication is as follows. David = Dmitry Donskoy defeats Goliath = khan Mamai and his representative – 'a tatar' Chelubey. That being said, Chelubey was killed by Peresvet, Dmitry's representative. David, like Dmitry, remains alive, [fig.41](#) [KP], ch.4.

David killed Goliath striking him directly in the forehead 'with a stone from the sling' (1 Kings 17:49). It becomes clear why the Russian chronicles called the defeated 'Tatar' giant with the name CHELUBEY. It means (in Russian) FOREHEAD+STRIKE, i.e. the warrior was killed with a strike of a stone in his CHELO = FOREHEAD. The exclamation 'FOREHEAD STRIKE' was encouragement to strike the enemy in his forehead. For a reason A.Nechvolodov

quotes Chelubey's name as: 'Cheli-Bey' [578], book1-2, p.804. In the Ostrog Bible it is written straight, that 'the stone' set off by David struck Goliath 'in CHELO (FOREHEAD)' (1 Kings 17) The biblical name GOLIATH could have been a distorted version of the name of CHELUBEY when 'CH' changes into -> 'G' and 'B' (changes into) -> 'TH' (at the change of ...) I.e. Chelubey = CHLB ? GLTH = Goliath.

It says further: 'He (David – Author's note) took his STAFF in his hand, picked out five smooth stones from the stream, placed them in the pouch of his shepherd's bag ... took his sling in hand, and approached the Philistine (Goliath – Author's note)... When the Philistine looked carefully at David, he despised him, for he was only a FAIR and handsome boy. The Philistine said to David, "Am I a dog, that you are coming after me with STICKS AND STONES?" ... David reached his hand into the bag and took out a stone. He SLUNG it, striking the Philistine on the forehead' (1 Kings 17:40, 17:43, 17:49).

Thus, the Bible's editors paint a fairy tale picture for us. A young shepherd boy David faces the giant Goliath with just a staff, a sling and five stones. Having taken a little string and a piece of cloth, i.e. a slingshot), and having skilfully cast a stone, the hero strikes the giant. In such a way literally the artists of the XVI-XIX cc. represent this theme. There is, for example, a fresco by Michelangelo 'David and Goliath' in the Vatican. Following the text from the Bible which has already been edited, Michelangelo depicted David's slingshot in a form of a cloth and two little strings. What ought to have been painted was a musket.

Let us see how Goliath was armed. 'He had a bronze helmet on his head and was wearing scale body armour. The weight of his bronze body armour was five thousand shekels. He had bronze shin guards on his legs, and a bronze javelin was slung over his shoulders' (1 Kings 17:5-6). This is a Mediaeval knight, encased in armour, with a helmet on his head. The helmet probably covered warrior's forehead. The mediaeval helmets had visors. It is also said here that the point of Goliath's spear was made of IRON (1 Kings 17:7). Most likely Goliath was encased in the iron and not in the bronze body armour. Bronze (brazen armour) was inserted by the editors who aspired to depict the events as 'terribly ancient'. Hardly a cast stone could SHOOT DEAD a knight encased in the heavy plate armour. That being said as Josephus Flavius tells us, the 'stone' 'broke the skull and passed through to his brain' [878], v.1, p.293. But it

would be comprehensible if it was a bullet from the musket or a cannon ball from a cannon. Bullets and buckshot successfully pierced the iron shields. The firearms have entirely changed the face of the battlefield. Heavy armed knights were powerless against the mortars and muskets.

So, most likely, David had in his hands not just any sticks and stones, but a MUSKET = 'a stick', GUNPOWDER = 'a sling', BULLETS or small cannon balls = 'the stones'. A long barrel of a musket or a portable cannon could have been evasively called 'a staff'. The words POROKH (meaning GUNPOWDER in Russian) and PRAKH (meaning ASH in Russian) (when the sounds Kh and Sh interchange) the editors cunningly turned into PRASHA (SLING in Russian). Using the fact that a sling was indeed a primitive weapon. Finally, musket bullets, cannon balls and buckshot could have easily been called STONES. We would like to remind you that in the Kulikovo battle field they were in fact firing cannons [4v1], ch.6.

Further. Synodic translation assures us, that David had a STAFF or a STICK in his hands (1 Kings 17:40, 43). The Ostrog Bible says something quite different. In the first case: 'He took his STAFF in his hand' (1 Kings 17). And in the second instance the same term is used: 'going against me with a STAFF' (1 Kings 17). (STAFF – is PALITSA in Russian – Translator's note)

Thus, in the old text a word PALITSA (STAFF) was there. Of course, the word 'palitsa' was also used for conventional weapons – a 'stick' with an end weighted with spikes. So the editors of the Bible could have swapped the word PALITSA (STAFF) for PALKA (STICK). However, in [KAZ] we have demonstrated that the Battle of Kulikovo was also described in the 'ancient' Indian Epic Mahabharata Story. Where partially there are also mentioned the STAFFS. But in Mahabharata it is the fire arms. So, most likely, David's staff in the Ostrog Bible also meant the firearm musket or musketoon. The word PALITSA (STAFF) originated from PALIT' (to burn), SPALIYU (I will burn), spaliyu = SPL -- > PLTS = palitsa, opaliat' (scorch with fire). The editors of the Bible distorted the text, in an effort to erase any mention of the fire arms.

Let us pay attention to Goliath's 'spear'. The Bible says: 'The shaft of his spear was like a weaver's beam, and the iron point of his spear weighed six hundred shekels. His shield bearer was walking before him' (1 Kings 17:7). Josephus Flavius is even



more forthright: 'His spear WAS NOT LIGHT [ENOUGH](! – Author's note) TO BE CARRIED IN HIS RIGHT HAND; INSTEAD HE BORE IT SUSPENDED ON HIS SHOULDERS. HE ALSO HAD A LANCE WEIGHING 600 SHEKELS. MANY FOLLOWED HIM, CARRYING HIS WEAPONS.' [878], v.1, p.291. Most likely it is not a description of a spear, but a musket or a musketoone, a small portable cannon. They were carried on a shoulder, [6v1], ch.4, like modern flame-blast weapons or portable missile launchers. They shot from a tripod, which were stuck in the ground and mounted a heavy gun barrel on top of it. It is for a reason that Goliath was accompanied by a TROOP of armour-bearers. The Mediaeval cannons were operated by several artillerymen.

Please remember the two statues of 'David' by the sculptor Donatello of allegedly 1408-1409. His 'Davids' were a product of his imagination. Donatello read the Old Testament most likely in the XVI-XVII cc., having been already brought up on the Scaligerian version. According to it he sculpted 'visual aids'. Donatello's David's head is turned very elegantly, however the Russian Horde czar-khan Dmitry Donskoy, most likely, looked different. Or for example the nude 'David' by Michelangelo. It is also very beautiful, but by no means bears any relation to reality.

A significant number of such portrayals were created in fact much later – in the XVII-XVIII cc. the core of the subject is either forgotten or deliberately obscured. The artists and sculptors portrayed elegant gowns, beautiful naked bodies and excessively elaborate poses. Noticeably more truth remained on the actual old imagery of the XVI cc. Unfortunately many originals were destroyed. Today we look at the past through the distorting prism of the biased editorial revision of the XVII-XVIII cc.

Nevertheless, observing the old work of art from a new point of view, it is possible to discover numerous traces of true history, sometimes rather colourful and not noticed by the picky editors and therefore fortunately preserved. They have to be searched for. Such work is akin to the painstaking work of an investigator.

## **32. WHAT IS NOAH'S ARK?**

In the biblical life description of Samuel the central place is assigned to the travelling of the ark (1 Kings 4-7). What is it? The ark appears in the Bible in several places and, most likely, what is meant here are two separate objects. The first ark is

described as a casket, a box for the Moses' tablets of stone, or their fragments [2v]. N.A.Morozov showed in [544], v.6, that this 'first ark', possibly survives until today and is well known. It is the famous Kaaba in Mecca, the object of worship for modern Muslims. The objects of adoration are the walled-in wreckage possibly of the meteor or volcanic origin. The travels of the arc, described in the Bible, are the wandering of the holy stone debris in the Middle Ages prior to their final resting place in Mecca on the Arabian Peninsula.

If the 'first arc' is a sanctum of the Meccan Kaaba, then the 'second arc', described in the 1 Book of Kings is something entirely different. We have discovered that here the issue at hand is of an icon and an arc, or an icon in the arc. Or of the relics in the arc [KP]. We would like to point out, that the 'first arc' and the 'second arc' are our terms, introduced for conveniently denoting the two biblical plots.

It turns out, that the travels of the famous biblical Arc of the Testament at the time of the king (czar) Samuel, is a sequence of appearances and travels of the famous icon, Theotokos of Tikhvin in Russia in 1383. The travels of the Lord's Arc are linked to the victories on the battlefields. Here the Israelites are the Russians of the XVII century, and the Philistines are their enemy the Swedes. To remind you, that some of the biblical books were written up to the first half of the XVII century [6v].

### 33. THE TATARS – THE TURKS – TORIT' (TO CUT WAY – IN RUSSIAN).

In our books we referred to various written testimonials and old pictures showing that the 'Russians' and the 'Tatars' in those times were indistinguishable [4v1], ch.6. In the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. they comprised a single nation. The Battle of Kulikovo was a civil war conflict. In the civil battles the 'Russian' and the 'Tatar' armies truly look virtually the same. Similar armament, similar banners, etc. So what did the word TATARS mean then?

That's what the Cossacks were called. TATARS probably originated from: TORIT' (TO CUT A PATH in Russian): TORIT/ = TRT -- > TTR = TATAR. Hence TORKI (nomadic tribes speaking Turkic language – Translator's note) and TURKS. The Cossacks were the horse cavalry troops of Russia Horde. It was them who 'cut a path', travelled very fast, made new routes, lead the colonization of the distant lands. Only in the epoch of the Romanovs they thought of the artificial division of the single nation of the metropoly of the Empire into the 'Russians' and the 'Tatars'. They tried to drive a wedge between them. They followed the principle of the age of

Reformation: divide and rule. Despite of the lengthy efforts they, generally speaking, failed.

### **34. THE COSSACKS-ARYANS: FROM RUSSIA TO INDIA. EPIC MAHABHARATA.**

We have mentioned earlier the famous 'ancient' Indian epic Mahabharata. Here is the summary of our research results.

#The Epic largely relies on the Bible. It was created in the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. and was finally completed only in the XVII-XVIII cc.

# The central theme of the Epic is the great battle of the people in the Kuru field. Here reflected is the colossal Battle of Kulikovo in 1380. In the Mahabharata under the name of Arjuna (= Horde-Khan) is described Dmitry Donskoy. And under the name of Duryodhana (=Evil Khan) appears Mamai, the adversary of Dmitry. The authors sympathise with Arjuna = Dmitry Donskoy and are ill-disposed towards Duryodhana = Mamai. Similar is the point of view of the Russian chronicles: 'good Dmitry' and 'evil Mamai'.

When comparing Mahabharata to the Russian chronicles, we restored many details of the Russian Horde history preserved in the 'ancient' Aryan Epic, but lost in Russia. They were either forgotten or cleansed by the Romanovs' historians. For example, the downfall of Duryodhana was described in the Mahabharata in great detail. But the surviving Russian primary sources speak of khan Mamai's blight very scantily. The reason is understandable. Having declared the Cossacks=Tatars the be 'evil people', the Romanovs' historians crossed out from our history all the positive accounts about khan Mamai and his fellows in arms. We were continuously indoctrinated with the idea that the 'Russians' and the 'Tatars' are allegedly long-standing foes.

There is a 'Book of the Women' in Mahabharata. And in it there is a big section 'Women's lament' [519], v.8, p.136-176. It describes the wives lamenting their dead warriors who fell in the field of the great battle. 'The Lament' is one of the emotional peaks of Mahabharata.

It is possible, that here is told a story of the mourning of those who perished in the field of the Battle of Kulikovo. In the Russian chronicles the lament was reflected very poorly. In this way we emerge deeper into the events of Hordian Moscow which

followed the battle. The significant part of the 'Lament' mourns the warriors of Duryodhana, i.e. of Khan Mamai. It is even more interesting considering that in the Romanovs' version Mamai is represented negatively, and there are no details about his supporters.

# Mahabharata narrates about the 'Mongol' conquest of the XV century. The famous Indian Aryans are 'Yuryievans' ('Yuiryievtsy') = Georgyievans (Georgyievtsy), i.e. – the Hordian troops of the Cossacks (aka the chronicle 'Tatars' who have colonized the Hindustan Peninsula and lands surrounding it. The word ARYA in Sanskrit 'means both: the name of the people and 'kind', 'wise') [519], v.2, p.250. It is possible that in the name ARYANS reflected the Russian word YARY (FIERCE), YARO (FIERCELY). Which very well corresponds with the essence of this name 'Yuryi'= Georgyievtsy – the FIERCE warriors of Yuryi (Georgyi - George) The Conqueror. Let's also remember the name Yaroslav, i.e. Fierce Glory or Aryan-Glory.

In the XIV-XV cc. the territory of modern India was occupied and developed by the army of Russia Horde. They were the 'Mongolian' army directed to the South and to the East. According to the Byzantine chronicler John Malalas, the colonization of the world of that time was carried out generally in a peaceful way. Vast expanses of Eurasia were yet little populated. In the majority of cases there was no one to fight. In particular, MALALAS DESCRIBES WESTERN EUROPE AS A HALF SAVAGE COUNTRY WHERE THERE ARE EVEN NO CITIES [338]. p.28.

The Hordians who stepped on the Hindustan Peninsula, were not at all Muslim in the modern meaning of this word. On the territories of the vigorously expanding 'Mongol' Empire reigned the Apostolic Christianity rooted in the XII century. Islam in the modern sense of this word appeared only in the XVI-XVII cc., after the split of the Christianity into Orthodox Christianity and Islam. The army of the Horde of the XIV century was called 'Muslim' post factum, in later history textbooks.

The Indian God KRISHNA (Buddha) – is the image of Jesus CHRIST, transformed on local grounds. The researchers of the history of religions have already cautiously spoken about it [2v1], ch.1. However, they avoided making any conclusions for fear of casting doubt over Scaligerian chronology. We, however, are articulating this idea clearly and directly. At the heart of the 'ancient' Indian Ramayana are the events of

the XIV-XVI cc., when the powerful 'ancient' Christian Rome, aka Russia Horde together with The Ottoman Empire-Ottomania spreads its rule over Eurasia, Oceania (Pacific Islands) and America. Hence the Mediaeval population of Hindustan believed in Christ. In India His name was expressed as Krishna.

The Horde army was followed by the migrants, women and children. In their rows of carts they carried not only weapons and armament, but also the documents, archives and chronicles. After the founding of the 'Mongol' states in the Hindustan Peninsula, which were controlled by the Hordian governors, there also appeared the libraries, where among other things, the Russian chronicles were kept. Khan's clerks, civil servants, scribes and scientists have arrived to India. The culture and the language of its metropolity and provinces was ubiquitous.

B.L.Smirnov, the Fellow of the Academy of Sciences of the Turkmen Soviet Republic wrote: 'Reference to the blue eyed Aryans repeatedly occurs in 'Mahabharata'; this anthropologic detail is curious enough for the matter of the origin of the Aryans, which until present day didn't receive a universally acknowledged admission' [519], v.4, p.560. Today in historic literature it is not acceptable to say 'Aryan'. It is preferable to say 'arya' or 'airya'. We can explain the 'blue-eyed' quality of the ariyas. In Russia, for example, there were always quite a lot of blue-eyed people.

In the result of the 'Mongol' conquest the Hordian chronicles and events described in them were 'spreading' over the entire Empire. The Hordians-Cossacks leaving for campaigns, took with them mementos, chronicles, documents and archives. Having settled in the distant provinces, they tried to preserve the memory of their motherland. But as time went by, their descendants began to think that the old legends inherited by them from their fathers and grandfathers, were a narrative about their life 'here', i.e. where they lived now. They began to sincerely look for the very place where, for example, occurred the battle of Kulikovo of their ancestors. They were mistakenly looking 'nearby', close to where they lived at that point. And of course they 'found' it. Here and there. Some would begin to think that it is some kind of field on the Hindustan Peninsula. 'It turned out' to be the field Kurukshetra. This being said, it is not impossible that some other important battles took place there, but they were 'local' battles. The other descendants of the Hordians, who settled in the West, would erroneously point at some field in Western Europe. It would 'result' as a battlefield of Sempach [7v1], ch.3. And so on. It is not impossible that the reflecting glare of the battle on the Moscow field of Kulikovo shed its light on the famous Kosovo field in Serbia.

The Romanovs' historians also contributed to the obfuscation of true history. They moved (on paper) the Kulikovo field from Moscow to outside of Tula [4v1], ch.6.

As we have shown in [KP], in the Battle of Kulikovo cannons were used. On the pages of Mahabharata (substantially edited in the XVIII-XIX cc.) there survive many references to the fire arms pounding the Kuru field (aka Kulikovo field) during the great battle between Pandavas and Kauravas. It is likely that in the original text of Mahabharata, dating back to the XVI century, the fire arms were described more explicitly.

Even after editing the surviving 'fire arms fragments' from Mahabharata are absolutely unambiguous. Only the incorrect chronology prevents the historians admitting that those are obvious descriptions of cannons. At the same time the 'fire arm scenes' in the Epic are so colourful that the historians had to come up with a theory of some kind of 'divine heavenly fire' in order to substantiate the artificial ageing of Mahabharata and to conceal from the readers the cannon battles in 'ancient' Indian history. At first they were concealing it under orders, but later they were doing it mechanically, having forgotten the origin of the matter [KA3], ch.1.

Here is a list of the Biblical events of the XV-XVI cc. comprising the essence of various chapters of Mahabharata. 1) The flood and voyage of the patriarch Noah-Manu (=Columbus) across the ocean in the XV century. 2) The Exodus of Moses in the XV century. 3) The story of Esther (Elena Voloshanka) of the XVI century. 4) The story of the biblical Susanna – another reflection of Esther. 5) The story of Esther is also described in the most 'ancient' Babylonian epic.

And here are the 'evangelical chapters' in the 'ancient' Mahabharata. 1) Immaculate Conception, Virgin Mary. 2) Indian God-Human Yudhisthira – as the reflection of Christ. 3) King Herod's schemes against Christ. The Holy Family's flight to Egypt. 4) Christ's return to Jerusalem. 5) The Flagellation of Christ. 6) Christ's Ascent of Golgotha. The Agony in the Garden of Gethsemane. The Apostles' dream. 7) The Ascension of Christ. 8) Christ's descent into Hell.

Having moved the Indian Epic (like the Epics of other nations) to the deepest antiquity and having narrowed down the geographical framework of the events described in it, the historians of the XVII-XVIII cc. endeavoured to hide the fact that Mahabharata in fact narrates about the recent events of the XIV-XVI cc. It was edited with a sprinkled patina of 'ancient dust'. As a result this enormous material is

perceived in an ambiguous way. On one hand – with a lot of respect, which is entirely fair. On the other hand – very few have read this Epic from the beginning to the end. It seems boring. To be precise, it was 'presented' to be boring.

However, it is clear now that we were intentionally conditioned to have a 'disinterested' perception! We were forced to think that Mahabharata itself is the sole source of the thousands of events described within it. And as the editors 'presented a fairy-tale' it is not surprising, that such a lukewarm attitude arises towards it. Like, hazy myths, unknown heroes, fire breathing dragons etc. Thousands of obscure (at a first glance) names, a great number of allegedly forgotten events... Ask your friends whether many of them have read at least one of the volumes of Mahabharata. You will not find many of them. Very few. Even amongst the admirers of 'ancient' Indian history. But now, after the restoration of the correct chronology of this Epic, the interest towards it rises sharply. Reading Mahabharata becomes captivating. As soon as we begin to understand that here unfold the events of the Great Empire of the XIV-XVI cc., it is impossible to pry oneself away from most of its pages. As it is from these pages that arise the biblical events, from the history of Russia Horde, The Battle of Kulikovo, etc.

Comparing different viewpoints – Aryan-Indian (from India, from the East), Russian (from the Empire metropoly), Western-European (from the Western countries) – OF THE SAME EVENTS, captivates the unbiased reader. Besides, the exposure of 'Scaligerian trickery' – is an investigation of a serious crime of the XVII-XVIII cc. in the face of science and mankind in general. It turns out the reformers didn't cover up all their tracks. On the whole, they did an excellent job. But they missed quite a lot. They failed to notice everything. And today their alibi, convincing on the surface, crumbles on closer inspection.

### **35. THIRTY REFLECTIONS OF THE BATTLE OF KULIKOVO DISCOVERED BY US IN THE 'ANCIENT' HISTORY.**

We will list 30 reflections of the Battle of Kulikovo, which we discovered on the pages of various chronicles both in the 'antiquity' and in the Middle Ages. We also indicate in our books, where these duplicates were presented and studied.

So: the Battle of Kulikovo of the year 1380 [4v1], ch.6. Considered to be just about the main military event of the Mediaeval Russian history. Here are its phantom reflections.

#### IN RUSSIAN HISTORY:

1) Khan Tokhtamysh = Dmitry Donskoy siege of Moscow allegedly two years later, in 1382 [4v1], ch.6.

2) Crushing defeat of Khan Mamai by Khan Tokhtamush – Dmitry Donskoy in 1380 [4v1], ch.6.

3) The Battle on Kalka River allegedly in 1223, where the 'Mongols' fought the allied forces of the Cumans (Polovtsy) and the Russians [4v1], ch.6.

4) The Battle of Sergiy Radonezhsky with the 'devils in the Lithuanian style hats', ended in the victory of the Holy Man. Is described in the Life of Sergiy [IIIAX], ch.3.

5) In the history of India: the famous 'battle on the Kuru field'. The battle supposedly took place in the 'ancient' India of allegedly the IV-III cc. BC or in the even more ancient epoch. This battle is the central event of the colossal 'ancient' Indian Epic 'Mahabharata' [ИИД], [КАЗ].

6) In the history of the East: The Battle of Kulikovo was described by the Venetian traveller Marco Polo, allegedly the years 1254-1323 [4v1], ch.6:10 and [5v2], ch.2:12.8.

7) In the history of Europe: the Battle of Kulikovo was known to the Western chroniclers, for example, to the German chroniclers, as the great battle of Sempach allegedly in 138. It supposedly took place in Western Europe [7v1], ch.3:11.

8) In the history of the Balkans: the Battle in the Kosovo field allegedly in 1389; it



is considered to have taken place in Serbia. The story of Sultan Murad = Dmitry Donskoy. We will talk about it in our future publications.

9) In the history of Byzantine: the battle of the emperor Heraclius and the Persian king Khosrau [ЦРИМ], ch.1.

#### IN THE HISTORY OF 'ANCIENT' ROME:

10) The battle of the 'ancient' emperor Constantine I The Great = Dmitry Donskoy with the emperor Maxentius or Maximinus – khan Mamai – Ivan Velyaminov allegedly in year 312 [КР].

11) The battle of the emperor Constantine (Dmitry Donskoy) with Licinius allegedly in the year 323 [КР]. Here Licinius is the reflection of khan Mamai = Ivan Velyaminov.

12) The Gallic War allegedly of the year 361 BC. The Romans fought with the Gauls, who invaded their country. The outcome of the battle was decided in the fight of a young military tribune Titus Manlius = Dmitry Donskoy with a giant Gaul = Khan Mamai [ЦРИМ], ch.4. See [fig.42](#).

13) Another Gallic War allegedly of the year 348 BC, in which Marcus Valerius Corvus won the fight with a mighty Gaul [ЦРИМ], ch.5 and [fig.42](#).

14) The Second Latin War allegedly of the years 341-340 BC, in which both Titus Manlius-father and Titus Manlius-son took part [ЦРИМ], ch.6.

15) The first Latin War allegedly of the year 499 BC [ЦРИМ], ch.7.

16) The Battle of the dictator-ploughman (Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus) allegedly of the year 458 BC [ЦРИМ], ch.7.

17) The Battle of the Romans of Sentinum and Clusium allegedly of year 295 BC [ЦРИМ], ch.6.

#### IN THE BIBLE, IN THE OLD TESTAMENT:

18) The famous battle between David and Goliath (1 Kings 17), allegedly in the epoch of 1015-1055 BC [КР]. Here David is a reflection of Dmitry Donskoy and Goliath is a reflection of Khan Mamai.

19) The battle between King Saul and the Philistines in which Saul was killed (1 Kings 29-31) allegedly in the XI century BC [KP].

20) David and Absalom story. Absalom dies in the battle (2 Kings 18) allegedly in the middle of the XI century BC [ЦРИМ], ch.6.

21) The battle between David and the Philistines (2 Kings 5) allegedly of the XI century BC [ЦРИМ], ch.6.

22) The rebellion of Sheba ben Bichri against David (2 Kings 20) allegedly in the XI century BC. [ЦРИМ], ch.6. Here David = Dmitry Donskoy and Sheba = Ivan Veliyaminov or Veniyaminov.

23) The battle between the Judge Gideon and the Midianites (Judges 6-8) allegedly circa 1245 BC [ЦРИМ], ch.7. Here Gideon is a reflection of Dmitry Donskoy.

-----

24) In the history of 'Ancient' Greece: the famous battle of Marathon allegedly the year 490 BC [3A] ch.1.

25) In 'ancient' mythology: the famous 'most ancient' victory of Zeus over the titans with the help of Cyclops, so called Gigantomachy [3A] ch.2. Today this myth is dated to the deepest history, identifying it as the very first and the most significant 'Olympian myth of creation'. THE WORLD BEGINS STARTING WITH THIS MYTH, the universe is conceived. In those allegedly dark ages there were supposedly no people yet. Only the mighty gods were soaring in the nebulous celestial spheres, who themselves only recently had emerged into the world and were fiercely fighting each other. Poets and writers, sculptors, painters and film directors, being inspired by these powerful legends, have created hundreds of wonderful works of art. Sincerely believing that with their artistic intuition they penetrated many thousands of years into the past, unveiling the mystery...

We will slightly disappoint the poets. The 'most ancient Olympian myth of creation' in fact tells us about the Battle of Kulikovo in 1380. For some, it may be that such a conclusion means the 'dilution of the pathos' of the legends about the Creation of the World. But not for us. In fact this fact enhances the value of the Battle of Kulikovo in the history of mankind. The 'ancient' tradition raised this event to a high pedestal, establishing it as the basis of the entire history. That is why the 'poetic frisson' remains. Only the dating changes. The important event becomes significantly closer to our times, appearing to be at the end of the XIV century. Zeus defeated the Titans with the help of the mighty Cyclops (i.e. cannons!) 'only' approximately six

hundred and twenty years ago. In the New Chronology this event is exceptionally ancient. As the written history of mankind on the whole goes back not more than a thousand years. And emerges from the darkness only at the beginning of the X-XI cc.

We have repeatedly come across the fact that the famous 'ancient' TARTAR is a reflection of TARTARIA = TATARIA, i.e. Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc., on the pages of the 'ancient' classics. Russia-Horde inspired both respect and fear in some Western-Europeans. That is why in the epoch of the Reformation the distant Tartar was painted in sombre tones. Purporting that it is situated somewhere far away. It is difficult to reach. Tartar is a gloomy underworld, situated at the same distance from the earth as the earth is from the skies. Tartar is surrounded by the tall brass walls and a ring of fire. There the storms are raging permanently. Even the gods are scared of Tartar. The entrance to Tartar is guarded by ruthless monsters, the sinister hellhound Cerberus = Kerberos.

And so on. Many shock and 'horror stories' about Russia-Horde started to circulate in the Western Europe of the late XVI – XVII cc. Tartar-Tartaria was described as an 'infernal' place, threatening everything that is progressive and cultured in humankind. Purporting that it is the empire of evil. The prison of nations. This tradition of fear firmly took root and from time to time emerges under all kinds of circumstances.

26) In the history of 'ancient' Greece: the famous Sicilian battle allegedly of 415-413 BC [3A] ch.3. It appears that in the 'ancient' description of the Sicilian War the two layers have become closely intertwined. The first – from the XII century and consists of the events connected with the Emperor Andronicus-Christ. The second – is the Battle of Kulikovo of 1380. The reason for the confusion between the XII and XIV centuries (cc) is clear. The chroniclers confused the two Baptisms of Russia. The first – by Andronicus-Christ himself in the end of the XII century. The Second Baptism – at the end of the XIV century by Dmitry Donskoy = Constantine the Great – the Biblical Judge Gideon – the Biblical King David. The chroniclers confused these two baptisms and the events connected to them. That is why the Biblical image of David absorbed the data of Andronicus-Christ [LIPC]

27) In the history of 'ancient' Greece: Decelean War allegedly the end of the year 413 BC. It is considered that it took place immediately after the Sicilian Battle [3A] ch.3.

28) In the history of Conquista – America's conquests allegedly in the beginning of the XVI century: the battle of the Spanish with allegedly Indian king Cotubanam [3A] ch.9.

29) In the ancient history of Iran (Persia): the battle of the king Takhmurup with the 'demonic hordes' [IIIAX], ch.2.

30) In the ancient history of Iran (Persia): the battle of the king Fereydun with the king Zahhak [IIIAX], ch.3.

Hence it can be seen what a strong impression the Battle of Kulikovo made on the nations of the Great Empire. It was written about, talked about, the legends were made about it, the songs were sung, the heroic epic ballads were passed on to the future generations.

The duplicates of the Battle of Kulikovo see. [Fig.43](#). In [Fig.44](#), the same list is depicted in a different way. It shows which epochs the phantom reflections of the Battle of Kulikovo were erroneously dated to. To reconstruct the correct history it is necessary to 'lift' all the duplicates found by us up the timeline and identify them with the battle of 1380. As a result the number of various stories in the written history substantially decreases, but the illumination of the events noticeably increases. We get an opportunity to look at the Battle of Kulikovo through the eyes of 30 various chroniclers. Each of them communicates something peculiarly their own, sometimes unnoticed by the others. As a result the story of the battle between Dmitry Donskoy and Khan Mamai becomes noticeably richer.

## **36. TWENTY FIVE REFLECTIONS OF DMITRY DONSKOY.**

1) KARL IV HABSBURG – 'Western-European' emperor (1347-1378) is the reflection of both DMITRY SUZDALSKY (1359-1363 according to [362] or 1360-1363) and DMITRY IVANOVICH DONSKOY (1363-1389 according to [362]). The chroniclers could have combined them into one ruler as they had the same name: DMITRY. Some of the facts of Dmitry Donskoy's biography found their way into the story of WENCESLAS Habsburg, who followed Karl IV [2v1], [7v1].

2) SVYATOSLAV IGOREVICH, allegedly 945-972, a Russian Prince [1v].

3) DMITRY OF PERESLAVL, a Russian Prince, allegedly the XIII century.

4) KHAN TOKHTA, allegedly the XIII century.

5) KHAN TOKHTAMYSH, the XIV century.

6) CONSTANTINE I THE GREAT, the famous 'ancient' Roman emperor, who

defeated Licinius and Maxentius (these are the two reflections of khan Mamai = Ivan Velyaminov or Venyaminov, allegedly the IV century [ЦРС] [КР].

7) DAVID (partial), the famous biblical king, who defeated the giant Goliath and Saul (both are the reflections of khan Mamai) [ЦРС] [ЦРИМ].

8) PERSEUS, the 'ancient' hero who cut off Medusa Gorgon's head [КР], ch.3.

9) MURAD I (partial) – the Sultan of the Ottoman Empire who died in 1389 in the battle of Kosovo Field [КР], ch.3.

10) ARJUNA – the 'ancient' Indian demigod, who defeated in the battle the demigod Duryodhana = (Evil Khan) (the duplicate of khan Mamai). He is described in the Indian epic Mahabharata [КАЗ], ch.1.

11) ROMULUS (partial) – the first 'ancient' Roman king. Some chroniclers confused the epoch of Andronicus-Christ (the XII century) and the epoch of Dmitry Donskoy (the XIV century) [ЦРИМ].

12) JEROBOAM I (partial) – the 'ancient' biblical king [1v], [2v].

13) HERACLIUS (partial) – Byzantine Emperor, who defeated the Persian Shah Khosrau (the duplicate of khan Mamai) [ЦРИМ], ch.1.

14) TITUS MANLIUS TORQUATUS - the 'ancient' Roman who defeated the mighty Gaul (= Golaith = khan Mamai). He was described, in particular, by Titus Levy [ЦРИМ], ch.4.

15) MARCUS VALERIUS CORVINUS – the 'ancient' Roman, who defeated the mighty Gaul (khan Mamai) in battle. Was described by Titus Levy [ЦРИМ], ch.5.

16) TITUS MANLIUS-SON – the 'ancient' Roman who struck the Latin khan Mamai during the Second Roman-Latin War [ЦРИМ], ch.6.

17) QUINTUS FABIVS – the 'ancient' Roman council, who lead the Romans in the Battle of Clusium and Sentinum, allegedly in the III century BC [ЦРИМ], ch.6.

18) GIDEON – the Old Testament commander, leading the army of Israelites in the war against the Midianites. He is described in the Book of Judges [ЦРИМ], ch.7.

19) TITUS QUINCTIVS, THE FARMER-DICTATOR (PLOW-MAN) – the 'ancient' Roman hero, the victor in the war with the Sabines [ЦРИМ], ch.7

20) MILTIADES (partial) – the 'ancient' supreme commander of the Athenian army in the Battle of Marathon [3A] ch.1.

21) HERMOCRATES, the son of Hermon – the 'ancient' Sicilian commander in the Sicilian Battle (Syracusan general during the Athenians' Sicilian Expedition) of allegedly the V century BC [3A] ch.3.

22) JUAN DE ESQUIVEL – a Spanish chief-conquistador, winning the battle of the early XVI century allegedly during the conquest of America. Described by Bartolomé de las Casas [3A] ch.9.

23) ARTHUR (partial) – the English king, who defeated a 'fierce giant', and also a Roman tribune Frolo (khan Mamai) [XP], ch.7.

24) TAKHMOURES – an 'ancient' Iranian shah, who destroyed the 'demons' in a fierce battle [IIIAX], ch.1.

25) FERAYDUN (partial) – 'ancient'-Iranian shah, defeating the evil Zahhak [IIIAX], ch.2, 3.

## **37. ASTRONOMICAL DATING OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY.**

1. (Years 1308 or 1071 or 1189) CONCISE ZODIAC KZ. Stone bas-relief on the ceiling of the temple in the city of Erment. 'Ancient' Egypt, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact – the first variant: 15-16 May 1071; the second variant: 30-31 May 1189; the third variant: 6-8 May 1308 [HXE]

2. (Years 1325 or 1146) ZODIAC RC FROM THE TOMB OF PHARAOH RAMESSES IV (also written Ramses or Rameses). An image on the ceiling of the burial chamber. 'Ancient' Egypt, Luxor, Valley of the Kings, allegedly 'antiquity'. In reality – the first variant: 15-16 April 1146; the second variant: 10-17 April 1325 [HXE]

3. (Years 1345 or 1285) ZODIAC NB WITH 'CLOTHED NUT'. Possibly, painted on the lid of a wooden coffin. 'Ancient' Egypt, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact – the first variant: the 31st January – the 1st February 1285; the second variant: the 29th -31st January 1345 [Д3EE]

4. (Year 1394) ZODIAC EB FROM THE BIG TEMPLE OF ESNA. Depicted on the stone slabs, on the temple's ceiling, bas-relief. 'Ancient' Egypt, Esna, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact: 31st March – 3rd April 1394 [HXE]

5. Here is an important result of the New Chronology. The star catalogue of the famous Almagest of Claudius Ptolemy (containing 1025 stars) was created, as it happens, in the interval between the years 600 and 1300. Thereby the Scaligerian dating of the 'Almagest' catalogue as of the II century appears to be a serious error [3v2].

# **Chapter 5. THE EPOCH OF THE XV CENTURY**

## **1. THE GOLDEN AGE OF THE EMPIRE.**

In the XV century the expansion of the 'Mongol' Empire and the development of new lands started by Russia-Horde in the XIV century were continued on a new level. In the Bible it is described as the beginning of the conquest of the Promised Land by the Prophet Moses' army. His troops came out of Russia-Horde, i.e. the Biblical 'Egypt'. In the Ostrog Bible, for instance, there are many 'Northern traces' (frost, snow, ice...) in the description of Moses' journey. In the later edition of the Bible the 'Northern traces' were erased more thoroughly. The exodus of the Israelites from Egypt is the beginning of the second wave of the Russian-Horde world conquest. In this instance the Bible replaced the name of Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc. with the name 'Egypt'. Incidentally the word ISRAELITE can be translated as a FIGHTER FOR GOD, and JUDEAN is ONE WHO PRAISES GOD [544]. These are not the names of the people as we believe today, but positive epithets. The ISRAELITES–FIGHTERS FOR GOD essentially means the same as CRUSADERS – 'cross bearing warriors', warriors for God.

In the XV century the troops of Russia-Horde = Israel and its allies – The Ottoman Empire = Judaea cross the Atlantic ocean in large ships, appear in America and reclaim large swathes of the continent. This epic expedition is reflected in the chronicles as the discovery of the America, the famous voyage of Columbus, the great exodus of the Israelites from Spain at the end of the XV century, and in the pages of the Bible as the patriarch Noah's voyage across the 'great waters'.

The other Russian-Horde troops arrived to North America from Siberia and Far East via Alaska, crossing the Bering Strait. As a result, on the continent of America in the XIV-XVI cc. there emerges the Hordian civilizations of Maya, Aztecs and Inca. Mistakenly dated today as deep antiquity. In the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. the famous American cities, temples and pyramids are being erected.

## **2. THE RISE OF THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE. THE OTTOMANS, I.E. COSSACK ATAMANS. (or HETMANS – military rank in Cossack regiment).**

The Ottoman Empire is sometimes called the Ottoman Empire, however we stick with its old name – The Ataman Empire. In the Russian documents of the XV-XVI

cc. the first sultan – the empire was named after - was called OTOMAN or ATAMAN. The historian of the XVII century Andrey Lyzlov, the author of the 'History of the Scythians', when talking about the Ottoman Empire in detail, uses the term ATAMAN or OTOMAN. He writes 'ATAMAN - FOREBEAR - FATHER OF THE TURKIC SULTANS' [497], p.283. Ataman is a widely known name for the Cossack chiefs. As it says in the mediaeval 'Notes of janissary', the Turkic sultan was called a 'son of hetmans' [424], p.115. Thus it is directly pointed out that the name of the forebear of the Turkic sultans Ataman (Ottoman) meant nothing else but Hetman, i.e. the Cossack Ataman. The words Hetman and Ataman just slightly differ in the pronunciation.

### **3. THE UNION OF THE TWO STATES: RUSSIA-HORDE AND THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE=ATAMANIA. THE BIBLICAL CONQUEST OF THE PROMISED LAND – IS THE HORDE-ATAMAN CONQUEST OF THE XV CENTURY**

Approximately a hundred years into the Russian-Horde Empire's existence, its rulers fell victim to the unprecedented consequences of their own excellent and far reaching communications routes. As a result of the fast development of the road networks spanning the vast territories, the epidemics which from time to time broke out in the south of the Empire would now easily spread over the entire Eurasia. The deadly diseases – plague, cholera and others – became an inevitable price for the unification under the sole rule of Europe, Asia and Africa. But the wider the area ravaged by the disease, the more rampant and rife it became. It was necessary to seek a solution. It was found by way of the introduction of administrative borders between the North and South regions of the Empire. As a result, besides Veliky Novgorod in Russia-Horde there emerges a second centre – Czar-Grad on the Bosphorus. The ancient city has again become a capital, this time of the southern regions of the Empire. So the authorities made an emergency resolution about the compulsory decontamination of those provinces where infection was raging. Many territories of Western and Southern Europe turn out to be as such. These were the regions where the Horde army = Cossacks headed for with the merciless order to annihilate the infected population. And then to repopulate the lands. This is the famous Ataman (Ottoman) conquest of the XV century, [Fig.45](#). See [6v1], ch.4-5.

Thus in the XV century Russia-Horde = Israel was compelled 'for the second time' to send their army to the South and to the West. They were conquering the territories which had already been conquered before. Where, since the beginning of the XIV



century, the Horde's rulers-governors already had their armed forces. They of course didn't want to be annihilated. However, the cleansing was carried out rather meticulously. The new governors were placed in the territories of Europe and Asia conquered for the second time. In Russian history the mark of these events remained as an extensive distribution of the 'Novorod's territories' to the boyars, boyars' children, noblemen and the best serfs. [6v1], ch.5:10.

So, in the place of Ancient Romea in the year 1453 emerged the Empire allied to Russia-Horde – The Ottoman Empire=Atamania = Judaea, [Fig.46](#). These events were described in the Biblical Books: Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, The Book of Joshua. The Israelites' march under the leadership of Moses and Joshua Ben Nun – is Russia-Horde's and The Ottoman Empire=Atamania's invasion of Europe and Eurasia in general. The cleansing of many territories is described as the annihilation of the local population by the Israelite army during the conquest of the Promised Land. The Israelites (the fighters for God) of the epoch of the Old Testament are the huge armies of Russia-Horde and The Ottoman Empire-Atamania. The Judaeans (the ones who praise God) are the priests and the chroniclers amongst the troops, a social strata of people, who, so to say, looked after the ideological sphere. Czar-Grad, the city where Andronicus-Christ was crucified, became the centre of Judaea.

'Ancient Hellas' is also the reflection of the Great Empire. The name of Hellas itself is a version of the word HORDE, as letters L and R often interchanged: Horde or Olda ---> Hellas.

#### **4. WESTERN EUROPE UNDER THE RULE OF RUSSIA-HORDE AND THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE-=ATAMANIA.**

In the XV century Western Europe continues to be a part of the Empire. Europe is divided between Veliky Novgorod and Constantinople. The Imperial taxes are being collected all over Europe, Africa and Eurasia. Recent historians called it 'sultan's tax'. In every province there was a Hordian governor-king or governor-duke. They all were the subjects of the metropoly of the 'Mongol' Empire, possibly to varying degrees. I.e. subjects of the Emperor. Thus the Western European would call the great czar-khan of Russia-Horde, seated in the distant Veliky Novgorod. There was one Empire, and there was one Emperor. We will repeat, that the name Novgorod was perceived by the Europeans as HAB-S-BURG. I.e. the Habsburgs before Karl V were the Hordian czars of Veliky Novgorod as viewed by the Europeans. They were paid taxes to by the conquered countries. And the Novgorodians split them with the Ataman (Ottoman) sultan. I.e. the taxes collected from the Western Europe, Northern

Africa, Asia and America were distributed between the two capitals. It is possible that from the Southern Europe and Northern Africa taxes went mainly to Constantinople.

## **5. THE BEGINNING OF THE RELIGIOUS SCHISM.**

In the XV-XVI cc. there was a visible religious schism in the formerly unified Christianity which split into several large branches: Orthodox Christianity, Islam, Catholicism, Buddhism and Judaism. But these names they would acquire later, only in the XVII-XVIII cc.

All the main religions known today originated from the same root – from the Royal (and later from the Apostolic) Christianity of the XII-XIII cc. This explains the conclusions made by the school of scientists of the XIX century, working in the field of the Comparative Religion. Having processed a vast amount of material they discovered a lot in common between the aforementioned religions. But being constrained by the incorrect chronology, they decided, that the Christianity had absorbed in itself allegedly earlier cults. This is incorrect. On the contrary, the unified Christianity of the XII-XV cc. branched out into several religions. Each of them inherited a considerable part of the former cult, having modified it. The previously universal symbolism was also divided. A broad cross began to be used by the Orthodox Church; a narrow cross – by the Catholic Church; a six-pointed star – also another form of the cross – by Judaism; a crescent with a star – also another form of the cross – by Islam. So in the XV-XVI cc. the following branches-religions began to differentiate.

1) THE ORTHODOX CHRISTIANITY, probably the closest to the original religion of the XII-XIV cc., spiritually chaste and austere. Ancient Russia becomes the centre of the Orthodox Christianity. The Orthodox Christianity prevails in the Balkans and in the East. In the past it was called Capholic or Catholic. Thus the term 'Catholic' changed its meaning in the XVI-XVII cc. From the term meaning one whole Christianity it has narrowed to meaning only the Western-European Catholicism, separated only in the XVI-XVII cc.

2) ISLAM OR THE MUSLIM FAITH – in the East, originally very close to Christianity. Also a very strict and ascetic religion.

3) CATHOLICISM – predominantly in the West. It moved away from the original reserved religion. In the XV-XVI cc. Catholicism existed in the form of the 'ancient' Greek and Roman pantheon of the gods with bacchanalian and orgiastic elements. As a consequence of such practices spreading, diseases occurred in some of the countries

of Western Europe, which were called venereal diseases after Venus – the goddess of love [544], v.5, [2v1], ch.1:3.

To eliminate such undesirable social consequences a reform of the Western-European religion was required. In some countries the vicarious rulers of the Great Empire introduced the Inquisition [5v1], ch.12:9.4. After the church reforms and successful machinations of the inquisition, the Catholic branch of Christianity acquired the modern form familiar to us today, also very reserved. [5v1], ch.12:10.

4) Another variant of Christianity is Buddhism in the East. India, China, etc.

5) JUDASIM – both in the West and in the East (the Karaims). Originally it was a form of the Royal Christianity. Over time Judaism underwent a profound evolution.

6) The rest – religions that were not so widespread. They 'split off' from the ones mentioned above only in the XVII century, [Fig.47](#).

The Gospels were written at the end of the XII – the beginning of the XIII cc. However in the XIV-XV cc. they were substantially edited. The rest of the Books of the Bible, of both the New and the Old Testaments, were written not earlier than the early XIII century. The editions of the Gospels and the Books of Psalms that exist today date back to the XIV century. The rest of the books of the Old Testament were edited in some instances up to and including the XVII century [6v].

## **6. THE EMPERORS OF THE GREAT EMPIRE = THE RUSSIAN CZARS-KHANS OF THE XV CENTURY.**

&& VASILY I.

Vasily I Dmitriyevich 1389-1425 according to [362], [36], [145]. In the Western chronicles he is reflected as 'Wenceslaus' Habsburg 1378-1400 according to [76]. The name WENCESLAUS could have meant CROWNING GLORY (VENETS SLAVY in Russian) or GLORIOUS CROWN (WREATH), or it could have originated from the Slavs the WENDS, i.e. WENS THE GLORIOUS (WENDY SLAVNYIE in Russian). Hence it is probably the name of the city VENICE.

Under Vassily I the Great Schism erupts in the Universal Church, accompanied by the internecine wars. During the Church Schism in 1415 the Khan supported the Christianity in Russia. From this point onward under Vassily I and under his son Vassily II Vasiliyevich Tyomniy (the Dark or Blind) Christianity becomes more consolidated in Russia. The Famous chronicle Baptism of Russia by Vladimir the Holy (Vladimir the Great) is dated to this epoch. Vassily I is canonized under the name of the Holy Grand Prince Vladimir, baptized Vassily (on the 15 July according

to the Julian Calendar).

He is also known in history under the names of: a) Vladimir the Holy (Vladimir Svyatoslavovich) erroneously dated to the X century; b) Vytautas the Grand Duke of Lithuania.

There is a dynastic duplication in Russian history, the shift of approximately 410 years in dates. The early history of Russia is a phantom reflection of its actual history from 1350 to 1600.

#### && YURI DMITRIEVICH

He ruled in 1425-1434 according to [362], or 1425-1435 according to [36]. In the Western chronicles he is reflected under the name of 'Robert' Habsburg Palatine or 'Ruprecht of Palatine' 1400-1410 according to [76]. The name 'PALATINE' possibly originates from the Slavic word PALATY meaning Royal Chambers, a palace.

Yuri Dmitrievich, co-ruler and the rival of Vassily II Vassilievich the Dark in the battle for the throne of the Empire. He is known in history also under the names of: a) Svyatopolk, the murderer of Boris and Gleb, erroneously dated to the XI century; b) Sigismund of Lithuania.

Yuri Dmitrievich is constantly fighting his successor Vassily II. This leads to the revolt connected to the succession to the throne act [361], v.5, ch.3, columns 150-154. The confrontation results in Yuri's sudden death, whilst being the Grand Prince and occupying the throne at the time [362], v.5, column 154.

#### && VASSILY THE CROSS-EYED.

Ruled in 1434, notably only for one month [362], v.5, column 154; [832], part 3, v.5, p.240. The Western European chroniclers called him the following: Jobst or Jodocus Habsburg or Jodokus, Margrave of Moravia (or Jobst von Mähren) and dated his rule to the year 1410 [940], list 340, reverse side. After his enthronement he was almost immediately dethroned. Deposition was peaceful, without any war.

#### && VASSILY II.

Vassily II Vasilievich Tyomny 'The Dark' (or Blind) 1425-1462 (?) according to [36], [362]. According to [145] and [362] ruled from 1450 until 1462. In the Western chronicles reflected as 'Sigismund Habsburg' 1410-1438 according to [76].

The rule of Vassily II is the time of revolts and civil discord. Antagonisms between the various branches of the formerly united church increase, which leads to the internecine religious wars. The attempts to unite the churches at the Council of

Florence in Italy in 1438 fail. The Russian Church and the Grand Prince Vassily Vassilievich do not recognize the union. The relations between Veliky Novgorod (Russia) and Constantinople break down. A dreadful plague epidemic breaks out and rages for a long time in the Empire. Its origin – the Southern regions of the Empire. Along the created caravan tracks the disease spreads over vast territories of Eurasia, engulfing the entire Empire.

In Russia they are preparing for the second conquest of Czar-Grad and the South Europe, which starts to break away from the metropoly of the Empire in the religious sense, and besides, became the epicenter of the epidemics. The Ataman (Ottoman) conquest begins. It is successful. In 1453 Constantinople is taken by storm and renamed Istanbul or, to be precise, Stan-Bul, i.e. Stan (CAMP or camping-ground in Russian- Translator's note) of Bulgars or Stan of Babylon.

Vassily II is known in history under the name of Yaroslav the Wise (Mudry), erroneously dated to the XI century. In the Bible the epoch of The Ottoman Conquest is described as the continuation of the conquest of the Promised Land, but now under the leadership of Joshua Ben Nun.

&& DMITRY SHEMYAKA

Dmitry Shemyaka 1446-1450 according to [362], [36]. According to [145] ruled in 1445-1450. In the Western chronicles he is reflected as 'Albert of Austria' 1438-1440 according to [76]. He was as the rival of Vassily II in their battle for the throne of the Empire. Temporarily prevailed and occupied the throne in 1446-150.

On the subject of the title AUSTRIAN see [5v2], ch.9. This is what THE EASTERN KINGDOM was called, i.e. OST+RICKS or OST+REICH = the Eastern state. The name ALBERT may have originated from ALBA = WHITE. In this case Albert of Austria is simply the White Eastern Kingdom.

&& IVAN III.

Ivan III (another name Timofey) Vasilyevich the Great 'Grozny' (the Terrible) 1462-1505 according to [362]. Karamzin notes that Ivan III was called the Terrible [362], v.6, column 215. Ivan III is a phantom reflection of Ivan IV 'The Terrible' of the XVI century with a hundred years chronological shift [6v], ch.5. In the Western Chronicles he was called Habsburg (i.e. Novgorodian) 'Frederick III' 1440-1493 according to [76]. In the Bible Ivan 'the Terrible' reflected as king Nebuchadnezzar.

He came to power as a result of an inter-dynastic battle. In the battle, the Great 'Stand'

on Ugra river, he defeated the preceding Grand Prince = khan and occupied the throne of Veliky Novgorod. At that point the metropoly of the Empire is divided into two parts – the Southern Ottomania=Atamania = Judaea, and the Northern Russia-Horde = Israel. The recently conquered Czar-Grad was turned into the second capital of the Empire. The Southern regions of Europe, Africa and Middle East were brought under its subjection. The Northern and Central Europe, Siberia and Asia remained in direct subordination to Veliky Novgorod = Yaroslavl, the throne of which is occupied by Ivan III Vasilyevich.

Ivan III is also known in history under the names of: a) Vsevolod Yaroslavich, erroneously dated to the XI century; b) Casimir of Lithuania.

Ivan III, aka Fredrick III, aka Tamerlane, aka (partial) Mehmed II the Conqueror, who conquered Constantinople, was the Hordian czar-khan [6v]. He conquered many lands in Southern and Western Europe during the Ottoman conquest. The intense antipathy of the Western chroniclers towards Mehmed II is very well known. At a later stage, while creating a 'new history of Europe according to Scaliger', they have multiplied – on paper – one czar-king into 'several rulers'.

## **7. THE 'MONGOL' EMPIRE AND THE FAMOUS CHRISTIAN KINGDOM OF PRESTER JOHN.**

The legendary Kingdom of Prester John is considered to be one of the exciting puzzles in Scaligerian history. The core of the matter is as follows. Mediaeval Western Europe was for some reason strongly convinced in the existence in the East of a vast Kingdom of a certain Christian ruler 'Prester John', THE DESCENDANTS OF WHOM WERE ALLEGEDLY THE GREAT KHANS OF THE 'MONGOL' EMPIRE. The legends of the mysterious Kingdom were spread allegedly since the XII century and particularly blossomed in Europe of the XIII-XV cc. [5v1], ch.8.

The modern historians consider this information to be a fabulous myth of the deluded Europeans. Purporting that there was never such a Kingdom of Prester John. However, this Kingdom is a historical reality: none other but the Russian-Horde Empire. Prester John, i.e. IVAN is IVAN Danilovich Kalita, aka Khan Batuy.

The 'Tatar and Mongol invasion' began with the unification of Russia under the power of the Novgorodian = Yaroslav dynasty of Georgiy (Russian George) the Victorious (Pobedonosets) – Genghis Khan followed by his brother Yaroslav = Khan Batuy = Ivan Kalita-Khalif [4v]. As a result of the chronological shift Ivan Kalita moved down a couple of centuries and turned into allegedly mysterious Prester John.

That is why, mixing up the brothers-Hordians, the English chronicles called Genghis Khan – PRESTER JOHN [517], p.185; [4v2], ch.6:16.

Why were the historians perplexed by this 'myth'? The reason is that the Mediaeval Europeans as it happens considered the Kingdom of Prester John to be CHRISTIAN. But today it is generally thought that the 'mongols' were Muslim. That is why it is claimed: the 'Mongol' KHANS COULD NOT HAVE BEEN the descendants of the Christians. In fact, Ivan Danilovicj Kalita-Khalif, of course, was a Christian. As the whole of Russia was Christian in his time.

The Mediaeval legends about the Kingdom of Prester John emphasize its fantastical wealth and undisputed political superiority over the Western rulers [5v1], ch.8.

## **8. THE GREAT TRANSMIGRATION OF PEOPLES. INDIA.**

In the Scandinavian chronicles' narration, for example, about colonization and conquest of Europe by the descendants of the 'Mongols', Goths, Turks and Tatars, is reflected the colonization of then sparsely populated Europe during the great invasion of the XIV century [5v]. It was also called the SCYTHIAN invasion. The Scandinavian geographic tractates and the Bible talk about it as populating of the world by the descendants of JAPHETH.

This colonization was not completely forgotten by Western Europeans of the XVII-XVIII cc. In the process of the artificial shift downwards approximately by a thousand years due to an error in the date of Nativity of Jesus Christ, it moved to the 'early Middle Ages'. And is reflected there in the form of the Gothic – Hunnic – Slavic conquest of Europe allegedly of the V-VI cc. well-known in the Scaligerian history. Later it was declared 'savage, barbaric invasion'. Altogether evil.

The colonization of the undeveloped territories of Eurasia, allegedly of the V-VI cc. was called the 'GREAT migration of peoples'. When reading the word 'great' in Greek we find 'megalion', i.e. the MONGOL migration. It is all correct. What is meant here is the invasion of Eurasia in the XIV century.

As the Mediaeval sources say [5v2], ch.9, in INDIA, i.e. in the DISTANT country lived Gog and Magog. We have already talked about where they lived in reality, The Goths and the Mongols, i.e. Cossacks, and the Russians and the Tatars in general lived in the metropoly of the Great Empire. So, once again it turns out that Mediaeval INDIA is Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc.

Generally INDIA is an old Russian word. It originated from a now forgotten dialect INDE, meaning 'in another place', 'from the other side', 'in some places, 'somewhere' [786], p.235. That is why INDIA is simply a FAR OFF COUNTRY, OVERSEAS. Then a Russian word INDE transgressed into Latin which was created in the XV-XVI cc. without even changing its form. In the Latin dictionary you will find: INDE – therefrom, from that place'.

So, the Western Europeans in their late 'learned language' Latin would call THE FAR OFF COUNTRIES - INDIA. That is why when the chronicler writes 'about India' you ought not think that he necessarily means modern India. In the XVII century the name 'India' was taken from Russia-Horde and kept only a small part of it previously belonging to the former Great Empire.

## **9. THE BACCHANALIAN CULT IN THE MEDIAEVAL WESTERN EUROPE**

'Classical Antiquity', the Dionysian bacchanalian cult was widespread in Western Europe not in 'deep antiquity', but in the XIII-XVI cc. It was one of the forms of the Royal Christianity. Ceremonial prostitution was an integral part of Western Christian liturgy. Another example is the cult of love in some Indian temples on the Hindustan peninsula.

The necessity to restrain the orgiastic cult inspired the establishment of the Imperial Inquisition and the enactment of rigorous reforms both in the church and social life of Europe in the XV-XVI cc. In the Eastern Orthodox Church and, in particular, in Russia, bacchanalian practices have never proliferated. That is why there was no Inquisition in the Orthodox Church. It was due to the pressure of the negative implications of the bacchanalian religious ceremonies that the Western Church was compelled to ban the Dionysian orgies and to change over to a more moderate form of the cult [1v], [2v1], ch.1.

The famous descriptions of the 'diabolical Sabbaths' in Western Europe tell us about the same Christian 'agape'-Bacchanalias, but already declared by the reformers of the Western Church to be the 'work of the devil'. One of the main characteristics of the agape-Sabbaths, as the Scaligerian history tells us, were the orgiastic Bacchanalia. Naturally, the new Western 'Renovated Church' put the onus for the agape-Bacchanalia on the 'devil' in order to smother any recollections among the congregation of their quite recent bacchic-Christian past. It was ruthlessly cut off and accredited to a 'different religion'. And under a term 'classical antiquity' banished it to the deep past.



A XIX century scientist Champfleury wrote: 'Time after time when I explored the old cathedrals in an attempt to uncover the mysterious truth behind their beguiling indecent ornamentation, all of my explanations seemed to me to be a commentary on a book written in some language which was entirely foreign to me... What is one to think, for example, of a strange sculpture placed in a shadow of a column of a subterranean hall in a Mediaeval Cathedral in Bourges?' Quoted according to [544], v.5, p.661. The human buttocks in an indecent pose and analogous imagery are being depicted [2v1], ch.1.

All such imagery and sculptures are not the mockery of the church, but have the same purely invitational meaning as an image of the jugs of beer spewing froth above the doors of the German beerhouses. Of course, all of this meant something only prior to the unfolding repressions of the new evangelical church and Imperial Inquisition of the XV-XVI cc. against the Western Christian Bacchanalian cult.

In a close connection with the Christian pornographic imagery are also the analogous 'ancient' monuments, for example, in 'ancient' Pompeii. However, falsely perceived 'coyness' prevents the scientific community from studying these most interesting materials.

V.Klassovsky tells us about the excavations in Pompeii: 'Those of the paintings which represent some acutely erotic and indecorous scenes so loved by the ancients, are kept locked... in the house of the loose women... SOMEONE DURING THE NIGHT SCRAPED OFF THE INDECOROUS FRESCOES WITH A KNIFE ... Lately all the Pompeii paintings and sculptures which are not compatible with the modern notions of decency, are being kept in the SECRET DEPARTMENT of the Bourbon museum, where only those, who present a special permit from the top authorities, are allowed access. To obtain such a permit in a lawful manner is not easy'[389], p.75-76.

In Pompeii some houses were discovered where above the entrances stone phalluses were attached. The connection between a phallus and the Christian cult can be seen not only in the Western-European temples. 'In Hierapolis there were carved out of granite phalluses of an enormous size, 180 feet high and higher; they were placed in the threshold of a temple [389], p.122. V. Klassovsky naively thought that these enormous phalluses served as a 'moral instruction' to 'those who were praying' (?) [389], p.122. But most likely it was a conventional symbol, like a signboard. Like the analogous stone phallic depictions of Indian Shiva Lingam murti [2v1].

Let us go back to the eruption of Vesuvius which destroyed Pompeii, Stabiae and Herculaneum. Their destruction in the XVI or even in the XVII century (year 1631)

reflected in the Old Testament as the downfall of Sodom and Gomorrah. In the Bible this is described as the punishment of the inhabitants of those cities for their lecherous sexual behavior. So what do we see in the excavated Pompeii? Take a walk down the streets of Pompeii. You will see brothels, many indecent frescos with graphic scenes of sexual nature. In this part of the city in the XV-XVI cc. there were organized mass orgies. The authors of the Old Testament, more chaste Christians, were outraged by this debauchery, which reflected in their account of the ruin of Sodom (Stabiae) and Gomorrah (Herculaneum).

Today it is considered that practically all the Mediaeval Roman Christian churches are built allegedly 'on top of the ruins of the pagan temples' [2v], ch.1. Where these 'preceding ancient monuments' were for some reason approximately of the same purpose and even having the same name as the Christian temples [196]. For example, St. Dionysius Church was built allegedly in place of the 'ancient pagan temple of Dionysus, etc. The picture is clear. Having declared its recent bacchanalian past 'unsound', - under the pressure of some or other external factors, - the Eastern Christian Church having transgressed to the reformist phase of the XV-XVI cc. simply RENAMED its pagan-bacchanal temples and announced the former Christian-Bacchanal gods to be the new Evangelical Saints. Sometimes even preserving their names. And the congregation got used to them.

## **10. THE INQUISITION IN THE PAGES OF THE BIBLE.**

The Old Testament speaks a lot about the abominations and vile customs of the local inhabitants of the land of Canaan, whom the Israelites = fighters for God annihilated. It is interesting to see what exactly those 'abominations' were. Their description corresponds surprisingly well

with a list of crimes which were subjected to persecution by the Inquisition. The 'new inquisition' was introduced at the end of the XV century in some isolated countries in the West, and by 1542 it embraced all of Western Europe [5v1], ch.12. All of the Bible's testimonies about the Inquisition wonderfully correspond with our reconstruction, since the end of the XV – the beginning of the XVI cc. – is precisely the epoch of the greatest sweep of the second Ottoman conquest of Europe. The previous wave of the Inquisition, usually dated the XIII century, is most likely just a phantom reflection of the XV-XVI cc. Inquisition [5v1], ch.12:10.

So, the specifications of the XV-XVI cc. Inquisition are sufficiently reflected in the Pentateuch, which narrates mainly about the events of this exact epoch.

## **11. THE ASTONISHING SURGICAL INSTRUMENTS IN POMPEII.**

[Fig. 48](#) and [fig.49](#) show the incredible 'ancient' surgical instruments of allegedly I century, discovered during the excavation in Pompeii. The quality and the high technological level are astounding. In [fig.48](#), on the top – dental extracting forceps and foreign body probe. Below - speculum ani, speculum uteris used by the gynecologists. Take notice of the METALIC SHAFT WITH THE MOST PRECISE THREAD! See [fig.49](#). We can see screws inserted in the apertures, and rivets. But for that one needed to know how to drill metal. It means that the metal drills were already popular. So in front of us we see the manufactured articles of not earlier than the XVI century [NOR], ch.6.

The historians write, that when these most 'ancient' objects were found, 'it was the XVIII century, and this set of tools, VERY SIMILAR TO THOSE USED UNTIL NOW (FOR EXAMPLE, THE GYNICOLOGICAL SPECULUM) CREATED A GREAT IMPRESSION, it showed the high development level of the ancient surgery' [674:1], p.218. And further: 'This speculum uteris, used by the gynecologists, shows the highest level of the development of medicine already reached at that time' [674:1], p.149.

## **12. THE 'ANTIQUUE' STATUES WITH THE RIPPLING MUSCLES WERE CREATED NOT EARLIER THAN THE XVI CENTURY.**

Let us turn our attention towards the excellent knowledge of the position of human muscles by many 'ancient' sculptors. But such knowledge the sculptors and painters acquired only when the medics began to dig out dead bodies, dissect them and study the anatomy. Even according to the Scaligerian history this didn't start earlier than the XV-XVI cc. From the history of the anatomy it is known that the first realistic and detailed description of human body appeared only in 1534. It was a book by the surgeon Andreas Vesalius [NOR], ch.6. The earlier authors had a good knowledge of human skeletal frame. But their knowledge of muscle position was poor. That is why in the really old images of the XII-XV cc. the people's bodies were depicted with smooth skin without representation of the muscles.

The grave-robbers were always subjected to persecution by both the authorities and ordinary people, who tried to protect the graves of their relatives. The church strongly

opposed the grave-robbing. The first grave-robbers often died as they didn't yet know about the ptomaine (post-mortem poison). The grave-robbing on a large scale became possible only in the epoch of the Revolt in the late XVI – early XVII cc (they were looking for treasure). And only later, having studied the anatomy and having understood their disposition under the skin, the painters and the sculptors began to depict the human body in a realistic way. But it probably occurred not earlier than in the end of the XVI century.

Now let us turn to the excavations in Pompeii. It turns out that there were discovered some sculptures and wall frescos with wonderful depictions of the human body muscles, [fig.50](#). Such lavish statues, drawings, frescos and paintings could not have appeared earlier than the XVI century. And most likely, they occurred in the XVII century, during the 'grave-robbing epoch'. Consequently, 'ancient' Pompeii was submerged by the volcanic eruption as late as in the XVI or even XVII cc. [NOR], ch.6.

At the same time on some of the frescos in Pompeii human bodies were depicted without representation of the muscles. Such images could have appeared earlier in the epoch of the XVI-XVII cc., when the anatomical knowledge has not yet been developed. However, the 'smooth bodied' images may date to the XVI-XVII cc., as far from all the Pompeii sculptors had mastered the art of muscular representation which was new for the XVI-XVII cc. Progressive artists began to paint in a new way, but a number of painters still adhered to the old methods, disregarding anatomy.

### **13. MOSES BEGINS THE OTTOMAN CONQUEST IN THE XV CENTURY. 'PASSAGE OVER THE SEA' IS THE PASSAGE OVER THE RIVER ICE.**

As it has already been said, in the XIV-XV cc. due to the expansion of the Empire it was necessary to create extended roads covering a significant part of Eurasia. Infectious diseases began to spread along the roads on a bigger scale than before. If earlier, in the pre-imperial epoch, the epidemics having broken out in one place would die away there, then now the disease could speedily spread over the vast territories. As a result there mass epidemics were breaking out in the Empire.

In face of an absence of medical advances at that time, the Horde authorities were unable to find a medical solution to combat the epidemics. Immunizations and vaccinations in use today were yet to be discovered. In order to stop the catastrophic spreading of the diseases, the 'Mongol' khans sent the army to the South and to the

West with an absolute order to exterminate, without exception, the population of the infected regions, to conduct 'cleansing' among the descendants of the first wave of the conquerors, i.e. in essence, their own brothers. In the Bible this major military operation of the XV century was described as the conquest of the 'Promised Land' by Moses, and later by Joshua Ben Nun. Aka Suleiman the Magnificent, a sultan of the XVI century, aka 'ancient' Alexander the Great. It was the 'second wave' of the great conquest of the world. See the Books of the Old Testament Exodus, Joshua, Leviticus.

The Biblical Egypt of the Exodus epoch is Russia-Horde of the XV century. The Biblical 'plague of Egypt' is the reflection of the infamous period of the epidemics and natural disasters in Russia of the first half of the XV century. The Bible effectively contains the dating of the Exodus of Moses - circa the year 1430 [6v1], ch.4. Immediately before the Exodus, the plague of Egypt descends onto the Biblical Egypt = Russia-Horde. The Russian descriptions correspond incredibly well with the analogous stories from the Old Testament.

A new reading of the Bible clarifies a lot of things. Here, for example, is the famous scene of Moses crossing over with the Israelites the 'waters of the Black Sea which moved apart', where the pharaoh's army which was following them sank when the waves surged. The referral to the famous Ostrog Bible, for example, allows us to reconstruct the truth [6v1], ch.4.

The Ostrog Bible unequivocally describes the crossing over the ICE-GLAZED RIVER! It is said very clearly that the WAVES THICKENED, that LIQUID FROZE, TURNED INTO A WALL, that the fighters for God (the Israelites) WALKED ACROSS THE SEA AS IF ON DRY GROUND, IN THE MIDST OF THE SEA ON DRY GROUND. Notably walked ACROSS THE SEA, and not ON THE SEA-FLOOR. The later editors, either not understanding or purposefully eliminating the descriptions of the icy waters, taught us a fantastical idea that purportedly the waters parted and the fighters for God passed between them like between two walls. Today you can see it in films. We have a choice. We can either consider this picture a fairy tale, or to see a true event in it – the crossing of the army across the frozen river. The ice is 'the waters being a wall to them' because of cold. Then the element of a miracle reflected in the Bible can be easily explained. The army crossed the river over the already thin spring ice probably at night, when the ice became slightly thicker. In the morning there could have been an ice drift, turning into an obstruction in the way of the pursuers. They could have stepped out onto the thinning ice and fallen through

into the water: 'FELL FULL FATHOMS UNDER' and perished. Such luck the fugitives perceived as a miraculous deliverance. Ice drifting begins abruptly, sometimes unexpectedly. At such a moment, without modern bridges equipped with ice breakers, any contact between the two river banks would be completely lost. It is impossible to cross a major river by boats during an ice drift. If it was, a large river like Volga, for example.

It emerged, that the synodic 'translators' of the Bible edited the ancient text, thoroughly eradicating all the 'traces of the North', snow, ice and frost [6v1], ch.4.

So, Moses 'crossing the sea as on dry ground' is the crossing over of a large river frozen over with ice.

This event produced such a deep impression on the contemporaries, that it was described once more in the Old Testament's Book of Joshua. This time it was presented as the Israelites' army miraculously crossing the river Jordan 'as on dry land'. The narration in this instance is much more detailed as its duplicate in the Book of Exodus, i.e. the story of Moses [PRRK], ch.2.

It emerged that the 'ancient' conquest by Alexander the Great is the reflection of the Ottoman Conquest of the XV century. There appeared a partial overlapping of Alexander over Biblical Joshua Ben Nun. And, as a matter of fact, Joshua Ben Nun is a direct successor of Moses in the conquest of the Promised Land. This is the same epoch. That is why such a dramatic event as the warriors crossing water over the thin ice, was reflected not only in the Book of Exodus, but also in Alexander's 'ancient' biography. Both texts basically narrate the same thing [6v1], ch.4.

In the Bible and in 'Alexandria' (life story of Alexander the Great) the army crossing over ice is intertwined with some battle, either close to a river, or directly on the river ice. The reason, why a number of the pursuers drowned when the ice cracked. There is some indirect evidence that the events took place exactly on the Volga river = Ra (the old name for the Volga river – Translator's note).

So in the Scaligerian history there are at least two famous episodes, when the victory in some battle was won not without the help of the BREAKING ICE. But that's not all. Anyone familiar with the Russian history will immediately remember another story – the famous BATTLE ON THE ICE (or THE BATTLE OF THE LAKE PEIPUS), allegedly in 1241, when the Russian Prince ALEXANDER NEVSKY defeated the Livonians (Germans) on the ice of the Chudskoye ozero (the lake Peipus). The Russian sources give various locations of where the battle took place. Some of them point out Chudskoye ozero, i.e. Pskov region. The other - lake Ladoga

(Ladozhskoye ozero) [145], p.165. These two lakes are situated far from each other – approximately 200 kilometers. Thus even the location of the battle raises some questions. During the battle many Livonians drowned in the lake. Possibly as a result of the cracked ice.

Most likely all three of the mentioned above battles are the reflections of the real event in Russia of the XV century.

The narration of the 'ancient' Titus Livy about death of the king Alexander II of Epirus also reflected the famous Battle on the Ice, however in a rather distorted way.

Altogether in the 'History' by T.Livy there emerged three phantom reflections of Battle on the Ice – i.e. Alexander Nevsky's Battle = Moses = Alexander the Great which took place in Russia-Horde, [fig.51](#). More specifically: 1) The Battle of Histria of allegedly 178-174 BC 2) The destruction of the Basternei army on a river due to the cracked ice, allegedly in 175 BC. 3) Death of the king Alexander II of Epirus on a river, allegedly in 326 BC.

We have collected in [Fig.52](#) the main parallels discovered by us between the 'History' by Livy and the history of Russia-Horde of the XIII-XVI cc. There were many of such matches. Respectively, Titus Livy was a chronicler of the 'Mongol' Empire = Russia-Horde of the XIII-XVI cc. [TsRIM], ch.8.

## **14. THE OTTOMAN CONQUEST AND AUSTERE ANICONISM**

**(In religion, opposition to the use of icons or visual images to depict living creatures or religious figures – Translator's note)**

In the XV century between the Empire's two capitals, between the Horde-Ottoman (or Ataman) authorities of Russia-Horde and the heirs of Constantine the Great = Dmitry Donskoy in Czar-Grad there occurred some tension. The Russia-Hordian khans gazed with discontent upon their Southern co-rulers, blaming them for the woes descending upon the Empire. The Hordians and the Ottomans (Atamans) were not very fond of the 'ancient classic' culture, considering their 'ancient classical' brothers to be wrapped in cotton wool, hedonistically wallowing in pleasure. Russia regarded the descendants of Constantine = Dmitry to be the outcasts. Divisions in faith appeared. The relations between the Old Rome = Russia and the New Rome = Czar-Grad tensed. But the main thing was of course metropolys fear of the epidemics approaching from the South and the West.

In the middle of the XV century the army of Russia-Horde = Israel moved on Constantinople and conquered it in 1453. In the modern textbooks this is the famous military assault of Czar-Grad by the Atamans (Ottomans) lead by Mehmed (or Mahomet) the Conqueror. Having captured the capital, the Ottomanian 'wave' descended upon the Southern and Western provinces of the Empire.

The revolt, which broke out in the Western epicenters of epidemics, was mercilessly crushed. But a dear price had to be paid for it. A great amount of people were exterminated. Including the healthy ones, as in the course of the war the Horde-warriors (Israelites) could hardly succeed in separating the sick from the healthy. The tragic feelings of the people who suffered this disaster, is reflected in the Biblical book Apocalypse, the first version of which was created in 1486, but later was supplemented and reworked up until the XVI century, see below.

The Ottoman Conquest – the 'second wave' carried an entirely different ideology from the 'first wave'. If the 'Mongols'= the magnificent ones of the XIII-XIV cc. created the 'antique classicism', then the 'Mongols'-Ottomans (Atamans) of the second wave of the XV century were destroying it. They considered that it was the liberal behavior of the Europeans of the XIII-XIV cc. which lead to the mass infectious diseases. Including venereal ones, as the bacchanalian festivities emerged and flourished during the 'antique classicism'. The Ataman (Ottoman) spirit of Cossacks once again, for the second time, emerging from Russia-Horde was more ascetic and austere. Eventually the ideology of the modern Islam grew out of it. Extremely severe and chaste.

In the XV-XVI cc. the aniconism ran across the entire Empire. In Russia the aniconism didn't take hold, but in The Ottoman Empire on the contrary it was highly developed up to its modern manifestation. In the Western Europe in many Catholic cathedrals you can see the traces of the aniconism to the present day: there are practically no icons there. Though there are no formal restrictions to depict people or animals in the Catholic Church today.

Bible mentions polygamy several times. Biblical patriarchs had several wives at a time. Old Testament Solomon, for example, is described as having an entire HAREM in. This fact also brings together Biblical customs of Pentateuch with the Muslim ones. The Muslims were allowed polygamy, and wealthy people kept the harems. All the sultans had the harems. The concept of polygamy has probably originated in the epoch of the 'Mongol' conquest. Many men were marching off and the amount of men in the metropoly was decreasing. One of the ways of ensuring reproduction of the



population was as follows – to allow a man to have several wives. Thus facilitating the birth of more children.

## **15. IRON CHARIOTS, HORNETS AND THE BRAZEN SERPENT IN THE BIBLE ARE CANNONS.**

When describing the wars of the fighters for God = the Israelites, the Bible pays particular attention to the presence and quantity of the IRON CHARIOTS in the army. Therein worked an interesting and simple rule: those, who had more iron chariots would win the battle. The question is, if the iron chariots were some ordinary iron wagons or carts, why then would they lend such remarkable strength to the army? As we show in [6v1], ch.4, Biblical 'iron chariots' are the firearms, the cannons.

Furthermore, the Bible describes some 'hornets', i.e. something FLYING IN FRONT OF THE ARMY AND STINGING, participating in the battle and defeating the enemy. Notably, better than a sword or a bow. It seems like this is the description of the buck shot which was used to fire from the cannons. The analysis of the ancient Bibles shows, that the Old Testament describes the muskets or the musketoons which the fighters for God = the Israelites = the Cossacks were equipped with. 'Serpents' and 'stinging asps' (including the 'brazen serpent' made by Moses) which are often mentioned in the Bible, are also the firearms, muskets and cannons [6v1], ch.4.

The 'brazen serpent' of Moses is most likely a large cannon made by the Atamans (Ottomans) to repel the enemy, who also had the cannons=serpents at their disposal. As referred to in [533], v.2, p.131, the Biblical expression 'venomous snakes' meant literally 'fiery'. The later depictions of a 'Serpent of brass' made by Moses in the form of a high pole, with a snake wrapped around it, are the distorted interpretation of a gun barrel, on which sometimes the images of snakes and some other dangerous beasts were cast. In [KAZ], ch.1 we cite some images of the Russian cannons of the XVI-XVII cc. from the Nesvizh Castle. In one of them there is depicted a serpent-dragon. Hence this gave rise to images of 'venomous snakes', 'fiery aspens' and 'brazen serpent' so colorfully described in the Bible.

So, the Bible often mentions cannons and firearms in general. But the editors of the XVII-XVIII cc. blurred these references, and in today's version of the Holy Scriptures the 'firearm topic' is significantly obscured. However, some thing or the other happily slipped the editors' attention.

[fig.53](#), [fig.54](#). The Israelites are painted as mediaeval warriors in a mediaeval city. And they carry a cannon on a carriage with them! See [6v1], ch.4.

## **16. THE MEDIAEVAL GEOGRAPHY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.**

In the Book of Exodus there are vivid traces of Mediaeval Western-European geographical names: KNUN – Genoa, the river PRT – Pruth, the descendants of Lot - the Latini, the stream of ARNN – the river Arno, VASSAN - the city of Bassano in Italy, RAVVA – the Italian Ravenna, RAMAH – Rome, etc. The matter is that the Ottoman (Ataman) conquest, aka the biblical conquest of the fighters for God of the land of Canaan, rolled out all over Western Europe too. It covered the vast territories and could not be carried out solely by efforts of a single monolithic army. Various military divisions set off in different directions. In the Book of Joshua it is mentioned, as a rule, that the battles were fought not by all of the Israelites against their enemies, but just about several tribes-factions.

N.A.Morozov in [544], v.2, pointed out, that it is possible to read the unvowelized text of many excerpts of the Book of Exodus, taking into account the location of the Sinai mountain = Horeb = Zion in Italy. The Biblical descriptions of Sinai clearly indicate that it was an active volcano. Most likely it was meant to be the Italian Vesuvius [1v], ch.1:11. The Biblical geographical names have appeared in modern Palestine quite recently, after Palestine was incorrectly identified with the Biblical Promised Land. In the Middle Ages there were no such names there.

## **17. MOSES AND JOSHUA BEN NUN.**

Moses was a czar-khan of the Ottomans (Atamans). In the Middle Ages they were often called the Saracens. This word is probably a variant of the word CZARIST. It turns out that there existed some Russian sources which directly called the Biblical Moses the czar of the SARACENS, i.e. the czar of the ATAMANS (OTTOMANS). This astonishing fact from the point of view of the Scaligarien history was brought across to us by the annotations to the mediaeval indexes of the 'erroneous books'.

Here we encounter the traces of the defunct mediaeval tradition which communicated the Biblical story in a dramatically different fashion to the way it is being painted for us by modern editions of the Bible. Many old books, which were denounced as false, were destroyed. So today we can judge their content only by such brief sketches.

The Biblical books in the XVI-XVII were changing, branching into various editions, while at the same time preserving the same name. For example, Exodus. But today only one version of it remains. Many think that THIS WAS ALWAYS THE ONE AND ONLY VERSION. It is not so. In the XVI-XVII cc. many biblical books were re-written, having changed the dating and the geography. At the same time the events

in Russia-Horde were removed and shaded over. The old authentic scrolls were destroyed. Controversy arose around such practices. The repercussions of these controversies are still felt by us now. For instance: 'The heretics put together Exodus of Moses crookedly', - writes an author of the late XVI century [937], p.359. Meaning that: 'The Exodus of Moses was represented incorrectly by the Heretics'. And, as we can appreciate it now, his indignation is justified.

The following rulers are the duplicates, the reflections of the same reality of the XV-XVI cc. One should not think that the Russian and Ataman (Ottoman) sources are perfectly accurate. Given that the Russian history was heavily distorted, [4v1], ch.1. The same sort of thing was happening in Turkey in the XVII-XIX cc. and even the XX century. That is why the 'phantom epochs' may contain mistakes in the dating and confusion amongst the rulers.

1) The Biblical epoch of Moses – is the time of the Ottoman Conquest in the first half of the XV century.

The character of Moses comprises: the Golden Horde Khan of the first half of the XV century Olugh Mokhammad (of Kazan) or Ulug Mehmed (the Great Mahomet or Muhammad) the founder of Kazan (=Medina?); the Ataman (Ottoman) sultan Mehmed I (1402-1421); the Ataman (Ottoman) sultan Murad II (1421-1451); the Ataman (Ottoman) sultan Mohamed II the Conqueror(1451-1481).

This very epoch is the same 'ancient classical' epoch of the wars of the Macedonian King Phillip II the Conqueror. It is at the same time the epoch of Kham Olugh-Mehmet in Russian History, circa 1420-1450.

2) The Biblical epoch of Joshua Ben Nun, who succeeded Moses, is the time of the Ottoman conquest, beginning with seizure of Czar-Grad in 1453 by Mohamed II, and culminating in the peak of the golden age under Suleiman the Magnificent (1520-1566). Suleiman was known as AL-QANUNI [336], т.5, с.148-149. It means the GREAT KHAN, as QANUNI AND KHAN only slightly differ in pronunciation.

This epoch is also the epoch of Alexander the Great of Macedonia who continued the conquest of Phillip II. The figure of Alexander is multi-layered. He embodied both the events of the XV century (Olugh-Mohamed I, Mohamed II the Conqueror and also of the XVI century. Including events from the life description of Andronicus-Christ of the XII century.

In Russian history it is also the epoch of Suleiman the Magnificent (1520-1566). And partially it is the epoch of his contemporary Ivan IV 'Grozny' (Ivan the 'Terrible').

The following picture of the disposition of the military columns, = 'tribes of Israel' of Joshua Ben Nun, takes shape [fig.55](#). Six Cossack camps were situated in Bulgaria, and six other were scattered along the coast of Turkey. The Bible (Numbers 2:17) says that among those 12 camps there should be one camp of the Levitical priests, the guardians of the Tabernacle of Testimony, not included in their number (Numbers 1:48 and further). That's exactly what we see! Czar-Grad (Yeros) = Jerusalem, the holy place is situated practically in the centre. The columns located in Bulgaria defend it from the direction of Europe, and the columns situated in Turkey cover the Mediterranean coast of Asia Minor [6v1], ch.5.

The famous siege and conquest of Biblical Jericho by Joshua's (Ben Nun's) army is the famous seizure of Czar-Grad by Sultan Mohamed II in 1453. The entire description of the siege of Jericho revolves around its walls. Effectively the mighty triple belt of Constantinople's walls was considered a miracle the art of fortification. The Bible says that Jericho's walls were destroyed by the besiegers in some unusual way. Purportedly, using a 'loud noise' produced by some jubilee trumpets' (Joshua Ben Nun 6:3). It turns out the Old Testament 'jubilee trumpets' are simply the cannons. And a 'loud sound' is simply the cannonade'. The walls were destroyed by the heavy siege cannons [6v1], ch.5.

The Ottoman conquest of the Promised Land by Joshua Ben Nun is also described in the European sources as the conquest by Apostle Jacob (Ya'akov (Ya akov) = James (Hebrew origin meaning Jacob – Translator's note). It is considered that the apostle St.James is buried in the Cathedral of Santiago de Compostela in Spain. The famous Way of St.James is the later version of this map which was compiled in 1648, has survived until today as a military map of the conquest routes by St.James = Joshua Ben Nun in the XV-XVI cc. [6v1], ch.5.

The Ottoman conquest was rolling on from the East to the West. Joshua Ben Nun's army marched out from Russia-Horde and The Ottoman Empire-Ottomania (Atamania). That is why on the map of 1648 there are no 'ways of pilgrimage' marked on the Eastern territories. The Horde military field maps were intended for the conquest of exactly Western Europe, Africa and generally the territories to the West and to the South of Russia-Horde. The randomness of the routes also becomes clear. The 'Mongol' troops moved according to the requirements of the colonization-war. But the general direction was to the West, in particular, towards Spain.

The conquest of the Promised Land by Joshua Ben Nun was not only the dispersal of the Christian faith, but also the military invasion. They were trying to convince not just by the word but also by the sword. And in the case of resistance – by the massive

howitzer weapon, mortar-guns and cavalry encased in armour. In a sense the Scaligerian interpretation of the 'ways of pilgrimage' as the ways of 'James' conquests' is reasonable. The only thing which has to be adjusted is the very meaning of the events of the XV-XVI cc. itself. It concerns the Ottoman conquest by Joshua Ben Nun = St. James (Jacob) [6v1], ch.5.

Soon the entire world was conquered. The Cossack = Israelite army reached the Atlantic. But their progress didn't stop there. The Horde navy soon left the ports of the Western Europe, which set off further across the ocean to America in order to conquer the unknown lands 'the other side of the sea'.

## **18. CONQUEST OF AMERICA BY RUSSIA-HORDE AND THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE-ATAMANIA IN THE XV CENTURY. BIBLICAL PATRIARCH NOAH IS CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS.**

In the XV century the second phase of the conquest began. The military navy of Russia-Horde = Israel and The Ottoman Empire-Ottomania(Atamania) = Judea crossed the Atlantic and disembarked in America. This event is known to us as the voyage of 'Christopher Columbus'. In the Bible all of this is described as the voyage of patriarch Noah crossing the 'mighty waters'. The other armies of Russia-Horde entered the American continent via the Bering Strait and colonized the Western coast of America and the North. Then they advanced to South America. In America the Horde and Ataman (Ottoman) colonizers have created cultures known to us today as the Indian civilisations of Maya, Aztec, Inca, Toltec and others (etc.) [6v2], ch.6.

In Spanish the discoverer of America was called Cristóbal Colón [797], p.603. It is not a name in a sense conventional today, but a nickname like Crusader Colón (Colonizer). The historians themselves recognise that the name Cristóbal originates from the word Christ, or Christian, or Crusader, and the word COLON meant: a colony, a colonizer, colonization. Today we do not know the actual name of this man. Only his nickname – Crusader Colonizer. I.e. a person under the banner of Christ, who discovered a new continent and started its colonization. It was as a Crusader that Columbus was depicted on some of the old prints [6v2], ch.6.

In the Middle Ages there prevailed some legends (which perfectly support our reconstruction) that America was discovered and populated by the TRIBES OF ISRAEL, who arrived there by sea. This is in the spirit of a biblical description: a

patriarch Noah crosses some vast ocean and his descendants populate the New Land, the New World.

## **19. THE BOOK OF MORMON ABOUT THE CONQUEST OF AMERICA BY NOAH-COLUMBUS.**

The Mormons is a religious movement of American origin. Besides the conventional Bible they revere equally or possibly to a greater extent the Book Of Mormon (The Mormon Bible).

The Mormons claim that their Bible is the authentic ancient document. Many don't believe that, as up until the XIX century it was out of sight of the Biblical Studies. When analysing the Mormon Bible [6v2], ch.6, we discovered that the Mormons are in the right here. This text could not have been invented in the XIX century. If it was true, then the historical records included in the book would have been obtained from the Scaligerian textbooks of that time. However, **VARIOUS PASSAGES FROM THE MORMON BIBLE COMPLETELY DON'T COMPLY WITH THE SCALIGERIAN VERSION AND CORRESPOND WELL WITH THE NEW CHRONOLOGY.**

The Book of Mormon is, most likely, one of the versions of the Bible, but it differs greatly from the European version. The main body of the Book of Mormon narrates of the events which are not reflected in the conventional Bible. The Mormon tradition claims that the Book of Mormon describes the events in connection with the American continent. It also tells a lot about the past of the Mormons prior to their relocation to America. These parts resonate with the conventional Bible. The chronology of the events described in the Book of Mormons which are recognised today, i.e. namely from the year 600 BC to the year 421 AD – relies entirely on the Scaligerian version. That is why it is incorrect. It turns out that this book tells us about the actual events of the XII-XVII cc. I.e. of the epoch which is also reflected in the conventional Bible.

The Book of Mormon describes the voyage of Nephi-Noah and his relatives in the Ark across the great waters, known to us from the European Book of Genesis. On the other hand the commentators of the Book of Mormon insist, moreover, in a plain language! - that this is a 'prophecy' of the 'foreseen' **DISCOVERY OF AMERICA.** Even in the Book of Mormon itself, in the subhead of The First Book of Nephi, ch.13, is clearly says: **THE VISION OF... DISCOVERY (AND COLONIZING) OF AMERICA'**. Indeed, it is difficult to disagree that here is the account of the first – or one among the first – voyages across the Atlantic. This was the voyage of Columbus at the end of the XV century.

Of course, the commentators of the Book of Mormon talk only about the PROPHECY of the discovery of America. Contrary to the clarity of the picture, they cannot say directly, that here is described the discovery of America in the XV century. Bound by the erroneous chronology, they shift the events into deep antiquity, allegedly 592-590 BC. See One Nephi, comments to chapters 16-18. This error has to be corrected and date it to the XV century. The shift of the dates upwards would comprise approximately 2100 years [6v2], ch.6.

When describing the voyage of Nephi-Noah (Columbus) the Book of Mormon refers to a compass, a globe, iron crossbows, firearms (described in a somewhat veiled way – cannons, muskets and other objects of the XV-XVI cc. epoch.

The Book of Mormon proclaims that the voyage of Nephi-Noah (Columbus) and Jared-Horde was the voyage of one of the Twelve Tribes of the children of Israel who left the land of Egypt or the land of Jerusalem. It is all correct. The Twelve Tribes of Israel are the armies of the hetmans (Cossack chieftains, attamans), who marched from Russia-Horde in different directions to conquer the Promised Land in the XIV-XV cc. KOLENO (BRANCH or LINE) meant KOLONNA (military COLUMN or military LINE), i.e. a military detachment (unit). Russia-Horde = Israel set off for the conquest of Europe and faraway America.

Is Columbus' voyage connected with the Exodus of the Twelve Tribes of Israel, notably from Spain? IT IS THOUGHT THAT THE VOYAGE OF COLUMBUS STARTED AT THE MOMENT OF THE EXODUS OF THE JEWS FROM SPAIN.

It is all correct. They referred not to the expulsion of Jews from Spain, but to the next stage in the advancement of the tribes = columns of Israel, i.e. the Russian-Horde (Hordian) and Ottoman (Ataman) armies. One of the Cossack detachments arrived to Spain. It paused there for some time as they were building a fleet. Maybe, for several years, as the Book of Mormons claims. And moved further to the West across the ocean. Such a major event in Spain of the XV century was interpreted by the recent historians as allegedly the 'expulsion of Jews from Spain'. The fact, that actually did take place, was given an entirely different meaning, fogging and obscuring the true meaning. The distortion was manufactured when creating the Scaligerian history.

Thus, the 'moors' or the 'arabs' were 'driven out' from Spain not at all by the indigenous population of the Iberian Peninsula. The Imperial army forced the people out further to the West. The lines-columns arrived to Spain under the order of the khan of the 'Mongol' Empire originally for the quarantine cleansing of the infected territories, and then, further down the line – to organise the relocation across the Ocean. The 'moors' or the 'arabs' who lived in Spain, were the descendants of the first

great conquest of the XIV century. The new wave of the XV century was the second one.

Subsequently it turns out that the 'most ancient Babylonian and Sumerian documents call the Biblical Noah by the name of ZIUSUDRA (Zi-ud-sura or Xisuthros), i.e. Cristopher, and effectively describe him as Cristopher Coloumbus of the XV century [6v2], ch.6.

Presumably, in some of the regions of the 'Mongol' Empire, for example in the Middle East and Asia, they used to write on the clay tablets up until the XVII-XIII cc. Maybe there was very little paper and expensive parchment there. That is why the fragments of the Bible, which during that epoch was only just taking shape, were written down by the local scribes and priests onto the clay tablets. Later, when the writing paper was delivered to those regions, the clumsy tablets grew out of use and were soon forgotten. They were discovered in the ground 200-300 years later by the archaeologists of the XIX-XX cc. Brought up on the erroneous chronology, they declared their discovery to be the 'most ancient Sumerian' testimonies dating allegedly thousands of years BC.

Furthermore, we learnt that the 'most ancient' holy book Popol Vuh of the American Mayan people is another version of the Bible, which narrates about the events of the XIV-XVI cc.

## **20. THE 'ANCIENT' BOOK POPOL VUH' ABOUT THE COLONIZATION OF AMERICA IN THE XV-XVI CENTURIES.**

Popol Vuh is a holy book of the American Indians Maya-K'iche. They were a powerful people inhabiting Central America. It is thought that the Mayan civilization blossomed in the XI century and was destroyed in the XV-XVI cc. during the invasion of the Europeans – the Spanish conquistadors. But this hypothesis of the historians is incorrect. It turns out that the epoch of Columbus is not only reflected in Popol Vuh, but the book itself begins with its description. Even Columbus' name is mentioned. Relocation from the Old World to the New World is one of the central themes of the book. All of this was taking place in the XIV-XVI cc. [6v2], ch.6.

The historians are convinced that the 'very ancient' Popol Vuh reflects only the local American history and 'by no means'; could have described the Biblical and Christian events in the Old World. As, they said, the regular contacts with Europe started only in the late XV century. Consequently, the historians reason, all the obvious parallels of the 'ancient' Popol Vuh with the 'ancient' Old Testament can be attributed to this.



Purportedly, in the XVI century some scribes of the American book inserted into it Christian and Biblical motives, brought into America only in the XV-XVI cc. I.e., they say, they falsified the text [1348], p.18.

Any thought of Popol Vuh being written as a Christian book in the XV-XVI cc. from the very beginning cannot cross a modern historian's mind as it would contradict the Scaligerian chronology.

A continuously expressed statement in Popol Vuh claiming the community alliance of the settlers in America is absolutely correct. Russia-Horde, which created the Empire, expanded in various directions from the collective center. Our point of view differs from the traditional one in that, that the historians refer the words of the American Bible Popol Vuh exclusively to the history of Central America. We, on the other hand, claim that here is presented a grandiose view of the resettlement of the peoples of Russia-Horde throughout the world at that time. One of the final countries of resettlement was Central America. But it was not the only one [5v], [6v2].

Having arrived in America, the people of Maya-K'iche 'found many cities' [1348], p.193. As Popol Vuh informs us, soon the question of the New Kingdom's establishment and Benediction came up. It was required to send back to the East across the ocean the embassy of Maya-K'iche to the great Quetzalcoatl to obtain the authority to govern [1348], p.206-210. This section of Popol Vuh is extremely interesting.

As soon as the suspension of the Scaligerian chronology lifted, in the name of the Mexican god Quetzalcoatl we recognise Caesar-Catholic. The sounds L and R could cross over: Quetzal-Coatl = Caesar-Coatl = Caesar-Catholic. This immediately carries us over to Europe, where the Russian Christian church is still called the Orthodox CAPHOLIC, and in some countries the CATHOLIC faith is wide-spread.

Thus the embassy of Maya-K'iche from a faraway America, having crossed the ocean, appeared in front of the great Capholic (Catholic) King and received the powers and authority to rule over the territories discovered in America. This event reflected in the European sources as the return to Europe of the confederates of Columbus to receive from the king the authority to rule the discovered American lands. It is clear that such authority could have been given only by the emperor of the 'Mongol' Empire. Furthermore, it is possible, that Quetzal-Coatl in the Indian texts is the Emperor Charles V. Whom the famous conquistador admiral Cortes did in fact report about the conquest of America [6v2], ch.6. In which case, Quetzal-Coatl is

known to us also as the Assyrian- Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar. Aka khan Ivan Vasilyevich IV Grozny (The Terrible).

The entire story with the respectful embassy of Maya-K'iche from America to the Eastern Czar-Catholic shows, that in the epoch of the XV-XVI cc. the hierarchical power structure in the Great Empire was clear. To come into the ownership rights of the discovered territories was possible only via the magnanimity of the Khan of Russia-Horde. He listened graciously and gave his permission. The members of the embassy breathed a sigh of relief. In Central America the civilizations of Maya and Toltec flourished.

There are strongly pronounced Evangelical storylines present in Popol Vuh. In particular, the appearance of the Star of Bethlehem in the sky, as an omen of the arrival of Christ and the Christophany (appearance of Christ) itself.

It would be more correct to call the Indian civilisations of Central America – Maya, Aztec, etc. – the HORDE-Indian. They appeared as a result of the Hordian-Ottoman (Ataman) conquest of America in the XIV-XV cc.

## **21. THE CLOSE TIES BETWEEN 'ANCIENT' AMERICA AND 'ANCIENT' EURASIA ARE WELL-KNOWN. BUT THEY BEGAN ONLY IN THE XIV-XV CC.**

Today a great number of impressive testimonies of the close ties between 'ancient' Maya and 'ancient' cultures of Europe and Asia have been amassed. [6v2], ch.6. However the historians and archeologists shift these ties back into the 'distant past'. The result they arrive at is, that long before the voyage of Columbus there was continuous relations between America and Eurasia, the level and intensity of which was so high, that corresponded to the state of the civilization only starting with the XV-XVI cc. For the historians there is an insuperable chronological contradiction at the bottom of it. That is why on one hand they are compelled to acknowledge the 'ancient', close and regular relations between America and Europe. And on the other hand, they constantly make stipulations that purportedly the connections were occasional and rare. And in general, they say, don't pay any attention to them. The main thing is, don't ask us any questions about the chronology.

These authors, being under the influence of the erroneous chronology, were compelled to concoct some artificial theories to explain the close 'ancient' connections between America and Eurasia. It is clear now, that there is no need in them. It is sufficient to say plain and clear: Yes, in fact the regular communications did exist. However, it was not at all in the 'deepest past', but only starting with the

XIV-XV cc. As a result of the colonisation of America by Russia and The Ottoman Empire. After that all the baffling questions accrued by the commentators become irrelevant per se.

## **22. MYSTERIOUS CENTRE WHICH THE WAVES OF THE GLOBAL MIGRATIONS WERE SPREADING FROM.**

Let us get back to the close ties between America and Eurasia in allegedly 'pre-Columbus' time'. 'A multitude of very specific parallels, - says Gordon Ekholm, - guards against any possibility of a random coincidence' [210], p.33.

And further: <<A famous Mexican ethnologist and art critic Miguel Covarrubias suggests that 'the great traditions of the Teotihuacan culture were brought to the Mexican Valley... by some MYSTERIOUS FOREIGN ELITE, WHOSE MOTHERLAND WAS SITUATED SOMEWHERE IN THE EAST... Having mastered the more primitive local tribes, the strangers, according to him, STOOD AT THE TOP OF THE NEW CIVILIZED SOCIETY, FORMED ON THE BASIS OF THE CULTURAL FUSION OF THE TWO CULTURAL STREAMS: LOCAL AND FOREIGN'>> [210], p.77.

And yet more: 'But, perhaps, the most extreme position in the debate about the origin of the Teotihuacan civilization was adopted by the Swiss explorer Sigvald Linne, who for many years conducted excavations on the territory of the city. He was arguing that ... the LOCAL POPULATION WAS ALTOGETHER DRIVEN OUT FROM THE BENIGN VALLEY BY SOME UNKNOWN ALIEN PEOPLE, WHO OVER TIME CREATED A BRILLIANT CIVILIZATION OF THE CLASSIC ERA. Thus, the majority of the experts on the Teotihuacan civilization, who worked for a long time at the town's site and were familiar with its culture better than anyone, concurred that the local civilization was imported either from the East, the West or the South, anything but originating in Teotihuacan itself' [210], p.78.

And also: <<Even in the late XIX – early XX cc. the scientists- Americanologists – Leonard Adam, Carl Gentze (Карл Гентце), Paul Rivet, Hoze Imbellione (Хоце Имбеллиони) and the others – drew to attention the ASIAN-AMERICAN PARALLELS IN ART. The substantiated works by L.Adam and C.Gentze pointed out some interesting similarities in the motives, ornamentation and stylized design of various articles of merchandise of the people of Eastern Asia on one hand, and North-West coast of America and Mexico on the other... The course of ancient history looked primitively simple according to this concept: 'THE GIVING' EAST AND

'THE RECEIVING' PROVINCES, WICH INCLUDED NEARLY ALL OF OUR PLANET... In this respect a considerable part was played by the works of German and Austrian ethnologists, the creators of the theory of The Kulturkreis ('culture circles' or 'cultural field')- F.Graebner, W.Schmidt, B.Ankerman, V.Coppers and the others, who tried to prove that THE CULTURES OF ALL THE PEOPLES IN THE WORLD ORIGINATE FROM SEVEN OR EIGHT WAVES OF CONSECUTIVE MIGRATIONS OF A GIGANTIC SCALE, EMANATING FROM A CERTAIN MYSTERIOUS CENTRE, WHICH SHOULD BE LOOKED FOR SOMWHERE IN THE SOUTH-EAST ASIA and regions of Oceania adjacent to it >> [210], p.20-21.

The mysterious centre was sought for a long time. But they failed to find it. We can point it out. The scientists, not knowing it themselves, discovered the outcomes of the Horde-Ottomania's (Atamania's) conquest-resettlement which was expanding in every direction, resulting in the birth of the Great Empire. Hindered by an incorrect chronology, the historians looked for the centre in the 'distant' past'. They didn't find it there. Because it is in Russia and The Ottoman Empire of the XIV-XVI cc.

It was the erroneous chronology which literally at every step of the way was preventing the historians to arrive at our conclusion. They write this way: <<Unfortunately, nearly all the parallels presented here are of a purely superficial nature, AND THE CHRONOLOGICAL GAP BETWEEN THEM SPANS EVERY TIME OVER A GREAT MANY CENTURIES. If, let's say, the lotus relief from Amaravati (India) date to the II century AD, then their Mexican 'doubles' from Chichen Itza were created at best circa the XII century AD. In Cambodia the step pyramids for the first time appear only in the X century AD, whereas in Mesoamerica – in the early I century BC >>[210], p.30.

Take away the wrong dates from here, lift all these parallels into the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc., and everything will fall into place. The mysterious mass parallels will transform into a bright picture of intercommunication between CONCURRENT civilizations of the XIV-XVI cc.

## **23. THE COLOSSAL DIVISION OF THE WORLD BETWEEN 'CASTILE' AND 'PORTUGAL'.**

There is an incredible fact well-known in the XV century history. Castile, as a part of Spain, and Portugal divided the world between themselves! One of the major documents consolidating the division of the world is called quite openly: The Treaty of Tordesillas between the Kings of Spain and Castile REGARDING THE

DIVISION OF THE WORLD. 7 June 1494." [707], p.375. This very division of the world is ratified in the papal bull of the 4 May 1493 [707], p.240. Also the papal bulls of 1452, 1455 and 1481 speak of the distribution of the spheres of influence worldwide between Castile and Portugal [707], p.246-247.

The crux of the matter is as follows. Castile and Portugal divided the world between themselves by drawing a line of demarcation along the meridian in the Atlantic from North to South, [fig.56](#). A part of the world to the East of the line was granted to Portugal. The rest of the world to the West of the meridian was granted to Castile. The division was accompanied by the debates: the division line would shift one way or the other. In [fig.56](#) can be seen the demarcation lines of the years 1481, 1493 and 1494 [707], p.248. The main border of the division of the world was the meridian passing through the Atlantic [6v2], ch.6.

It is reported: <<That is how appeared the famous papal bulls of Pope Alexander VI ... placing the kings of Castile INTO POSSESSION OF THE MASSIVE BODIES OF WATER AND LAND TERRITORIES... It is believed that Alexander VI was the conciliator in the Castile-Portugal dispute and that he, wishing to reconcile the litigant sides', 'divided the world' between both of the Iberian powers>> [707], p.247-248.

So in the late XV – early XVI cc. the entire world was divided between Castile and Portugal. Notably with much *éclat* and on a large scale. A straight division line was drawn rather simply – along a meridian across the Atlantic. The seas and the lands to the right of the meridian would belong to Portugal. Those to the left – to Castile [707], p.248-249, 376.

Today this treaty is perceived by the historians as something 'rather strange'. They could not have failed noticing a surprising inconsistency between a massive scale of the affair and an apparent insignificance of the two 'rival countries' – Castile and Portugal. Have a look at the map. Find a small country which is called Portugal today. Then find a small region in Spain called Castile. The population of both of these countries is numerically insignificant. These countries were not particular wealthy or rich in natural resources in the Middle Ages. The historians themselves write: 'WEEK, TORN BY THE FEUDAL WARS, UNSUCCESSFULLY TRIED to compete with Portugal in the waters of the Atlantic ocean. THE CASTILIAN PEOPLE WITH GREAT EFFORT MANAGED TO KEEP POSESSION OF THE CANARY ISLANDS' [707], P.245. In regards to Portugal's status up until the end of

the XIV century they write: 'IT WAS ONLY A REMOTE EUROPEAN BACKWOODS' [707], P.244.

So, 'week Castile' and 'remote European backwoods' – Portugal – allegedly divide the world between themselves. And what is most surprising, they do not encounter any opposition. They had disputes only between themselves. And only in regards to where to draw the demarcation line. And the Roman pope approves of this division! It is strange isn't it?

The role of the pope also surprises the historians: 'It is relevant... to pose a question, on which grounds did the pope take charge of the seas and lands which did not belong to him and what could these privileges mean?' [707], p.245.

But all the oddities appear because the historians look through the prism of the Scaligerian history. Our reconstruction puts everything in its place.

In the late XV – early XVI cc. the only two mighty superpowers of that time – Russia-Horde (Castile) and The Ottoman Empire=Ottomania (Atamania) (Potugal) – come to an agreement about the division of the world. Both of these states were a part of the 'Mongol' Empire. That is why they agreed quickly and with no particular problems. The purpose of the agreement is clear. To regulate the actions of the Russian and Ottomanian administration in the vast territories colonized by the Empire in the XV-XVI cc. I.e. they have divided between themselves the Biblical Promised Land. This way it was easier to control the distant provinces and to organize normal life there. It is difficult to do so from one centre in view of the sheer size of the Empire which has expanded incredibly.

The reason, why it is Porte-Head, i.e. 'Portugal' ('gal' = 'golova' = 'glavny' meaning Head or Main in Russian – Прим. переводчика) (The Ottoman Empire), that a part of the world east of the Atlantic meridian went to, is clear. The fact is that during that epoch the Ataman (Ottoman) navy ruled exactly in the Mediterranean and in the Eastern part of the Atlantic. And Russia-Horde colonized a significant part of the North-Asian continent situated to the West of the demarcation line, [fig.56](#). Russia-Horde was advancing into America not only with the Ataman (Ottoman) fleet, but also from Siberia, via the Bering Strait and then across Alaska into inland America.

The pope's role in the division of the world also becomes clear. A treaty of such importance should be sanctioned by the spiritual authority of the Great Empire. I.e. the Pope. As was done.

The treaty between Russia and Ottomania (Atamania) remained in force up until the XVII century. Only after the victory of the rebellious Reformation and the breakup of the 'Mongol' Empire the Treaty became a subject of attack from the reformists. 'By the XVII century, when the initiative of the colonial expansion passes to England, France and Holland, and Spain (in fact Russia-Horde – Author's note) and Portugal (in fact The Ottoman Empire=Ottomania (Atamania) – Author's note) lose the significant part of their West-Indian and East-Indian domain in the crippling battle, the clauses of the Treaty in Tordesillas sound like an anachronism. However UP UNTIL THE END OF THE XVIII CENTURY The Treaty of Tordesillas preserved its legal validity in resolving the boundary disputes in the South-American domains of Spain and Portugal' [707], p.379.

In fact, PORTUGAL is PORTE-GALIA, i.e. Porte-Glava (porte=gates, glava=head) or Porte Glavnaya (glavnaya=main). Or Porte Helios, i.e. Porte Sunny or Porte Sublime. We would like to remind you that 'PORTE... (Ottoman Porte, High Porte, SUBLIME Porte) are the names of the domains of the Ottoman Empire... recognised in the European documents and literature'[797], p.1038. Thus, Portu-Gal was one of the names of the Ottoman Empire.

So what is CASTILE of the XV-XVI cc.? It is possible that CASTILLA originates from the word CASTLE, i.e. a tower, a fortified manor-place or a city. It is quite possible that Cas-Tile is a distorted Cazy-Itil, i.e. meaning Cossacks from Volga. We would like to remind you that in the Middle Ages Volga river was called Itil (Or Atil). In other words, Cas-Tile could have been one of the old names for Russia-Horde or the Volga Cossacks.

In the XVII-XVIII cc. the history was re-written. The famous names of Cas-Tile and Portu-Gal survived in the Iberian Peninsula only as the names of the two small regions which were a part of the Great Empire. And today we were taught to think that these two names always referred just to contemporary Castile in Spain and to contemporary Portugal. Which is wrong.

## **24. HOW AND WHEN THE HISTORY OF AMERICA WAS FALSIFIED**

To falsify the history of the discovery and colonization of America is far easier than to falsify the European History. The history of Europe needed a lot of work. It was necessary to break down the strong-minded resistance of the entire social strata of European society, who still remembered its recent history well. It was hard work to introduce the Scaligerian version [5v2]. Predominantly it was done by the military

force. On the other hand the events in distant America troubled the Europeans far less. They were separated from America by the Atlantic. The scant information about America would reach Europe only with the ships which occasionally crossed the ocean.

The chronicle writing of America was in the hands of just a small number of Europeans. It was easy to negotiate. It was quickly explained to them – what they should write, and what they shouldn't. While the authentic Hordian-Indian chronicles were burning on fires. Having ruthlessly destroyed heaps of American manuscripts, the cynics like Diego de Landa, would then pick up a quill and write the 'correct history of the Native Americans'), shedding crocodile tears [6v2], ch.6.

The 'Spanish Conquista' of the early XVI century was, in fact, one of the waves of the Hordian conquest which reached America. The first wave is the conquest by Columbus of the late XV century, and the second wave of the early XVI century is known to us as the Spanish Conquista (La Conquista). See our book <<Завоевание Америки Ермаком-Кортесом и мятеж Реформации глазами "древних" греков>>. ('The conquest of America by Yermak-Cortes and the Reformation revolt through the eyes (as seen, viewed by) the 'Ancient' Greeks'.)

But then a question arises. Is it correct that the destruction of the flourishing Hordian-Indian civilizations of America by the Europeans dates exactly to the early XVI century? Did it not take place later, in the XVII-XVIII cc.? In the epoch of the Reformation in Europe. When the victorious rebels, having split from Horde-Ottomania (Atamania), with fire and sword spread their 'reformist ideas' into Central America as well. In the XVII century the troops of the West European Reformists finally made an incursion on the territory of America. In a grueling fight they broke down the culture of Maya, Aztek and Toltecs, which had developed over the preceding 150-200 years. The wars were bloody. The sovereign rulers of Central America remained at most true to the idea of the 'Mongol' Empire. They warded off the attacks of the navy of the rebellious Western European governors for a long time. But in the very end the American Hordians were defeated.

After the victory of the Reformation it was decided to re-write the American history and to offload all the horrors of the XVII-XVIII cc. war onto the Hordian-Ottoman (Ataman) colonization of America of the XV-XVI cc. They killed two birds with one stone. Firstly, the Reformists white washed themselves. Secondly, in the face of Spain, they blamed the weakened Horde-Ottomania(Atamania) for their own atrocities on the territory of America. They said, they had split open the skulls of the Indian babies, etc.



Similar propaganda, blaming the Spanish conquistadors, allegedly of the XV-XVI cc., of the atrocities, spread over West Europe starting in the XVII cc. It is hardly accidental, that practically all the prints in the book of Bartolomé de las Casas were executed in the spirit of the 'information war'. Here are just a few of the gravures' engravings' names: 'The conquistadors setting the dogs on the Indians', 'Roasting over a slow fire', 'Mass torture of the Indians by the Spanish', etc. [6v2], ch.6.

This is the competent and enduring way that the history of America was falsified.

## **25. THE DISTRUCTION OF THE AMERICAN INDIANS.**

The majority of the North American Indians were mercilessly annihilated during the US wars as well as those Native Americans killed in the epoch of the XVIII century. It is considered that Holland, France, England and then the USA, in severe battles and in violent disputes among themselves, were seizing the former 'Spanish territories' in America [336], v.2. In fact, the conquered lands were the vast American domains of Russia-Horde and Atamania (Ottoman Empire) which suddenly 'became no one's' after Moscow Tartaria fell apart circa 1775 [4v1], ch.11. The founding of the USA in 1776 was accompanied by other distinguished events, which are now becoming clear. For example: 'In 1774 there was announced the freedom of the trade exchange between the colonial provinces... In 1778 a FULL REFORM OF THE CROSS-ATLANTIC TRADE took place'[336], v.2, p.417

'Even Washington for a long time had to lead the wars with the Native Americans, in which the success was reached only by the merciless use of power and was connected with multiple heavy losses' [336], v.2, p.484.

A small number of Native Americans who survived, were forced into reservations where they, on the whole, remain until present day. A myth was created and forcefully introduced into the mass consciousness, alleging that the 'Indians are themselves to be blamed'. Purportedly, the well-mannered European settlers in America of the XVII-XVIII cc. were forced to defend themselves from the attacks of the proud Native Americans, who for some reason were protecting their lands. In the end the Europeans' patience came to an end and they had to shoot all the Native Americans with the cannons. In order to save the remaining ones from hunger and cold, they were honourably and altruistically provided with infected blankets. Many, for some reason, died. The surviving ones were freely inebriated with alcohol. They were recommended not to step outside the gates of the reservation. However they were savage, uneducated, not suited to a new life. So on the whole everything ended for

them quite well. Now the descendants of the Native Americans, which are few and far between, are invited to share, as they say, in the fruits of European civilization.

Thus was the story of the employees of the Museum of Ethnography at the University of British Columbia in the Canadian city of Vancouver and the Vancouver Centre of the Native American Culture, heard by A.T.Fomenko and T.N.Fomenko in 1991.

It is interesting that on the maps of the West and North West of America of the XVI-XVII cc. there was an enormous 'white spot' [6v2], ch.6. As we have demonstrated, these territories even then were under the rule of Moscow Tartaria. The Europeans were not allowed there. In any case, up until 1775. Only from this moment, after the defeat of 'Pugachev', Moscow Tartaria started to fall apart, and the USA emerged. It is curious to see when exactly the USA populated, for example, the territories of San Francisco, one of the most fruitful regions of the West Coast of America. These territories to the North of the Californian Peninsula, constituted the 'white spot' on the maps up until the second half of the XVIII century. Here are the three images, two of which are very rare.

The first – is an engraving with a view of San Francisco in 1848, [fig.57](#). Its coastline is practically empty. There are only four ships docked in the bay. There are just a few small houses in the valley. There are surrounding thick woods on the hillsides. There is obviously very few people there. The region is not developed yet. Everything is clear. The USA came here comparatively recently. The old Hordian-Indian settlements are already destroyed, and the new city has not yet been built.

The second image was made only ten years later, in 1858, [fig.58](#). It is astounding that in ten years a big city had time to grow!

The bay is literally clogged with vessels. Young San Francisco has grown rapidly on the territories which were recently seized from the the Hordians-Indians.

The last image is a photograph of the end of the XIX century. There is already a big city depicted on it.

## **26. THE KORAN AND THE BIBLE.**

Over the course of time Islam underwent great change and only recently assumed its current form.

The Western commentators' of the XIX century's attitude towards the Koran and Muhammad (still not completely overcome to this day) was on the whole very sceptical. Purporting that it is a derivative recent text, largely based on the Old Testament Bible, on the Judaic and Christian works. Originally, they say, recorded

either on the bones, papyrus, palm tree leaves, pebbles, or preserved in memory... Now we understand the reasons for such a negative attitude. The fact is that the chronologists of the XVI-XVIII cc. brutally distorted the past. The Bible and the 'ancient classic' texts, which in reality were created in the XIII-XVII cc., were dated to the deepest antiquity and declared venerated works embedded in the foundation of the entire civilization. The Koran, written approximately in the same epoch, was shifted to a not so remote past and the first year of The Hijra era was professed to be 622. As a result, the Koran, purportedly turned out to be 'much younger' than the Bible and the 'ancient classics'.

Moreover, as a result the Koran and the Bible turned out to be the holy books of different religious movements, seceding from the previously united Christianity of the XIII-XVI cc. This made a strong impression on the representatives of various spiritual schools which emerged in the XVII-XVIII cc. which was reflected in their appraisal of the holy books.

The new chronology fundamentally changes this psychological picture. It becomes clear that the Koran is one of the versions of the holy books which were created in the XIII-XVII cc. that is to say simultaneously to the Bible. This is why many testaments in the Koran are not the 'quotations from the canonised Bible', but often independent and original. Even when they describe the same events as the Bible, the interpretation is different. What the bewildered commentators declare to be 'incorrect citation' of the Bible and the other sources known to us today is just a different perspective on the mediaeval events contemporary to the authors of the Koran.

That is why the Koran is a vitally important and fascinating book, and in regards to us, we read the Koran with an immense interest from the beginning to the end. It turns out that it conveys to us important information lost or cleaned out in the other religious movements.

After the split of the Great Empire the attitude in the Romanovs' Russia towards the Koran and Muhammad became complicated. The emerged religious schism further aggravated tension between the Romanovs and the rulers of Turkey. Nevertheless in the Russian scientific community, unlike in Western Europe, the attitude towards the Koran on the whole remained respectful. It was published and translated in our country as a major work which merited serious study. Even the wars of the pro-Western Romanovs with Turkey didn't influence the respectful attitude towards the Koran in Russia. Despite the attempts of the Romanovs to drive a wedge between the Russians (the Orthodox Christians) and the 'Mongol' Tatars (the Muslims), it didn't succeed.

The Western torrent of 'scientific criticism' at some point descended not just on the

Koran, but also on the Book of Mormon [6v]. The accusations against it were in many respects similar to those towards the Koran. Generally the Book of Mormon is often declared to have been 'made up' in the XIX century. The reasons for this 'criticism' are the same. As it turned out the Book of Mormon which surfaced in the XIX century has conveyed to us an old version of history which substantially differs from the Scaligerian one. Subsequently this book was immediately condemned and categorised as 'illegitimate'.

The XVII century author Andrey Lyzlov annotated the Koran and captured a great deal accurately. But as a XVII century Christian, already having been brought up with a sceptical attitude towards Islam, he thought that the Koran (and Islam on the whole) despite, allegedly, being in conflict with the Christians, nevertheless borrowed important ideas from 'earlier' Christianity, Judaism and 'Paganism'. It is not entirely true. All these movements emerged from the whole Royal (and later the Apostolic) Christianity of the XII-XVI cc. That is why they retained so much in common.

At the same time the opinion voiced by Lyzlov has its reasons. As we understand now, the Koran was created in the XV – first half of the XVII cc. as some kind of specific 'ecumenical Book' intended to rectify the rupture, which emerged in the Empire and in the religion. The Islamic leaders sincerely desired to restore the former unity. At least for the significant part of the former Empire (Western Europe was not considered 'their own' any longer). To achieve that they incorporated into the Koran ideas close to the representatives of different religious branches. Their intention was to attract them under their banner. To a great extent it succeeded. Islam has united a great number of people.

The Koran's structure also becomes clear. It is a highly poetic work filled with allegories, and also ideas close to the Christians, the Jews and the 'Pagans'. The poetic language has attracted many. The idea of the restoration of the former unity struck a chord.

## **27. MEHMED II THE CONQUEROR AND THE PROPHET MUHAMMAD.**

### **YAROSLAVL METEOR OF 1421.**

We have discovered that the life description of Prophet Muhammad includes some accounts of Andronicus-Christ from the XII century [PRRK]. In particular the following storylines are present: the Annunciation and the Immaculate Conception; caesarean section; the Star of Bethlehem; reference to John the Baptist; the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem; Jesus driving the tradesmen out of the temple; the destruction of the temple and its rebuilding in three days; the judgement of the whore; Descent into

Hell; the ascension of Jesus to heaven; Resurrection from the dead and the Last Judgement; the Conversion of Paul the Apostle (Saul).

In the Prophet Muhammad's life story there are also accounts of Moses and Joshua Ben Nun from the XV-XVI cc. For example, a mother gives up her child to be raised by another woman, later the infant is returned to his mother, but she still gives him back. Moses kills the Egyptian, and a pharaoh in revenge wants to kill Moses, but fails. In the life story of Muhammad we are told that he was falsely accused of the murder of a Christian called Sergius, and also about the failed attempt to assassinate the Prophet Muhammad. The Exodus of Moses with the Israelites from Egypt corresponds with Muhammad and his followers' migration (Hijra) from Mecca. Muhammad's great Battle of Badr corresponds with Moses' victory over the pharaoh's army. Muhammad, like Moses, at a single blow cuts through the water, etc. See [PRRK].

However, the facts of the famous Sultan Mehmed II the Conqueror were incorporated into the life story of Prophet Muhammad most of all. The well-known Arab conquest is the Ataman (Ottoman) seizure of the Promised Land in the XV-XVI cc. In particular, the conquest of the cities Taif and Tabuk by the Prophet Muhammad is the reflection of the seizure of Czar-Grad in 1453 by Sultan Mehmed II the Conqueror [PRRK], ch.3. Besides, in the life description of the sultan Mehmed II the Conqueror there are fragments of the 'biographies' of Czar Ivan the 'Terrible' (III = IV) and Khan Ulugh Mehmed.

An interesting theme directly connected with the life description of the Prophet Muhammad was exposed. It turns out that a large iron meteor which fell in Yaroslavl in 1421 was reflected in the Bible, Islam, Christianity, in the 'ancient paganism' of Ancient Rome and Ancient Greece. This fall of the meteor on Novgorod (i.e. Yaroslavl) is described in detail in the Russian chronicles, as well as in the Old Testament. It's reflected in the works of the famous Plutarch as the fall of an 'iron shield' (iron meteor) from the sky in the 'classical' Royal Rome and its usage in forging weapons of steel is described. The Russian Chronicles report the falling of the rocks (or a rock) from the sky, out of a fiery cloud in 1421.

It turns out that the Horde master craftsmen started using the debris of the Yaroslavl meteor (as the additive) to smelt extra strong and resilient steel, as the result of which the famous Damask (Bulat) steel was invented. The Russian (Damask) steel later was reflected as 'ancient' Syrian. Aka – Damask (i.e. Moscovian) (Bulat) steel [PRRK], ch.5.

We have also discovered the mentioning of the meteor of 1421 fallen in Russia in the 'ancient' Greek texts. In particular, it is a legend of an 'ancient' bronze anvil which fell

from heaven to earth, to Tartar (Tataria = Tartaria). Another famous 'meteor reflection' is the famous smiting god Hephaestus-Svarog, who fell to earth and broke both of his legs.

Another reflection of the Yaroslavl meteor are the Iron Tongues which fell to earth from the sky under the divinity czar Hephaestus-Svarog. Near the place of the fall an ancient settlement Kleshin emerged, not far from Yaroslavl, which later grew into a town of Pereslavl-Zalessky. The legendary 'Blue Stone' in Pereslavl-Zalessky on the shore of Lake Pleshcheyevo is a 'substitute' of the ancient Kleshin Stone, i.e. the meteor.

The rubble of the Yaroslavl meteor (or its 'substitutes' in place of the lost originals) is also most likely safely kept, in the Muslim Kaaba in memory of this event. In the Biblical Arc of the Old Testament there were remnants of the stone 'tablets' of Moses, and in the Muslim Tabernacle in Mecca – fragments of the stone or iron meteor, blackened by the kisses of hundreds of thousands of people. Or the debris of lava, the volcanic 'bombs'. It is known that the Kaaba 'Stone, fallen from Heaven' is the greatest relic of the contemporary Mahometans (Islamites) and the Hagarenes of the Middle Ages.

It is possible that there are the pieces of lava, according to the XIX century explorer Crichton. Lava emerges during a volcanic eruption. For example, the eruption of Vesuvius in Italy. Which we already earlier identified with the Biblical mountain Zion-Horeb, where God-Thunderer handed Moses the tablets of stone [1v]. Maybe, they could have been the pieces of lava, on which later the sacred text was inscribed. The fact, that the Black Stone of Kaaba is considered to be 'fallen from heaven' could also be a recollection of debris ejected in the air during the eruption and then fallen to earth. It is clear why the Bible says that the stone tablets broke down. The pieces of the red-hot volcanic rocks falling from the air often break on impact with the ground. However the most established opinion (and most likely, the correct one) states that the Black Stone of Kaaba is the debris of a meteor.

We also analyse the mass cult of the sacred (rough) stone in the Bible, Islam and Christianity, which originally emerged possibly as a veneration to the iron Yaroslavl meteor. It is also worth paying attention to the mass ancient custom of the rough 'blue stones' in Yaroslavl and its suburbs.

Another 'ancient' story about the Yaroslavl meteor is a famous 'Ancient' Greek myth of Phaethon, the son of Helios, who plunged into the river Eridanos and 'split Tartar apart' (i.e. Tartaria). It means that Phaethon fell in 1421. The astronomical dating of the horoscope, which we discovered on the old bas-relief the 'fall of the Phaethon' (Phaethon zodiac), [fig.59](#), corresponds well with the fall of the meteor on the 19th

May 1421. Thus the date stated in the Russian chronicle is verified astrologically and, therefore, almost certainly with a probability of 0,999 (see the details in [PRRK], ch.5), is correct.

Through the efforts of the 'classic' authors of the XV-XVI cc., Phaethon, aka the Yaroslavl meteor of the 1421, was 'transferred' to the starry sky and depicted on the 'classic' and mediaeval star maps as a renowned stellar constellation of Auriga. The river Volga was presented as the constellation of Eridanos, and Damascus steel which became famous – as the Cygnus constellation. So even from here you can see how many far reaching consequences for the 'classical' world of the XV-XVI cc. were there in the fall of the iron meteor in Timerevo, near Yaroslavl, and subsequently the beginning of the Damask steel production. So, once again, and from a different unexpected side, it is proven that the names of the constellations and their configurations were by no means determined in the 'deepest antiquity', as the historians assure us, but in the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. [3v].

The reflections of the Yaroslavl meteor of 1421 are also the legends of apostle Peter-Rock with the keys of Heaven, and the god Hephaestus-meteor with the tongs of heaven. Some chroniclers confused Keys and Tongs (in Russian Klyuchi and Kleshi sound similar – Translator's note). The fall of Phaethon was refracted as Apostle Peter's crucifixion 'headfirst' (Peter was crucified upside down).

The Old Testament Prophet Elijah is another partial reflection of Phaethon-Hephaestus-Peter, aka the Yaroslavl meteor of 1421. We refer to the famous Prophet Elijah's ascension to heaven in a chariot of fire. While Elijah of Phoenicia (Hephaestus-Phaethon?) leaves 'his deputy' – prophet Elisha (possibly, the duplicate of god Haelios, father of Phaethon).

Most likely, the famous Biblical Tabernacle, in which the Arc of the Covenant was situated, is a blacksmiths, where in a special box (like in Kaaba) the Yaroslavl meteor debris were kept.

Finally, we examine the story of Prophet Muhammad's confederate– Ali-Aaron-Ayyub. It turns out that Ali-Ayyub Sultan was a friend and a banner-bearer of Prophet Muhammad and, that after allegedly 800 years of oblivion he once again emerges in the story of Mehemet II The Conqueror. In this respect a possible beginning of the Hijra era is the founding of Kazan by Ulu-Mahmet in 1437-1438. A likely correspondence looks like this: caliph Ali is Ayyub Sultan; caliph Muawiyah is Mehmed the Conqueror; the first Osman Umayyad caliphate is a union of Russia-Horde and Turkey-Atamania of the XV-XVI cc. Besides, the famous legends of Ilya of Murom and Rustam (or Rustem) encompass the recollections of caliph Ali.

So, in the life description of Prophet Muhammad there become apparent some vivid

parallels with the life description of Jesus Christ, Biblical Prophet Moses and the famous sultan Mehmed II the Conqueror (1432-1481). The image of Muhammad is complicated and complex and originated in the epoch of the XV-XVI cc. as a result of combining various written sources. While the main core of the 'biography' of prophet Muhammad is a description of sultan Mehmed II the Conqueror.

## **28. THE ARAB CONQUEST.**

After the Battle of Badr (also described in the Bible as Moses' victory over the pharaoh's army) the style of the Prophet Muhammad's life story takes a dramatic twist. The following narration up until Muhammad's death consists of a list of the military campaigns, battles, sieges and conquests of the cities. Wars, wars (and more) wars... The matter is clearly about a massive conquest. In fact this is what the Scaligerian history claims to have happened. It is considered that the famous Arab conquest begins from the victory at Badr. Sweeping through many countries. There were especially many conquests under the belt of Omar, Muhammad's successor. It was he who created the Arab Empire. Prophet Muhammad started and developed this, and Omar successfully completed it. A great many pages in the life descriptions of Muhammad and Umar ibn Al-Khattab are devoted to the Muslim military invasion. In the Bible these events are described as the conquest of the Promised Land by Israelite (i.e. Horde-Cossack) armies of Moses and his successor Joshua Ben Nun (The Books of Exodus and Joshua). Moses started the wars successfully and Joshua Ben Nun completed them brilliantly.

In fact it was the Ataman (Ottoman) conquest of the world of the XV-XVI cc. which later on spread onto the American continent. In Eurasia some of these campaigns were carried out by the Atamanian (Ottomanian) Mehmed II the Conqueror [5v] and [6v].

## **29. THE BLOODSTAINED RIGHT HAND – THE RELIGIOUS SYMBOL IN ISLAM.**

In the Muslim symbolism a prominent part is played by a depiction of a right hand covered with blood. The historians do not know the origins of this symbol or when it was introduced. Some hazy hypotheses have been put forward [PRRK]. The sources inform us as follows:

# This symbol had a ritual, sacred meaning.

# It was perceived as a commemorative sign in honour of some sultan (allegedly Murad). This is the image of the great sultan's hand. Purportedly he left an imprint of his right palm on an important document.



# The imprint of the right hand on the janissary's banners was made in blood. The custom was so widespread that as early as in the time of A.S.Pushkin it was common practice in the Turkish army.

# In the epoch of the XVII-XIX cc. the Atamans (Ottomans), and later the Turks were Muslim.

It occurs that a ceremonial mark of a palmprint on a military banner could have been connected with Prophet Muhammad, the green banner of whom is called the Prophet's Banner.

The palmprint of the sultan's hand covered with blood, as a well-known symbol is also mentioned in the life description of Mehmed II the Conqueror in 1453. The Turkish historian Jalal Assad wrote: 'Sultan enters Hagia Sophia on horseback over the piles of dead bodies... with his HAND COVERED WITH BLOOD he, allegedly, leaned on one of the columns, which is still visible today' [240], p.56.

Today Mehmed's II 'palmprint' is shown to the tourists in Hagia Sophia (the Church of Holy Wisdom) [PRRK]. Thus, the symbolic depiction of a right hand covered in blood could have appeared as a memory of Mehmed II.

The life description of Prophet Muhammad is multi-layered. The information on sultan Mehmed II, Prophet Moses and the Emperor Andronicus-Christ is intertwined in it. But before his execution Andronicus-Christ's right hand was cut off [TsRS]. It became a Christian symbol and was depicted, in particular, in the 'ancient' Carthaginian temples on the military banners of the 'ancient' Roman legions, [PRRK], ch.4, etc.

It is possible that such a custom appeared in the epoch of the Crusades of the XIII century, when the armies of Russia-Horde and its allies moved onto Czar-Grad to punish the perpetrators of Andronicus-Christ's crucifixion. Christ's severed and bloody right hand was depicted on the military badges as a symbol of vengeance for their executed god. Since then this sign became one of the symbols of the legions of 'Ancient' Rome, i.e. Horde Empire. Most likely, originally there was also a Christian symbol fluttering on the Islamic military banners – the right hand of Christ covered in blood. Under such banners the Christians-Mahometans of that time went into battle. Later the origins of this symbolism were buried, and the chroniclers started to remember either sultan Mehmed II, or sultan Murad, or simply spoke of a ritual meaning of the bloodied hand on the banners of Prophet Muhammad.

### **30. JANISSARY.**

The Ottoman Empire was founded by the Horde Cossacks who came from Russia-Horde (Biblical Israel) to conquer the Promised Land. Naturally there were many

Slavs and Turks among the warriors. The Cossacks-Hordians had a strong effect not only on the Ataman (Ottoman) army's hand-picked contingent, but also made up the Empire's nobility from whom was elected the sultan and his court. It is not surprising that the sultan was proud to wear the Janissarian ketcher (a hat), which in fact was a Hordian headdress [PRRK].

So it turns out that Janissary are one of the heirs of the Order (aka Horde) of the Crusaders, i.e. 'Bearers of Christ' of the XIII century = the participants of the Crusades on Czar-Grad. In memory of this Trojan war there were established the 'ancient' gladiator games, aka the mediaeval knight tournaments. And also the Olympic Games were created. [RE].

Right up to the XIX century the Janissary occupied a prominent social position in Ataman (Ottoman) and later on in Turkish society. However in 1826 they were massacred. In that epoch the efforts of Western Europe to tear Turkey away from Russia and to re-orientate the sultans towards the West were successful. The fierce Janissary obstructed this 'movement towards civilisation', kept alive the memory of the former unity with Russia. It became necessary to slaughter them on the sly. At the same time the documents connected to the Janissary Order, the customs, Janissary's banners, etc. were destroyed. The memory of the past was becoming wiped out.

### **31. YAROSLAVL METEOR OF 1421 IN THE BIBLE.**

# There are strong reasons to believe that in the suburbs of Yaroslavl there still survives an enormous sanded up crater of a large iron meteor which fell in 1421. Both, the geological data and the surviving traces of the 'iron names' surrounding this place indicate this: Zhelezny Borok (Iron Borok), Bolshoye Timerevo (Big Timerevo), Maloye Timerevo (Little Timerevo) ('Timer' means 'iron' in Tatar and Bashkirian) [PRRK].

# Among the archaeological excavations there were discovered some pieces with the clear traces of the meteoric iron.

# According to the archaeologists, here was a major manufacturing and trading centre of a European importance connected with the iron processing.

# Apparently, the well-known Arizonian and a lesser known Yaroslavl meteor craters are similar and the iron meteors which fell down there were of comparable sizes [PRRK], ch.5.

Please note the date: 1421. It turns out that Yaroslavl meteor fell in the first half of the XV century. Precisely during the epoch of the Ottoman conquest. Its beginning is described in the Bible as Moses' famous Exodus from Egypt with the Israelites [6v]. That is why the fall of the meteor could have been reflected in the Old Testament.

Actually, there is such a narration. It is the handing of the stone tablets by God to Moses. Here are two themes closely intertwined with each other.

The first is the eruption of Vesuvius in Italy (i.e. the Biblical mountains Sinai = Horeb) accompanied by fire, smoke, thunder and falling of the volcanic bombs.

The second theme is the falling of a large meteor in Yaroslavl. Which also was accompanied by fire, smoke, thunder and falling of the meteoric debris. It is said in the Bible: 'On the morning of the third day there was thunder and lightning, with a thick cloud over the [Sinai] mountain, and a very loud trumpet blast. Everyone in the camp trembled.' (Exodus 19:16). It's no coincidence that Moses' stone tablets were broken.

## **32. DAMASK STEEL.**

The Indian, Syrian and Damascus Steels are considered to be the most ancient [988:00]. The historians refer here to the territories of the modern India and the Middle East. However, we have shown that earlier 'India' and 'Syria' were used as names for Russia-Horde of the XIII-XVII cc., i.e the metropoly of the Great Empire. Besides the old D-Mascus (Damascus) is a kingdom of Mosokh, Moscovia, and later – the city of Moscow. Here D is the article denoting respect, alike to 'the' [6v]. The ancient Damask steel was first produced in Russia-Horde. It corresponds well with our concepts of the fall of the iron meteor near Yaroslavl, in the very centre of Vladimir and Suzdal Russia.

In the epoch of the 'Mongol' conquest the Damask swords which were in the armament of the Cossack (= Israelite) army of Russia-Horde, circulated rather widely. They turned up in various provinces of the Empire. Later, after its split in the XVII century, the Damask steel weapons remained in some places in the arsenals of splinter states. Its primary origin was forgotten. The new generations of the local warriors began to celebrate allegedly 'their own' ancient Damask steel, having a vague memory of ancient 'Indian', 'Syrian and 'Damascus' Steels. Not understanding any longer that all of these names on the whole meant the same thing, and at some point indicated the metropoly of Russia-Horde. After the sly editors 'drew' on the Scaligerian maps the new 'ancient' Syria, India and Damascus (where we see them today) the obliteration of the true history became even more tangible. Fairytale theories flourished of the ancient Damask steel being produced in the places where they had never made it.

As time passed, the secret of Damask steel was, as we are told, lost. Since then many tried to unsuccessfully reproduce it. Our explanation of all these failed attempts to produce the Damask steel anew in present days is very simple. Despite the fact, that

Yaroslavl meteor was large, sooner or later its debris was bound to become exhausted. Though it was used very carefully and only as an additive to steel, however the original bulk of the material was still limited. When the debris came to an end, the manufacturing of Damask steel also stopped. It remained the legendary weapon of the past.

At the same time, there was enough of the valuable meteor iron to organize in the XV century the manufacturing of a significant amount of the Damask steel for the army of Russia-Horde. This, partially, explains the military superiority of the Cossack armies of that time. The Damask steel Russian (aka 'Indian') blades cut through the shields, armour and swords of their enemies. The Damask steel weapons were enshrouded in legend. The secret of the Damask steel was lost simply due to the fact that during that time they didn't yet know how to do subtle chemical analysis. This is the reason why the composition of Yaroslavl meteor remained unknown to the Horde=Damascus craftsmen. Once the meteor debris finished – the valuable additives to steel also were exhausted. And without the knowledge of the meteor composition, without its 'formula' it was impossible to reproduce these additives artificially. If the ancient steelmakers themselves invented the physic-chemical 'formula' of Damask steel (without the use of the meteor) they would have hardly forgotten it.

When and why was the art of the Damask steel production forever lost? We named the main reason: the debris of the meteor became exhausted. The second reason had the evolutionary nature. In the epoch when there were no firearms Damask steel played, of course, an exceptionally important role. It cut through the ordinary armour and shields. The soldiers steel-clad in chain armour with a Damask steel sword in their hands had of course a clear advantage in the battle field. But with the invention of the muskets and cannons the significance of the Damask steel lessened and gradually faded away. For some time, mechanically, they could have continued to forge the Damask steel weapons out of the remains of the old Damask swords and chain armour. But the speedy development of the firearms resulted in the chain armour fading into the past. They became useless against the bullets and buck shot. It became unnecessary to cut shields and armour. The swords and the sabres, of course, remained amongst the weaponry, but the requirements towards the quality of the metal became weaker. A sword made of regular good steel was sufficient to cut through the uniform and normal clothes. And it was not at all compulsory for it to be made of the legendary and expensive Damask steel. So Damask steel could 'survive' till the XVII-XVIII cc., gradually turning into collector's and museum armament.

### **33. THE STONE DEBRIS IS PRESERVED IN THE MUSLIM KAABA IN MEMORY OF YAROSLAVL METEOR.**

During the creation and consolidation of the Great Empire the Horde army expanded in different directions. The military workshops, where they fixed and made weapons moved alongside the armies. There were probably also such mobile forges where they made Damask steel. To do so Yaroslavl meteor debris was necessary, used as the additive to steel. A certain amount of it was carried along and used when required. Obviously, it was guarded rigorously. The pieces were transported in special boxes. Several Horde armies had them. All of which contributed to the stories of the famous Biblical Ark, in which the priests carried the relics of the 'stone tablets', handed to Moses by God Himself. Thus the broken tablets could have been the debris of Yaroslavl meteor [PRRK].

But is it possible that the debris of some other meteor fallen in a different place was venerated? We will answer like this. Just the fact of meteor falling, even a very spectacular one, is not enough on its own for a strong cult of worshiping its remnants to be established. Of course the meteor blast could have impressed accidental witnesses. But those people who didn't see the fall would hardly be filled with reverence based only on a few eye witness accounts. Should the meteor pieces however be needed for the important military and social ends, then the picture changes fundamentally. The Yaroslavl meteor was not just a 'stone from the sky'. The production of Damask steel originated as a result of it. That is why the attitude towards the remains became very reverent. They 'guarded' people, 'presented' them with military victories and even prosperity. This is exactly how the Bible describes the qualities of the pieces of the stone tablets in the Ark.

The Bible believes that on the stone tablets there were WRITTEN the laws given to the Israelites by God. Where did this legend come from? Here is a simple explanation. The Yaroslavl meteor was of iron origin. The essential distinction between an iron meteor and an aerolite is that when you smooth the surface of an iron meteor, on the polished flat cut, complex shapes RESEMBLING INSCRIPTIONS will bleed through. But nothing of the kind happens with the aerolite. The 'writings' which appear on the polished section of the ferriferous meteor are called Widmanstätten patterns. When examining such patterns, our ancestors could probably decide that these were the exact divine laws given to Moses. Later the commentators 'successfully read' the arabesque like meteor patterns and wrote the required text into the Bible. Thus canonizing the laws designed by people with the authority of the 'Celestial stone'.

As it was said earlier, Kaaba most likely is the Biblical Ark of the Old Testament in the end 'emerging' in Arabia. It is likely that the stone debris kept at some point in Kaaba, were the pieces of the Yaroslavl meteor. The thought of them being those very pieces you can see today in Kaaba is very seductive. The remains of the famous 'shield from heaven' described by Plutarch. But, most likely, it is not so. The fact is that according to witnesses, the remains seen today, which are embedded in the cement, belong, it seems, to a stone meteor. However, as far as we know, their chemical analysis was never carried out.

During their military campaigns the Hordians and Atamans (Ottomans) carried the debris of the Yaroslavl meteor with them in a chest containing holy relics or in several chests, see the Bible. These portables boxes and cloth tents were the original 'Kaabas', aka 'cubes'. The troops traversed great distances. The 'Kaabas' moved together alongside them. One of them at some point landed in the Arabian Peninsula where it was hauled up. When the conquests came to an end this very 'Kaaba-Cube' became the focus of worship of the conquerors' descendants and the locals. It is Kaaba in today's Mecca.

So, at first Kaaba, or a number of Kaabas, came out of Russia-Horde. But if there survive the literary accounts of this important event, then the original Hordian 'Kaaba' could have also been depicted on the old maps. Notably, exactly in Central Russia. Are there such maps?

Yes, there are. And several of them. Here, for example, the world map by Pierre Duceillier, allegedly 1550 [PRRK], ch.5. Straight in the centre of Russia there is an interesting image. A commentator writes, albeit slightly perplexedly: 'A cartographer places Alexander's Shrine (from the shores of La Manche it appears to the cartographer AS MECCA'S KAABA) far in the North [40:c], p.12.

So, in Central Russia, closer to the North, there used to be situated a structure, which according to the historians, bore a resemblance to the Kaaba in Mecca. It was called the Shrine of Alexander of Macedonia. According to our result, the biggest contribution into the multi-layered image of Alexander was made by Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent of the XVI century. I.e., partially, the Biblical military commander Joshua Ben Nun. Therefore we are talking about the XVI century here, about the epoch of the Ataman conquest. So it appears that in that time in Russia there was a holy shrine resembling the Kaaba in Mecca. On the map, upstream of the river Don, there was depicted a black structure of a cuboid shape. We would like to remind you, that Kaaba is a big cubic building covered with a black coverlet.

Thus, in the centre of Russia-Horde, there was a structure resembling the Kaaba-Cube. It is probable, that inside it were preserved Yaroslavl meteor fragments. At first

there were a lot of stones there. Maybe several hundred tons worth. A large building was required, a warehouse. Or it could be even a number of such 'Arks'.

The 'Shrine of Alexander' was very well known in Russia during the 'Classical Antiquity'. It is depicted on Ptolemy's maps, [Fig.60](#) [PRRK], ch.5. The 'shrine' was clearly considered to be a large building with windows. The contemporary Kaaba is also a building.

According to Ptolemy beside the 'Shrine of Alexander', in Russia-Horde, there was also another Shrine nearby – Royal (Ceasar's Shrine), [fig.60](#). It is possible, that here were also kept the holy remains of the iron meteor. As it was mentioned before, the Cossack armies carried with them the pieces of the meteor for the forging of Damask steel. That is why there were several 'Shrines', they were mobile.

### **34. THE BIBLICAL TABERNACLE.**

Let us look at the Biblical Tabernacle, where the Ark of the Covenant was. The commentators assure us, that a tabernacle is something like a tent, where the box with the stone fragments of Moses' tablets stood. However, it is most likely that this is a much more recent perception of what a tabernacle was. Though the matter of the Tabernacle is not of major importance for us, however this topic shows how the real life events could have been fantastically interpreted in the chronicles.

The 'first' Arc of The Old Testament is a box where the fragments of the iron meteor were kept. These pieces of iron were used to produce Damask steel. But then a thought occurs that the TABERNACLE was simply a FORGE, A BLACKSMITHS' SHOP. Precious pieces of the meteoric iron would be kept exactly in the blacksmiths' shop, where they were needed by the black smiths and steelworkers. Here there was finished metal products (swords, cannons, muskets...), steel feeds, furnaces, anvils, hammers, clippers, water containers for thermo hardening, boxes with coal and charcoal for the forges, etc. Altogether a complex and secure Hordian manufacturing operation.

Curiously enough the Tabernacle is described in quite some detail in the Bible and in the Illuminated Compiled Chronicle. Let us see if it says anything about a blacksmiths. To begin with we open the Synodic translation of the Bible. We read and at the first glance we do not discover anything resembling a blacksmiths. There is a verbose, odd and obscure text in front of us. There many numbers in it. We open the earlier Illuminated Compiled Chronicle. Though the description of the tabernacle is also still hazy here, however there emerge some vivid details, which were either erased or distorted in the Synodic translation. They clarify the essence of the matter. It is likely to be a mediaeval alchemic fragment inserted into the Bible. The

description is clearly intended for the initiated, 'for the benefit of the insiders'. It seems, before us we see the encrypted description of a blacksmiths and the process of Damask steel making. It is unlikely to be possible to fully restore the initial meaning of this instruction. But some striking similarities can still be detected [PRRK], ch.5.

### **35. AYYUB SULTAN.**

It is generally thought, that Ayyub Sultan, the companion and the standard-bearer of Prophet Muhammad, fell at the walls of Constantinople allegedly in 669 during the rule of caliph Muawiyah (after Prophet Muhammad died) and was buried then at the site of his death. After that, as we are told, Ayyub's final resting place was engulfed in the murk of oblivion for many hundreds of years and even the place itself was completely forgotten. However after 800 years it was in some mysterious way remembered. In 1453 sultan Mehmed the Conqueror entered the vanquished Constantinople and immediately ordered the enclosure of the site of Ayyub Sultan's death and the commencement of the construction of his magnificent tomb. Ever since it has become Istanbul's Islamic sacred place.

The historians were compelled to justify how it was that Mehmed II suddenly learned of the burial place of Ayyub Sultan, when allegedly nearly 800 years had passed since his death. They say that a certain wise man Aksemsettin (the Seyh-ül Islam) dreamt of the burial place, woke up, found it and told Mehmed II. On the third day of conquering the city the Sultan gave a command to embark upon the development of the sumptuous shrine of Ayyub Sultan.

Our idea is simple. Ayyub Sultan was a contemporary and supporter of Mehmed the Conqueror. The tomb at the site of his death was erected IMMEDIATELY, and not after 800 years. Naturally it was possible only under the condition that Muhammad the Prophet and Mehmed II the Conqueror are the people of the same epoch. Or, as a matter of fact, the same person.

Presumably, it was that fatal night in 1453 beyond the city walls of Constantinople when the famous knight and the high priest, Caliph Ali = Biblical Aaron = Ayyub Sultan = the Russian epic hero Ilya Muromets = the Persian epic hero Rustam - instantaneously perished. Notably it is far from a complete list of names under which this legendary man went down in history [PRRK], ch.6.

### **36. TACITUS AND POGGIO BRACCIOLINI.**

Many works talking about the events of the XII-XVII cc., when erroneously dated, were shifted back into the past and declared to be descriptions of 'ancient events'. For example, Ross and Hochart, the historians of the XIX century, discovered some



clear traces pointing to the late mediaeval origin of the famous 'Annals' by Cornelius Tacitus. But Hochart and Ross were mistaken in the interpretation of their own conclusion. Unaware of the inaccuracy of the chronology of Scaliger-Petavius and considering Tacitus to be an 'ancient' historian, they appraised the facts discovered by them as the proof of the Annals' forgery . In truth, these facts point out the XV-XVI cc. as the time of creation of Tacitus's 'Annals' – the original text, which described the events of the XVI-XVII cc., but later tendentiously adapted by the editors of the XVI – XVII cc.

It becomes clear that in the XV-XVI cc. a well-known writer Poggio Bracciolini wrote various historical works about his time and about two-three previous generations. Later his phantom reflection under the name of 'Cornelius Tacitus' was dated as 'classical antiquity' and a number of writings by Poggio-Tacitus 'moved' to the distant past (with a shift of approximately 1400 years) [2v1], ch.1. In other words, 'Tacitus' is a pen-name of Poggio Bracciolini. He has 'doubled' on the pages of history. The original remained in the XV-XVI cc. and its phantom reflection found itself allegedly in the I<sup>st</sup> century under the name of 'Tacitus'.

In the epoch of the split of the 'Mongol' Empire the historical chronicles about the Great Revolt were important for Western Europeans. The story of Esther of the XVI century (see the next chapter), i.e. the history of the state coup in the metropoly of the Empire, was akin to the rebellious reformists, who aspired to break away from Russia-Horde. That is why the works of Tacitus describing 'Ancient Rome, in particular about Ivan The Terrible = Nero and about the story of Esther, were embraced with special interest. Tacitus-Bracciolini was fairly well informed of the conflicts in the Imperial Court of Russia-Horde. His books about the events leading to the Reformation were of crucial interest [RE].

In [2v2], ch.4:4 we showed that Machiavelli most likely lived in the XVII century and not in the XVI century. It was moved backwards in time by a chronological shift of 100 years. The strong interest towards the works of Tacitus and Machiavelli in the rebellious epoch of the late XV - XVII century becomes natural and clear.

### **37. PLUTARCH AND PETRARCH.**

The researchers of Petrarch's work point out an oddity which is incomprehensible to them. Petrarch wrote many letters to his contemporaries. And in his Latin correspondence Petrarch strived - allegedly on purpose - TO OBSCURE THE REALITY OF THE MIDDLE AGES BY SUBSTITUTING IT WITH 'CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY'. When addressing his contemporaries, he used the ancient nicknames and names – Socrates, Laelius, Olympius, Simonides, etc. meaning that he wrote the

way as if he 'lived in an ancient time'. We are told that he Latinised his letters on purpose, so they take assumed the form of antiquity. Even when talking of his own era, he 'disguised' it under the elegant drapery of the 'classically ancient'.

Possibly, from the pages of Petrarch's letters, even though 'carefully' edited in the XVI-XVII cc., arises the true epoch of the XIV-XV cc. This was in fact the real 'classical antiquity', forcefully banished by the historians into the remote past. So today it is necessary to seriously consider a theory purporting that Petrarch purposefully disguised the Middle Ages as 'the classical antiquity'.

Petrarch wrote "On Famous Men", a series of biographies. He, as it were, 'repeated' the work of the 'ancient' Plutarch's – 'Parallel Lives'. It is likely that PLUTARCH is simply another nickname of PETRARCH. As a result of the activities of recent chronologists Petrarch 'divaricated' on the pages of the chronicles. One of his reflections under the name of 'Plutarch' was moved into the deepest past.

Approximately 1400 years back, as in the cases with Poggio Bracciolini and Alberti, see below.

Almost all the characters of PETRARCH are public figures of 'classical' republican Rome: Lucius Junius Brutus, Publius Horatius Cocles, Camillus, Titus Manlius Torquatus, Fabricius, Quintus Fabius Maximus, Marcus Porcius Cato Major, Scipio Aemilianus Africanus, etc. Most likely, Petrarch - aka Plutarch – simply wrote the biographies of the personalities of his epoch. Only later the editors of the XVI-XVII cc. reviewed these life descriptions and shifted them into the deep past.

Or there is Alberti (1414-1472), a major architect, the author of the fundamental architectural theory. He is reflected as a phantom 'in the remote past' (with a shift of approximately 1400 years) under the name of the 'classical' architect Marcus Vitruvius Pollio. He wrote a major work which apart from his theory of architecture also included information on mathematics, optics and mechanics.

Similarly, the mediaeval distinguished philosopher and author Georgius Gemistus of the XV century was 'split in two' under the quills of the Scaligerian chronologists and one of his phantom reflections, which 'moved into the past', is known to us today under the name of the famous 'classical philosopher Plato' [1v], [2v2], ch.1.

## **38. APOCALYPSE IS 'THE BOOK OF THE OTTOMAN CONQUEST'.**

The famous Biblical book Apocalypse was written in 1486 and devoted to the events anticipated in 1492, i.e. in the year 7000 from Adam, when 'Judgment day' was expected. It was exactly in 1492 in the face of this gloomy anticipation that Christopher Columbus (=biblical Noah) set out to sea. Our astronomical dating of the

Apocalypse as the year 1486 (see [1v], ch.3), - i.e. the year 6994 from Adam – ideally corresponds with its content. It turns out that the first version of Apocalypse was created only six years before the anticipated end of the world.

Apocalypse should take the place not as the last book of the Bible, but should be one of the first books of the Old Testament. I.e. Apocalypse is contemporary to the five books of Moses and not the Gospels. It was incorrectly placed in the Bible next to the Gospels, as it was written much later than they were, providing a narrative of the XII century.

Some of the prophecies of the Old Testament (Ezekiel, Zachariah, Daniel, etc.) contain astronomical fragments. Their analysis shows that the prophecies are the works of the late Middle Ages. It corresponds with the results of applying empiric statistical methods to the Bible, shifting the time of the writing of the Bible to the XII-XVII cc. The proximity of the prophecies of the Old Testament to the Apocalypse means, that they all were created in the XV-XVI cc. In the [6v1] Appendix (Annex) 3, indicated are the excerpts of the Book of Daniel describing 'the story of Esther' in XVI century Russia.

The essence of Apocalypse is usually expressed as follows: The second coming of Jesus, He passes judgement of the people in The Last Judgement, separates the righteous people from the sinners, lets the righteous people into paradise, to the New Jerusalem, and casts the sinners down to hell. These motives lay in the foundation of various depictions of the Apocalypse in the churches, church books and on icons. Jesus lived in the XII century. Approximately 300 years later, in the XV-XVI cc. the Ataman conquest takes place, led by Moses and continued by JOSHUA BEN NUN, i.e. NEW JESUS. It is this epoch which is described in the Apocalypse as the SECOND COMING OF JESUS. Since the Cossacks-Israelites were the crusaders and marched under the banner of Jesus Christ, the chroniclers called their leader the 'New Jesus'.

The Ataman (Ottoman) invasion was a major blow not just for Europe, but also for the rest of the world at that time. The invasion spanned many countries. As it was mentioned before one of the reasons for it was the 'cleansing' of the infected regions, eradication of the illnesses, which had spread across the significant part of Western Europe and Mediterranean.

To remind you, the Western-European Christian Cult, aka the 'ancient' pagan Bacchanalias of the XV-XVI cc. resulted in the spread of infectious diseases. Not just the venereal ones. The Khans of the Empire found themselves confronting a serious state problem. But at that primitive level of the development of medicine the causes of the disease and its proliferation were not clear. The medics could not offer any

effective methods of mass treatment. And then the khans of the Empire made the only, as they thought, correct decision – to wipe out the diseased population of the infected regions using military force. To burn down the houses of the sick. The soldiers were given orders not to come into contact with the infected people. To avoid the local food and water. Swords and all weapons in general had to be disinfected, cleansed with fire and boiled in water. Clothes to be periodically incinerated... All of this is unequivocally described in detail in the Books of Exodus and Joshua [6v1], ch.4-5.

After some qualms, the unpopular decision was made in the end and implemented with an iron fist. Naturally, the population of Western Europe (i.e. mainly the descendants of the Hordians-'Mongols', who arrived to the sparsely inhabited lands a century to a century and a half earlier, during the conquest of the XIV century) , opposed such dictates of their Khan-Emperor. Those who were able that is. No one wanted to die. Even the infirm rose up in arms to rebut the Atamans (Ottomans). Both sides knew how to fight. The war broke out. However the rebellion was crushed with a heavy hand. These were the events, which seismically shook Europe and are reflected in the Apocalypse as 'The Last Judgement'.

The Apocalypse is permeated with grim pictures of the Last Judgement. The Judgment is inevitable for everyone. The military aspect of the events taking place is emphasized relentlessly. Jesus is continually depicted with a BATTLE SWORD.' A message to thee from Him whose sword is sharpened at both its edges' (The Apocalypse 2:12). His eyes were like BLAZING FIRE ... Coming out of His mouth was a SHARP, DOUBLE-EDGED SWORD (The Apocalypse 1:14, 1:16). And so on: (The Apocalypse 2:16), (The Apocalypse 19:15)...

Here was a vividly defined picture of the unstoppable military invasion, death, fires and stampedes. The surviving tradition of the illustrations demonstrates that they were referring to the real war. The mediaeval authors equated the Biblical Gog and Magog with the Tatars-Mongols [5v1], ch.8:4. The old illustrations to the Apocalypse are filled with warriors depicted in a way usually associated with the manner in which the soldiers of the Horde were presented [2v1], ch.2.

As we have said already, the Atamans (Ottomans) (Israelites) were ordered to annihilate the sick population of the infected regions. The segregation of the sick from the healthy reflected in the Apocalypse as the division of the populace into the pure and impure, the righteous and sinners. The righteous were assured a good life in Paradise, and the sinners were cast down into Hell.

A torrent of damnation was brought down by the Apocalypse upon the 'Babylonian lechery'. It was cursed at length and with intensity as ABOMINATIONS AND EVIL

SPIRITS (The Apocalypse 18:2). Here is described, quite explicitly, the cause and aim of the Ataman's (Ottoman's) quarantine policy – the eradication of the negative consequences of the sexual immorality which had spread in the Western 'ancient' church of the XV-XVI cc. The infamous inquisition was created for the purpose of 'cleansing' [5v1], ch.12:9-10.

The fall of Babylon described in the Apocalypse was possibly equated with the conquest of Czar-Grad by the Atamans in 1453. It took place 33 years prior to the year 1486 recorded in the astronomical horoscope of the Apocalypse. But it is quite possible that by Babylon was meant not only Czar-Grad, but collectively many Western countries immersed in vice and sin, according to the author of the Bible. The fact, that the biblical story of the patriarch Noah is also another reflection of the events of the year 1492, corresponds with the direct connection between Noah's voyage and the DOOM OF THE MANKIND, the catastrophe in which allegedly almost all the people perish. 'Judgement Day in 1492 is presented here as 'the Flood', where the Book of Genesis describes the Flood as the Last Judgement, the God-sent punishment for the 'corruption of the people'. In essence it says the same as the Apocalypse.

The Old Testament story about the patriarch Noah, the Flood and the Babylonian pandemonium, is most likely another version of one of the central storylines of the Apocalypse. But outlined more succinctly.

To conclude, there appears to be a remarkably close proximity in time between the three major events: 1) the beginning of Columbus' = Noah's of the Old Testament's journey in 1492, 2) the anticipation of the 'end of the world' in 1492, 3) the epoch of the biblical Apocalypse, not earlier than 1486.

Later on, when creating or specifying the theory of the chronology of different eras, the chronologists of the XVII-XVIII cc. combined the end of the already elapsed XV century with the BACKWARDS CALCULATED rounded calendar date of seven thousand years. And then they built a theoretical justification, purporting that the 'roundness of this date itself' was catastrophically dangerous and that is why in 1492 everyone was allegedly expecting the end of the world. But all of this was written later, when it had already been forgotten, that at the end of the XV century 'the end of the world' was not expected as a FORESEEN EVENT, BUT ACTUALLY DID TAKE PLACE in the form of the Ottoman Conquest and the merciless 'surgical treatment' of various European countries. This is the exact reason why the images of the Last Judgment (Joshua Ben Nun = The New) embedded in the Apocalypse shocked people to the very core. This was not a 'prediction', but an account of recent events.

Thus circa 1492 'the end of the world' took its actual place in Western Europe and was impressively described in the Apocalypse. But later these events were withdrawn from the history of the XV-XVI cc. and transplanted into the future. The Apocalypse was freshly re-written (having destroyed the original text) and declared as a PROPHECY, which purportedly predicts the end of the world in a certain future.

Why was this done?

The Apocalypse, as we have it today, was designed as an important ideological and educational Book in order to remind the people and their descendants of the Ottoman conquest, which was described as the "Last Judgement".

is also reflected in history as the conquest of St. James [6v1], ch.5:4. The famous map of St. James' 'religious conquests', i.e. most likely the map of the military routes of the Atamans (Ottomans) of the XV-XVI cc., was canonised and declared by the church as the sacred scheme of routes down which the future generations should go on pilgrimage every year in order to reach the Spanish cathedral Santiago de Compostela and bow down to the holy relics of St. James. The Church tried its best to reinforce the memory of events of the Ataman invasion in people's minds.

A similar thing was done with the Apocalypse, i.e. 'The Book of the Ottoman conquest'. It was declared holy and, having included it into the biblical canon, turned it into an object of devotion for the ensuing generations. When the book was declared a prophecy of the Last Judgement, the people believed it, as something like this had recently been experienced. When the Khans-Czars of the Great Empire educated the population of the colonized territories, demanding them to abide by the law and threatening the disobedient with the Judgement of Jesus, they were believed unreservedly. As they remembered that 'one such Judgement of Jesus' did already take place. And therefore if necessary it can be repeated once more.

Everywhere in the churches and temples of the Empire they began to paint frescos – the impressive images of the Judgement of Jesus. Stating at the same time that all of this will only take place in the future. The rulers of the Empire wisely employed this method of mass education in the spirit of obeisance to the Imperial dictates.

In the West and in Russia the Judgement of Jesus was represented in fundamentally different ways. In Russia the Final Judgement was pictured in soft tones, without the elements of intimidation. The stress was upon the depiction of the righteous, giving praise to the Lord's Throne. Hell was presented in a tawdry, not very frightening way. But in Western Europe the Last Judgement was portrayed using darker methods, inducing a more penetrating effect on the psyche, depicting terrifying executions, the tortures of the damned, hellfire, torture instruments and gruesome physiological details. Recall the paintings of Hieronymus Bosch, Pieter Brueghel and many others.

It is all clear. In Russia-Horde, in the metropoly of the Empire, as in Atamania (Ottoman Empire), there were no quarantine actions on the liquidation of the XV-XVI cc. epidemics. That is why the attitude towards the Final Judgement here was more impassive. The population of the metropoly didn't experience the cataclysms connected with the 'mandatory treatment of Europe'. There were of course plenty of other rueful feelings here, as everywhere, but the 'surgical operations' passed Russia and The Ottoman Empire by.

But Western Europe found itself in the epicentre of the atamans' invasion. Here the quarantine operations were carried out on a full scale. It is sufficient to read over the Books of the Old Testament – Exodus and Joshua, to imagine the red-hot situation in Europe of the XV-XVI cc. That is why the Western Europeans, saved from the epidemics (by severe means, but saved nevertheless) perceived the Final Judgement as directly experienced reality, hence the harrowing nature of the paintings and frescos of the Western artists.

In the West the reading of the Apocalypse to the congregation was imposed as a duty on the priesthood, so that the Europeans didn't forget Jesus' Judgement which took place in the XV-XVI cc. It was here where the Great Empire had to forcibly conduct the quarantine operations. That is why in Europe it was necessary to keep alive the memories of the Last Judgement, so that the seductive orgies, which gave rise to past epidemics, didn't flourish again. In other words the authorities sternly warned the people against the 'drugs'. But in the East, in the metropoly of the Empire, the situation was different. Here Christianity, starting with the XII century, constantly remained in a rather ascetic framework. There were never any orgies there, at least not on the mass scale. Likewise in Islam. That is why in the Eastern churches it was not necessary to read the Apocalypse as an admonition to the Congregation. So it was not read.

The shock experienced by Western Europe in the XV-XVI cc. bred within some social groups a deeply entrenched enmity towards the 'surgeons', i.e. towards the Atamania (Ottoman Empire) and Russia-Horde, a hatred which had not been felt before. That the 'surgeon' had cured the 'bacchanalian drug addiction' was a fact condemned to oblivion. It was the grievance for the sufferings inflicted during the compulsory treatment that took precedence. The memory of the 'pain' experienced before was used by the Western reformists determined to exert their control. It acted like an enzyme which fermented and created the conditions to justify their ambitions and aspirations to split the Empire. It was the cunningly promoted 'Hatred of the doctor' which slyly facilitated the organization of the conspiracy in the metropoly of Russia-Horde and allowed the break-up of the Empire.

In the XVII century the Reformative Western Europe at last gained independence [6v2]. The break of the 'Mongolian' Empire enabled the Western Europeans to invade Russia and physically destroy the Hordian dynasty, placing the pro-Western Romanovs into power. The bloody pogrom ran through Russia. The metropoly was occupied by the foreigners over a long period of time. SERFDOM, i.e. SLAVERY for the majority of the population of the country is introduced. The Romanovs' occupying regime held out for a long time. The Hordian-'Mongolian' traditions are destroyed on the invaded territories, the whole way of life changes radically, including the church practices. It is not surprising that in the epoch of the Great Revolt in Russia the people could have seen in the Apocalypse some indication of the beginning of the last Judgement. But this time – in Russia, in the East. So what do we see in the XVII century?

We quote: 'A resurgence of interest in the Apocalypse in Russian society occurs in the middle of the 'rebellious' XVII century... The supporters of the old orders saw in the drastic reformer (Nikon – Author) if not the Antichrist himself, then at least his precursor... The end of the world was anticipated in 1658... then in 1666, and finally, similar to the situation in 1492, taking into account the earthly life of Christ, - in 1699. At the end of the expected date, as if in support of the premonitions, Peter the Great's state reforms began... Since the middle of the XVII century and in the duration of one a half centuries the APOCALYPSE BECOMES ALMOST THE MAIN BOOK OF THE OLD RUSSIAN FAITH... in particular the apocalyptic quality of the outlook was characteristic to the extreme Old Believers – Bezpopovtsy (Sects of Russian religious dissenters that renounced priests and all sacraments, except Baptism – Translator's note), such as 'stranniks'(religious pilgrims – Translator's note) (runners), who denied the possibility of salvation in secular life, from which one should run away, as the kingdom of Antichrist was perceived by them NOT AS FORTHCOMING, BUT AS ALREADY ARRIVED' [623], p.29-30.

### **39. WHEN DID THE GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES 'SOLIDIFY'.**

Many geographical names in course of time fundamentally changed their meaning. That is why we should not refer to, for example, just the 'city of Rome'. You should say 'the city of Rome in such and such century'. In which case the geographical location of Rome will fundamentally shift.

The names of the countries, cities, etc. 'lived in time' and moved around the map. At first they were not securely fixed due to the lack of reliable links between the nations. The languages and the writing systems were only just starting to take shape. Only at a considerably later stage with the circulation of books and single uniform printed



geographical maps, the geographical names, finally, became permanent on the map. Indeed, how could information about the geography of the world be fixed and distributed? To do so it is necessary to own some kind of multiplying equipment, allowing reproduction of at least several dozens of copies of a map or a manuscript in order to make it a universal asset. Without it the information becomes mercurial and fast-changing. The old localizations fade from memory, new ones are introduced, and the process becomes difficult to control. The relocation of the names and the frequent change of their meaning stopped only with the appearance of the printed book. In the pre -press epoch the relocation of the cities' names, the names of the nations, the change in the meaning of these names, was a frequent occurrence. See the previous chapter.

#### **40. HERODOTUS – THE CHRONICLER OF THE HORDE.**

Moving along the fundamental 'History' of Herodotus, we have discovered the significant identifications, shown in [fig.61](#), [fig.62](#), [fig.63](#). Incidentally, the name 'The Histories of Herodotus' probably meant 'The History of Horde (Horda)' [ZA], ch.1.

# The very first book of the 'History' is Clio. It turned out that in it, primarily, is told the story of Andronicus-Christ from the XII century and the Crusades of the XIII century, i.e. the Trojan war.

# The second book Euterpe tells us, as it turns out, about Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc., i.e. about the biblical Egypt. In particular, under the name of 'construction of the Egyptian Labyrinth' it speaks of the building of the overground and underground Moscow of the XVI century during the time of Ivan IV the Terrible, who turned Moscow into the capital of the 'Mongolian' Empire [6v].

# In the third book Thalia we discovered another narrative of Andronicus-Christ, named here as king Polycrates [GR]. However this subject occupies only a small part in the book. Its main content is the story of Cambyses, king of Persia and Egypt, i.e. of khan Ivan IV the Terrible.

# The book of Melpomene mainly speaks of the Novgorodian Serf War and once again of Andronicus-Christ [TsRIM] and [GR].

# The book of Terpsichore begins a narration about the Epoch of the Reformation of the XVI-XVII cc.

# The book Erato continues this narration, but here is inserted the description of the 'ancient' Battle of Marathon, i.e. the Battle of Kulikovo of 1380 [ZA], ch.1.

# The last books of the 'History' of Herodotus, namely Polymnia, Urania and Calliope, tell us, as it turns out, about Ivan IV the Terrible and the rebellion of the Reformation in the late XVI- early XVII cc.

We found out that despite some confusion, Herodotus on the whole moves in the right direction from the XII to XVII cc. His last books Thalia, Terpsichore, Erato, Polymnia, Urania and Calliope comprise the greater part of the 'History'. Therefore the epoch of the Reformation is given the most attention. And it is understandable why. As we said earlier, it felt acceptable to the Western Europeans, who got free from the direct vassalage to Russia-Horde = Israel and paying taxes to the metropoly. From the early XVII century there was much more money left in West than before. It was used more liberally and in some places they began to create their own statehood and an army.

## **41. THE CLOCK AND ASTRONOMY.**

It is perceived that the first mention of the mechanical clock is dated to the late VI century [797]. Then it allegedly disappears and reappears only in the epoch of Renaissance. The science historians inform us: 'In the XIII century... the Italian master craftsmen constructed the first mechanical clock [954], p.3. According to the new chronology, the clock (water-clock and their ilk), appeared not earlier than the XI century, and the mechanical clock was invented not earlier than the XIII century [3v1].

Only 'since the XV century a clock appeared, where the part of a string with a balance weight was fulfilled by a spring. The clock instantly weighed far less. In the early XVI century they learned how to make a portable spring clock which weighed just 3 or 4 kilograms' [954], p.39.

More or less precise cataloguing of the stars longitudinally should have naturally begun following the invention of the clock with a MINUTE HAND. Why is a minute hand necessary? The fact is that during the diurnal rotation the celestial dome with the stars travels one degree in 4 minutes. Thus in one hourly minute a star travels 15 arc minutes. The ancient celestial catalogues contain the stars positions within the accuracy of several arc minutes. In order to achieve accuracy of the catalogue within 15 arc minutes, it is necessary to know how to record the interval of time lag of one hourly minute. To get the precision of the catalogue within 10 minutes – as in *Almagest*, for example, - the observer should confidently measure the time interval of 40 seconds on the clock.

But even an hour hand without a minute hand was introduced in the water-clock only in the XIII century or possibly later [544], v.4, p.267. Only in the XIV century the tower clock, also only with an hour hand, appeared in various European cities – in Milan since 1306, in Padua since 1344. And only in the XV century there appeared a clock with a spring and weight. At first such a clock was used for the purposes of the

astronomical observations by Walter, and later by Tykko Brahe and others [544], v.4, p.267-268.

In the middle of XVI century the second Minute hand was added to the Hour hand, and two hundred years later – the third Second Hand [954, p.39]. The emergence of the Minute hand usually dates to circa 1550 [3v1].

That is why all more or less reliable astronomical observations, including the cataloguing of the stars, could have begun not earlier than the XI-XIII cc. This corresponds with our dating of Ptolemy's star catalogue *Almagest* as not earlier than the XI century. At that the epoch of the finalizing of *Almagest* as the astronomical encyclopaedia, was the XVI century. And not at all the II century, as perceived by the Scaligerian history [3v1].

## **42. ASTRONOMICAL DATING OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY.**

1. (Year 1404) SMALL ESNA ZODIAC EM (ZODIAC EM FROM THE SMALL TEMPLE OF ESNA). Depicted on the stone slab relief on the ceiling of the temple, bas-relief. 'Ancient' Egypt, Esna, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact: 6-8 May 1404 [NKhE].
2. (Year 1405) the 'RADIAL' ZODIAC RP2 IN THE CHAMBER OF COURT IN PADUA. Murals of the upper hall. Italy, Padua, allegedly 1315-1317. Astronomical dating: 14-16 October 1405. In fact this zodiac was created in the XVIII century. See [GRK], ch.4.
3. (Year 1421) PHAETHON ZODIAC FN on the stone bas-relief in the Villa Borghese. Italy, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact: one of the versions – 19 May 1421 – precisely matches the date indicated in the Russian chronicles [PRRK], Ch.5.
4. (Year 1486) ZODIAC OF THE APOCALYPSE , contained in the famous biblical Book of the Revelation of St. John allegedly written in the Ist century. In fact: 1 October 1486 [1v].
5. (Year 1495) ZODIAC BL ON THE BAYEUX TAPESTRY. Positioned (among various other depictions) on the embroidered linen cloth approximately 70 metres long and approximately 50 centimetres wide. Europe, England, allegedly the XI century. In fact 16 March 1495 [KR], ch.1. Therefore the famous tapestry was made no earlier than in the XV century. Besides it was not the conquest of England depicted on it, but the Trojan War and Christ's deposition. As far as we know, before us nobody tried to astronomically date the Bayeux Tapestry, let alone speak of a zodiac with a horoscope present on it. There is nothing surprising in this. Usually the historians prefer 'not to notice' any zodiacs on the ancient artefacts. Or, when it is completely obvious, they begin to pontificate about their allegedly purely religious

meaning. They, most likely, do their best to escape the need to astronomically date such images and, mainly, to lead the readers away from such a 'dangerous' thought.

# Chapter 6. THE EPOCH OF THE XVI CENTURY

## 1. KAZAN = KHAZAR REBELLION IN RUSSIA-HORDE

In the middle of the XVI century the Kazan kingdom – aka the legendary 'ancient' Khazar Khaganate – becomes the centre of the Judaic religion. The Kazan czar, i.e. The Khazar Kagan and his court convert to Judaism. Kazan makes an attempt to break away from the Empire. It is possible, that there was some kind of connection between Kazan = Khazar Judaism and the Western Reformation, Protestantism.

The Kazan Judaism of the XVI century and contemporary Judaism should not be confused with each other. The present names of the religions originated from positive sounding notions. For instance, Jew meant 'One who praises God'. For a long time these terms were not attached to any of the religious branches. They were still in general use. That is why the mediaeval terms: Jew, Orthodox, Catholic = universal do not always correspond with the same terms in the contemporary sense which is already associated with this or that religious institution. The aforesaid also refers to the names of the countries. For example, Israel, i.e. fighter for God, was a religiously tinged name of the entire Horde Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. Judaea was the name for Asmania (Osmania) - Atamania with its capital in the Biblical Jerusalem = Czar-Grad. That is why in the epoch of the Reformation the name Israel was used by some newly emerging states in order to emphasise their rightness in the religious debate. Only later this name was assigned to just one religious branch and one state.

In 1552 the czar-khan of Veliky Novgorod – Ivan the 'Terrible' – severely crushed the Kazan – Khazar revolt [6v1], ch.6. The history of the capture of Kazan was intertwined in the chronicles with the seizure of Czar-Grad by the Osmans a century earlier, in 1453.

In the book [ZA] we showed that the seizure of Kazan is described, in particular, by 'classical' Herodotus in his work 'The Histories'. Moreover, it is described more than once and 'under different names'. For example as the conquest and crushing defeat of 'Egyptian Memphis' by King Cambyses II (i.e. by Ivan the 'Terrible'). For the second time – as the construction by King Xerxes (Ivan the Terrible once again) of a 'bridge across Hellespont'. Allegedly across the strait which separates Europe and Asia. The subject matter here is the beginning of Xerxes' punitive campaign against Europe with a purpose of punishing the Greeks and the Europeans in general 'for disobedience'. At the very beginning of the campaign Xerxes gives an order 'to pacify

Hellespont' and to build a bridge across it, over which it would be possible to transport a huge Persian army from Asia into Europe. The massive bridge was built. This storyline by Herodotus reflects the building of the city of Sviyazhsk for the purpose of transporting Grozny's army across the Volga river prior to the conquest of Kazan [ZA].

## **2. THE REVOLT-REFORMATION IN WESTERN EUROPE.**

In the second half of the XVI century in Europe the governors who do not wish to obey the distant czar-khan of Veliky Novgorod form a rebellion. They seek independence. The banner of religious separation from the Empire was chosen as the ideological basis of the revolt. The rebels-protestants took advantage of the emergence of Lutheranism in the West as a just cause for political separation. Martin Luther himself was most likely a purely religious reformer and loyal subject of the 'Mongol' Empire.

'The Reformation ... is one of the major events in world history, the name of which was used to symbolize the whole period of the new era spanning the 16th and the first half of the 17th century'[936], v.2, p.471. As a religious motto the reformists chose Lutheranism. In Russia it was called the heresy of the Judaizers [6v1], гл.7. In the Romanovs' version of Russian history this heresy is mainly moved from the XVI century to the preceding XV century. The truth is that the Romanovs themselves were mixed up in the heresy of the Judaizers [6v1], ch.7. They were covering their tracks. However, even in the distorted version of the XVI century there survive many traces of the actual events. It is generally thought, that in the XVI century in Russia the heresy of the Judaizers re-emerges.'

## **3. RUSSIA-HORDE'S PREPARATION OF THE PUNITIVE CAMPAIGN TO SUPPRESS THE WESTERN REFORMATION.**

Having crushed the rebellion in Kazan, Russia-Horde turns its attention towards the seething West. The decision was made to send a punitive force there. In the Russian sources this event is known as the beginning of the Livonian war [6v1], ch.8.

In fact the whole of Western Europe is called as Livonia here. It was only later that the Romanov historians cunningly depicted Livonia as just a small region on the territory of contemporary Lithuania, where the Russian army was headed to in order to crush Lutheranism. In other words, as we understand it now, to crush the entire Western Reformation. The historians made light of the matter in such a way as if to

say that the conflict between Russia and Western Europe was the struggle between the enormous Russia with the tiny Livonia. So in the end it came across as if the Empire was fighting a fruitless and long drawn out war with a small, but proud Livonia. I.e. allegedly with Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Sweden. This is the so called Livonian war of the XVI century.

So the 'Romanovs' Livonia' was granted - on paper – the achievements of the entire Reformation Europe. The small countries, included today by the historians into 'Livonia of the XVI century', were on the edge of Western Europe along the border with the metropolis of Russia-Horde. The name of Livonia itself in the XVII century, after the collapse of the Empire, has disappeared from the maps [797], p.707-708. Along with the so called Livonian Order. In other words, with Livonian Horde. The historians themselves admit that the Livonian Order was in fact GERMAN [797], p.708. So the historians tried at all costs to take the name of Livonia away from the whole of Western Europe and keep it just for the Baltic countries.

The Reformation in Western Europe = 'Livonia' was perceived in Velikii Novgorod as a revolt in the dependent regions. A decision was made to crush it by force. A massive campaign was prepared – the third conquest of Europe, so to speak. But at this point a revolt ignites in the capital of the Empire, escalating into terror and the oprichnina (political and administrative apparatus established by Ivan IV the Terrible – Translator's note).

#### **4. THE STORY OF ESTHER AND THE OPRICHNINA AS THE MASSACRE OF THE RULING MILITARY CLASS OF THE GREAT EMPIRE.**

A major revolt rises up in the capital of the Empire. Czar-khan Ivan IV falls ill, becomes deranged and retires from office. According to the Western sources, Karl V – aka Ivan the Terrible – leaves for the monastery, abdicating from the throne. In the epoch of the oprichnina it is a teenage Ivan, the son of Ivan the Blessed, who is formally the czar, but it is the others, his mother's relatives, who in fact rule. The pro-Western faction of the Zakharyins-Romanovs assumed power. The coup takes place 'via a woman'. I.e. with woman's help. It is described in the Old Testament as the legendary Esther [6v1], ch.7. A group of the Lutherans, which were called the Judaizers by the Russian Orthodox church, found itself in power for a certain period of time. They were the foreign Protestants, who enjoyed full confidence with the Zakharyins-Romanovs. They sabotaged the punitive Russian-Hordian campaign to the West which had already started. The epoch of the oprichnina begins. It is one of

the darkest periods of Russian history. The massacre of the Hordian military commanders and elite takes place. Including the heirs to the Russian throne. One of the bright reflections of this in the 'ancient' history is the slaughter of his brothers by Svyatopolk the 'Accursed'. In the Bible it is reflected as the 'massacre of the Persians'. To commemorate this event in the Judaic church the famous holiday of Purim was established.

There are several consecutively ruling czars represented on the pages of the Russian history under the name of 'Ivan the Terrible'.

1) Czar Ivan Vasilyevich, subsequently – Vasilij or Ivan the Blessed (1547-1553).

2) Czar Dmitry Ivanovich, a younger son of Ivan Vasilyevich, who died as an adolescent in an accident (1553-1563).

3) Czar Ivan Ivanovich, the second son of Ivan Vasilyevich, a youth on whose behalf and under whose authority the oprichnina was unleashed (1563-1572).

4) Czar Simeon (1572-1584), crowned to rein under the czar name Ivan after the defeat of the oprichnina and dethronement of Ivan Ivanovich. The founder of the new dynasty to which belonged czar Feodor Ivanovich and the last czars of which were Boris Feodorovich 'Godunov' and his teenage son Feodor Borisovich, who were assassinated by the conspirators.

The palace revolt in Russia of the XVI century, which put the end to the Livonian war, and the oprichnina and terror which followed it, are described in the Bible, in the Books of Esther and Judith. The 'story of a woman' played an important role. In the Bible it is depicted twice. As Esther, in 'the Book of Esther', describing the court life of Russia-Horde in the XVI century. And as Judith, in 'the Book of Judith', which gives an account of the same events, but through the eyes of a Western chronicler far from the khan court of the Empire.

In the Romanovs' version the story of the heretic Esther-Judith has been cleaned out from the XVI century as dangerous for the Romanovs who were embroiled in heresy. However it turned out that the epoch of the XVI century in the Romanov's history is duplicated in the XV century. It affords us an invaluable insight into the XVI century, by peering into its XV century reflection. Here the 'story of Esther' is presented in its brightest form. Ivan III should be read as a czar of the epoch of Ivan the 'Terrible' of the XVI century. It is most likely Ivan's IV brother – Georgiy, who came to power after Ivan IV = Vasilij the Blessed stepped down. Georgiy I is described in the Bible as Artaxerxes Macrocheir (Latin: 'Longimanus'). In Russian history he also reflected as Yuri Dolgorukiy, the founder of Moscow. Under his rule the capital of the Empire



was in fact moved to Moscow, where the Kremlin was built. It took place only at the end of the XVI century. But not in the XII-XIV cc. as we are constantly assured. Notably the transfer of the capital is closely related to Esther and the revolt in the Empire.

The recollections of these events were painful for the Romanovs even in the XVIII century. That is why in their version, the creation of which started in the XVII century, the 'story of Esther' was presented in a muffled way. At the same time, however, a fairly honest chronicle of these events was composed, which was included in the Bible. But here they were disguised under the invented 'biblical' names for the characters, countries, etc. The biblical canon was being created in the late XVI – XVII cc. Its final edition was carried out by the winners-reformers. In other words by the protestants.

## **5. THE DETAILS OF THE STORY OF BIBICAL ESTHER = HERETIC ELENA VOLOSHANKA AND DMITRIY-MORDECAI, HER SON.**

&& THE BIBLE (BIBLICAL) VERSION.

In the Old Testament 'Book of Esther' the events unfold in the Persian kingdom under the great king Artaxerxes. The capital city is Susa. King Artaxerxes falls out with his wife Astin. She is accused of being disrespectful towards her husband. The king disgraces her. The king's subjects demand Astin's banishment and her replacement with another queen.

The Bible says: 'The Queen Vashti (Astin) would not come into the king's presence on his command... the king ... had an errand for the seven chamberlains that waited on him... They were to bring queen Vasthi (Astin) into the king's presence... Vain was the royal summons that the chamberlains brought her; she would not come. Whereupon the king broke out into a great passion of rage... Mamuchan thus spoke: ... So please thee, let an edict go out in thy name... forbidding Vasthi ever to come into the royal presence again. LET THE CROWN PASS TO SOME HEAD WORTHIER THAN HERS... and the king did as Mamuchan had advised' (Book of Esther 1:12-13, 1:15-16, 1:19, 1:21).

The 'Persian' custom of selecting a bride for the czar is described in the Book of Esther as a matter of state importance. 'Now in Shushan the palace there was a certain Jew, whose name was Mordecai ... Who had been carried away from Jerusalem with the captivity ... whom the king of Babylon had carried away. And he brought up Hadassah, that is, Esther, his uncle's daughter' (Esther 2:5-7).

Esther takes part in the bridal parade and the choice falls on her (Esther 2:17) So, a FOREIGNER Esther, aka Hadassah was chosen as the NEW WIFE of the Persian king Art-Xerxes. She was a JEWESS, a step-daughter and a relative of Mordecai. One of the captive Jews moved from Jerusalem = Czar-Grad by the king Nebuchadnezzar = Ivan the Terrible. At first Mordecai FORBIDS her to disclose her origin and faith (Esther 2:20).

The Bible tells us: After this did king Ahasuerus promote Haman ... and advanced him, and set his seat above all the princes that were with him ... And all the king's servants, that were in the king's gate, bowed, and revered Haman... (Esther 3:1-2).

On Haman's command the letters were sent by posts into all the king's provinces in the name of Art-Xerxes 'to destroy, to kill, and to cause to perish all Jews ... and to take their spoils for prey' (Esther 3:13).

Among other things Haman writes the following: 'There is a CERTAIN PEOPLE SCATTERED ABROAD AND DISPERSED AMONG THE PEOPLE IN ALL THE PROVINCES OF THY KINGDOM; and their laws are diverse from all people; neither keep they the king's laws... If it please the king, let it be written that they may be destroyed (Esther 3:13). (Could it be 3:8, 3:9?)

The Jews demanded of Esther who had already become Art-Xerxes' wife to prevent the massacre. She succeeds. As if by chance it happens, that king Art-Xerxes catches Haman who 'was fallen upon the bed whereon Esther was'. (Esther 7:8)

The king was enraged: 'Will he force the queen also before me in the house?' (Esther 7:8) Haman was hanged, and then was the king's wrath pacified. The Jews were saved. And 'the house of Haman' was given unto Esther the queen. (Esther 8:7-10)

After the fall and death of Haman = Ivan Molodoy (Ivan the Young) (see below), the Jews succeeded in taking vengeance upon the Persians and crushing them. To commemorate this Purim, a two-day holiday was established (Esther 9:26). The decree of the king Art-Xerxes, which annulled the earlier sanction to persecute the Jews, provoked the Jews to attack their enemy. By this time the new edict praised the Jews.

The Bible: '...the enemies of the Jews hoped to have power over them, though it was turned to the contrary, that the Jews had rule over them that hated them. The Jews gathered themselves together ... to lay hand on such as sought their hurt...' (Esther 9:1-2)

And further: 'THUS THE JEWS SMOTE ALL THEIR ENEMIES ... And in Shushan palace the Jews slew and destroyed five hundred men... The ten sons of Haman ... slew they' (Esther 9:5-6, 9:10). And also: 'But the other Jews that were in the king's provinces ... and slew of their foes seventy and five thousand...' (Esther 9:15-16).

It is curious that here the Ostrog Bible (one of the earliest East Slavic translations of the Bible – Translator's note) and the Elizabeth Bible (the authorized version of the Russian Orthodox Church – Translator's note) carries on: 'AND DEVASTATED THEIR DOMAIN ON THAT DAY'. But in the synodic translation and the Hebrew Scriptures, the direct opposite is said: BUT ON THE PREY THEY LAID NOT THEIR HAND'. It appears that the later editors sometimes radically altered the version of events, changing black into white and vice versa.

#### && THE RUSSIAN VERSION.

The Biblical Arta-Xerxes, aka Nebuchadnezzar, aka Ivan III the Terrible (allegedly 1462-1505) is a partial reflection of Ivan IV the Terrible (1533-1547-1584) [6v1], ch.7-8. Ivan IV was born allegedly in 1503 (in fact he was born in 1526 [RI], ch.2, [ERIZ] and was declared the Grand Prince in 1533 [988:00].

Biblical Esther – is Elena Voloshanka, the wife of Ivan Molodoy (Ivan the Young), the son of Ivan III = Ivan IV. The story of Elena Voloshanka in the Romanovs' version is shifted into the XV century. In fact the events took place in the second half of the XVI century. Elena was in fact a foreigner, who came to Moscow from the South. 'In 1482 the heir to the throne Ivan Ivanovich married Elena Voloshanka, the daughter of the MOLDAVIAN ruler (of MOLDAVIA)' [778], p.115. Exactly corresponding with the Bible, she was a Hebrewess and belonged to the heresy of the Judaizers, which was a secret heretic movement in Russia in that time [690], c.10-12. Reportedly, 'on the surface the followers of the heresy remained Orthodox Christians and maintained a pious exterior. In front of the people... they presented themselves as the strict devotees of Orthodox Christianity, denounced and damned false doctrines. In secret they carried out their nasty work' [690] p.9-10.

So, Esther is Elena Voloshanka, i.e. Moldovanka (Moldavian), the princess of Moldavia. Her father is the Khan of Moldavia – that is the biblical Mordecai.

The expert on the history of the church A.V.Kartashov states: 'In ...1470 in Novgorod there appears a heresy of the so called the 'Judaizers'. It's vaccine is brought from the outside... the Novgorodians... invited... Prince Alexander of Kiev (on the other accounts he was a Lithuanian prince [690], p.9 – Author)... The prince arrived in Novgorod ... with his aids who brought ideological novelties from the West ... Not

the novelties of the Christian West, but of the Western Jewry. In the prince's entourage there was Skhariya the Jew, a medical scholar' [372], v.1, p.489. Within a year some people from the circle of the high-ranking clergymen of Novgorod joined the heretical movement. The heretics were sometimes called Skharians after Skharia (Zechariah).

And further: 'THE RELATED, PROFESSIONALLY FAMILIAL nature of the cult is striking ... The whole matter was essentially arranged as a covert plot... The sect managed to maintain its SECRET LIFE for a whole ten years ... at the end of 1479 Ivan III, the conqueror of Novgorod, arrived there himself and was enchanted by the talents and gallantry of the cunning libertines – proto-presbyters.

He decided to move them into his capital. He made Alexei the Arch-priest of Uspenskiy Cathedral and Denis – the Proto-pope of the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral. Chances are that this honorary transferal ... was suggested to him by the secret alliance of the Judaizers itself... the Moscow branch of which had already been established AT THE VERY ROYAL COURT of Ivan III and was headed by Feodor Vasilievich Kuritsyn, his MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS and deacon of the Ambassadorial Council. It's all kept shrouded in secrecy until 1487 when the conspiracy collapsed in Novgorod' [372], v.1, p.490-491.

Allegedly in 1487 (in reality a century later) the Archbishop Gennady of Novgorod uncovers the Heresy of the Judaizers and initiates its persecution. In Novgorod, i.e. in Yaroslavl, heresy was destroyed. However in Moscow the heretics were left untouched as they comprised the CLOSEST ENTOURAGE OF THE CZAR IVAN III. Nevertheless, Gennady and the other hierarchy of the Russian church insist on the persecution: 'Execute the heretics – burn and hang them!' [690], p.13.

Allegedly the council against the heretics was appointed in 1490. Hanging over them was the imminent danger of complete annihilation. But among their number they already could count Elena Voloshanka, Ivan III's daughter-in-law, the wife of Ivan the Young. It is also possible, that she was a heretic from the very beginning. The wedding of Ivan the Young and Elena of Moldavia took place allegedly in 1482 or 1483 [778], p.115, [282], p.54. Shortly after Elena of Moldavia gives birth to a son, Dmitry, a family scandal flares up among the family of Ivan III, in the centre of which are Sophia Paleologue, Ivan's III wife, and Elena, his young daughter-in-law. Ivan III falls out with Sophia Paleologue.

In March of allegedly 1490 Ivan the Young dies suddenly. Some thought that he was poisoned. The doctor who was treating him was executed.

The quarrel between Elena Moldovanka and Sophia Paleologue, the wife of Ivan III – is enflamed even more. The conflict between Ivan III and Sophia becomes explicit. The czar rejects his wife and openly BRINGS ELENA CLOSER – a young widow, the wife of his deceased son. She acquires the absolute trust of Ivan III. This is the biblical 'story of Esther'.

There emerge two antagonistic camps. One - Sophia Paleologue and her son Vasili. The other – Elena Moldovanka and her son Dmitry. Both boys are the potential heirs to the throne. The first camp is supported by the Russian Orthodox Church, Joseph Volotsky and the Archbishop Gennady. The second camp is supported by the Heresy of the Judaizers.

At that point Ivan III favours the second camp for a considerable time, supporting the Heresy of the Judaizers. The threat of crushing heresy recedes. The same year, allegedly in 1490, Judaizing heretic Zosima becomes the Metropolitan of Moscow [372], v.1, p.495. The heretics Alexei and Dionisy were appointed by the czar for the ecclesiastical ministry in the Moscow Kremlin: Alexei as the Arch-priest of Uspenskiy Cathedral and Dionisy – the priest of the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral.

The Archbishop Gennady of Novgorod and the other hierarchs of the Russian church succeeded in convening the councils in an attempt to destroy heresy in Moscow. The council is held allegedly in 1490. However IT DOES NOT RULE AGAINST THE HERETICS. The imprisonment of Vasily, Ivan III's son and the cruel execution of Vasily's confidants and zaritsa Sophia's supporters formed the pinnacle of the triumph of the Heresy of the Judaizers. They were thrown into the Moscow river. Sophia Paleologue flees to Beloozero (White Lake). Elena Voloshanka triumphs. Allegedly in 1498, while Ivan III is still alive, her son Dmitry is triumphantly crowned Czar. He becomes Ivan III's co-ruler. It is here that the Old Testament Book of Esther concludes its narration.

But to complete the picture we would like to tell you what happened next. Sometime later Ivan III comes to his senses and returns his favour to Sophia Paleologue and his son Vasily. VASILY WAS DECLARED AN HEIR TO THE THRONE. Soon, allegedly in 1503 Sophia dies. Ivan III was also taken ill. 'In 1503 Ivan (Ioan) III REPENTED IN HIS FORMER WEAKNESS TOWARDS THE HERETICS AND ASKED THE CLERICS FOR FORGIVENESS' [690], p.16. From that point the pendulum started moving in the reverse direction , and the counter stroke was intense. Elena Moldovanka was thrown into a dungeon, where she died shortly, allegedly in 1505. In 1504 THE EXECUTIONS OF THE JUDAIZING HERETICS SWEEPED THE GRAND DUCHY OF MOSCOW. From that point the heresy of the Judaizers for

some time ceased to exist in Russia. But, apparently, it took its toll on Ivan III. Allegedly in 1505 Ivan III dies.

However the biblical Book of Esther does not speak a word of it. We add the word 'allegedly' to the dating of the XV century as in fact the events took place a century closer to us.

It turns out that the legendary patriarch Joseph of the Old Testament is the reflection of Joseph Volotsky – renowned saint of the Russian church, as well as of – Dmitry-Mordecai, the heretic, the son of Elena Voloshanka = the biblical Esther of the VI century [PE], ch.5. The relocation of the family clan of Jacob-Israel to Egypt described in the Old Testament Book of Genesis – is the emergence and establishment of the Western heretics-Reformers in Moscow. Russia-Horde becomes immersed in the Great Strife.

## **6. THE ORIGINAL ESTHER IN THE RUSSIAN HISTORY OF THE XVI CENTURY AND A NUMBER OF HER STRIKING DUPLICATES IN EARLIER EPOCHS.**

In [6v1], ch.7 we presented two bright reflections of the story of Esther in Russian history. One of them is the epoch of the heresy of the Judaizers under Ivan III, where Esther is Elena Voloshanka. The other is the epoch of the Seven Boyars after the death of Vasily III, where Esther is Elena Glinskaya, the mother of Ivan IV the Terrible. However, neither of the reflections occupies the correct place on the timeline. The original story of Esther is associated with the oprichnina of the XVI century and the Great Strife of the early XVII century, the origins of which lie in the late XVI century. The epoch of the XVI century, which was the key one in Russian history, was most thoroughly worked on by the Romanovs' historians. Their goal was to conceal both the very moment of the split of the "Mongol" Empire and its causes. Luckily a more or less exact duplicate survived in the XV century under Ivan III as it was not recognized by the Romanovs' falsifiers. If they did recognize it, they would have immediately eradicated it, in order to remove accusations of the heresy of the Judaizers from the Romanovs-Zakharins, i.e. the Skhariyans, Zakhariyans.

[Fig.64](#) shows a diagram of the story of Esther in its several variants. The most interesting is the original in the XVI century. Having broadly generalized it, it can be described as following:

Plot 1: THE TWO CZARS-CO-RULERS – Arta-Xerxes and Haman. Haman is named 'our second father' (Esther 3:13). Or 'second after' [6v1], ch.7. They are related, either father and son, or a brother and his older brother.

Plot 2: THE TWO WIVES. According to the Bible, they are Astin and Zeresh. Astin is the wife of Art-Xerex (Horde-George). And Zeresh, ZRS or ZRSh in Hebrew (Esther 5:14), is the wife of Haman = Ivan. The name Zeresh, Zeres or Tsereth would probably (most likely) mean Czaritsa (Queen in Russian).

Plot 3: THE THIRD WOMAN-RIVAL AND THE HERESY. There appears the third woman – Esther. She pushes aside both of the women, Astin and Zeresh. Astin is banished, and Zeresh is defeated. The heretic Esther gets the house of Haman, the husband of Zeresh (Esther 8:1).

Plot 4: A SEXUAL SCENE involving Art-Xerex, Haman and Esther. The scene results in Haman's death. Here Esther acts as a wife and a lover of both.

Plot 5: SLAUGHTER OF THE KING'S CHILDREN FOLLOWED BY – POGROM. IN THE Book of Esther it is the slaughter of Haman's children and the massacre of the Persians by the Jews. To commemorate this event the celebration of Purim = fate was established.

Plot 6: AS A RESULT – ENTHRONEMENT OF ESTHER'S RELATIVE. In the Bible it is Mordecai's accession to power.

Let us look at the scheme closer and see which events of the XVI century it is comprised of.

Plot 1: THE TWO CZARS-CO-RULERS. Ivan IV had a co-ruler Georgy or Yury, his brother [6v1], ch.7. The historians don't like to speak of Georgy's death. But when they do, they immediately add that he was allegedly disabled, feeble minded [6v1], ch.7. 'His consort Iuliania was considered to be the second Anastasia' [362], v.9, ch.1, column 26. The name IULIANIA is close to Elena – well known to us as the name Esther from allegedly XV century.

Plot 2: THE TWO WIVES. The history of Ivan IV the Terrible's wives is very dark. The first two – Anastasia and Maria. It is not very clear which of them was the wife of Ivan IV and which one – of Georgy. Why Georgy's consort was considered 'quasi Anastasia' [6v].

Plot 3: THE THIRD WOMAN-RIVAL. The third wife of Ivan IV is considered to be Marfa Sobakina. Somehow she didn't become an actual wife to Ivan. Further still, this impediment was for some reason 'attested to by the verdict of the high clergy' [776], p.210. She died in 1571 before the end of the oprichnina and the old branch of the Horde dynasty ascent to power, i.e. Simeon [4v]. Marfa is the biblical Esther. And her name MARFA or MARTHA, MARDA is a slightly distorted name MARDOCAI. The letter 'F' = Fita (Θ) in the name Marfa is spelled practically indistinguishable to 'D'. It

was after Marfa's death Ivan the Terrible performed ecclesiastical penance. It was exactly in the same way that in the duplicate of the XV century Ivan III repented after the death of Elena Voloshanka.

Plot 4: A SEXUAL SCENE. In the XVI century it was the reason for the death of Ivan Ivanovich – the son of Ivan IV the Terrible. It appears that there is something ambiguous going on between the czar-father and the son's wife. 'The last QUARREL BETWEEN THE FATHER AND HIS SON happened in Alexandrovskaya sloboda ... Grozny (The Terrible) found his daughter-in-law – czarevna (princess) ELENA – sitting on the bench in a warmly heated room wearing only her undergarments... He physically assaulted his daughter-in-law ... when Ivan Ivanovich tried to defend his wife... Ivan the Terrible attacked him as well. This scene was described by the Jesuit Possevino... One Italian interpreter told him that the czarevich (prince) was seriously wounded with a heavy blow to his head with a staff' [776], p.235. There were also the other versions of the event.

Here is described the same scene from the Biblical Book of Esther, allegedly from the XV century. The father-czar and his son-co-ruler find themselves at the bed of the son's young wife. Incidentally according to the Bible, Esther is presumably the son's wife, because Haman was called 'our second father' (Book of Esther 3:13). A quarrel flares up, as the result of which the son dies.

Plot 5: SLAUGHTER OF THE KING'S CHILDREN FOLLOWED BY – POGROM. THE PERSECUTION AND EXECUTION OF THE CLOSE RELATIVES OF THE FIRST TWO CZARINAS Anastasia and Maria is associated with Marfa Sobakina in the epoch of the Oprichnina [362], v.9, ch.3, column 110. The circumstances of this matter are unknown and Karamzin speculates on the reasons for the execution. While the persecution and execution of the relatives of the first two wives is a distinct trace from the story of the biblical Esther = Elena Voloshanka.

Plot 6: AS A RESULT – ENTHRONEMENT OF ESTHER'S RELATIVE. Under Ivan IV the Terrible the time of the oprichnina is the time of ruling on behalf of the young Ivan Ivanovich [4v]. Possibly it was him, who was Marfa's son. Ivan the Terrible himself at this time has most likely become Vassily Blazhenny (the Blessed). The state is ruled by the others.

According to the Bible, at the end of the epoch of Esther, Mordecai accedes to the throne. What are his traces in the XVI century? They are vague, though something has survived. 'DURING THAT TIME (in the last yeas of the oprichnina – Author's note) A BIG INFLUENCE OVER THE CZAR WAS GAINED BY Eliseus Bomelius, a physician and astrologer from Westphalia who had arrived to Russia from England



... in London Bomelius was ... imprisoned for black magic ... In May 1571 ... he became GROZNY'S (Ivan The Terrible) MAIN PHYSICIAN TO THE CZAR AND COURTIER ASTROLOGER. A doctor and astrologer, Bomelius became one of the TRUSTED ADVISORS TO GROZNY (IVAN THE TERRIBLE) ... He predicted all sorts of disasters and immediately presented recommendations of how to avoid them ... He concocted poisons for the courtiers who fell out of favour' [775], p.439-440. The Russian sources inform us that 'Bomelius, planted from abroad, 'STEERED THE CZAR AWAY FROM THE FAITH' and 'INCITED THE CZAR TO KILL MANY OF THE BOYARS AND PRINCES' [775], p.498. After the demise of the oprichnina Bomelius attempted to escape Russia. He was captured and executed [775], p.484. He was spit-roasted on an enormous skewer [776], p.197.

It is feasible that the story of Bomelius, an astrologer, a physician and a poisoner, is the surviving trace of the biblical Mordecai in the XVI century which survives to our day.

It turns out the story of Esther has also been told by the legendary Plutarch in his 'Parallel Lives' as a story of Artaxerxes II Mnemon King of Persia, a 'grandson' of the Persian king Artaxerxes Macrocheir (Latin: Longimanus – 'with a long hand) [6v1], ch.7. Hence the 'classic' Plutarch lived and worked not earlier than the end of the XVI century. However it is no longer news to us. We have already presented the facts identifying Plutarch as Petrarch and advancing his lifetime into the XVI-XVII cc. [2v1], ch.1:4.

## **7. JUDITH.**

This is what the biblical Book of Judith tells us.

# The Assyrian King Nebuchadnezzar who rules in Nineveh marches against the King Arfaxad and defeats him. It resembles a civil war.

# Nebuchadnezzar gets angry with his WESTERN allies who no longer fear him and display signs of independence.

# Nebuchadnezzar plans a massive military campaign to the West in order to curb the arrogance of the Western Kings and win back their lands held under the Assyrian power.

# The general Holofernes is appointed head of the Assyrian army. At first it is planned to conquer the country and the city of Bethulia. The Assyrians invade the land of the city of Bethulia.

# A wealthy widow, Jewess Judith decides to save her country from the invasion of the enemy. She infiltrates Holofernes' camp, cunningly gains his trust and enchants Holofernes. Left alone with him she kills him by decapitating him with a sword.

# The Assyrian army is demoralised and flees. The Israelites attack the Assyrians, drive them out and chase them to Damascus, destroy, plunder and enrich themselves.

Given that these events take place under the Assyrian King Nebuchadnezzar it occurs that the Book of Judith describes the Russian and European history of the XVI century. This logical conclusion can be explained [6v1], ch.8. It turns out that here is given an account of the events of the epoch of Ivan III = Ivan IV the Terrible. We have already identified him with the Assyrian Nebuchadnezzar. The story of Judith clearly shows the traces of the story of Esther already familiar to us. A foreigner, a Jewess, infiltrates the court of the 'Persian' king, becomes his wife or an 'intimate person'. As a result a son or a close relative of the king – the king's co-ruler, tragically dies. It is followed by the massacre of the 'Persians' by the Jews. It is no coincidence that in the modern biblical canon the Book of Judith is placed next to the Book of Esther.

Previously Russia and Turkey were a part of the same Empire. Up until the XVII century the relations between them were quite amicable. Only after the break of the Empire in the XVII Turkey and Russia began to grow apart.

In the epoch of the oprichnina and the unrest of the late XVI century Western Europe gradually gains independence. Osmania = Judaea estranges itself from the seething Russia-Horde = Israel and makes an attempt to once again conquer the rebellion in Western Europe. But it cannot succeed in this single-handedly.

## **8. THE EMPERORS OF THE GREAT EMPIRE = THE RUSSIAN CZARS-KHANS OF THE XVI CENTURY.**

&& VASILIIY III.

Vasilii II Ivanovich also had the following names: Ivan, Varlaam, Gavriil [161], p.68, and also [145], p.173. He ruled in 1505-1533 according to [362], or in 1507-1534 according to [36], [145]. On the pages of the Western chronicles he is reflected as Habsburg, i.e. Novgorodian, 'Maximilian I' 1493-1519 according to [76].

It was a peaceful rule. The major event was the division of Western European and possibly African 'Novgorodian lands', which were affected by the Ataman conquest. The lands were divided between the new governors from the Russian-Hordian nobility. However there was so much land, that there was not enough of the elite and

it was necessary to attract the 'best serfs'. The land parcelling was under control of the special authority called Novgorodskaya Izba (Novgorodian Hut) [6v1], ch.5:10.

On the pages of history Vasiliy III is also known by the name Vladimir Vsevolodovich Monomakh, where he is erroneously dated to XII century.

&& REVOLT, ELENA GLINSKAYA = JEZEBEL, QUEEN OF ISRAEL.

Revolt: Elena Glinskaya + Ivan Ovchina 1533-1538 according to [775]. It is followed by Semiboyarshina (the government formed of 7 boyars - court nobility), i.e. board of trustees in 1538-1547 according to [775]. To clarify: after Vasiliy III Ivanivich's death there began an inter-dynastic war, followed by the reign of the Boyars Duma = Semiboyarshina, lasting up until the accession to the throne in 1547 of Vasiliy III's son - Ivan IV Vasiliyevich 'The Terrible', who reached maturity.

The Western chronicles did not register this strife in the history of the Habsburgs = Novgorodians. It seems that viewed from Europe the turbulent events in the Moscow court surrounding the throne occupied by the juvenile Ivan, were not visible. That is why in the Western chronicles immediately after 'Maximilian I' = Vasiliy III the power passes to 'Charles V' = Ivan IV. Technically that was what happened. However in Russian history the others were ruling for Ivan minor – at first – the boyars, and then Elena Glinskaya and Ivan Ovchina (Sheepskin) [776], p.11-15. Later there was Semiboyarshina. And only in 1547 Ivan IV the 'Terrible' finally took the power into his own hands and ascended to the throne [362], v.8, column 56-57.

The 'Mongol' Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. reflected in the Old Testament as the Kingdoms of Israel and Judaea.

Vasiliy married Elena Glinskaya in the beginning of 1526 [578], Book 2, p.262. This event was described by the Western chronicles as 'Charles V' Habsburg's marriage to JEZEBEL, the daughter of the King of Portugal. In the Bible this marriage is reflected in the history of the Kingdom of Israel as the marriage between King Ahab and JEZEBEL (3 Kingdoms 16:31). Thus the infamous Jezebel is the reflection of Elena Glinskaya, the wife of Vasiliy III. In the Fourth Book of Kings of the Bible the Russian-Hordian czar-khan Vasiliy III is reflected under the name of the Old Testament King Ahab. Partially he is also 'Charles V of Habsburg'.

Elena Glinskaya dies young. It is thought that she was poisoned [362], v.8, column 29. Vasiliy Shuisky accedes to power. He executes Prince Ivan Ovchina Telepnev. The name Shuisky originates from the word Shuja or Shui. In the Third and Fourth Books of the Bible Vasiliy Shuisky, i.e. King Shui reflected as the legendary Old Testament commander-czar Jehu.

## && IVAN IV 'THE TERRIBLE'.

The epoch of Ivan IV Vasilievich 'The Terrible' (born 1526, see above) 1533-1584 according to [775]. In 1547 he acceded to the throne [362], v.8, column 56-57. On the pages of the Western Chronicles Ivan IV is described under the name of Habsburg, i.e. Novgorodets, 'Charles V' 1519-1556 according to [304], v.3, p.27 or 1519-1558 according to [76]. In the Bible Ivan 'The Terrible' is described as the legendary czar of Assyria and Babylon Nebuchadnezzar. Ivan 'The Terrible' is a 'combination', a Hybrid of four different czars-khans. In the history of 'Ancient' Rome it is reflected as a 'foursome' of famous emperors: Tiberius + Caligula + Claudius + Nero. He is also the very same Henry IV: allegedly 1053-1106. He is also the very same Ivan III the Terrible: allegedly 1462-1505. He is also the very same Frederick III: allegedly 1440-1493 [6v1], ch.5.

It is thought that the time of 'Ivan the Terrible' is well documented and studied. It is not so. There are virtually no authentic documents left from 'Ivan the Terrible'. His time is one of the most dark and intriguing in Russian history. It separates two completely different epochs: Russian-Hordian and the Romanovs'.

Under Ivan IV Veliky Novgorod was conquered and defeated. It was one of the most notorious crimes of the Oprichnina [776], p.145-160. In the bible the massacre of Novgorod = Yaroslavl is reflected as the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Assyria and Babylon [6v1], ch.5.

In the Western chronicles the same events were described as the struggle between Charles V and the Protestants. One of the central events is Charles V defeating the protestant city of Magdeburg on Elbe River allegedly in 1550-1552 [304], v.3, p.107. It is feasible that here on the pages of the European chronicles, were reflected the distant events in Russia-Horde, when Ivan IV 'The Terrible' defeated Veliky Novgorod, i.e. Yaroslavl on Volga river.

At the end of his life 'Ivan IV' withdrew to a monastery, virtually forsaking all power and responsibility. Then in 1553 he falls seriously ill and turns into a holy fool [4v1], ch.8:5 and [6v1], ch.5. He becomes Vasiliy (or Ivan) the Blessed. I.e. the famous holy fool of the XVI century.

## && IVAN IV AS VASILIIY THE BLESSED.

Ivan IV Vasilievich = Vasiliy the Blessed or Ivan the Blessed, Moscow miracle worker, 1547-1553. Ivan IV began to rule together with his brother Georgiy Vasilievich and his cousin Vladimir Andreevich. The main event of the young czar Ivan IV's reign was the conquest of Kazan in 1552.

During Ivan IV's reign a major rebellion ignites in the Empire under the banner of the religious separation from the metropoly = Veliky Novgorod. The government decides to crush the rebellion. The first step was the siege and conquest of Kazan in 1552. The next stage was planned as the military campaign to Germany, which was in the grip of a rebellion-Reformation. This is 'The Livonian war'.

In 1553 Ivan IV was taken seriously ill and became deranged. He was called Vasiliy the Blessed Moscow Miracle worker, and also – Ivan the Blessed Moscow Miracle worker. Several years later he died. In the end of XVI century in Moscow in the Red Square St. Basil's Cathedral was built = Pokrovsky Cathedral, where, most likely, the remains of Ivan IV were re-interred. However under Ivan IV the czar's quarters are still situated in Suzdal, and the administrative centre of the Empire, the court of the governors was in Yaroslavl. The Moscow Kremlin had yet to be built.

Ivan IV is also known in history under the name of Vsevolod, except erroneously dated to the XII century. The biblical king Nebuchadnezzar who lost his mind is the very same Blessed Vasiliy as one of Ivan IV the Terrible's periods of reign.

#### && DMITRY IVANOVICH.

Dmitry Ivanovich, 1553-1563. An infant, the son of Ivan IV Vasilievich. Selected Council Izbrannaia Rada (the circle of persons close to the czar, a legislative body - Translator's note) – a board of trustees headed by Adashev, ruled on behalf of Dmitry Ivanovich. During the rule of Izbrannaia Rada the Livonian War was started in order to bring Germany to submission, seized by the rebellion of the Reformation. By the end of Dmitry's reign a major military invasion into Western Europe was prepared. However the dynastic revolt in the Empire prevented it. In 1563 an adolescent Dmitry perishes in an accident. As a result of the distortion of Russian history this death was dated several years later and was depicted as the murder of czarevitch (Prince) Dmitry by 'Boris Godunov' in Uglich.

He is also known under the name of Iziaslav, except erroneously dated to the XII century.

#### && IVAN V IVANIVICH.

Ivan V Ivanovich 1563-1572. In the Western chronicles reflected as Habsburg = Novgorodets 'Ferdinand I' 1558-1564 according to [76].

Following the tragic death of the adolescent czar Dmitry Ivanovich, his younger brother, infant Ivan V Ivanovich acceded to the throne. From his enthronement the Zakharyins-Romanovs regain power and begin the terror. The Livonian war is brought to an end. The climax of the terror is the establishment of the oprichnina, the

defeat of the Old Russian capital – Yaroslavl (Yaroslavovo Dvorishe (Yaroslav Court) of Velikiy Novgorod), the execution of Vladimir Andreyevich Staritsky, the member of the Royal House, the co-ruler.

On the pages of history Ivan V Ivanovich and his uncle Georgiy Vasilievich, who was ruling under him during his time are also depicted as: a) Yury Dolgorukiy (Yury The Long-Armed), erroneously dated to the XII century; b) the biblical Artaxerxes Macrocheir ('Longimanus'), erroneously dated to the VI century BC.

Only after 1564 the infamous terror attributed to Ivan 'The Terrible' began. The Terror had started indeed. But it was unleashed by the Zakharyins, who were butchering their enemies. And as we know, their opposition included, PRACTICALLY THE ENTIRE OLD BOYARS NOBILITY. I.e. the Russian-'Mongol' nobility of the Horde dynasty. The struggle between the supporters of the Empire and the faction of the Zakharyins-Romanovs, eager to seize power, ignited. The Zakharyins-Romanovs evinced pro-Western interests. Civil war flared up. This is the actual beginning of the Great Strife in Russia-Horde.

During this time the first attempt of the revision of Russian history was made.

It is clear that political objectives were being pursued, which, strictly speaking, were not concealed. 'The concern regarding the disclosed revolt of the boyars which in 1563-1564 impelled the monarch to embark upon the AMMENDMENT OF THE HISTORY of his reign' [775], p.172. And further: 'The blossoming of the Moscow official chronicle writing in 1550 – early 1560 and ITS COMPLETE CESSATION after 1568 ... The fate of the clerks in charge of the chronicle writing... The print worker Ivan Viskovati was executed... FEAR PREVENTED ANY ATTEMPTS TO RESTORE THE WRITING OF THE CHRONICLES IN ZEMSHCHINA (the basic part of the territory of the Russian state with its centre in Moscow not included by Ivan IV in the special appanage of the sovereign, the oprichnina. It included the cities of the Perm' and Viatka regions and Riazan', Starodub, Velikie Luki, and other cities. - Translator's note). [775], p.22.

Thus the people who were writing the history of Russia were annihilated. Besides, we are shown a 'dangerous place for chronicle writing' – the pogrom of Novgorod. This is the moment where the name of 'Veliky Novgorod' was stripped from Yaroslavl and then transferred to the Pskov region. The motives were purely political. The new people came to power – the Zakharyins (the Skharievtsy), the future Romanovs. They had their domain in Polotsk, in the Western Russian region and gravitated towards Pskov and Hanseatic League (a commercial and defensive confederation of merchant guilds and their market towns that dominated trade along the coast of Northern

Europe – Translator's note.) They wished to distort the Russian history in such a way that the origins of the old Horde dynasty from Yaroslavl were concealed. They created the impression that the Russian dynasty allegedly originated from North-Western Russia, Pskov region, where the Zakharyins themselves came from. Changing the geography of the events and their dates, the Romanovs-Zakharyins underpinned their new dynasty with the 'historical foundation'.

In 1564 the oprichnina was established. "The boyar V.M. YURIEV-ZAHARYIN became one of the main initiators of the oprichnina and it was the Zakharyins around whom the RULING CIRCLE OF THE OPRICHNINA has grouped around "[775], p. 225.

We are not going to dwell on the details of the terror of the Oprichnina. They are very well-known. We would only like to emphasise that the entire terror of Ivan 'The Terrible' fits within the period from 1563 to 1572. I.e. precisely during the reign of the juvenile Ivan Ivanovich on whose behalf the Zakharyins-Romanovs ruled.

The main stages of the terror: the establishment of the Oprichnina in 1564, the Kazan deportation in 1565, the conspiracy of the equerry Fedorov-Chelyadnin, THE CRUSHING DEFEAT OF NOVGOROD in 1569-1570, the murder of the Metropolitan Philip and the Archbishop of Kazan Gherman, the murder of the czar's cousin Vladimir Andreyevich, THE MASS EXECUTIONS of the boyars in 1568 [775], p.338.

The crushing defeat of Veliky Novgorod = Yaroslavl is the turning point of the oprichnina. The city was completely destroyed and the entire population was banished. The pogrom was followed by the execution of the member of the royal dynasty – Prince Vladimir of Staritsa. The civil war breaks out.

A new faction of the Zakharyins-Romanovs decided to eradicate the Russian-Horde dynasty, the old capital and the pillar of which was Veliky Novgorod = Yaroslavl. The Moscow oprichniks' army of the Zakharyins-Romanovs destroyed Yaroslavl and executed Vladimir Andreyevich, who could have claimed the throne from the side of the Horde dynasty.

The Horde = Rat' (Army) puts up an armed resistance. In the Miller-Romanovs' version of history it is presented as the invasion of the Crimean Khan. In 1571 the 'Crimeans', i.e. the Horde, approached Moscow. Moscow is captured and destroyed. The Czar Ivan 'abandoned his army and fled to Rostov'[776], p.162. Shortly before then in 1569 the czar requested asylum in England, presumably anticipating a dangerous turn of events. The Horde prevailed. The famous 'Moscow affair' begins.

The Horde, which by then had gained strength, crushes the party of the Zakharyins-Romanovs. The leaders of the previous oprichnina, the 'Romanovs' oprichnina, are executed. During this time the famous ... Malyuta Skuratov-Belskiy and Vasily Griaznoy are in operation. It is thought that they didn't participate in the first 'Zakharyin's-Romanov's terror'. Their activities began only after the Novgorod pogrom [776], p.169. Thus they act as the HORDIANS (ORDYNTSY) who severely punished the usurpative Zakhariyins-Romanovs clique. 'Skuratov helped Ivan the Terrible to dispose of the old guard oprichniks' [776], p.175. I.e.the Zakhariyins' guard.

Thus the Hordian Malyuta Skuratov rooted out the representatives of the Zakharyins Oprichniny (Oprichny) terror. It was for this that he was later declared to be 'evil'. We can see who was the author of today's formally recognized version of Russian history. It is the Zakharyins-Romanovs and their descendants.

The Horde-Rat' (Army) is victorious. The Zakharyins' Oprichnina Duma is defeated. Basmanov, its leader is executed. The new Duma is created consisting of 'the nobility of the highest possible rank... Almost all these figures or their relatives were subjected to persecution under Basmanov' [776], p.174-175. Directly following this, 'the English ambassador' was informed about the cessation of the secret talks regarding the granting of the asylum to the Czar's family in England' [776], p.189.

To summarize, the first attempt of the Zakharyins (Skharievtsy) to seize the throne of the Empire failed. The 'Mongol' Horde reaffirmed its status. In fact the capital for some time was transferred to Novgorod. 'The czar soundly settled in his new residence (in Novgorod – Author's note)... ON THE YAROSLAVOVO DVORISHE (Yaroslav Court) 'by the czar's palace a new bell was hung up' [775], p.374. Even the czar's treasury was transferred from Moscow to Novgorod [776], p.181. Incidentally 'the treasure which was brought to Novgorod was stored in the church cellars in THE YAROSLAVOVO DVORISHE (Yaroslav Court) [776], p.189. Today it is thought that the city in question is referring to Volkhovsky Novgorod on the swamps, in fact it is Novgorod-YAROSLAVL. Which is quite natural: Yaroslavl is the old capital of the Horde Empire. And the YAROSLAVOV DVORISHE (YAROSLAV COURT) is simply a Court in Yaroslavl.

To sum up. The version of the historians for the period of 1563-1572 is as follows. The actual power belongs to the boyars Zakharyins-Romanovs, 'who concentrated the control over Zemschina in their hands and who were ruling at court of the successor czarevitch Ivan, their relative on his mother's side' [776], p.165. The court of the



YOUNG CZAREVITCH IVAN was the control centre. The Zakharyins rule on his behalf.

Here is our point of view. As a matter of fact here we say exactly the same. The power belongs to the Zakharyins-Romanovs who rule the country on behalf of the young CZAR Ivan. The difference being only that the historians 'proceed' here with the invented 'Terrible czar' with 50 years of reigning, where as we claim that Ivan IV is no more. The young Ivan Ivanovich is the czar.

&& SIMEON-IVAN BECKBULATOVITCH.

Simeon-Ivan Beckbulatovitch 1572-1584. In the Western chronicles he is reflected as the Habsburg 'Maximillian II' 1564-1576 according to [76].

Following the crushing defeat of the oprichnina czarovich Ivan was forced to abdicate. Simeon, the head of Zemschina, a member of the Royal house becomes the czar. He adopts the royal name of Ivan and attempts to continue the Livonian war. But Russia's strength is exhausted by strife and terror. Simeon-Ivan enjoyed only regional success in the war. The campaign against Germany was postponed. But it never happened.

Simeon is also known under the name of Mstislav, notably he was erroneously dated to the XII century.

Our reconstruction. After the Civil war 1571-1572 the party of the Zakharyins-Romanovs suffers defeat. The executions of the leaders of the Oprichnina in Moscow have begun. The historians call all of this 'Moscow massacre' or 'Moscow affair' [775], p.163. At the head of the new oprichnina stand the most noble families, which prior to this were being wiped out. The army-Horde once again comes into power. The Yaroslavtsy-Novgorodtsy stand at the head of the country. The old documents confirm our version: 'The oprichnina army received the biggest reinforcement in its entire history; more than 500 Novgorodian noblemen joint its ranks... The Czar tried to create a force represented by the Novgorodian oprichniki' [776], p.169.

The capital was even transferred to Novgorod for a while. The government was headed by the Tatar khan Simeon Beckbulatovitch, most likely the youngest son of Ivan III, i.e. the uncle of the deceased Ivan IV. In 1575 the young czar Ivan Ivanovich was forced to abdicate. Then Simeon-Ivan was magnificently crowned czar in 1576. It was customary to change the name when crowned to reign in Russia at that time, as the example with Vasily III shows. Simeon is of course a rather elderly man. He is around 70 years old by then.

During this period Moscow virtually ceased being the capital. At first there was an attempt to transfer the capital to Novgorod, where they have already begun, but didn't complete the building of the Royal Court and a mighty fort [776], p.169. But then due to some reasons the czar moved to Tver: 'Having left Moscow, Simeon moved for his 'great reign' in Tver'[776], p.205. The historians enclose the words 'great reign' in quotes because they dislike that the chronicle informs us about the 'great' reign of Simeon'. What about 'Ivan the Terrible?' - they say. It cannot be that some Simeon was a Grand Prince when the czar and the Grand Prince 'Ivan the Terrible' was still alive! But 'Ivan the Terrible', as we are told, in the last years of his reign also turns out to be in Staritsa under Tver with his entire family [776], p.228. Everything is clear. 'Ivan the Terrible' in his later years and khan Simeon is one and the same person.

To sum up. The version of the historians of the period of 1572-1584 is as follows. Tatar Simeon is absurdly vested with overall authority by The 'Terrible czar Ivan' who then leaves himself at a loose end.

Our view. Following the return of the Horde dynasty to power, in 1572 the head of the Zemskaya State Duma khan Simeon becomes the sovereign ruler. In 1575 the 22 year old czar Ivan Ivanovich, who had already been stripped of power, was forced to abdicate in favour of Simeon. This is the famous abdication of Ivan the Terrible in 1575 [776], p.195. The Hordian Khan Simeon acceded to the throne and reigned until 1584.

We know that 'Ivan the Terrible' prior to his death was already old and senile. However, Ivan IV was born allegedly in 1530 (in fact in 1526) and at the time of the death of 'Ivan the Terrible' in 1584 he would have been 54-58 years old. The historians explain such decrepitude by citing mental disorder. Simeon, the son of Ivan III in 1584 should have been approximately 80 years old. Indeed, Ivan III died in 1505, i.e. 79 years before 1584. Ivan III had several children and it is only Simeon we know nothing about. This is why the notion that Simeon 'Beckbulatovich' is the son of Ivan III seems entirely natural.

In truth, the Great Strife of the XVI-XVII cc. was a longstanding civil war. As a result the state system of Russia radically changed at its core. The old Russian-Horde dynasty was destroyed. The coup d'etat was carried out by the representatives of the Western Russian, Pskovian faction of the Romanovs. The coup was supported by the Reformation revolt in the Western Europe. A brand new period in the history of Russia and the world has begun [6v2], ch.1.

The main thing that the Romanovs did was to declare the preceding Russian-Horde dynasty to be 'unlawful'. The entire Great epoch which lasted nearly three hundred years was denounced as a period of the 'cruel foreign yoke' in Russia. They declared their predecessors, the Russia Horde khans, savage barbarians from distant Eastern countries, who had usurped the power of the first 'Rurikovichs'. The former life of the country under the 'Mongol conquerors' was depicted as the epoch of grim violence. On the other hand the Romanovs presented themselves as the 'restorers of the truly Russian national identity', which had at last replaced the bloodthirsty 'foreigners'-Tatars. The Tartar Godunov was declared to be 'evil'. They said he had butchered a boy.

You have to hand it to them, the Romanovs were smart. In fact they hardly manipulated the historical facts. They simply presented them in a different light. As a result the Russian history of the 'Mongol' period was hugely distorted. The remains of the Cossack army Horde = Rat' scattered during the war and partially pushed aside from the centre to the borders of the Empire, were declared by the Romanovs to be the fugitive surfs. Or 'the bad folk' banished for some kind of wrong-doings. The Romanovs' historians wrote a new history of the 'evil Horde' in the light of the social commission dictated by the new masters. The result was perfectly plausible at first glance. However, they didn't succeed in plastering over everything. That is why today we can restore our true history.

But besides the main strategic task the Romanovs also pursued other aims, smaller, but by no means unimportant to them. Namely:

- To conceal the fact that the Great Strife began not in the XVII century, but in the middle of the XVI century as early as under 'Ivan the Terrible'. And that the Romanovs were among its main organisers and instigators.
- To prove the legitimacy of their claim to the throne. To do so they presented themselves as the relatives of the last legitimate czar.
- To conceal their participation in the oprichnina and the internecine fighting, dumping all the bloody sins onto 'the Terrible Czar'. They cover up their involvement in the religious heresy of the Judaizers.
- To trace their ancestry from a kind of ONLY LEGITIMATE WIFE OF THE 'TERRIBLE CZAR' – Anastasia ROMANOVA.

It is possible that specifically for this purpose the Romanovs' historians combined the four czars into one, falsely presenting their wives as the wives of the same person. We would like to remind you that according to the canonical law, after the fourth

marriage all wedlock was considered to be unlawful. Thus the marriages of the last of these four czars were wrong, and the children born within them had no rights to the throne, as it were. Then the czar Feodor Ivanovich was declared childless. This was not true. His son, i.e. Boris Fyodorovich 'Godunov' the Romanovs declared to be unlawful czar, who did not inherit the throne. This is also not true.

## && FEODOR IVANOVICH

Feodor Ivanovich 1584-1598 according to [362]. He is the son of Simeon-Ivan. A peaceful reign without any internal disturbances. The military actions in the Livonian war were stopped, however the separation of the West from the Empire as a result of the Reformation revolt was not recognized as lawful at the court of the Great Khan. In the West they understood that when Russia consolidated its strength the Livonian war would resume.

The wife of Feodor Ivanovich is Irina Godunova. The family of the Godunovs operates at court in the XIV-XVI cc. Its representatives occupied high posts. The son and the heir of Feodor Ivanovich is Boris Fyodorovich Godunov. In the 'Romanovs' version he was falsely presented as IRINA'S BROTHER i.e. as a person who did not have the inherent right to the throne.

## **9. MOSCOW OF THE XVI CENTURY IS DESCRIBED IN THE BIBLE AS JERUSALEM IN THE TIMES OF NEHEMIAH.**

In [6v2], ch.2 we have shown that the transferal of the capital of Russia-Horde to Moscow in the end of the XVI century and the construction of Moscow Kremlin were described in the Bible as the reconstruction of Jerusalem. The Old Testament Book of 'Nehemiah' is entirely dedicated to this important event.

In fact there are TWO JERUSALEMS described in the Bible. The first one is the Jerusalem of the New Testament. We call it The New Testament Jerusalem. It is Czar-Grad (Yoros) on the Bosphorus. It is the very same 'ancient' Troy. Jesus Christ lived here and was crucified (on the Beykoz mountain) in the XII century.

The Second Jerusalem is the Jerusalem of the epoch of the so called reconstruction of the temple described in the Bible. This is Moscow of the XVI century. The Books of the Old Testament which describe the 'second Jerusalem' are the latter books of the Bible. Though today they are on the contrary considered to be the most ancient. In fact they were written in the XVI century and were edited up until the middle of the XVII century.

The numerous parallels between the descriptions of the Old Testament Jerusalem in the Book of Nehemiah and the Moscow Kremlin, which we have discovered, do not leave any doubts about the fact that at this point the Bible gives an account specifically of the construction of Moscow and the Kremlin in particular. This amazing correspondence comes down to the last detail. While in the modern Palestinian Jerusalem (its original name, as we know, El Quds) there is nothing even faintly reminiscent of the Biblical description of Jerusalem.

Thus, the Old Testament Book of Nehemiah, when speaking of the second reconstruction-building of Jerusalem in the 20th year of Artaxerxes, in fact narrates about the construction of Moscow and the Moscow Kremlin in the XVI century circa 1567. Whereas the six Biblical fortress gates of the 'reconstructed' Jerusalem are the six old gates of the Moscow Kremlin. Namely:

# The cattle, Sheep gate of the Old Testament Jerusalem is the Spasskiy (Saviour) Gate of the Moscow Kremlin. The Jerusalem Gate in Jerusalem is also the Spasskiy Gate of the Moscow Kremlin.

# The Fish Gate of the Old Covenant Jerusalem is the Timofeev Gate of the Moscow Kremlin.

# The Fortress Old Gate of Jerusalem is the Nikolsky or Old Nikolsky Gate of the Kremlin.

# The Dung Gate, the Dirty, Sordid garrison gate of the Old Covenant Jerusalem is Kremlin Troitsky Gate.

# The biblical garrison Valley Gate in Jerusalem is the Kremlin Borovitsky Gate.

# The biblical Fountain Gate in Jerusalem is the Kremlin Tainitsky Gate.

# Further, the fortified walls of the tower of the 'reconstructed' Old Covenant Jerusalem are the Moscow Kremlin towers. In particular the biblical towers Meah and Hananel are the Kremlin Nabatnaya and Tzarskaya towers.

# The biblical Tower of the Furnaces is the Kremlin Arsenal (Arsenalnaya) Tower.

# The Old Covenant Dragon Spring in front of the Valley Gate in Jerusalem is the Chertoryk river opposite the Kremlin Borovitsky Gate.

# The Biblical Garden of the King and the City of David within the Jerusalem walls are the embankment Czar Garden (Tsarsky Sad) and Czar Palace (Tsarsky Dvorets) in the Kremlin. The very same garden was described in the 'ancient sources' as the famous 'Hanging Gardens of Babylon' ('Semiramida Gardens').

# The Biblical 'Wall of the Pool of Shelah' within the Jerusalem fortress is Furrier's Chamber of the Czar's State Courtyard (Monarchic Court) in the Kremlin.

# The Old Testament Sepulchers of David inside the Jerusalem wall are the Czar's Burial Chambers Tombs in the Kremlin Cathedral of the Archangel (Arkhangelsky Sobor).

# The Biblical 'House of the Mighty' and Rybaritsa the Pool inside the Jerusalem wall are the Hobro Courtyard, The Armoury Chamber and the Timofeevskaya Tower = the Fish Tower in the Moscow Kremlin.

# The Old Testament 'Armory at the Angle of the wall' of the Jerusalem fortress is the Arsenal in the corner of the Kremlin, in the Corner Tower.

# The Biblical 'the House of the High Priest (Eliashib)' inside the Jerusalem fortress is the Assumption Cathedral in the Kremlin.

# The Old Testament House Royal and the 'High Pillar' ('great projecting tower') next to it within the Jerusalem fortress are the Czar's Palace and the Ivan the Great Bell-tower in the Kremlin.

# The Biblical Horse Gate inside the Jerusalem Fortress is the Czar's Argamac Horse Stable at the Borovitskii corner of the Kremlin.

# The Old Testament Judgement Gate of Jerusalem is the Administrative Order by the Moscow Kremlin Troitsky Gate.

In the XVI century the Empire reaches the height of its power. Moscow becomes its new capital after Yaroslavl = Veliky Novgorod upon the Volga river. In the XVI century the massive construction works begin in the place of the small settlement which used to be situated here (in 1380 the Battle of Kulikovo took place there), where the best architects, summoned from various different countries, work. The new capital of the World Empire is being built. At first using a cut-and-cover method, in a ditch for foundation, a large underground town is built. Then a roof is laid' over it, then it is covered with soil and on top of it and above ground a city is built - Moscow. This gigantic building and construction work greatly impressed contemporaries and was described in many 'ancient' sources of the XVI-XVII cc. In the Bible it is reflected as 'the restoration of Jerusalem' which was called the Second Jerusalem, i.e. following the First – Jerusalem of the Gospels = Czar-Grad. Speaking of the erection of the Second Jerusalem under Ezra, the Bible primarily refers to the building of the magnificent Moscow Kremlin.

In the Book of 'Genesis' the Bible once again allegorically alludes to the construction of imperial Moscow in the XVI century. This is the erection of the Tower of Babel. The Graeco-Roman 'classicists', notably Heradotus, describe Moscow as the 'Egyptian labyrinth'. Primarily they refer to the mysterious underground Moscow which truly resembles a labyrinth. This underground city was created as a powerful defensive fortification enabling the safe storage of the treasury, armaments, and provisions, the secret manoeuvres of military troops and their unexpected appearance at a besieging enemy's rear. Moscow of the XVI century, the last capital of the 'Mongol Empire', was designed and built as an impregnable city.

To conclude, Moscow of the XVI century gave rise to the 'classical' legends about the Tower of Babel and the Labyrinth. We discovered the ancient paintings where the Biblical Tower of Babel is depicted either in the centre of the Labyrinth or next to it [GRK], ch.4. We can see that the ancient authors actually combined the Tower of Babel and the Labyrinth and considered them as parts of the same construction.

The founder of Moscow the Grand Prince Yuri Dolgorukiy (literally Yuri the Long-Armed'- Translator's note) with the 400 year shift rises exactly to the epoch of Ivan IV the Terrible. The corrected years of Yuri Dolgorukiy's reign are as follows: 1563-1572. Instead of the erroneous scaligerian-Romanovs': 1148-1157. The years between 1563-1572 is the exact epoch of the oprichnina. It perfectly corresponds with the construction of the Moscow Kremlin in the XVI century.

So it appears that the Russian chronicles on the whole truly say that it was Yuri Dolgoruky who founded Moscow. It is only necessary to amend the erroneous chronology. In the Bible the Prince Yuri DOLGORUKIY is present as the Artaxerxes Longimanus = Long Armed, the King of Assyria and Babylon. Meaning Artaxerxes 'XERXES' Long-Armed or Horde-Georgii the Long-Armed.

A settlement called Moscow was founded in the place of the Battle of Kulikovo at the end of the XIV century. The old centre was situated near Staro-Simonov (Old Simon) Monastery. It is quite possible that it used to be the capital of a small appanage principality. In the late XVI century in the times of the strife and the oprichnina – the epoch of the Biblical Esther – the czar arrives here from Suzdal = Biblical Susa and founds a new capital. He builds the Moscow Kremlin. To accomplish that he sends for the Italian masters. He either could not or would not call the domestic ones as the country was split into two antagonistic factions: the oprichnina with the czar as its head, surrounding himself with the heretics Judaizes, and Zemschina to which the old capitals of Vladimir and Suzdal Russia belong to. This building of Moscow and the whole situation in general, the historians dated a hundred years earlier, in the epoch

of Ivan III. They also generated some other duplicates-reflections in the Russian history. Namely the story of Yuri Dolgorukiy allegedly of the XII century. Hence a false impression emerged, that allegedly Moscow was founded a number of times. Purportedly in the XII century or maybe even earlier. The first city on Neglinnaya, allegedly in the IX century.

Under the name of the Biblical prophet Nehemiah leading the reconstruction of Jerusalem, the Old Testament described the famous Kuzma Minin. The liberation of Jerusalem is the Biblical account of the liberation of Moscow by Kuzma Minin and the Prince Dmitry Pozharsky's militia in the early XVII century. In the Bible Books 1,2 of Ezra and Nehemiah alongside the name of the prophet Nehemiah the name Zerubbabel is constantly mentioned as one of the main participants of the reconstruction of Jerusalem. Under the name of Zerubbabel was partially described the same Kuzma Minin.

Dmitry Pozharsky, who alongside Minin entered the annals of Russian History, is also reflected on the pages of the Bible. Most likely it is the Biblical Sheshbazzar, the prince of Judah (1 Ezra 1:7-8, 1:11). It was Sheshbazzar, who received the vessels of the house of the LORD from the hands of Mithredath, the treasurer (1 Ezra 1:8).

So, the famous monument to Minin and Pozharsky in Red Square is the monument to the Old Testament Horde heroes Nehemiah and Sheshbazzar.

Biblical Nehemiah, i.e. Kozma Minin, was buried in Nizhnii Novgorod in the Kremlin's Our Saviour Transfiguration Cathedral. The sepulcher of the Prince Pozharsky = Biblical Sheshbazzar was situated in the chapel of the Spaso-Euthymius Monastery [6v2], ch.2:7.

## **10. JERUSALEM IN PALESTINE.**

So, the Old Testament reconstruction of Jerusalem has no relevance to 'Jerusalem' in modern Palestine. When and how did the concept emerge of the Biblical Jerusalem as situated on the Eastern bank of the Mediterranean Sea, in the remotest part of Palestine?

Most likely this 'Jerusalem' emerged on the world map (including the 'ancient' ones, compiled and reproduced in Europe) in the epoch of the XVII century, at this point as a mere dot on a piece of paper. Someone, sitting in Europe marked a place on the map and said: 'Biblical Jerusalem must be situated here'. Why was this done?

Following the split of the Great Empire and enthronement of the pro-Western Romanovs in Russia, Atamania remained the only serious threat for Europe. That is



why all the efforts were concentrated into fighting it. The European state with the participation of the Romanovs planned the Crusade into Turkey. These plans resulted in the lengthy Russian-Turkish wars in the late XVII – XX cc.

The idea of the Crusade was easy to connect with the 'liberation of Jerusalem'. All the more so as there was a Jerusalem in Turkey. It is Czar-Grad (Yoros), Jerusalem of the Gospels, the holy city, where Christ was crucified. The city which at some point was known to the entire Great Empire. But the ideologists-reformers of the XVII century didn't want to name Istanbul, the capital of Turkey as the goal of their campaign. As the religious split had taken place relatively recently – in the XVI - XVII cc., and many still remembered something about the former religious unity of the 'Mongol' Empire. That is why the fact that holy Jerusalem is the capital of the Turkish sultan, could mean for many that the sultan is the embodiment of the much truer faith than the French king, for instance. And therefore maybe the Sultan should be the one to submit to, so on the whole the emerging situation was quite slippery.

It would be much more intelligent to say that Jerusalem is, of course, under the power of the Turks, but they, being heretics, turned it into a pit in the middle of nowhere, not showing the due respect for the holy place. Besides, it is useful to set the 'holy goal' at the rear of the Turks. So that in order to conquer it, it would be necessary to conquer the whole of Turkey. That was the main purpose of the idea.

This immediately implies though that holy Jerusalem should be identified on the territory of Turkey, but not in its capital. It should be somewhere far out, in the middle of nowhere. Of course they were trying to find a place more or less corresponding to the universally acknowledged biblical description of Jerusalem and its vicinity as the Promised Land, flowing with milk and honey, lush with blossoming gardens and generally reminiscent of paradise on earth. But the Western Europeans were not allowed into Turkey for a long time. That is why it was difficult to know exactly where the rivers were flowing with milk and honey there and where they were not. From general consideration it was presumably decided that the East coast of the Mediterranean Sea was suitable enough. The magnificent sea, the wonderful climate... But to mark the 'Jerusalem dot' on the very coastal line of the Mediterranean Sea was not right. As the Gospels and the Bible in general do not describe Jerusalem as a sea port or a coastal city. It is described as a city situated far from a big sea, though a lake is mentioned close by. Although there should be river Jordan flowing nearby. The real Jerusalem – Czar-Grad (Yoros) - is in fact a long distance away from the wide open sea and is situated on the long Bosphorus, which

as well as the Marmara Sea, was depicted on many Mediaeval maps as a wide long river. It was considered to be Jordan.

That is why the 'Jerusalem dot' on the map was put at some distance from the Mediterranean coast. Just around fifty kilometres away from it. How were it's authors to know, that in those places the fertile lands stretched only a narrow line along the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, and that fifty kilometers away from it there is mainly stony desert.

So, the dot was marked. And the name of Jerusalem was written on the map. One of the main ideological goals of the planned crusade was thus decided – the sacred frontier which they should aspire to reach, was now indicated and was at the very rear quarters of the Turks. But in order to acquire it the whole of Turkey must be conquered.

The wars began. They lasted for a long time and were bloody. Only in the very end of the XVIII century, i.e. almost two hundred years later, the Europeans were eventually able to launch an assault behind enemy lines, in Egypt. Close to the sacred mark – the 'suffering Jerusalem' in Palestine. It was Napoleon's famous Egyptian campaign which began in 1798. It was only in 1799 that Gaza in Palestine was seized. The Europeans were at last within a stone's throw of the Palestinian 'Jerusalem's mark'. Then on the 3rd April 1799 Sur was seized followed by the victory in Nazareth on the 8th April, [6v2], ch.2. Which means that at last they had 'reached Jerusalem'.

It is possible to imagine that when the Western Europeans arrived in Jerusalem they found there the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Although rebuilt numerous times, but nevertheless standing proudly in the village of Al-Quds in the middle of the stony desert. 'Proving' that it is not just any common village, but ancient Biblical Jerusalem. That very sacred goal pursued for so long by the Western 'Crusaders' of the XVII-XVIII cc.

However it turns out that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was 'newly built' in 1810 or even later. The alcoves for the crosses exist only in the stone veneer of 1888. It is not possible to see the Holy Sepulchre itself. It is possible that it could be there, but it would be underground. However search and excavation is not permitted [6v2].

But if we are told that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was rebuilt in 1810, than doesn't it follow herein, that prior to the XIX century there was simply no church there at all? Later, in the XIX-XX cc. this site was declared, without foundation, to be 'holy'. Pilgrimages began to be made here.

The history of the Western Europeans knowledge of the 'holy places' of modern Palestine is very insightful. It began only after Napoleon. Even up until the end of the XIX century the Europeans were in a muddle in regards to how to situate the Biblical holy places on such unsuitable territory. Where, for instance, could they 'find' the walls of Biblical Jerusalem, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, etc. But then they were 'painted' and 'manufactured' [6v2], ch.2.

As far as we know, none of the Russian Emperors has ever appeared in the 'Holy Land' in modern Palestine. It is probably no coincidence. Chances are they understood very well, that all the 'Palestine relics' were first drawn on paper, and then manufactured on the location quite recently.

## **11. THE NEW JERUSALEM OUTSIDE OF MOSCOW.**

For a long time Czar-Grad was considered the only centre of worship in the entire Christian world. In time the kingdom expanded and the people from the provinces were not always able to go to Jerusalem on the Bosphorus to worship. An idea emerged to create semblances of the holy city 'in situ', in the provinces. It emerged either in the XIII or in the XV cc., when Czar-Grad was seized. The conquest of the holy city was reflected in the biblical 'prophecies' of the fall of Jerusalem. At the end of the XVI century Jerusalem was built in Moscow [6v2]. Shortly before this Kazan was also referred to as Jerusalem. In the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah the construction of the Moscow Kremlin is referred to as 'the reconstruction of Jerusalem'.

Long after the Bible was printed in the XVII century the construction of another Jerusalem, namely in the modern day Palestine, begins. Later on it was declared 'the only Jerusalem'. The historians chose to forget about the previous Jerusalems so that no awkward questions would arise. However not everything was forgotten. A remarkable example of the construction of Jerusalem in the XVII century in the time of patriarch Nikon on the Istra river outside Moscow survives. It was designed on a large scale. However, the works were scrapped a few years down the line. It was appointed a place of a conventional monastery.

Hence it appears that everything could have turned out differently. If the original plan was not cancelled and the New Jerusalem was accomplished on the large scale, then it is entirely possible that today's Jerusalem would have been located on the Istra river, near Moscow, but not in modern Palestine. Mind you, no one would of course have remembered that in the XVII century the river was called Istra. Everyone would have sincerely called it 'the Gospel river Jordan'. The numerous guide-books would

have told us with conviction about the centuries-long history of this Isra-Jordanian Jerusalem. They would have pointed out to us 'that very same' Mount Sinai which Moses had once ascended. But if anyone dared to openly declare that the city of Capernaum in the XVII century was called Zinovieva Pustosh (Zinoviev wasteland), this person would have been looked at with the same suspicion as anyone, who today would attempt to reinstate the former Arabic names in present day Palestine. For example, the Arabic name Al-Quds of modern Jerusalem, the Arabic name of the village renamed 'Biblical Jericho', etc.

More importantly, the editing of the Bible would have taken a different direction. They would not have eradicated the traces of snow, frost and the Northern winter in general. On the contrary, they would have added something about the thick snow and bitter cold. Everything would have looked rather convincing. Even more convincing than in the modern 'Southern, Palestinian version'.

But for some reasons Jerusalem on Istra was abolished. Only after this they started calling it The New Jerusalem. Alleging that it was not the 'actual' Jerusalem. And in general, the entire grand design was only a whim of the Patriarch Nikon. And the 'genuine Jerusalem' is situated in a completely different place. Allegedly in the present day Palestine.

## **12. BABYLONIAN EXILE.**

In the Bible there are a number of events called the 'Babylonian Exile'. The first is the Babylonian exile of the XIV century, during the epoch of the 'Mongol' conquest. It is reflected in the history of the Catholic Church as the Babylonian captivity of the papacy. Its details are virtually unknown. What is suggested to us is a XVII century version. It was composed after the breakup of the 'Mongol Empire' and is a part of the distorted Scaligerian history. In particular Dante's works, for example his 'Letters', where he speaks a lot of the Avignon Exile (he calls it Babylonian [2v1], ch.1:4) were written, most likely, not earlier than the XVII century.

The same refers to the works of Petrarch (allegedly 1304-1374) which were allegedly written XIV century. As we said before they were most likely to have been created in the XVII century [2v1], ch.1:4.

It is thought that Dante lived in 1265-1321 [797], p.359. The bronze bust of allegedly XV century, modeled on the mold of Dante's face is well known [304], v.2, p.410. Most likely it was made not earlier than the XVII century using the death mask of a man who lived in that epoch. Alternatively it could be yet another 'visual aid' of the XVII-XVIII cc. for the textbooks on the Scaligerian history in front of us.

The second Babylonian captivity was in the XV century. It is the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans in 1453.

The third Babylonian captivity took place in the XVI century. It is the conquest of Kazan-Khazaria in 1552 and Novgorod-Yaroslavl in 1570 by Ivan the Terrible, i.e. the biblical Nebuchadnezzar [6v1], ch.6. The important events in Russia-Horde of the XVI-XVII cc. are connected to these foreigners-settlers. Namely, the story of Esther.

### **13. THE BIBLICAL TEMPLE OF SOLOMON AND HAGIA SOPHIA IN INSTANBUL.**

When the Biblical and European histories are aligned, King Solomon overlaps the Byzantine emperor Justinian I allegedly of the VI century. He 'restores' the famous Hagia Sophia in Czar-Grad. The Holy Temple built by Solomon and Hagia Sophia coincide. The temple erected by Solomon in Jerusalem is often called Solomon's Temple. So it is CONSTANTINOPLE'S HAGIA SOPHIA WHICH IS SOLOMON'S TEMPLE IN JERUSALEM. Going forward, king Solomon (the very same Justinian I) is the reflection of the legendary sultan Suleiman, aka Suleiman the Magnificent. Born in 1494 or in 1495, he became a sultan in 1520 and died in 1566. One of the most eminent rulers of the Ottoman (Ataman) Empire. So Hagia Sophia = Solomon's Temple was erected in the XVI century. It is the first construction project of the enormous temples. It didn't turn out entirely successfully. In approximately twenty years the temple began to 'sprawl', and Selim II had to reinforce it with the 'supporting piers' [6v].

Prior to the early XVII century and possibly later, Hagia Sophia, where the sultans had already been praying for many decades, still did not change its Christian appearance. In other words the Istanbul sultans up until the XVII and maybe even up until the XVIII century PRAYED IN THE CHRISTIAN CATHEDRAL! This is contrary to any ingrained prejudices we may have about the Ottomans = Atamans. But it corresponds brilliantly with our reconstruction: as the Ottomans (Atamans) came from Russia-Horde, were Christian and prayed in the Christian churches. The Christian icons were not plastered over. All the major changes in the ritualism, at least those connected with the iconoclasm, prevailed only in the XVII-XVIII cc.

Suleiman the Magnificent's wife was the Russian Roxelana, and Solomon's wife was the daughter of the Egyptian Pharaoh. But as we have shown already, the Biblical Egypt is Russia-Horde. So, Solomon's wife is a Russian princess. By the way, the

Queen of Sheba, who once came to visit King Solomon, is partially identified with the Empress Helena, mother of Constantine. She is also the Russian princess Olga. Furthermore, the mysterious biblical 'a great many waters in the midst of David's Column' in Jerusalem – is a vast underground reservoir-cistern of the Mediaeval Istanbul.

Besides, the Old Testament's 'Sea of Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem on the 12 oxen' – is once again the legendary Istanbul cistern-reservoirs [6v].

## **14. THE AMAZONS.**

Many think that the Amazons existed only in the 'ancient' Greek myths. In the meantime the Russian Povest Vremennykh Let (The Tale of the Bygone Years – The Russian Primary Chronicle, also called Chronicle of Nestor or Kiev Chronicle – Translator's note), for example, tell us about the Amazons. The equestrian squadrons of female warriors did in fact exist in Russia-Horde. For example, THE EQUESTRIAN FEMALE COHORTS ACCOMPANIED EQUIPAGES OF THE GOLDEN HORDE QUEENS [282], p.146.

Astonishingly this CONVOY OF THE AMAZONS existed at the Russian czars' court until the early XVII century! There survived some foreign travelers' commentary about it [282], p.145-146. Giving this description, the historian I.E. Zabelin could not refrain from an obvious comparison: 'The ceremonial female equestrian convoy, the Amazons of a sort, leads us to wonder, whether such a custom for a queen's escort was adopted from the long-term customs of the escorts of the ancient Queens of the Golden Horde [282], p. 146. As we understand it now, the Golden Horde was simply a Russian state of the XIV-XV cc. with its capital in Kostroma or Yaroslavl – Veliky Novgorod. Moscow Rus' (Russia) of the XVI century became the heiress of that state. Naturally the customs of Moscow and Golden Horde corresponded.

The country of the Amazons, as situated in Russia, is named directly on the magnificent map of Charles V and Ferdinand dated to the XVI century. It turns out that Amazonia situated between the Volga river and the Don river, in the region of the Sea of Azov, Tartaria, below the Volga and Don skid way. This country is named on the map of Charles V as AMAZONVM [4v1], ch.4. HERE THE NATIVE COSSACK, I.E. TATARIAN LANDS WERE SITUATED.

Finally we will quote a wonderful title of one of the chapters of 'Universal Chronicle' by Marcin Bielski published allegedly in 1551. The chapter is thus named: 'ON AMAZON WOMEN, THE TATARIAN WIVES' [344], p.231. Thus in the XVI-XVII

cc. it was JUST THE TATARIAN WIVES WHO WERE CALLED THE AMAZONS. And who are the Tatars? In the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. they are the Cossacks. Therefore, the Amazons were the Cossack wives, kazatchki. They were always famous for being great horse riders, active in public life. They sometimes fought alongside men.

The Cossack-Amazonians are reflected in various 'ancient' sources. The Amazons entered the realms of classical literature and art. The Amazons were the favourite motif on Greek painted vases. They were depicted on a horse wielding a spear, fighting the Greeks [4v1], ch.4.

## **15. THE CONQUEST OF CENTRAL AMERICA BY ATAMAN (COSSACK LEADER) YERMAK = CONQUISTADOR CORTES.**

It appears that Yuri Vasilievich, the brother of Ivan the Terrible, is described by Herodotus as 'ancient' Dorieus. Herodotus gives a detailed account of him as a brother of Cleomenes. Thus we were lucky to come across an old document containing the most interesting facts of the mysterious story of Ivan IV the Terrible's brother – Yuri Vasilievich, the son of Solomonia Saburova, the first wife of Vasili III [163], p.250-251. 'Ancient' Herodotus unexpectedly lifts the veil off an important page in Russian history hitherto obscured by the Romanovs. It is for a good reason that the historians still ardently dispute whether Yuri Vasilievich, brother of Ivan the Terrible, ever existed at all. It turns out that not only he existed, but also accomplished remarkable deeds.

We discovered that the famous Cossack ataman Yermak Timofeev of the second half of the XVI century was described by Herodotus as Spartan Dorieus, the brother of king Cleomenes, i.e. Ivan the Terrible. Herodotus informs us about Dorieus' campaign, his conquest of the city of Sybaris and his death [ZA], ch.7. It was the second campaign, following the one in the early XIV century, being the colonization of Siberia and its subjection to the metropolis of Russia-Horde.

According to the Romanov sources at first the relationship between Ivan the Terrible and ataman Yermak-Vasili was hostile. The chronicles accuse Yermak of robbery, looting and insubordination to authority. Herodotus says something similar about Dorieus. Dorieus is also resentful, clashes with his brother and refutes his brother's authority.

According to Herodotus the confrontation between the Spartan king Cleomenes and his brother Dorieus resulted in Dorieus, at the head of the army, LEAVING THE

KINGDOM AND ESTABLISHING COLONIES OR SETTLEMENTS IN DISTANT COUNTRIES. The two Spartan kings could not coexist in the same country. One of them had to leave. A plausible excuse was concocted – to conquer the far off territories. That is where Dorieus set off to.

According to the Romanov chronicles, following the animosity between Ivan the Terrible and the Cossack Ataman Yermak-Vasili, the latter sets off to conquer Siberia at the head of the Cossack army equipped with the firearms. Not only did Yermak conquer the cities, but founded new settlements. A vast and wealthy country is being colonized. It is probable, that Yermak-Vasili was purposefully 'pushed out' of Moscow as far as possible, when an honourable, but dangerous occasion turned up. Something in terms of: Let him fight! And if he is killed, as it did happen in the end, we will glorify him, proclaim him a great conqueror.

We will repeat that Herodotus unexpectedly illuminated the dark Romanov version of Ivan the Terrible's reign. Herodotus has got the details of Yuri Vasilievich = Dorieus, the brother of Ivan the Terrible = king Cleomenes. Moreover, we discovered an astonishing fact: in essence Herodotus claims, that Ivan the Terrible's brother was that very same famous Yermak-Vasili, whose name was so popular in the Russian history of the XVI century.

Where did this 'classic' name DORIEUS originate from? As it points to Yermak, it could have been connected with his great campaign to the East. Immediately the name 'DAURIA' springs to mind, which was very well known in the Far East: 'DAURIA is a country stretching from the Yablonoï Mountains to the East up to the river valley of Arguni. THIS NAME OCCURS SINCE THE RUSSIANS EMERGENCE THERE and originates from the Tungus tribe inhabiting it' [988:00], 'Dauria'.

The facts that we discovered about Dorieus-Yermak are interesting and unexpected. Notably it would be impossible to uncover them without the New Chronology. Hence it is clear how vital it is to have the correct dates at your disposal.

Furthermore, the core of the narrative of Yermak's conquest of Siberia is the colonization of America by Russia-Horde and Ottoman (Ataman) Empire in the XV-XVI cc. In the Western sources all of this is described as the conquest of America by the Conquistador Cortes.

In [6] we showed that the voyage of Columbus is the reflection in the Western chronicles of the conquest of America in the XV-XVI cc. carried out by Russia and the Ottoman Empire, where the troops of Russia-Horde invaded the American



continent not only from the East, having crossed the Atlantic, but also from the West, having made it through Siberia, via the Pacific Ocean. The Cossacks entered America also via Alaska. Having colonized a continent, little populated at that point, the Cossacks and Ottomans-Atamans created here the civilization of Maya, Aztec, Inca and Toltec... These civilizations perished during the epoch of the Reformation of the XVII-XVIII cc., when the troops of the Western European armies who were crushing the 'Mongol' Empire, arrived to America. Including its distant American colonies. Later the atrocities of the 'progressive reformers' were attributed to the Horde colonists of the XV-XVI cc.

Was the colonization of America reflected in the RUSSIAN CHRONICLES? At first glance it wasn't. However, it turns out that the conquest of America is nonetheless described in the Russian sources. Only these descriptions are included as a part of the stories about the famous voyage of Yermak and his conquest of the 'vast Siberia'.

The Romanov editors GREATLY BELITTLED THE SCALE OF YERMAK'S CONQUEST AND NARROWED DOWN ITS GEOGRAPHICAL FRAME. Today we are led to believe that allegedly only several hundreds of Cossacks set off for the campaign. And they succeeded in conquering a huge country. Besides, in order not to insult the colleagues-reformers across the ocean, the Romanovs did their best to erase from the chronicles any mention of the fact that the Cossack army, having crossed Siberia, invaded America and founded their prospering civilizations – ones which later on were declared by the historians to be 'terribly ancient'. Following the emerging of the USA in the XVIII century – in place of the former territories of Russia-Horde – the true history of America was, by coordinated efforts, plunged into darkness.

The traces of the true events surface even in Karamzin's work – one of the most faithful of the Romanov historians. Karamzin himself, without our prompting, compared Yermak's voyage with the conquest of Central America by Cortes [362], v.9, ch.6, column 226-228. And it is correct. To a far greater degree than Karamzin believed himself. Correct - not figuratively, but literally.

It is for or a reason that the old depictions of Yermak's voyage show him navigating large rivers [ZA], ch.7. Of course some Siberian rivers are very wide. However, earlier the seas and the oceans were depicted on the geographical maps as rivers [1v], [2v]. That is why some old images of Yermak's voyage could have been describing the crossing of the ocean by the large Cossack ships.

Likewise Herodotus' account of Dorieus' army sailing across the sea to a faraway 'island of Sicily' could have reflected the crossing of the Atlantic or the Pacific Ocean by the Russian-Horde troops on their way to America.

When the historians radically minimized the scale of the events, it appeared that sailing from Greece to the nearby island of Sicily had begun to be considered 'very far-off'. What actually happened is that in the old original an account was given of the crossing of the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans. I.e. about truly long-distance expeditions. The cunning editors of recent times started to assure us that the 'ancient' settlers of Dorieus were sailing not to America, but merely to the 'island of Sicily'. Purporting that it was 'too far and dangerous'.

Let us take a look at the name of khan KUCHUM who Yermak fights with. The name KUCHUM pointed not only to the ruler, but to the entire kingdom, which was sometimes called the 'Kuchum's Domain'. If the conquest of America is reflected here, then will we find KUCHUM and his kingdom there? Yes, we will. In [6v] we showed that during the colonization of America the name of the people of MAYA KICHE or KICHE MAYA emerges. It is plausible, that KUCHUM is a variant of the pronunciation KICHE MAYA which appeared in the Russian chronicles.

The name of the American people Maya Kiche is the marking of the Slavic conquest reaching America and engulfing it in the XIV-XVI cc. The first Hordian settlers could have appeared here in the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. under the 'Mongolian' conquest. After two hundred years, in the XV century, the Cossack czar Yermak-Vasili meets the descendants of this first wave of the Horde-Cossacks. They called themselves Kiche Maya = Kuchum. We would also like to note, that KICHE is close to the word KOCHevnik (NOMAD in Russian – Tr. note), meaning the horse cavalry of the Horde.

The great significance attributed by the Russian chronicles to Yermak's voyage becomes clear. In the XVI century it was not Siberia at all that they conquered: there was no need to do so. As it is, Siberia was already a part of the Great Empire for a long time, since the early XIV century, when the 'Mongol' invasion swept through Eurasia. The second 'conquest of Siberia' by Yermak in the XVI century could have of course meant the suppression of the small rebellions or separatist tendencies on his way. But such a voyage clearly wouldn't 'cut it' to play such an outstanding role attributed to it by the chroniclers. But if the matter at hand concerned the COLONIZATION OF AMERICA, then the picture would be altered. The campaign in fact becomes a grandiose event.

Supposedly Yermak's troops crossed Siberia and the Far East quite fast. As they were HOME lands. But the main events began later. The Cossacks continued their journey across the Bering Strait and the Pacific Ocean towards the distant America. Called by Herodotus a 'distant ISLAND of Sicily'. Where the king Dorieus (Dauria=Horde?, Dal, Dalnii meaning 'Distance' and 'Distant' in Russian) had to sail his ships to. It is clear why the old Russian texts, wrongly ridiculed by Karamzin, claimed that not hundreds of Cossacks, but THOUSANDS of them were marching with Yermak. Obviously, in order to conquer a vast transoceanic continent, large numbers of the soldiers-crusaders were needed.

Aside from Russian Alaska, Russian Oregon and Russian California, the emergence of the entire Great Tartaria also becomes clear = Moscow Tartaria spanning Siberia as well as the significant part of the American continent [6v].

It is clear why the name of the Cossack czar YERMAK in a form of AMERICA began to apply to the entire continent. The conqueror named the country after himself. Besides, the name AMERICA or AME-RICA could have originated from MAYA-RICA, i.e. (meaning) MAYA-STATE, THE STATE OF MAYA, MY STATE. In the Middle Ages the word RICA meant STATE (for example, Costa Rica, etc.).

The stories about the famous conquistador Hernan Cortes came down to us from the Western European, mainly Spanish chronicles. In a nutshell the essence of the conquest of Central America by Cortes sounds like this. It turns out that it is necessary to repeat almost word for word the accounts of the Russian chronicles about Yermak. This will result in the following.

A great conqueror at the head of a small naval brigade, equipped with firearms, conquered a distant vast country, the inhabitants of which were brave warriors. Cannons and muskets, thus far unfamiliar to the locals, crushed their resistance.

It turns out that the surviving documents about Yermak's voyage emerged not earlier than the middle of the XVII century or even later. Most likely they were based on the old testimonies of Yermak's contemporaries [ZA], ch.8. However these texts didn't survive. Yermak died in 1584. It means that today we view his voyage based on the texts written at least 20-30 years later, and more likely half a century later. Or even later. The old testimonials were edited by the Romanovs' censors. They 'corrected the history' adapting it to the newly created version. The main purpose was to erase from the chronicles any traces of the fact that having crossed all of the Siberia and Far East, Yermak's army made an intrusion into the territory of Central America. It was there where the MAIN EVENTS unfolded. Also it is not impossible that Yermak set

out to America either from the shores of Kamchatka or from the east, from the island of Cuba in the Atlantic Ocean.

The Siberian chronicles became accessible to the public only after the final division of the spheres of interest between the Romanov Russia and the USA in the second half of the XIX century. Since 1867 the Romanovs gave Alaska away to the Americans [4v]. After that the Russian sources were edited once again and in 1880 it was kindly allowed to publish the Kungur Chronicle.

What do we know about the documents giving us an account of the conquest of Mexico and Central America by Cortes allegedly in the first half of the XVI century? The picture is similar to the one in the Russian historiography. The surviving Western-European texts on this topic surface not earlier than in the XVII century. It is thought that the conquest of Central America was described mainly by the Spanish. This being said they mean the people who lived on the territory of modern Spain.

But most likely the 'Spanish conquest' is the Ottoman conquest. To recap, the famous division of the world in the XV-XVI cc. between Spain-Castile and Portugal was in fact the division of the world between Ottoman (Ataman) Empire and Russia-Horde. Certainly, some parts of the Ottoman and Horde troops could have consisted of the inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula, where present-day Spain is situated. But at that time all of these lands as well as many others were part of the Great Empire. That is why when reading today about the SPANISH conquest of America one ought to understand that at the bottom of it is the OTTOMAN and HORDIAN colonization of the continent in the XV-XVI cc.

There survives information in the Russian Siberian chronicles informing us that Yermak was buried near some volcanos [RI], ch.4. So where were they situated? There are no volcanos on the territory of present-day Siberia. Hence Yermak was not buried in Siberia. But where? The answer is simplified by the fact that WE HAVE ALREADY FOUND OUT THE TRUE SETTING OF THESE EVENTS. They unfolded in Central America. Near the city of Meshiko (Mexico) there are indeed situated the two huge volcanos – Popocatepetl and Istasiuatl, more than 5 thousand meters high [ZA]. They are probably presented in the Russian Kungur Chronicle. Later on the Romanov historians 'dragged' (on paper) Yermak's voyage from America to the Asiatic Siberia and edited the old texts. But, luckily, they didn't pay attention to the volcanos described and even depicted in the drawings in the Kungur chronicle. Thus we yet again catch the falsifiers red-handed.

The mysterious phrase in the Kungur Chronicle becomes clear: FIERY COLUMNS CAN BE SEEN BY THE TATARS AND MUSSULMEN, BUT NOT BY THE

RUSSIANS. Indeed, it is very far from the European and Siberian Russia to Mexico – across the ocean. It is in fact impossible to see the columns of fire and smoke above the Mexican volcanos. But the American inhabitants – Meshikas-Mexicans, Aztecs = Ostyaks, could see these 'great burning candles' really well.

## **16. YERMAK'S VOYAGE AND CORTES' CAMPAIGN CORRESPONDENCE SCHEME.**

# The Conquistador Hernan Cortes is the Cossack ataman Herman-Yermak Timofeyevich.

# Diego Velazquez, the governor-sovereign's vicegerent of the emperor Charles V in Cuba is Stroganov or the Stroganovs, the sovereign's vicegerent of Ivan the Terrible allegedly in the Urals. Or perhaps in Cuba not far from America.

# Emperor Charles V is czar-khan Ivan IV the Terrible [6v].

# The clash between Cortes and Charles V's authorities is the conflict between ataman Yermak and the authorities of Ivan the Terrible. However the authorities flirt with Yermak-Cortes, invite him to serve and declare a major campaign.

# The ships sail off. The sudden fury of Diego Velazquez in the beginning of Cortes' campaign is the reflection of Ivan the Terrible's sudden wrathful decree at the start of Yermak's expedition.

# The campaign of the allegedly small crew of Hernan Cortes to Central America is the voyage of the allegedly small crew of ataman Yermak to the Siberian Czardom.

# The true historical event was the voyage of Herman-Yermak from Russia via Siberia to Central America, to Mexico. The Western chroniclers described this campaign as the voyage of Hernan Cortes from the island of Cuba to Mexico. I.e. they described only the last stage of Yermak's conquest, omitting his voyage through Siberia, The Far East and The Pacific Ocean.

# The accounts of the both campaigns emphasized the fact that the colonizers were equipped with the firearms which the locals did not possess. Due to this in particular, victory was gained, despite the high courage of those on the defensive side.

# The American Aztecs are described in the Russian chronicles as the 'Siberian Ostyaks'.

# King Moteuczoma or Motecuhzoma, who was later killed and who fought against Cortes in Mexico, is the czar-khan Kuchum, who was also later killed and fought against Yermak in the 'Siberian Czardom'.

# The seizure of the city of Meshiko, the capital of Mexico by Cortes is reflected as the seizure of the Asiatic city of Siberia, the capital of the Siberian Czardom by Yermak. Both the American capital and the Czardom itself were called the same name MESHIKO.

# The Spanish conquistadors of the epoch of the 1519-1524 years are the Russian-Horde Cossacks and Ottomans-Atamans, i.e. also the Cossacks of the epoch of the 1581-1584 years.

# The well-known 'La Noche Triste' ('the night of sorrows') is the severe defeat of the conquistadors and Cortes' wounding is the well-known night attack of khan Kuchum on Yermak's crew and the death of the famous ataman.

# Cortes' letters to the Emperor Charles V are Yermak's messages to the czar Ivan the Terrible.

# The temporary setback of the conquistadors is the temporary retreat of the Cossacks after Yermak's death. They soon regrouped with fresh reinforcements. Following which the wave of the colonization ultimately overwhelmed the vanquished country.

# The name MEXICO or MESHIKO is a slight distortion of the name MOSOCH-MESHECH or MOSCOW. Thus was also called the vast MOSCOW Tartaria, spanning not only over the Asiatic Siberia at that time, but also the greater part of America. The word MESHECH itself could have originated from sMESHAYU ('I will mix' – translated from Russian), sMESHEniye ('medley, mixture' – translated from Russian), i.e. a mix of races. Hence the word MUZHIK (a man, a peasant). The word MOSOCH entered the Bible as the name of one of the biblical patriarchs. That is why in some old chronicles the word MESHIKI could have been understood as meaning MUZHIKI (MEN).

# Why is it still not possible to trace the Ostyak capital Isker-Siberia in the Asiatic Siberia? The answer: because it was situated in America. It is the Atzec city Meshiko = Mexico.

# The confusion in the description of Yermak's voyage by the Western chroniclers is clear. Yermak-Herman went from Russia to the East, via Siberia – to America. But the Western chroniclers decided that he – Hernan Cortes – sailed from the island of Cuba to the West, to America. The fact is that it is indeed as early as at the end of the XV century that the Hordian and Ataman troops appeared in America, having crossed the Atlantic ocean. It was the Columbus expedition [6v2]. Since then the Western chroniclers confused the directions of the Horde or the Ottoman invasions. As Russia and Ottoman (Ataman) Empire entered America from both directions from the West

and from the East. Or in fact Yermak's army set out to Mexico from the island of Cuba in the Atlantic Ocean.

# Cortes' voyage in 1519-1524 was dated by the chronologists approximately sixty years earlier than the voyage of Yermak: 1579-1584. As we understand now, Yermak's expedition is in its correct chronological place. But the Western Europeans were noticeably mistaken and shifted the dates approximately 60 years down the line. The duration of both campaigns roughly coincide.

# Ataman Yermak's death at the end of his campaign and the serious wound of the conquistador Cortes at the end of the voyage to Mexico. The Romanov historians deceived us when assuring that Yermak purportedly died in Asiatic Siberia. There are surviving testimonials in the Russian chronicles that Yermak was buried in Mexico, close to the two large volcanos in the Meshiko valleys.

## **17. THE CHRONICLER OF THE VOYAGE OF YERMAK-CORTES.**

According to the commentators the book by Bernal Diaz 'The True History of the Conquest of New Spain' is the most authentic and the most colourful among the conquest chronicles, the most valuable material on the conquest history of America'[64:3], p.320.

At the same time 'the most complete Siberian chronicle was written by SAVA YEFIMOV, who finished his book on the 1st September 7145 {1636}. The aforementioned Yefimov declares in it that HE COMES FROM AMONG THE YERMAK'S COMPANIONS AND THAT HE WAS AN EYEWITNESS TO EVERYTHING DESCRIBED BY HIM' [876:3], 306-307.

Thus emerges before us the name of the Cossack, a participant of Yermak's expedition, who left behind a whole book describing the voyage. It provided the basis for the chronicles known to us today. Sava Yefimov's accounts correspond well with another edited version of his work known today as the 'book of Bernal Diaz de Castillo'. Presumably in the XVII century there were several editions made of the book by Cossack Sava Yefimov = Bernal Diaz. It was rewritten both in Russia, in Siberia and in Western Europe, in Spain. Some things were changed, in particular characters' names, however the core of the matter remained the same. That is why we managed to restore the true facts, having detected a striking correspondence between the Siberian Chronicles and the Spanish = Ottoman book by Bernal Diaz. That is why in the history of Russia there remained a version which was

later called the 'book by Sava Yefimov', and in the history of Ottoman Empire its other version under the name of the 'book of Bernal Diaz'.

The chronicle of Bernal Diaz is considered to have been published in 1632, and Sava Yefimov's chronicle was completed in 1636. These dates are close. As we understand now it is not a coincidence. We speak here about the same remarkable piece of work.

In the both versions the same kind of contemptuous sneer of the later historians towards Sava Yefimov = Bernal Diaz can be felt. Purporting that an 'inelegant' 'swashbuckler' wrote a bulky chronicle. It is of course important for history, but the author was just an 'uneducated bandit'. He has shed much more blood than ink. And thus, we are told, was just spinning a good yarn.

The conclusion. The comrade-in-arms of Yermak-Cortes described the campaign of 1581-1584. In Russia he became known under the name of Sava Yefimov. In Spain he is already famous as Bernal Diaz del Castillo = the Castilian. His work is at the heart of the modern perception of the conquest of Central America. The Romanov historians edited the chronicle, having shifted the place of action exclusively to Siberia. They pretended that Yermak's army had never been to America. In general they did their best to distort the story in such a way, that the mere notion of the Horde Cossacks conquering America at the end of the XVI century began to seem absurd.

Apparently, the story of Yermak is reflected on the pages of the 'ancient' Roman classics, Cornelius Tacitus and Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus, for example. The general Germanicus, the nephew of the Emperor Tiberius (= the reflection of Ivan the Terrible), is the Cossack ataman-conquistador Yermak-Cortes, who conquered Central America [RI], ch.4.

To conclude, the pages of Tacitus, Suetonius, Herodotus, etc. give us a detailed account of the ataman-conquistador Yermak-Cortes. Where a lot of information which survived in the works of the 'ancient classics' is described in the Russian and Spanish (Ottoman) chronicles either more sparsely or is not reflected at all. Now we write a completely new and much more detailed history of the conquest of Central America. The picture becomes richer and more colorful.

## **18. WHY THE AMAZON RIVER WAS NAMED THE AMAZON. THE ELEPHANTS IN AMERICA.**

Let us turn to the Western-European version of the discovery of the Amazon river in South America. These documents colourfully illustrate the 'relocation of the names' which we detected. In the epoch of the great conquest and then during its second



wave in the XV-XVI cc., which in the Bible was called the 'conquest of the promised land', the colonizers brought with them their recollections of their Motherland. I.e. of Russia-Horde and the Ottoman (Ataman) Empire. There were some special people in the Cossack army responsible for the written documents, military and diplomatic correspondence and the archives. The notes of a journey were written, the maps were compiled and reports were prepared for the Imperial administration in the metropoly of the Great Empire. The Horde and the Ottoman armies conquered the vast territories and founded settlements and cities. The people settled down there for a long time and even for good. They carried over here the customs, names and the geographical names from their distant Motherland. They called some of the American settlements the same names as their native European and Asiatic cities which they had left behind forever. The military and battle archives of the conquerors formed the basis of the future American libraries and archives. The chronicles giving us accounts of the events in the Old World also found their way here. The first settlers still remembered their true content, but their descendants were forgetting about the roots of the old texts passed on to them by their fathers and grandfathers. And after a couple of generations they started to think that these dusty chronicles purportedly described the events in the New World. Thus some important events and names of the Old World 'migrated' (on paper) into the New World.

We have repeatedly given the examples of such 'paper relocation' [STKR]. For example, the battle of Kulikovo 'was relocated on paper' from Moscow to the remote India during its colonization by Russia-Horde in the XIV-XV cc. And the battle of Kulikovo was erroneously considered to be the local Indian 'battle in the field of Kurus'. Even the suitable 'battleground' was picked out. It was drawn on the map near the city of Delhi. Since then 'this battle' is considered to be one of the most important events in the history of India.

A similar thing was happening in America. For example, a country Amazonia from Russia-Horde has 'relocated' here too (see above). And appeared on the map as a name of the South American Amazon river, although no Amazon women were ever there.

Let us clarify. In the Horde chronicles which emerged in America, there appeared some accounts of the great Volga river flowing in the meridian north-south direction. Later, when the European origin of the chronicles was forgotten, the descendants of the pioneers decided, that in them there was a description of the great South American Amazon river. As though the magnificent Volga transferred – on paper – its properties to the magnificent Amazon. And for some time, looking into the Russian

chronicles, the confused chroniclers were mistakenly convinced that Amazon was allegedly flowing ALONG THE MERIDIAN [ZA], ch.8. In time they of course got things straight and realized the correct direction of the Amazon (it flows approximately along the parallel of latitude). But the old texts, like those of the chronicles of Oviedo, survive in the archives. And raise the commentators' eyebrows. Purporting that he was a wonderful geographer, but was so oddly mistaken.

The documents of the conquistadors contain accounts that allegedly there were CAMELS, ELEPHANTS AND TIGERS in America. However there were never such animals in America and there are none of them now. All such fragments found their way into the chronicles of the Spanish conquest on the territory of America as a result of transporting here the European and Asian chronicles during the colonization of the XV-XVI cc. The Horde Cossacks and Cossack-Amazonians remembered Eurasia and Africa, where they saw, of course, the camels, the elephants and the tigers.

On the whole the theme of the 'elephants in America' have been irritating the historians for a long time [6v2], ch.6:27:2. There are a lot of references to the elephants that survive in the American Indian culture [336], v.1, p.206. It is clear now, that, for instance, the American burial mounds in the shape of elephants, were erected in the epoch of the XIV-XVII cc. by the Hordians, who had arrived there recently from Eurasia, where there are plenty of elephants. The elephants were also depicted on smoking pipes. On reflection, the historians declared unfoundedly, that purportedly the American burial mounds and pipes were 'unbelievably ancient', that they were made by the 'primitive people' in a distant epoch, when there were prehistoric elephants and mastodon wandering around America, which later became extinct [336], v.1, p.206. Thus the Hordian-Ottoman constructions of the XIV-XVII cc. were shifted to the 'stone age'. The historians emitted a sigh of relief, having mistakenly thought that they had solved the problem.

## **21. ANCIENT HISTORY IS BEING RE-WRITTEN.**

In the memory of the Western Europeans of the XVI-XVII cc., who were the descendants of the Hordians of the first wave of the XIV century, the era of the 'ancient' Russia-Horde of the XIV-XV cc. turned into a nostalgic beautiful memory. In the XVI-XVIII cc. the Europeans started to talk about this Hordian epoch as the 'beautiful ancient Rome' dealt deathly blows by the 'evil nations'. Having distorted the history, they started to keep quiet about the fact that the Ottomans' invasion was aimed at stopping the epidemics in Europe. The military aspect of the invasion was given precedence. The blame for the 'barbaric destruction of ancient Rome (i.e. the

Western provinces of Russia-Horde of the XIV-XV cc.) was attributed to the 'aggressors' – Russia and Atamania (Ottoman Empire). Hence the tension between West and East, which later triggered the wars between Russia, Turkey and Western Europe.

It is understandable why the Europeans, beginning with the XVII-XVIII cc., paid such deference to the 'iron ancient Rome'. They started talking about it with a heady idealism, as if of a beautiful legend, worthy of emulation. In the XIX-XX cc. the 'ancient' Roman ruins were restored all over Europe. And where there was nothing left, they simply built them anew, unashamedly declaring them to be the remains of the military Roman camps, aqueducts, theatres and arches. They wanted so badly to have their own 'sightseeing attractions'. Without compunction they erected 'half ruined ancient columns' of modern reinforced concrete. They made cracks and holes 'from the savage cannon balls' in the freshly built 'ancient' walls. They broke the bricks off in a beautiful way. For example, in the XVIII-XIX cc. an 'ancient' modern replica was erected – the Coliseum in Italian Rome, in imitation of the genuinely old Coliseum of the XIV-XV cc, in Czar-Grad [VAT]. The modern replicas were muddied and cured with smoke to give them an 'ancient' patina. Numerous 'designers' worked hard. Here and there, nearby, there were authentically old pieces, fragments from the XIV-XVII cc. BC which were scattered picturesquely, on each of them – an obligatory plaque: II century BC, VIII century BC, XXVI century BC and so on. Tourists arrived in their droves, and with them money. Piles of it.

A French artist Hubert Robert, 1733-1808, in 1784 was appointed in charge of the Louvre museum and the curator of its art gallery. He created a series of large great canvases celebrating the ruins of 'ancient Rome'. He painted gigantic half-ruined Roman temples, lit by the rays of the setting sun. Moonlit remnants of the grandiose statues. The colonnades overgrown with trees... But there were never any ancient constructions of such a size in Western Europe. Hubert Robert aimed to arouse the emotions with such exaggerations. He expressed the spirit of his age. The talented artist placed tiny figures of people in front of the background of crumbled silent 'classical' temples, who in admiration were gazing at the traces of Europe's great past.

Thus the history of the Horde Empire was divaricated (on paper). One 'half' of it was turned into an idealised glamorised myth to be worshiped and adored. The other part – in fact the same one! – was declared to be the Empire of every evil. So:

1) 'ANCIENT' ROME is mainly the reflection of the Great Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. The Russian emperors are the Russian-Horde czars-khans.

2) ISRAEL was in that epoch the name for (including the Bible) Russia-Horde with its capital in Vladimir, Yaroslavl = Veliky Novgorod, and later in Moscow. They also emphasized fighting in the name of God, the militarized nature of the metropoly: the 'Mongol' troops of Russia-Horde always inspired fear.

3) JUDAEA in that epoch was the name for the Ottoman Empire=Atamania with its capital in Czar-Grad (and the Yoros fortress) = Biblical Jerusalem =ancient Troy. Concurrently the God praising nature of that part of the Empire was emphasized. Everything is clear: it was Czar-Grad where Jesus Christ lived and was crucified. Later in this city, which became holy for the Christians, they began to Praise God (Judaean = those who praise God).

In the Bible under the word ROSH or ROS (RASH or RAS) is meant RUSSIA (Ezekiel 38:2-3, 38:18 and further; Genesis 46:21). By the way, in the Western reading the word in English, for example is spelled Russia and until now is read Russia, i.e. the same Rosh. In the Ostrog Bible is said perfectly clear: PRINCE ROSSKA!

Under the Biblical names GOG and MAGOG (and also MGOG, GUG, MGUG) (for example, Apocalypse 20:7) are hidden the very same Russians and Tatars, who had created 'Mongolia' = Magog, i.e. the Great Empire. The Mediaeval tradition claims that the Apocalyptic people Gog and Magog are Goths and Mongols. Some English chronicles actually identified Gog and Magog, speaking of one people Goemagog. In fact they identified Goths with the Tatars and Mongols.

In the Bible under the words MESHEKH (or MESECH) (MShKh or MSKh) are meant MOSOCH – the legendary persona after whose name, as asserted by many Mediaeval authors, MOSCOW was called.

The Biblical TUBAL (FUVAL) (TBL or TVL) – is TOBOL river in Western Siberia, on the East side of the Urals. It is the very same BALTICS. The fact is that letter Fita (? , ?)= Theta (Θ, θ) was pronounced as T (Th) and as F. Besides the sound V could shift to B and vice versa because of the double interpretation of the Greek letter Vita = Beta (B, β Β?τα).

The famous 'ancient' Assyria, described among other places in the Bible - i.e. Syria or Ashur – is identified with Russia-Horde. The Biblical names: ASSYRIA or ASSUR and also ASUR or SYRIA and also ASHUR are simply the backward reading of the three old names of our country: ROSSIA – i.e. ASSYRIA or ASSUR; then there is RUS' – i.e. ASUR or SYRIA and, finally, RUSSIA – i.e. ASHUR. The British, FOR EXAMPLE, use the word RUSSIA (for ROSSIA) until now.

The Biblical Babylon is the White Horde of the Volga Horde. And after the Ottoman conquest the Biblical Babylon is most likely Czar-Grad on the Bosphorus. The Biblical Nineveh the Great City – is Novgorod Veliky on Volga river. The Biblical Assyrian Damascus is Russian Moscow [6v1], ch.5.

'ANCIENT' GREECE is just the name of Greece of the epoch of the XII-XVI cc. For the identification of these 'ancient' and mediaeval events see [2v2].

'Such an integral part of the mediaeval historiography as anachronism' becomes clear. 'THE PAST IS DEPICTED USING THE SAME CATEGORIES AS THE MODERN TIMES... THE BIBLICAL AND CLASSICAL CHARACTERS APPEAR IN MEDIAEVAL COSTUMES... the presence of the kings and patriarchs of the Old Testament alongside the classical thinkers and characters from the Gospels on the portals of the temples best of all explains the anachronistic attitude towards history' [217], p.117-118.

The historians reliant on the erroneous chronology, think that the Middle Ages 'confused on massive scale' the epochs and notions that the mediaeval authors, and only 'due to their ignorance' identified the 'ancient' biblical epoch with the epoch of the Middle Ages. This is not true. The writers and the artists, on the whole, faithfully reflected the reality.

The 'classical' authors who for example described the 'classical Greece' – Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon et al - lived in the XIV-XVII cc. They were not the falsifiers, but the chroniclers who reflected the original mediaeval events. They were writing at the same time as the other chroniclers known to us as the mediaeval ones. The difference between the 'classical' writers and the 'mediaeval' ones is that their works were dated incorrectly and were shifted back into the past. Besides, the Scaligerian editors have 'raked over' them. They got rid of all the obvious traces of the Middle Ages. A lot of things were distorted, but some things (even a lot of things) survive. This falsification took place in the XVI-XVIII cc.

## **22. THE BIBLE.**

The Bible describes the events of the XII-XVII cc. and is completed at the end of the XVII century. The New Testament narrates the second half of the XII century, and the Old Testament – about the XII-XVII cc. The books of the New Testament give the account of the life and deeds of the emperor Andronicus-Christ (Andrey Bogolyubsky), Mary Theotokos (Mother of God), Christ's apostles who lived in the second half of the XII - beginning of the XIII cc. The Old Testament also relates to these characters, but also tells us about the Ottoman conquest of the XV-XVII cc,

about the Moscow Kingdom – the metropoly of the XV-XVII cc. Empire, about the Ottoman Empire (Atamania) and finally about the Time of Troubles in the early XVII century.

The legendary Old Testament mount Sinai (Zion), aka Horeb – is the Vesuvius volcano in Italy. The biblical cities Sodom and Gomorrah destroyed by God ('24 Then the Lord rained on Sodom and on Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of the heavens... 28 ...the smoke of the country went up like the smoke of a furnace' (Genesis 19:24, 19:28) are the famous cities of Stabia and Herculaneum, buried by the eruption of the Vesuvius in the XVI – early XVII cc. The part of the Apocalypse of the Old Testament about the destruction of Jerusalem gives an account of the ruin of the city of Pompey during the eruption of Vesuvius in 1631 (and far from the II century as we have been assured). The ruins of 'ancient' Pompey excavated from the ground show us the way people of the XVI-XVII cc. lived. The 'classical' artists of Pompey were the contemporaries of the epoch of Rafael and Julio-Romano. It is not surprising that they had a common style [1v], ch.1.

The well-known God's Revelation together with the commandment tablets that the biblical Moses received also on Vesuvius in the XV century. '...there was thunder and lightning, with a thick cloud over the mountain (Sinai), and a very loud trumpet blast... Mount Sinai was covered with smoke, because the Lord descended on it in fire. The smoke billowed up from it like smoke from a furnace, and the whole mountain trembled violently. As the sound of the trumpet grew louder and louder, Moses spoke and the voice of God answered him' (Exodus 19:9, 19:11, 19:13, 19:16, 19:18-19). Besides this, the legend absorbed not only the story of Moses' commandment tablets, but also the story of Yaroslav meteorite falling near the Volga river in 1421 [1v], ch.1, [PRRK].

Biblical Phoenicia – Venice, the mighty Republic of Venice. According to the Bible the 'ancient' Phoenicia was a powerful maritime state reigning over the entire Mediterranean and establishing its colonies in Sicily, Spain and Africa. The 'ancient' Phoenicians traded heavily with the far away countries (Ezekiel, ch.27).

Various events from the Old Testament, for example, the journey of the Israelites lead by Moses and the conquest of the Promised Land by Joshua ben Nun, didn't take place in the modern Palestine, but in Europe, in particular in Italy, as well as in America.

According to the Scandinavian chroniclers [5v2], ch.9, the biblical PARADISE is situated in the East [523], p.32. The Volga River was called in the 'ancient' sources as RA. According to the common view in the Middle Ages, from the Paradise in the East

the four great rivers were flowing out. See for example the map of Hans Ru"st, allegedly of the XV century [1v], ch.5:9.

So, the geographers of the Middle Ages used the name PARADISE to name some geographic region. Which one? It is not so simple to understand it from the old reference maps. But there is in fact a place from which the four major European rivers flow out. It is the Central Russian Upland. Here, not far from each other, are situated the sources of rivers Volga, Don, Dnieper and Western Dvina. The largest of them is Volga. That could be the reason why it was called RA. As according to many PARADISE used to be situated there. So appealingly described in the Bible. These lands were actually very convenient for living. Here, the metropol of the Great Empire many were striving for.

### **23. THE STOPPED SUN.**

Both in the Bible and in the history of Charles the Great there plays out a familiar theme of the stopped sun. An idea to place the centre of the world in the sun, in other words to bring to THE SUN TO A STOP appeared in the XVI-XVII cc. when the Books of the Bible were being written and edited [6]. The famous words in the Book of Joshua ben Nun about the SUN that STOOD IN THE SKY 10:12-14, in a poetic way reflect that deep impression made on people when the heliocentric model was first revealed. Quite unexpectedly it turned out that IT IS POSSIBLE TO STOP THE SUN. Contrary to all evidence! As the sun is continuously moving across the skies and 'never stops'.

The editor of the bible of the XVII century attributed to bringing the sun to a standstill to Joshua Ben Nun [6v1], ch.5. I.e. to the conqueror of the epoch of the Ottoman conquest of the 'Promised Land'. But it was in the XVI century when there originated the idea of the heliocentric model finally and conclusively formulated by Tycho Brahe (Hipparchus) and Nicolaus Copernicus [3v1].

Thus, the discovery by Brahe and Copernicus revolutionized people's minds. The scientists 'made the Sun stand still', i.e. placed it in the centre of the universe and made all the planets, including the Earth, revolve round it. Prior to that Ptolemy's system was predominate, where the stars revolve round the Earth [3v1], ch.11:7.6.

In the 'most ancient' Bible the Sun was brought to a standstill allegedly during a battle, which was Joshua Ben Nun's revenge for a prior defeat.

In the well-known Mediaeval epic poem 'The Song of Roland' the Sun was brought to standstill during the battle which was Charles the Great's (the Great King) revenge for the defeat of his rear guard.

[Pic.65](#) shows an unusual symbol which can be seen in 'The Triumphal Arch of Maximilian I' by Durer [PE]. The oblique Andreevsky cross surrounded by the four symbols of the stopped sun. The sun while moving across the skies stumbles against the czar's crown and comes to a standstill. We see that the discovery of the heliocentric model was depicted on the coat of arms of the Horde Empire. On 'The Triumphal Arc' there is also the image of the stopped sun, boxed in between the two czar's royal crowns. Such images are also present in both 'The Triumphal Procession', [pic.66](#), and in a A.Durer's gravure 'Large Triumphal Carriage' [PE].

## **24. WHEN THE SYMBOLS OF THE CONSTELLATION OF STARS AND THEIR NAMES WERE INVENTED.**

We are being told that the constellations of the stars depicted on the Mediaeval and modern star maps were invented in the deepest antiquity. There were some changes occurring over the course of time, but as we are told, on the whole, the starry sky was divided into the constellations a long time ago. They claim, for example, that the star signs appeared 'possibly as early as 2500 years ago'. See the details in [3v2].

The figures of the constellations of Serpent-bearer, Gemini and Orion, for example, appeared allegedly long before AC. And naturally long before Christianity. So allegedly there are no Christian symbols there, let alone the symbols connected to the events in the Middle Ages. And thus there is allegedly no connection with the Biblical events.

However, it is not true. A fresh approach to the ancient celestial maps uncovers some incredible connections, for example, with the biblical history. The sky atlas turns from something 'very ancient' and half-forgotten into a selection of bright illustrations on the history of the XI-XVII cc. It is, in short, an 'illustrated textbook'. The pictures-hieroglyphs, i.e. the celestial figures, reflected major events of that epoch [3v2], ch.9. Later all of this was forgotten.

The most ancient fragment of the celestial map is the Zodiac. The figures of the zodiacal constellations acquired their final form not earlier than the XII century. The first half of the Zodiac represents the biblical events of the XII century. The second half – the story of Georgi Pobedonosets (George the Conqueror) = the Russian-Horde czar-khan Georgi Danilovich = Genghis Khan. I.e. the events of the XIV-XV cc., the creation of the Great Empire and the seizure of Czar-Grad in 1453.



The celestial maps of the Northern and Southern skies were finally created in the XV-XVI cc. There are, in particular, depicted on them the events of the late XV century: the voyage of Columbus = Biblical Noah = 'ancient' Jason crossing the Atlantic Ocean; the discovery of America = 'India'. The striking images of the Biblical Apocalypses written in 1486 also reflected in the map of the Southern sky [1v], ch.3 and [3v2], ch.9.

## **25. WHEN AND HOW THE ARABIC NUMERALS WERE INVENTED.**

V.V.Bobylin, the mathematics historian wrote: 'THE HISTORY OF OUR NUMERALS PRESENTS NO MORE THAN A SET OF ASSUMPTIONS, INTERMITTENT WITH THE ARBITRARY ASSUMPTIONS, which, as a result of preceding application of the indoctrination method, occasionally comes across as SOMETHING SEEMINGLY PROVEN'. Cited by [989], p.53. Having explained various theories of the origin of the Arabic numerals, the authors of the Encyclopaedia [989] conclude: 'Thus WE STILL DO NOT HAVE A HISTORICALLY VALID THEORY WHICH COULD ADEAQUATELY EXPLAIN THE ORIGIN OF OUR NUMERALS' [989], p.52.

However the matter is much simpler. As we show in [4v2], ch.1, all the 'Arabic numerals' originated from the preceding Slavonic and Greek demi-radix numeration system. Where it was exactly the SLAVIC VERSION OF LETTERS-SYMBOLS used. The Russian XVI century ornate cursive writing was its source. All of this took place in the XVI century in the epoch of the invention of the positioning system.

It doesn't follow from the fact discovered by us, that the 'Indo-Arabic' numerals were invented exactly in Russia, in the metropoly of the Empire. It could have been done in one of the Imperial provinces. For instance in Egypt or in Europe in the late XVI – early XVII cc. Then the Great Empire was still one and its lands fulfilled different functions. It was convenient and sensible. In some regions the Horde czars-khans developed shipbuilding, in the other – science and medicine, and in the third – the fine arts... All the achievements belonged to the 'Mongol' Empire, 'went in to the pot'. The Imperial court and the Great czar-khan, the Emperor himself were considered to be the owners of all of the achievements. Only after the breakup of the Empire in the XVII century there occurred the phenomenon unknown before. There appeared and magnificently flourished sharp provincial competitiveness – whose science or whose medicine was better. Such a question has simply never arisen before. But at that point some were proud of their ships, purporting that they were the best, while the others

were responding by having the best cannons. Having forgotten that not so long ago both the ships and the cannons (and everything else) were collective, Imperial and were produced in this or that place in accordance with the economic plan put together in the administrative office of the Great Emperor.

Therefore, we will repeat, the 'Indo-Arabic' numerals could have been invented in a place where in that epoch they decided to organise the scientific centres and to channel the funds to. But we claim that AT THE ROOT OF THE INVENTION LIES EXACTLY THE SLAVIC TRADITION OF RECORDING NUMERALS BY USING LETTERS. As we have demonstrated in [4v2], ch.1, only within this tradition it was possible for the 'Indo-Arabic' figuring to emerge. If they were invented in Europe, it means that in Europe they used the Slavic letters and language. And if they were invented in Russia, it means that Western Europe simply made use of the new notations, having possibly altered them; in particular, having repositioned five with six and three with seven [4v2], ch.1.

## **26. TRACES OF REPOSITIONING SIX INTO FIVE IN THE OLD DOCUMENTS.**

Here is, for example, the engraving 'Melancholia' by the famous Albrecht Durer who lived allegedly in 1471-1528, [pic.67](#). In the right upper corner there is depicted a magic square of dimensions 4 by 4. The Sum total of the numbers in each line and sum total of numbers in each column is the same and equals 34. In [pic.68](#) this square is enlarged. Have a look at the first square in the second row. Here is number 5. And it should be there, otherwise the square stops being 'magic'. But it is obvious that this five is a result of the correction of the number six which was previously there [4v2] ch.1.

The picture is clear. Today's six was originally perceived as a five. And vice versa, the current five was then perceived as a six. These were the original denominations used in Durer's 'magic square'. But when the symbols were repositioned, the square ceased being magic. So it was necessary to amend the image. It is possible that it was done by Durer himself. Or, it might be done after his death by his pupils or followers. It is possible that the numbers were amended not only on the Durer's drawings. So, on the engraving 'Melancholia' there survived clear traces of the AMMENDMENTS OF THE NUMERALS in the XVI-XVII cc.

## **27. THE AMENDMENT OF THE OLD DATES IN THE XVII CENTURY.**

The fact that in the early XVII century the value of the 'Indo-Arabic' numerals had not been long established yet, was cunningly used by the Scaligerian historians in order to falsify the dates of the early XVII century. Let, for example, in some document the date of YEAR ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND FOURTEEN be written down according to the old style, i.e. as 1514, where digit 5 in the shape of letter DZELO denotes the numeral SIX. Then the numeric value of the digit has changed and has become FIVE. If we forget that numeric value of digit 5 was changed we can read the date 1514 'in a new way' (which would be wrong): as 1514. Instead of the correct 1614. As we can see the date became older by a hundred years. Using this simple method it was possible to shift the dates of many early XVII century documents backwards. It is probable that the chronologist widely used this method. As a result many events of then XV-XVII cc. were shifted a century back.

So now a question arises - when did the famous figures of the allegedly XV-XVI cc. really live: the rulers, scientists, writers, artists and sculptors... For example we are being assured that A.Durer lived in 1471-1528. Doubtfully so. Most likely he lived in the late XVI - early XVII cc. As the old value of the dates like 15(...) which are marked on his works was 16(...). And therefore his engravings, star maps for Ptolemy's Almagest, etc. were made not in the early XVI century, but in the early XVII century. To recap, our analysis of Almagest showed that this book in its contemporary version appeared not earlier than the beginning of the XVII century [3v1]. Therefore Durer's star maps for Almagest were made approximately at the same time.

## **28. SCANDINAVIAN GEOGRAPHICAL TREATISES AND MAPS OF OLD RUSSIA.**

From a great variety of geographical names cited in the Scandinavian chronicles and geographical treatises [5v2]. ch.9, we will choose only three, presenting the most interest to us at the moment: 1) RUSSIA-HORDE - the very same Great = 'Mongol' Empire of the XIV-XVI cc; 2) DON - river; 3) EUROPE.

We would like to explain the meaning of the sign '=' used in the following list.

The Mediaeval cartographers sometimes themselves identify some of the geographical names clearly saying, for example, that 'Thrace is the same thing as Grikkland' [523],p.96. Some 'patchings' were discovered by the historians. Some were added by us. We mark all of them with the equal sign.

## && WHAT RUSSIA-HORDE WAS CALLED BY DIFFERENT PEOPLES.

It turns out that Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc. was called the following names (some of them possibly referred not to the entire Empire, but to its parts):

Scandinavian RUSIA = RUTSCIA = RUZTSIA = (Scand. RUZCIA) - RUSLAND = Scand. RUZALAND = RIZALAND (Scand. RISALAND) = LAND OF GIANTS = Scand. GARDARIKI = LAND OF CITIES (CITY is 'GOROD' in Russian) = HORDE-RIKI, i.e. HORDE-STATE, Scand.GARDAR = VELIKY GRAD (Rus.GREAT CITY) = GOROD = GRAD, Old Slavic (Slavonic) = GRHAS, ancient Indian (Old Ind.) = HOUSE (DOM in Russian) = GRHAS, ancient Ind. = GARDAS, Lithuanian (GARDAS, Scand.) = GUARD RAIL (OGRADA in Russian) = GARDAS, Scand. = GARDS, Got. (GARDS, Scand.) = HOUSE, FAMILY (DOM, SEMIA in Russian) = SAMARIA - SARMATIA, land of Sarmatians, see the city of SAMARA = KYLFINGALAND, Scand. = LAND OF BELLS = AFRICA = THRACIA = TURKEY = TATARIA = BLALAND = OSTARRICHI = ASIAN-TATAR-EMPIRE = AUSTRIA = SCYTHIA (SCITHIA, Scand.) = SITHIA, Scand. = CIPHIA or CITHIA, Scand. = CITIA, i.e. China! = SCOTIA, hence SCOTLAND = SCOT-LAND, SCYTHIA is named after MAGOG! = SVITJOD THE GREAT (SVITJOD HINN MIKLA, Scand.) = SARMATIA+ALANIA=GOTHIA, i.e. SCYTHIA was divided into these three regions = THE GREAT SVITJOD (The Great Saint) = GODLAND, Scand. = LAND OF THE GREAT GOD, or LAND OF GODS, or GOD'S LAND = LAND OF GOTHS = GOTHIA (GOTH LAND), GOTHS = GODS = GOD = GAUTAR = GEATS = HETHITES (OR HITTITE) = HOMELAND OF THE GIANTS = JOTUNHEIM = JOTLAND = GREAT GOTHIA = NOBLE GOTHIA (Scand. REIDGOTLAND = HREIDGOTAR). The Great Svitjod was at first populated by the Turks, i.e. closely connected with TURKEY. The Great Svitjod probably included THE LITTLE SVITJOD, i.e. SWEDEN.

Furthermore, the Old Russia = THE GREAT SERKLAND, sometimes is placed either in Africa or close to Africa = THRACIA = Scand. KVENNALAND = QUENLAND = KUNALAND = LAND OF THE AMAZONS = LAND OF WOMEN-QUEENS (Scand. QUEN-LAND or QUEEN-LAND) = LAND OF SERES, i.e. RUSSII (RUSSIANS), hence ASSYRIA, then SCITHIA = CHINA! = LAND OF SARACENS! – A Muslim country = CHALDEA! = PALESTINE! = MESOPOTAMIA! = INDIA, i.e. a DISTANT land, where the division of INDIA into THREE INDIAS – is, most likely, the division of Russia into THREE HORDES. PARTHIA was populated from SCITHIA, where at some point Parthia was probably used for PRUSSIA = PRUTENIA =PRT = P+RUSSIA = White RUS (RUSSIA).

It is possible that Rus (Russia) = Bjarmaland = Land of Boyars or Barmes (Bjarmians, Beormas). Where the name Bjarmeland = Great Permian was later used only for the territory of modern Germany, Austria and Italy. Later the historians relocated the name Great Perm (or Great Permian) to the territory of the Romanov Russia.

Going forward, Rus' (Russia) = Scythia = BARBARIA, according to the English sources.

We will add some identification which we encountered: RUS (RUSSIA) = KINGDOM OF PRESTER JOHN, and will also integrate some synonyms of Rus' (Russia) which were used in the English sources. See [517], ch.3:1.5. So.

THE ANCIENT RUS (RUSSIAN STATE) = SUSIE, RUSSIE, RUISSIE, RUSIA, RUSSIA, RUTHENIA, RUTENIA, RUTHIA, RUTHENA, RUSCIA, RUSSCIA, RUSSYA, ROSIE.

Let us point out the name RUTHIA. Without vowel marks we have RT or RD. It is simply HORDE, RAT'(ARMY). One of the most best-known names of the Great Empire. It turns out that the English called Ancient Rus' (Russia) absolutely correct – HORDE.

Such amplitude of the synonyms can be explained by the importance, which the World Empire acquired in the XIV-XVI cc. Each nation among the many peoples of Europe, Asia, Africa and America populating it, would give it their particular name. That is why such a variety of names survive to our time.

To remind you, the Empire was in close connection with the Ottomans, i.e. with the Cossack Atamans. Russia and Ottoman Empire (Atamania) began to grow apart only with the Romanovs coming to power in Russia. The relationship deteriorated and turned into the military confrontation.

The 'ancient' Empire of Alexander III of Macedon (Alexander the Great) is the phantom reflection of the Ottoman Empire (Atamania). [2v2], ch.1:18-19. By the way, why was Alexander called The Two-Horned ISKANDER? The meaning of the word Two-horned is clear - it is the Ottoman crescent. But what about ISKANDER? Could it mean 'a man from SCANDIA', i.e. a man from SCYTHIA! See above the identification of SCANDIA and SCYTHIA.

&& WHICH MEDIAEVAL RIVERS WERE CALLED BY THE NAME DON.

The Scandinavian sources inform us of the following identifications:

DON = DANUBE = DANUBIS (Scand. DANUBIUS) = DUN (Scand. DUN) = DANUBIUM (Scand. DANUBIUM) = DYNA (Scand. DYNA) = HISTER,

HYSTER (Scand. HISTER, HYSTER) = ISTR (Scand. ISTR) = DNESTR (or DNIESTER) = DON = THANAIS (or TANAIIS) = TANAKVISL = DUNA (Scand. DUNA) = WESTERN DVINA (or DAUGAVA RIVER) = DAN = JORDAN – JOR+DAN.

Such variety is very simple to explain. We have already said that earlier DON used to mean RIVER. As we showed in [4v1], ch.6:2.12, the today's Moskva-river sometimes used to be called Don.

&& THE SONS OF BIBLICAL JAPHETH.

According to the Scandinavian sagas, the seven sons of Biblical Japheth ruled Europe. Where it is told in great detail who owned what. In [5v2], part 3, we showed that the settlement of the sons of Japheth is another reflection of the Great Empire conquering Europe and was ruling it for a long time.

The sons of Japheth are the seven major peoples or the seven Euro-Asian regions which were a part of the Empire during the first stage of its expansion in the XIV century. They are:

1)MAGOG = 'MONGOLS' = GREAT MIGHTY = GOTHs; 2) MADAI – the very same Mongols; 3) IVAN (JAVAN) OR IVANS (JAVANS) – IVAN KALITA = BATU KHAN, who conquered the West; 4) TURKS – TATARS = TIRAS, Southern part of the Empire; 5) TOBOL – Siberian part of the 'Mongol' Empire or BALTIA;6) GOMER – ET-RUSCAN ITALY, FLORENCE and Western Europe in general; 7) MESHECH = MOSCOVIA. The very same original MECCA.

## **29. CATHERINE DE'MEDICI IS A REFLECTION OF THE RUSSIAN CZARINA SOPHIA PALAIOLOGINA AND MARY STUART IS A REFLECTION OF ELENA VOLOSHANKA, I.E. ESTHER.**

'Catherine de'Medici is among the MOST FAMOUS WOMEN OF THE PAST. The heiress of the well-known Florentine Medici family, the wife of the French king Henry II and regentess on behalf of the juvenile kings of the ruling Valois dynasty, SHE LEFT A DEEP MARK IN THE HISTORY OF FRANCE. FOUR CENTURIES AGO SHE WAS CONSTANTLY TALKED OF AND WRITTEN ABOUT. This was mostly due to the bloody events of The St. Bartholomew's Day massacre of 1572. The massacre of the Huguenots in Paris shook the whole of Europe... Her personal drama fired the imagination and was perceived with undiminishing interest by close and distant descendants' [659], p.3-4.

In reality Catherine de 'Medici is to a great extent the reflection in the Western chronicles of Sophia Palaiologina, the famous Russian-Hordian princess, the wife of Ivan III the Terrible. Karamzin informs us that they called Ivan III – the Terrible: 'He was the FIRST to be given the name of GROZNY (Terrible) in Russia' [362], v.6, column 215. He was also called the GREAT. We will repeat that he is the reflection of Ivan IV Vasilievich the Terrible from the XVI century.

Today Sophia Palaiologina is dated to the XV century. And Catherine de' Medici lived in the XVI century. However, there is nothing surprising in such a hundred years shift. We discovered it in the history of the XV-XVII cc. [4v1]. Ch.2:2 and [6v1], ch.6:2. In the Bible Catherine-Sophia are described as the Queen Vashti (Astin) the first wife of King Artaxerxes.

It is quite challenging to point out the original of Sophia-Catherine in the XVI century, as the epoch of Ivan IV suffered particularly thorough cleansing by the historians. From what survive it is only possible to understand that the image of Sophia Palaiologina combined with information about several wives of 'Grozny' (the Terrible) – Anastasia and Maria [6v1], ch.7.

Elena Voloshanka, the rival of Sophia Palaiologina in the Russian-Horde court, the very same Biblical Esther, reflected in the Western chronicles as the notorious Diane de Poitiers and also as the famous Mary Stuart, her contemporary from the XVI century. Please make note of the similarity between the names Esther and Stuart. Biblical ESTHER or ESTER or STR without the vowel marking (on account of TH turning into T) was considered in Europe as the name STUART, i.e. STRT, without the vowel marking. Or, in other words ASTRUM (ASTER), i.e. a STAR in Latin.

The following 'merging' result derived from the parallelism between the Western European 'Habsburg dynasty' and the Russian-Horde dynasty of czars-khans of the XIV-XVI cc. The brief gist of it is as follows.

# Catherine de Medici is the reflection of Sophia Palaiologina.

# Diane Poitiers (and Mary Start) is the reflection of Elena Voloshanka, i.e. of Biblical Esther.

# Henri II d'Orléan is the reflection of Ivan III=IV the Terrible.

# The death of the king Henry II is the reflection of the death of czar-khan Vasiliï III, i.e. Biblical king Ahab.

# Biblical prophet Micah is the famous seer Michel de Nostredame (Nostradamus).

# The Huguenot-Protestant rebellion in France against the Catholics is one of the manifestations of the Reformation revolt in the 'Mongol' Empire of the XVI century. Such uprisings, the Oprichnina in the XVI century Russia in particular, reflected in the Bible as 'slaughter inflicted by the Jews on the Persians'.

# The notorious massacre of Saint Bartholomew's day France in 1572 is the response of the Empire to the rebellion of the Protestants – Huguenots. It is a partial reflection of the crushing of the Jewish heresy in the metropoly of the Empire and its other regions.

# The disgrace of Mary Stuart and her execution in prison is the reflection of the disgrace of Elena Voloshanka = Biblical Esther who was put in the Hordian prison and died there.

# In the British history of the XVI century the legendary queen Elizabeth Tudor (1533-1603), who reigned in 1558-1603, is the phantom reflection of Sophia Paleologue. Her name Eli-Zabeth or Eli-Sabeth could have been a distortion of the name Great Sophia or Al-Sophia. i.e. the name of Sophia Palaeologue. Besides the name TUDOR probably originated from T-HORDE, where the article T was put in the beginning of a word, where it was necessary to stress its significance.

We are assured that Ivan the Terrible's proposal of marriage to queen Elizabeth allegedly failed, as did the proposal of marriage to Mary Hastings and that purportedly Elizabeth never married. Now it is clear that it is not true. Elizabeth, aka Sophia Paleologue, DID MARRY Ivan the Terrible and became the famous queen-khaness. Together they ruled the Empire. Which England was a part of. That is why on the pages of the English chronicles Elizabeth-Sophia is reflected as the English ruler.

In the epoch of Reformation the history was re-written. In Europe it was declared that allegedly Elizabeth never married, and that Ivan the Terrible marriage proposal to her failed. In the Russian history Elizabeth remained under the name of Sophia Paleologue.

Thus the Russian-Horde story of Esther is reflected in the Western chronicles twice. First - in French history as Catherine de Medici and her rival Diane Poitiers. The second time - in the Anglo-French history as Elizabeth Tudor and her rival Mary Stuart.

See the parallelism we have discovered in [fig.69](#) [7v1], ch.4. It turns out that the story of Esther = Elena Voloshanka was colourfully described by 'ancient' Suetonius and Tacitus. Notably in the versions close to the Biblical one [RI], ch.2.



We would like to repeat that in that time Scotland was used as a name for the Land of Scythians, i.e. Russia-Horde [4v2], ch.6. The death of Elena Voloshanka at the end of the XVI century was the result of the temporary defeat of the heresy of the Judaizers. It is clear, that in the metropoly of the 'Mongol' Empire and its provinces the execution of the heretic Elena = Esther at that point was quietly accepted. The name and cause of the heretic later became an emblem of the Reformation in the XVII century.

In the Russian chronicles death of Elena Volosanka is covered extremely poorly. It is quite clear. The story of Esther rather sensitively affected the family of Ivan III = IV the Terrible. It is quite possible that after Voloshanka = Esther and her son were taken prisoners, they were exiled as far as possible from the metropoly. Banished out of sight. They could have easily chosen the British Isles as one of the furthest provinces of the Empire. They probably considered it impractical to exile them to Hordian America due to its extreme remoteness. England was far more convenient. On one hand, far enough, on the other - within close range. Out there Elena = Esther was executed. The local governors of Russia-Horde in England, the locals and the chroniclers witnessed the momentous events reaching them from the metropoly. Some distinguished prisoner was brought from the mighty capital of Russia-Horde. It immediately sparked the interest of the English towards her. Her story was written down according to their understanding of it. The description turned out fantastical in many respects. Later, when England separated from Russia-Horde in the XVII century, the story of Esther was declared to be 'purely Franco-English', and it became known as the story of Mary Stuart. At that point the writers sprang into action. F. Schiller created a popular tragedy about Mary. Stefan Zweig wrote a famous novel. In all these narratives it is difficult to recognise at first glance the true events of the struggle between Sophia Paleologue and Elena Voloshanka. As the authors by that time had forgotten the core of the matter.

### **30. THE LEGENDARY JOAN OF ARC IS DESCRIBED IN THE BIBLE UNDER THE NAME OF THE PROPHETESS AND WARRIOR DEBORAH.**

'Joan of Arc (Jeanne d'Arc), the 'The Maid of Orléans' (circa 1412-31), is a folk heroine of France. She was born into a peasant family. During the Hundred Years' War 1337-1453, she led the French people against the English invaders and in 1429 she freed Orleans from the siege. In 1430 she was captured by the Burgundians, who in exchange for money handed her over to the English, who in their turn declared Joan of Arc a witch and put her on ecclesiastical court trial. For charges of

"insubordination and heterodoxy" she was burnt at the stake in Rouen. In 1920 she was canonized by the Catholic church. [797], p.431. A vast amount of literature is written about Jean of Arc.

The story of the prophetess and warrior Deborah is narrated in chapters 4-5 of the Old Testament Book of Judges. In the synodic translation her name reads as Devra, however in the scholarly literature they usually use Deborah [797], p.365.

The comparison of the Joan of Arc and biblical Deborah stories reveals a vivid parallelism [7v1], ch.9. It was partially known to some of the authors of the XVII-XVIII cc. But today it is thought that the chroniclers 'were only comparing' Joan of Arc and Deborah, i.e. identifying them in the literary sense. But this 'congruence theory' was formed only in the XVIII-XIX cc., when the historians who were editing the texts, were substituting the direct identification of the ancient characters with tenuous 'comparisons'.

Even the supporters of the traditional version admit that THE MAID OF ORLEANS BEGAN TO BE CALLED JOAN OF ARC ONLY FROM THE SECOND HALF OF THE XVI century [7v1], ch.9. But this implies that in the duration of MORE THAN A CENTURY the heroine was called something else. The question is, what?

According to our results she was called DEBORAH. Under this name she entered the Book of Judges. Then in view of the growing interest towards Joan, her other names and nicknames also fell into common use. And later, in the XVII-XVIII cc. the former name Deborah was gradually extruded from the story of Joan. The fact that Joan and Deborah is the same person was slowly forgotten. The 'biblical events' were pushed into the past, two thousand six hundred years back! The following generations of historians began to sincerely perceive Joan of Arc and the biblical Deborah as two different characters.

In our reconstruction Deborah = Joan of Arc lived in the epoch of the Ottoman conquest in the world of the XV-XVI cc. That is why the original geography of the events connected to her campaigns was much wider than the modern version. We are assured that allegedly the armies of Joan = Deborah fought only in France, in the comparatively small area. But the Bible and Josephus Flavius here refer to:

- the ASSYRIANS [878], v.1, p.230 and the kingdom HAZOR (Book of Judges 4:2), i.e. the RUSSIANS and RUSSIA [6v1], ch.6;
  - the kings of CANAAN (Judges 4:2), i.e. KHAN rulers;
  - town of Kedesh (Judges 4:6, 4:10), probably the capital Kadesh, i.e. Czar-Grad [5v] and [6v];
  - the waters of MEGIDDI (Judges 5:19), i.e., probably, the waters of MACEDONIA.
- Etc.

When creating the Scaligerian history all of these large-scale campaigns were artificially 'squeezed' into the territory of one county in France, greatly reducing the scale of events. As a result some of the distant geographical names also 'moved' here. And the entire story of Joan of Arc turned into an allegedly 'purely French' story. Furthermore, it turns out that the famous French marshal Gilles de Rais, Joan of Arc's legendary comrade-in-arms, is partially described in the Bible under the name of Samson, the famous hero and warrior. This congruence is a result of the stories of Joan of Arc and the biblical Deborah overlapping each other [7v1].

### **31. THE EPOCH OF THE JUDGES OF ISRAEL DESCRIBED IN THE BIBLE IS THE EPOCH OF THE INQUISITION OF THE XV-XVI CC.**

One of the main books of the Old Testament is the Book of the Judges of Israel. Following the shifts on the global chronological map of A.T.Fomenko, we identified some of its stories with the real events of the XIII-XVI cc. Here they are.

1) The story of the prophetess-warrior Deborah (Judges 4-5), aka Joan of Arc, in the French version allegedly the XV century. Joan was found guilty by the Inquisition tribunal and was executed. One of the landmark cases of the Middle Ages.

2) The story of Abimelech (Judges 9), aka Simon de Montfort in the French version, allegedly XIII century. He spearheaded the crusade against the Cathars, he supported the Inquisition in its battle against the Cathar heresy by fire and sword. Simon de Montfort was also described by the 'ancient' – Greek writers, in particular Plutarch = Petrarch, and the well-known general Pyrrhus [6v2], ch.1:7.5.

3) The story of Samson (Judges 13-16), i.e. Gilles de Rais, allegedly XV century. Marshal Gilles de Rais, French national hero, faced the Inquisition court and was burnt at the stake in the town of Nante. One of the most infamous landmark cases 'on witchcraft'.

All three storylines are directly connected with the activities of the Inquisition on the territory of France (in the Scaligerian geography). A thought occurs that the epoch of the JUDGES of Israel is the EPOCH OF THE INQUISITION of the XV-XVI cc. And by the JUDGES of Israel the Bible means the JUDGES of the Inquisition. To recap, the Inquisition tried and scourged mainly in Western Europe. In [5v1], ch.12:9-10, we showed that today the role of the Inquisition was distorted and the pervasively negative attitude towards it is a result of Scaligerian brain-washing. In those times the Inquisition was a Horde and Ottoman organisation whose aim was to eradicate the social consequences of the epidemics which broke out in the provinces of the Empire. Also to eliminate the introduction of orgiastic elements of the Christian church

service, which blossomed in the West as a result of the distortion of the ascetic Christianity of the XII century which led to social decline and the spread of venereal disease. But later, after the breakup of the Empire, the work of the Inquisition was rendered exclusively in dark tones and, let's face it, rather successfully. But the Old Testament Book of Judges perceives the Inquisition either sympathetically or neutrally, which corresponds very well with the point we are making.

We have also studied the rest of the storylines in the Book of Judges. It turns out that they are related to the 'Mongol' Inquisition in Europe too.

For example, the well-known biblical story of the 'body cut into pieces' and the battle of Israel with the tribe of Benjamin is the famous 'expulsion of the Jews' from Spain in the late XV century. In particular, according to the Bible the assault of a husband -Levite and death of his concubine draws the whole of Israel into war against the tribe of Benjamin. In Spain in the XV century the assassination of an official of the Spanish Inquisition - inquisitor Pedro de Arbues precipitated a massive persecution of the Jews.

The Old Testament places a special emphasis on the 'blood epistle' in the form of the body parts sent to all of the tribes of Israel in order to chasten the sons of Benjamin, i.e. one of the tribes of Israel for the vicious thing they did. Now then, the 'blood epistle' to the tribes of Israel is the infamous edict of 1492 by King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain. According to the historians of the Inquisition, the edict made a 'stunning impression' [330], v.3, p.150.

According to the Book of Judges, furthermore the tribe of Benjamin is virtually wiped out in its entirety. All the rest of the tribes of Israel descended upon the sons of Benjamin, killing them and driving them out from their homes. So, the destruction of the Benjamin tribe by the Israelites is the crushing of Marranos in Spain in the late XV century.

As we showed in [6v2], ch.6, the 'exodus of the Jews' from Spain in 1492 reflects Columbus' voyage and the conquest of the distant America. In the late XV – the early XVI cc. the flotillas were departing Spain and Portugal for the inviting lands overseas. It was the extension of the Horde-Ottoman conquest of the world. The wave of conquests having rolled up onto the shores of the Atlantic for some time had ended up here. Later, when the large naval vessels - 'Noah's arcs' were constructed, the Horde and Ottoman armies moved on, across the ocean. The vestiges of this massive event were imprinted in the Spanish chronicles as the 'Jewish exodus'. The 'Mongol' Empire required major military and trading assets for such an event. The 'Mongol' governors in Spain – the Orthodox Christian sovereign-catholics Ferdinand and

Isabella – used every effort in order to organise the crossing of the ocean by the massive fleets with thousands of people. As always, such actions were accompanied by exerting a certain amount of force upon the large masses of population. The people would mainly embark upon the unknown and frightening ocean not by following their hearts, but by following an order, under penalty of the church or the administration.

Understandably, the chronicles of that time all vied to inform about mass migration of peoples across the 'great sea' (the Atlantic ocean). But later, in the XVII-XVIII cc. the Scaligerian historians, erasing the very fact of the existence of the 'Mongol' Empire, edited these accounts and instilled into them a sombre mood of forced banishment. Which the merciless rulers of XV-XVI cc. Spain were to blame for. The armies of Horde and Ottomania were called 'Gods Warriors', i.e. armies of Israelites. Therefore there is a large element of truth in the words about 'Israelites exodus' from Spain. The Israelite = Horde armies boarded the ships in the ports and embarked upon the ocean. In that epoch such an enterprise was very dangerous. Most people and families left Europe for ever. This fact lent a tragic air to the event as a whole. Thus the **HUNDRED THOUSAND OF Jews BANISHED** from Spain and Portugal, referred to in the sources, are most likely the crew of several 'Mongol' flotillas setting out to colonize the American continent = The New World.

It doesn't concern the religious persecution of a selected part of the population according to their nationality or on any other grounds during that epoch, nationalities in the modern sense of the word were not formed yet, but the formation of the military and commercial and administrative bodies for the transfer across the ocean. Most likely, entire villages and colonies were signed on to these ships. Some families would look after the cattle, and some would provide the repairs of the shipboard equipment. Those who refused or balked were, clearly, malicious heretics. They would be dealt with by the Inquisition tribunal. Some of them were burnt at the stake, after which the rest became much more compliant. As a result, America was successfully colonized.

## **32. THE BIBLICAL ABDUCTION OF THE WOMEN OF SHILOH IS THE 'ANCIENT' ROMAN RAPE OF THE SABINE WOMEN. AKA – THE CATALAN ABDUCTION AND DIVISION OF THE WIVES ALLEGEDLY IN THE XVI CENTURY.**

The last chapter of the Book of Judges narrates the cessation of the persecution of the Benjamites. '...But look, there is the annual festival of the LORD in Shiloh ... So they instructed the Benjamites, saying, "Go and hide in the vineyards and watch. When the young women of Shiloh come out to join in the dancing, rush from the vineyards and each of you seize one of them to be your wife. Then return to the land of Benjamin. When their fathers or brothers complain to us, we will say to them, 'Do us the favour of helping them, because we did not get wives for them during the war. You will not be guilty of breaking your oath because you did not give your daughters to them...'

So that is what the Benjamites did. While the young women were dancing, each man caught one and carried her off to be his wife. Then they returned to their inheritance and rebuilt the towns and settled in them.' (Judges 21:1, 21:3, 21:6-7, 21:16-21, 21:23).

It turns out that this storyline is described in the 'ancient' Roman history as the well-known Roman rape of the Sabine women in the epoch of the founding of Rome. And also in the history of Mediaeval Greece, when the Catalan military, allegedly circa 1311, divided between themselves the wives of the knights killed in the Battle of the Cephissus. According to the chronological shifts discovered by A.T.Fomenko, the founding of Rome in Italy dates circa 1380. Thus, in the history of the Middle Ages the dramatic biblical storyline of the abduction and division of the wives is accounted for and dates not earlier than the XIV century. Considering the one hundred years shift it is not impossible that the event dates to the XV century. It may well be that they might be speaking here of one of the Horde squadrons of Israelites=Benjamites, who left Spain after 1492 to conquer the Promised Land [2v2], ch.2.

Besides, in the book [TsRIM] we show, that the rape of the Sabine women in 'Ancient' Rome to a great extent is the reflection of the abduction of the wives by serfs in the Russian Novgorod=Yaroslavl.

### **33. HAREM-TEREM ('TOWER-CHAMBER' in Russian – Translator's note)**

In [4v] the section 'Russian terem and Eastern harem is the very same thing' we showed that in Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc. amongst the prosperous Hordians, there was a common custom to keep harems. Here can be seen an earlier similarity between the customs of Russia and the Ottoman Empire. Why did the harems = terems appear? In the epoch of the 'Mongol' conquest of the XIV century and the Ottoman conquering of the Promised Land following it in the XV century, there developed a shortage in the male population of the Empire. A great many warriors and Horde officials left for the distant land in order to colonize it. There were also human losses on the battle fields. As a result the amount of women in the metropolity of the Empire considerably exceeded that of men. The replenishment of the human resources was required. The harems=terems appeared as one of the methods to solve this new problem. At the same time another problem was solved – to protect young women from insalubrious sexual relations in order to guarantee a healthy and viable offspring for the elite. Well-off harem children were intended to take important posts and positions in the various provinces of the 'Mongol' Empire spanning Eurasia, Africa and America.

### **34. THE BIBLICAL STORY OF SAMSON IS THE BATTLE OF ZEMSHCHINA AGAINST THE OPRICHNINA IN RUSSIA UNDER IVAN IV THE TERRIBLE.**

&& SAMSON IS AN ALLEGORICAL DESCRIPTION OF ZEMSHCHINA AS ITS TWO MAIN LEADERS AND TWO OTHER FAMOUS CHARACTERS OF THE XVI CENTURY.

Ivan Petrovitch Cheliadnin-Fedorov, the equerry, who had wielded a lot of influence and was well respected, became the leader of the Zemshchina opposition [776], p.118. 'Zemtsy (landed proprietors) addressed the czar with a protest against the arbitrary actions of the oprichny guards who inflicted unbearable insults on zemshchina... The dvoryane (noblemen and gentry) demanded the immediate abolishment of the oprichny governance. The uprising of the noblemen was quite impressive: 300 Zemshchina nobles participated in it... The opposition declared itself in 1566. The protest against the oprichnina's violations originated from the members of the Zemskoy Sobor (Assembly of the Land) summoned in Moscow... The czar

denied the request of the Zemshchina noblemen and used the emergency powers granted to him by the Oprichnina edict, to punish Zemshchina. 300 petitioners were thrown into prison [776], p.119.

Karamzin gives an account: 'Fedorov (Cheliadnin – Auth.), a man of old customs, DECORATED WITH MILITARY GLORY and the gravitas of the state experience, having occupied the respected post of the Equerry and the head of the State Office for 19 years, a magnanimous and splendid nobleman became an object of slander' [362], v.9, column 58.

During the epoch of the struggle of Zemshchina against Oprichnina Filip Kolychev, the supporter of Zemshchina forces comes to the fore of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. 'The conflict with the highly influential ecclesiastical authorities, put the czar (Ivan the Terrible –Auth.) in a difficult situation, and he had to come to terms with the choice of a new candidate for the potential metropolitan. Father Superior Philip of The Solovetsky monastery was urgently summoned to Moscow (his secular name was Fedor Stepanovich Kolychev). Philip descended from a highly distinguished old Moscovian family...It appears that he was put forward by the same faction, which was HEADED BY THE EQUERRY I.P.CHELIADNIN AND WHICH AT THAT TIME WAS THE MOST INFLUENTIAL IN ZEMSHCHINA. The Solovetsky Father Superior was distantly related to the equerry. Philip entirely aligned his fate with that of the boyarin Cheliadnin... IN HIM THE ZEMSHCHINA OPPOSITION ACQUIRED ONE OF THE MOST ACTIVE AND ENERGETIC LEADERS. Kolychev... CATEGORICALLY DEMANDED THAT THE OPRICHNINA WAS IMMEDIATELY DISBANDED. THE BEHAVIOUR OF SOLOVETSKY FATHER SUPERIOR MADE IVAN THE TERRIBLE FURIOUS [776], p.118.

However the czar was confronted by Zemshchina and he was forced to come to an arrangement with Philip Kolychev about the mutual neutrality. As a result 'on the 20th July 1566 Philip was forced to publicly repudiate his demands and pledged 'not to intervene' in the Oprichnina and the czar's 'household customs' ... After this Kolychev was consecrated metropolitan' [776], p.118.

## && THE PARALLELS IN THE STORY OF SAMSON AND THE BATTLE OF ZEMSHCHINA AGAINST OPRICHNINA.

In [7v1], ch.10 we discovered some correspondence between the biblical Samson and the French version of the story of Gilles de Rais. But the French version, as well as the Old Testament account are only the variant reflections of important events in Russia-Horde in the middle of the XVI century. I.e. the fight between the two major organisations, parties, which gathered together a great many people under their



banners. These were the tragic events in the history of Russia-Horde. Biblical Samson, as well as Gilles de Rais are the slightly allegorical reflections of Zemshchina. I.e. a large party which was at the head of the opposition to Ivan the Terrible and Oprichnina.

We will describe the parallels between 'Horde Zemshchina = biblical Samson' as a table, see the details in [7v1].

In column 1 there are listed the main storylines constituting the core of the Old Testament story of Samson.

Column 2 reflects the correspondence with the French 'biography' of Gilles de Rais.

Column 3 contains the fragments of Cheliadnin's biography reflected in the Old Testament Book of Judges.

Column 4 recites fragments of Cheliadnin's biography reflected in the Old Testament Book of Judges.

Column 5 points out the facts of metropolitan Philip Kolychev's life which entered the Bible under the guise of the deeds of Samson.

Column 6 is designated to the analogous data from the 'biography' of Khan Simeon Beckbulatovich.

Column 7 contains the information from the 'biography' of Simeon, Prince of Rostov, which contributed to the story of Samson.

Column 8 we designated to Ivan the Terrible, who was also reflected both in the Bible and in the French version under the symbolic names: 'Gilles de Rais' or 'Bluebeard'.

Asterisked are the events from Russian history reflected in the Bible, in the 'biography of Samson' and 'the Frenchman Gilles de Rais' [7v1], ch.12.

### **35. SEVEN DECEASED WIVES OF BLUEBEARD. THE ENGLISH KING HENRY THE VIII AND HIS SIX WIVES ARE THE REFLECTIONS OF IVAN THE TERRIBLE AND HIS SEVEN WIVES.**

In [7v1].ch.10:4, we are talking about Bluebeard, one of the reflections of 'Gilles de Rais' in French history. King Bluebeard had 7 wives whom he killed [330], v.2, p.487. The fact of him having a comparatively large number of wives and that there were seven of them stands out. Considering the parallelism with the Russian history discovered by us, we should draw your attention to the fact that 'Ivan the Terrible' also allegedly had 7 wives. They probably should be distributed between the four

czars, combined in the Romanov version under one name of 'Grozny' (the Terrible). And now let us recall that in the English history there is also a famous character – Bluebeard. This is the King of England Henry VIII [7v1], ch.10. There are no other famous kings with a nickname of Bluebeard in European history.

In [7v1}, ch.3/ we showed that the dynasty of Novgorod khans, the rulers of the Empire of the XIII-XVI cc. reflected in the Western chronicles as the Habsburg dynasty. Furthermore, in [7v1[, ch.4, we showed that the epoch of Oprichnina is dramatically reflected in the history of France and England. Specifically czarina Sophia Paleologue is described as the French Catherine de Medici and the English Elizabeth Tudor, and Elena Voloshanka – as Mary Stuart. But then the English king Henry VIII is the Western-European reflection of the khan-czar of the 'Ivan the Terrible' epoch. This is in fact correct [7v1], ch.12 and [ShEK].

Incidentally Henry VIII as Ivan the Terrible is considered to be a cruel tyrant [304], v.3, p.181. The name HENRY itself could have originated from KHAN+REX, i.e. Khan-Czar or Khan-Rus, i.e. as the sounds of Kh-Sh and S were often interchangeable.

Henry VIII is considered to be a polygamist, he had six wives. At this point it is difficult to say which names exactly Ivan the Terrible's wives are concealed beneath the names of the Englishmen's Henry VIII wives.

## **36. WHERE AND WHERE ICARUS ASCENDED INTO THE SKY. THE RELIGIOUS MYSTERY PLAYS.**

We all know the most 'ancient' legend about the destruction of Icarus. He took to the air using artificial wings, but fell down and drowned. His fall is depicted, for example, in the 'ancient' paintings, discovered during the excavation of Herculaneum and Pompeii. Now then, Icarus' famous flight is the flight of the aeronaut Nikita, Trofim's son, under the czar Ivan the Terrible – Nero [RI], ch.2. Besides, the Ancient Greek legends about the Labyrinth, Minos, Minotaur are the reflections of the dramatic events of the XVI-XVII cc. in the capital of Russia-Horde [6v3], ch.3. Specifically, the story of Esther = Elena Voloshanka, a heretic and Ivan the Terrible's lover. Thus the flight of Daedalus and Icarus precisely during the times of Minos and Minotaur once again date them to the second half of the XVI century.

In Russian history we know Icarus by the name of 'Nikita, the serf, Trofim's son'. He climbed the tall Crucifixion Church in Alexandrovskaya Sloboda and leaped from the belfry flapping a pair of wooden wings. Nikita purportedly even flew over the rampart surrounding the czar's headquarters. We were informed about this detail in

the science division of the Alexandrovskya Sloboda museum in October 2006. During the epoch of Oprichnina Sloboda was Ivan the Terrible's capital. It is most likely that Nikita invented something along the lines of a light glider, on which he could remain airborne for a considerable amount of time.

The flight was successful. However after his landing Nikita was allegedly accused by the czar of 'a diabolical act' for which he was executed. This corresponds with the 'ancient' accounts of Icarus, son of Daedalus, who crashed and drowned. Most likely the Western chroniclers like the 'Ancient Greeks' and Suetonius got confused in the details of the notorious event in the capital of Russia-Horde. They knew that Icarus-Nikita ascended into the air and that he perished 'because of the flight'. But they didn't know the flight itself was completed successfully, and the death of the pilot was a result of the czar's wrath. The chroniclers 'glued' these facts together and it resulted in Icarus allegedly rising into the air, but 'falling down and crashing'.

'The ancient' master craftsman Daedalus, the wings inventor, should be searched for in the XVI century, in the epoch of Ivan the Terrible. The search should also cover the epoch of Ivan III, the phantom reflection of Ivan IV and dated to the XV century instead of the XVI century. The search won't take long. We have repeatedly looked to Aristotele Fioravanti – the famous architect and master craftsman, who allegedly lived in the XV century and who did much for Ivan III. It turns out that it was he who was the 'ancient Daedalus' [RI], ch.2.

It is widely thought that 'the teachers of the Russian architects in the subterranean construction were the Italian architects-builders, the creators of the Kremlin and Kitai-Gorod (the walled merchant town - China Town): ARISTOTELE FIORAVANTI, Petrus Antonius Solarius, Aloisio the New, Petrok Maly. Ignatius Stelletskii claimed that both the underground and above-ground Kremlin was built according to the plan of the 'wizard and sorcerer' Aristotele Fioravanti' [815:1], p.9.

And further: 'ALL THE THREE ARCHITECTS COULD NOT LEAVE MOSCOW AND HAD TO LAY THEIR BONES THERE. Is it a fluke? Not in the least!... This idiosyncratic triumvirate of the Moscow Kremlin (Aristotele Fioravanti, Solarius and Aloisio – Author) was the bearer of its innermost secrets... To let even one of this glorious trio back to Europe would have been almost equivalent to making Moscow's innermost secrets the subject of malicious gossip... It is that and only that, it seems, to be *raison d'être* of the violent death of the creators of the Moscow citadel in its depths', p.106-107.

To recap, the major building and construction of Moscow began not in the XV century under Ivan III as it is thought today, but in the XVI century under Ivan IV [6v2], ch.2. Erecting the capital in the new place could be attributed to the fact that Ivan the Terrible's court for some time lapsed into the heresy of the Judaizers, which caused a rift in the Empire's ruling elite. The czar even left the former capital (Yaroslavl or Suzdal) and decided in favour of a small settlement located at the site of the Battle of Kulikovo. There they began to build the stone Moscow = the Second Jerusalem. However the czar could not invite the local Horde builders as a result of the social rift. The Orthodox Church strongly condemned the heresy of the czar and his immediate entourage [775]. This was the reason for summoning the Italian architects. In that time Italy was one of the provinces of the 'Mongol' Empire and naturally, the Western architects quickly arrived to the metropoly by order of the Emperor. On the completion of building, the chief architects, who knew the scheme of the underground Moscow, could be silenced for ever, so they could tell no one.

It is quite possible, that Icarus-Nikita took flight from the Church of the Ascension in Kolomenskoye. Perhaps during Ivan the Terrible's reign there were several of such flights depicting the Ascension of Christ. There survive a tradition which directly connects Nikita's flight under Ivan the Terrible with Moscow Kolomenskoye. This tradition hardly originated from nothing. The information about Nikita's flight lived amongst the gliders and pilots [RI], ch.2.

In the Middle Ages in Europe there were popular mysteries, i.e. the religious plays depicting the Gospel events for the public. For example, Christ's arrest, Pilate's trial, the Flagellation of Christ, the Road to Golgotha and the Crucifixion [KAZ]. 'This Liturgical performance which took place not in a church, but in public, is considered to be the oldest religious drama and simultaneously 'the first performance bearing the similar characteristics of theatre' [415:1], p.9, 11. It is not improbable, that in some of the Western mystery plays an 'actor' who was personifying Christ was crucified for real.

Most likely Nikita's flight from the tall cathedral-belfry in the presence of the czar Ivan, courtiers and a multitude of spectators was an element of such a religious mystery play. The ascent of a man into the air on wings symbolised the climax of the play - The Resurrection and The Ascension of Christ. It is likely that Nikita took off exactly from the Church of the Ascension in Kolomenskoye. The very name of the church suggests that it was exactly from here, in full public view, a man depicting the Ascension of Christ rose up into the sky. The mysteries were illustrating the key moments of Christ's life. It is absolutely clear that the climax – the Ascension –

should have been represented in some way. But at this point the directors would be presented with problems. It was not so easy to show Christ ascending. It is most likely that for a long time they were unsuccessful. They had to be satisfied with some conventional scenes symbolising the 'ascent to heaven'. It is possible that the actor was hoisted up with ropes or some other device.

They approached this subject in a more fundamental way. Clearly the capital should have been the place for the most gripping performances dedicated to the Gospel. That is why it must have been this very place where they should have begun to think about how to recreate the Ascension Day. They began to experiment. Soon they realised that it was possible to create 'wings' capable of lifting a person into the air and keep him there. Thus aeronautics was born. It is possible, that Nikita could have been the first or among the pioneers. Supposedly there must have been many rehearsals of the religious show which would culminate with the flight of the actor who was playing Christ. When the directors and gliders decided that enough experience had been accumulated, they announced the performance. A premier, so to speak.

The entire court assembled, numerous guests. It is likely that there were rumours swarming and everyone was expecting something extraordinary. Ivan the Terrible, the great khan himself, was seated in the first row. The actors were nervous. The closer to the end of the performance, the greater the tension. Lo and behold! A man with wings ascends the dome of the Kolomensky Church of the Ascension. The climax of the performance. Nikita breaks away from the dome and soars into the air. The flight was a success. The czar was delighted. It is highly unlikely that Ivan the Terrible was enraged and ordered the execution of the adventurous serf. Contrarily, we should think that Nikita was handsomely rewarded. A different matter is that in the minds of the later chroniclers the two excerpts of this extraordinary performance could have merged together. The first – the execution and death of Christ performed by some other actor. The second plot – is the flight of the glider pilot Nikita, performing the Ascension of Christ. By the way, human sacrifices were no longer carried out in Russia during that epoch. Particularly during the Apostles Christianity which condemned the 'ancient' 'pagan' customs, among which bloody sacrifices indeed existed. That is why it is most likely that in Russia the actor was not actually 'crucified' for real. However, the Western chroniclers were more accustomed to more bloody forms of Christian mystery plays. So they decided that allegedly Nikita was executed by the cruel czar. A myth about a poor Icarus who fell from the sky was born. Ultimately some of the actors-glidiers could have in fact easily crashed. As it was a new and dangerous activity. Then again, the very same 'ancient classics' would add that contrary to Icarus, Daedalus successfully landed using his wings. Thus the

'ancient' myth narrates both about the misfortunes and the successes of the aeronautics.

Nikita's flight in Kolomenskoye from the height of the Church of the Ascension feels more genuine than from the Crucifixion Church Belfry in Alexandrovskya Sloboda, though it is worth repeating that there could have been a number of similar flights. As the mystery plays were staged over many years. In some years an actor could have flown into the air from the Crucifixion Church Belfry in Alexandrovskya Sloboda, in the other years – from the Church of the Ascension in Kolomenskoye. There also must have been other locations from which the Russian=Horde gliders demonstrated their skills in front of the delighted audience.

After some time the religious performances became a thing of the past. But the art of gliding in the air remained and began to develop according to the laws of scientific research. Professional aeronautics was born.

### **37. THE ROMAN EMPEROR CLAUDIUS, AKA IVAN THE TERRIBLE WAS A WRITER. IT TURNS OUT THAT THE FIRST VERSION OF THE FAMOUS 'LITSEVOI SVOD' (THE ILLUSTRATED CHRONICLE COMPILATION) WAS COMPILED UNDER HIM.**

Practically in all the phantom reflections of Ivan The Terrible it is stressed that he was a prolific writer, was interested in literature and was the author of many works. The same account was also given about the Emperor Claudius, allegedly 41-45 years. Suetonius informs us:

'He was neither uncultured nor lacking in eloquence, but on the contrary had constantly devoted himself to the liberal arts ... As Emperor he continued work on his history, hosting frequent readings but employing instead a professional reader. He began the work with Julius Caesar's assassination, then he started afresh with later times... He completed only two books of the earlier work, but forty-one of the later times. He also wrote an eight-volume autobiography... and also penned a 'Defense of Cicero against the charges of Asinius Gallus', a work of no little learning. HE ADDED THREE ADDITIONAL LETTERS OF HIS OWN INVENTION TO THE LATIN ALPHABET, maintaining that there was a dire need of them, and after becoming the Emperor was able to initiate their general use...

He gave no less attention to Greek studies... He would often make his Senate reply to Greek envoys with a prepared speech in their own language...

HE WROTE COMPLETE WORKS IN GREEK: TWENTY VOLUMES OF ETRUSCAN HISTORY AND EIGHT OF CARTHAGINIAN. A new Claudian wing was added, in his name, to the old Museum at Alexandria, with HIS ETRUSCAN HISTORY READ ALOUD FROM BEGINNING TO END ANNUALLY IN THE OLD, AND THE CARTHAGINIAN IN THE NEW, VARIOUS READERS BEING EMPLOYED IN TURN, AS IS THE WAY WITH PUBLIC RECITATIONS.' [760], p. 145-146.

This information is very interesting. It turns out that the Emperor Claudius, i.e. Ivan the Terrible was the author of an immense work consisting of at least SEVENTY NINE BOOKS (as stated: 2 + 41 + 8 + 20 + 8). Among them: 43-volume History of Rome, 20-volume Etruscan History and 8-volume Carthaginian History.

As we already understand, the history of 'Ancient' Rome written by Claudius is the history of Russia-Horde of the XIII-XVI cc.

Et-ruscan history is also the Russian history, and the Carthaginian history is the history of Czar-Grad [5v], [TsRIM]. So it means, that under the Emperor Claudius = Ivan the Terrible there was created an enormous work on the history of Russia-Horde and Czar-Grad. We will repeat: 63 books on the Russian History and 8 books on the history of Czar-Grad.

It is hardly likely that the Emperor Claudius – Ivan the Terrible wrote with his own hand all 79 books he is credited with. As the czar has a lot to do. Most likely he ordered the creation of a detailed history of the 'Mongol' Empire. Scholars, scribes and artists were summoned, who under the Emperor's supervision created such a prodigious body of work.

But we are told that no such immense body of work survives until our time. They say that hundreds and thousands of years have passed... Allegedly everything is lost... However neither Suetonius nor Tacitus say anything about Claudius' books perishing. Which means that they still did exist during their time, i.e. in the XVI-XVII cc.

As Claudius is Ivan the Terrible, than the historical manuscript created on his initiative should have left an indelible mark in Russian history. Is that so? Yes. It is. We know that it is under Ivan the Terrible the multivolume Litsevoi Svod was created. The mammoth historical literary classic encompassing world history from the most ancient times to the epoch of Ivan the Terrible. Incidentally for a very long time Letsevoi Svod was not published at all. It was published for the first time in Moscow by the publishing house 'Akteon' [477:31], amid the extensive public discussions on the New Chronology.

However, according to our results, THE ORIGINAL text of Litsevoi Svod never survived. Most likely in the XVII century under the Romanovs it was edited in the spirit of 'new ideas'. So the version which exists today belongs to a later date. Nevertheless, even in the 'Romanov' way it presents an invaluable monument of the XVII century based on the sources of the XVI century.

So to conclude, under the 'Ancient' Roman Emperor Claudius = Ivan the Terrible Litsevoi Svod was created. According to the Roman accounts, at first it consisted of 71 books. Even re-worked and abridged by the Romanovs this body of work comprised 10 gigantic volumes. That is why the publishing house 'Akteon' divided most of the volumes into two parts. As the result Litsevoi Svod in its new modern facsimile edition takes up 19 voluminous books.

Nothing of its kind has been created ever since! All known Western European, Arabic, Eastern, Chinese and other chronicles known today pale by comparison with the Russian-Horde Litsevoi Svod. None of them are even remotely similar. This is understandable. Litsevoi Svod was created in the capital of the Great Empire in the XVI century, in the age of its progress and might. That is why from the very beginning it was destined to be unique. The best scholars and craftsmen were gathered. Writing of the world history, i.e. the history of the Empire of the XIII-XVI cc. was under the control of Ivan the Terrible = Claudius himself. The executants did their absolute best. Litsevoi Svod is illustrated with magnificent illuminations.

'Ancient' Suetonius spoke respectfully of Litsevoi Svod, calling it a body of work dedicated to the Roman, Etruscan and Carthaginian history.

Suetonius' accounts of Claudius personally writing the Roman, Etruscan and Carthaginian history corresponds with the opinion of the historians, that Ivan the Terrible was himself editing the text of Litsevoi Svod. It is thought that some notes on some pages were made by Ivan the Terrible [775], p.28-31.

According to Suetonius the Emperor Claudius also wrote 8 books about his own life. I.e. his autobiography. Most likely he didn't write it himself, but dictated it to the scribes, or based it on his own archives. Thus we learn that in the XVI century there was a large account written of Ivan the Terrible's life: 8 volumes! Unfortunately this work didn't survive. It is possible that it seemed to the Romanovs unacceptable. That's why it was destroyed. And but for Suetonius we would have never learnt that Ivan the Terrible (Claudius) wrote his own autobiography.



### **38. THE LIGHTHOUSE OF ALEXANDRIA (PHAROS OF ALEXANDRIA).**

Apparently the famous 'ancient' Lighthouse of Alexandria, aka Pharos of Alexandria (one of the seven wonders of the ancient world) – is a well-known Bell tower of Ivan the Great in Moscow [RI], ch.6. In the ancient times the Pillar of Ivan the Great was compared to a burning candle. Hence comes the legend of the 'lighthouse'. The divine bronze statues of Pharos of Alexandria are the huge bells of Ivanov Pillar. Incredible as it may be, in the 'ancient' history of Pharos of Alexandria accounts are given of the events from the reign of Peter I (The Great), from the late XVII – early XVIII cc.! See [RI], ch.6.

Besides, the 'Pillar of Ivan the Great' in Moscow was described by the 'ancient classics' as the 'Ancient' Roman military column or as the famous Tower of Babylon [RI].

The historians think that allegedly Pharos (Etruscan) Lighthouse was close to Egyptian African Alexandria. However today there are no traces of it there. Then they unfoundedly professed that allegedly the lighthouse 'of course, is dilapidated', and that it remained there allegedly until the XIV century, after which it 'irretrievably disappeared'. 'The remains of a tall pedestal on which the beautiful tower stood, survive until our time, BUT THEY ARE ABSOLUTELY UNACCESSABLE TO THE ARCHITECTS AND ARCHEOLOGISTS, as they are built into the mediaeval fortress' [572], p.118. Purportedly the remains 'may be still there', but unfortunately it is impossible to see them.

Such lamentations are needless. Pharos Lighthouse exists even now, though in a somewhat reconstructed version. Those who wish to see it should visit the Cathedral Square (Sobornaya Square) of the Moscow Kremlin and see the Etruscan Pillar of Ivan the Great.

### **39. TACITUS AND SUETONIUS DESCRIBE THE TIMES OF TROUBLES IN RUSSIA.**

#### **THE EMPEROR VITELLIUS IS THE FALSE DMITRY I.**

Apparently, starting with the 'biography' of the emperor Vitellius, Suetonius and Tacitus describe the Time of Troubles in the Horde Empire. Tacitus is speaking about the great revolt in his preface to the 'Histories'. In Tacitus' 'Annals' descriptions are given of the emperors Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Nero and Claudius. I.e. primarily the epoch of Ivan the 'Terrible', the second half of the XVI century [RI], ch.10.

In the 'Histories' Tacitus begins his narration with Galba followed by Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian, Titus and Domitian. According to our findings Vitellius is the reflection of the 'False' Dmitry I. Incidentally, Tacitus informs us that he himself is a contemporary of all the above mentioned 'ancient' emperors. Consequently the famous Cornelius Tacitus lived in the epoch of the first half of the XVII century. Or later.

The next emperor of 'Ancient' Rome was Vespasian. And the Russian czar who succeeded the 'False' Dmitry I was Vasili Shuisky. Hence 'ancient' Vespasian could be a phantom reflection of Vasili Shuisky. Our idea holds up very well [RI], ch.10.

Furthermore, Roman emperor Titus is Russian prince Skopin-Shuisky. Titus' siege of Jerusalem is the defence of Moscow in 1610 by Skopin-Shuisky, which Tacitus combined with the liberation of Moscow by Minin and Pozharsky in 1612 [RI], ch.11.

#### **40. MOSCOW OF THE LATE XVI – EARLY XVII CC. IS DESCRIBED BY FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS AS JERUSALEM.**

The well-known work of Flavius Josephus 'The Jewish War' describes the civil war in Judaea under the emperor Titus, followed by the siege, military assault and the fall of Jerusalem, the capital of Judaea. It is thought that during that time Judaea used to be a province of the Roman Empire. Therefore all of these events took place in the early XVII century in Russia in the metropoly of the 'Mongol' Empire. In particular, the seizure of Jerusalem by Emperor Titus must be some major and well-known event in the Times of Troubles in Russia. Such an event does exist. It is the defence of Moscow by Skopin-Shuisky in 1610 followed by the final victory over the 'Poles' and the liberation of Moscow in 1612 by Pozharsky and Minin. Jerusalem described by Flavius Josephus is Moscow, the capital of the Empire. The walls of Kitai-gorod (China town), Bely gorod (White Town) and Zemlyanoy Gorod (Earthworks Town) in Moscow are described by Flavius as the three walls surrounding Jerusalem.

To remind you, there were two well-known Jerusalems in ancient history. The first, evangelical – is Czar-Grad on the Bosphorus, Homeric Troy. The second Jerusalem is described in the Old Testament Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. It was 'reconstructed' during the reign of the kings Artha-Xerox, Cyrus and Darius. Apparently here the subject matter happens to be the construction of Moscow and the Moscow Kremlin in the middle of the XVI century under Ivan the Terrible = Artha-Xerox [6v2], ch.2.

Today we can see only the foreign made old plans of Moscow-Jerusalem. It clearly states that the Russian originals didn't survive (were destroyed?). Surprisingly NONE of the old original plans of Moscow of the XVI century epoch survived! Just the

foreign 'copies'. We are being assured that allegedly they more or less accurately follow the 'lost Russian originals'. But is this true?

Most likely it is the result of the editing 'activities' of the epoch of the Reformation. After Russia's occupation by the Western armies followed by the ascent to the throne of the Romanov dynasty, the history of the Great Empire began to undergo distortions. Including removing from the old 'Mongol' maps and city plans various Horde names which became inappropriate in light of the 'Reformation history'. Everything 'incorrect' was crossed out and burnt. After which crocodile tears were shed in front of the future generations for the 'lost originals'.

There are known reports that in Russia under Godunov the 'extensive cartographic activities' have unfolded. It is understandable as it is during Godunov's reign the 'Mongol' capital Moscow (Jerusalem) achieved its highest peak. However, we will repeat, that there are no surviving original plans of Moscow. Everything perished!

But now we can reasonably contemplate what exactly was depicted on the Russian-Horde maps burnt by the Reformers. It is probable that Moscow (Jerusalem) was depicted in the way in which 'Ancient' Rome is drawn today. In particular, the Pillar of Ivan the Great could have been called the Babylon Tower or the Pharos of Alexandria (Lighthouse) or the Roman Milliarium Aureum. I.e. the central pillar of Rome from which the distances into all the ends of the Great Empire were measured. Clearly all such names (which became 'incorrect') were immediately abolished [RI], ch.11.

The 'ancient' book 'The Jewish War' by Flavius Josephus describes the grandiose war encompassing not only the Judaic Kingdom, but the entire Roman Empire comprising Judaea, among others. As we understand, the subject matter is the Times of Troubles in Russia and the wars of the Reformation, spreading all over Europe. Thus the voluminous work of Flavius Josephus was devoted to the events of the XVI-XVII cc. which his contemporaries were deeply passionate about. His book reveals many details of that epoch which were previously unknown [RI], ch.11.

Flavius Josephus, Suetonius and Tacitus complete their accounts with the Great Strife of the early XVII century, i.e. the fall of the Great Empire. It is exactly during this time the Scaligerian chronology is being created and enforced. It was already used to the utmost by Flavius Josephus for example. Therefore there is every reason to believe that in the works by Flavius Josephus, Suetonius and Tacitus there must become apparent the chronological shifts invented by the Scaligerians. Notably, the shift which combines the beginning of the Roman Empire in the XIII century with its ending in the XVII century. In other words, concluding with his narrative about the

Times of Troubles of the XVII century, Flavius could 'skip' to the end of XII – the beginning of XIII cc and tell us, albeit briefly, about the events in the gospel Jerusalem = Czar-Grad. We already know that the chroniclers sometimes confused the Gospel Jerusalem with The Old Testament Jerusalem, i.e. Moscow of the XVI century.

Our prognosis comes true. Flavius Josephus does in fact 'leap' from the XVII century into the end of XII century and gives us a summary of the story of Andronicus-Christ. His death followed by the avenging Crusade of Russia-Horde and its allies onto Czar-Grad in order to punish those responsible for the crucifixion. These accounts are vaguely reflected by Flavius Josephus, but it is still quite recognisable [RI], ch.11.

#### **41. DOMITIAN.**

The Biography of Emperor Domitian concludes the works by Seutonius and Tacitus. It turns out that the 'ancient biography' of Domitian narrates about False Dmitry and Mikhail Fedorovich Romanov. Then there is a jump into the beginning of the Empire, and the last part of the 'biography' of Domitian gives an account of King Herod and Emperor Andronicus-Christ. Thus at this point Suetonius and Tacitus 'skip' back in time from the XVII century into the XII century, from the end of the Great Empire into its very beginning. As a result 'ancient' Domitian is a 'bonding' of the following four genuine historical figures: False Dmitry II + Czar Mikhail Fedorovich Romanov, then King Herod + Emperor Andronicus-Christ. The first two are from the first half of the XVII century, and other two are from the late XII century.

In his book Suetonius clearly states that his youth fell within Domitian's reign [760], p.216. Therefore the 'ancient' Suetonius was born in the early XVII century, in the epoch of Times of Troubles. He wrote his book in his adulthood. Hence in the middle of the XVII century or even later.

#### **42. THE STORY OF IVAN SUSANIN IN THE BIOGRAPHY OF 'ANCIENT' DOMITIAN, I.E. OF MIKHAIL ROMANOV.**

We all know a story of Susanin who saved the young czar Mikhail Romanov from Polish captivity having paid for that it with his life. This story was popular in Romanov Russia. In particular, the composer M.I.Glinka wrote a famous opera called 'Life for the Czar' (it is sometimes called 'Ivan Susanin').

The story of Susanin still touches people. In order to satisfy interest in this subject the historians make somewhat odd 'discoveries'. For example, in January 2007 yet again a statement appeared that allegedly several years earlier Susanin's remains were found in Kostromskaya district. Though, as noted, 'for many years the place of the hero's death was unknown'. The remains were 'examined in the Russian centre of

forensic investigation under the supervision of the professor Victor Zvyagin.

Vladimir Filippov was assigned to reconstruct Susanin's appearance based on the skullbones' (Journal 'Arguments and Facts', issues 1-2, 10-16 January 2007, p.13). As far as we know there are no scientific publications which would tell us in detail on what grounds the found bones were declared to be 'Susanin's remains'. That is why our attitude towards this 'finding' is rather sceptical, as it is towards the 'discovery of the remains of Andrey Bogolyubsky and Yuri Dolgoruky ', widely advertised in its time, which were also unsupported by any scientific data.

Let us get back to more reliable accounts kept by the ancient authors. It turns out that the 'most ancient' Suetonius and Tacitus tell us about the story of Susanin. Allegedly more than two thousand years before Mikhail Romanov, prior to the event taking place [RI], ch.12.

As Susanin saved young Mikhail Fedorovich, and he agreed to accept the Imperial crown, according to the Romanov version, The Times of Troubles declined. The new Emperor emerged in Russia. This event is considered to be a turning point in the bloody Strife of the early XVII century. In Romanov interpretation it was Susanin's heroic deed which saved the country from further civil wars: 'Mikhail Fedorovich Romanov's election as Czar of Russia put an end to the strife' [578], book.2, p.1002. We can find in 'ancient' Tacitus' accounts a perfectly analogous presentation of a story about Sabinus (it turns out that it is Susanin). He straightforwardly claims that according to many Romans it was Sabinus' death which saved Rome from the new civil wars and upheavals [RI], ch.12.

Let us draw our attention to the psychological difference in the descriptions of Susanin by 'ancient' Suetonius and the Romanov sources. The 'ancient' version is more exalted as opposed to the Romanov's version, slightly more grounded. For example, the Romanov historians have a 'burning barn', and Suetonius and Tacitus – a 'burning temple' (or even Capitol). According to the Romanov historians, frightened Mikhail was hidden in the barn, burying him in the hay. According to Suetonius and Tacitus, the trembling Domitian is hidden in the sacred temple. Possibly, someone wished to turn (on paper) a prosaic shed (and barn) into a poetic temple (and Capitol). It may be that on the contrary the Romanov historians purposefully lessened the scale of the events, belittling them. It could possibly be that the ancient text was describing a temple-cathedral, and the Romanov editors turned it into a 'barn' and 'farm shed'. Thus by doing so they moved the events from the Imperial capital to a small village, tenaciously destroying any traces of 'Ancient' Rome in the Russian sources.

### **43. WHY DOMITIAN WAS BURIED AS A 'GLADIATOR'. WHERE THE GLADIATOR GAMES ORIGINATED FROM.**

It is said that Domitian (i.e. Andronicus-Christ) was buried 'like a gladiator' [726:1], p.135. The ancient authors paid particular attention to this aspect. We repeatedly came across the 'ancient classics' start talking about the 'emperor-gladiator' when describing some of the phantom reflection of Andronicus-Christ. What is it all about? The common explanation of a word Gladiator is: 'Term 'gladiator' originates from a word 'gladius' – a sword, which was used by Roman legionaries and various types of gladiators' [589:1], p.8. This is quite possible. Latin GLADIUS = SWORD could have been a slightly distorted Slavic word KHOLODNY (COLD), i.e. 'cold' weapon. Besides in Russia a word 'KLADENETS' (steel sword) was used to describe a SWORD (was called 'KLADENETS'). So 'GLADIATOR' is a man armed with a COLD WEAPON or KLADENETS. But we will note a following peculiarity in the Scaligerian version. Not only gladiators, but also regular soldiers of the Roman army, were armed with swords (gladius). But they were not called gladiators! Only the participants of the special combat-performances were thus called. A suspicion arises that a word 'gladiator' could possibly have had a different origin.

It is possible, that the Latin word GLADIATOR, in relation to Domitian-Christ, originated in the process of distortion of the word-combination KOLYADA+TORIU when K turned into ---> G. To remind you, sometimes Christ was called KOLYADA [TsRS]. And the word TORIT' is Russian, meaning 'to clear a path', 'to carry'. Hence, the words 'tract', 'roadway', etc. [7v2]. Hence originated a name with a meaning 'carrying Christ' (KHRISTA TORIU). It becomes clear why the name Christopher in Greek meant 'bearing Christ' [533], v.2, p.604. That is why Saint Christopher was often depicted carrying young Christ on his shoulders [RI], ch.12. So in Domitian's biography the word GLADIATOR could have originally meant CHRISTOPHER, i.e. denoting Christ. If KOLYADA is CHRIST, than the expression KOLYADA=TORIU could have literally meant the same as CHRISTOPHER (CHRIST TORIU). Then later, KOLYADA-TOR could have turned into GLADIATOR. It appears that two ideas got intertwined in the term 'gladiator': 'cold weapon' (kladenets) and 'Christ Toryu' – carrying Christ).

The famous gladiatorial contests in Ancient Rome probably originated to commemorate the execution of Christ-Kolyada in 1185 and the Trojan War = Russia-Horde Crusade. To begin with the Gladiatorial Games were the religious performance, a mystery play, enacting the Passion of Christ and vengeance catching up with his enemies. The masses of believers and spectators would gather in the church-circus. In particular, Andronicus-Christ murder by the Roman soldiers was re-

enacted. Perhaps a man personifying Christ was called KOLYADA-TORIU, i.e. CHRISTOPHER, 'Christ bearer', a man who symbolically carried the image of the suffering Christ. Later the original meaning of the mystery-plays was forgotten and they continued to exist just as the bloody performances, where a gladiator (Kolyadator) died under the strikes of the soldiers representing the Czar-Gradians of the late XII century. Then the battle of the two groups of warriors would commence. One of them represented the Jews who crucified Christ, and the other – the crusaders (gladiators) avenging him. When in time the meaning of the religious performance became vague, the 'main gladiator-Christ' was forgotten.

It becomes clear why the 'ancient' gladiator contests were so ruthless and often resulted in the gladiators' death. Allegedly in the III century approximately every other combat would result in the death of a gladiator [589:1], p.167.

The spectators often participated in judging and could either pardon a wounded soldier, or condemn him to death. Then he would be slaughtered in the arena accompanied by the roar of the crowd. Today it is 'explained' to us that such was the bloodthirsty nature of the Romans. Of course, many enjoyed watching battles and death. However, most likely, the violent performances were based on the real events – the execution of Andronicus-Christ, followed by a war and punishment of his murderers. That is why at first the 'actors' were killed on the arena for real. The memory of the recent events was still fresh. And only while the heart of matter was gradually forgotten, some of the participants of the show were left alive.

A similar idea also came from the religious performances dedicated to god Mithra, i.e. once again Christ. Here the performers represented on the stage of a circus-church the death of Christ in the shape of a bull impaled by a bullfighter's steel weapon. It is not impossible, that we see the traces of the original symbolism, in which an Ox-bull identified with a cross (stauros), in the famous Spanish Corrida (Bullfighting). Maybe in some versions of the liturgical performance (which later on turned into Corrida) a bull symbolises a cross, bringing death to Christ, and the matador – Christ himself. Later the original meaning of the mystery plays was forgotten, and the performance took on a life of its own. The toreadors began to kill the bulls in an arena in front of the audience excited by the smell of blood, simply for entertainment and a demonstration of their fighting skills.

And so, Domitian-Christ was buried 'as a gladiator' for no other reason that it was Kolyada-Tor, i.e. Christ, who they were burying. And since Kolyada (Nikolay) is Christ, then a 'gladiator' meant Christ bearer or Cross bearer, a man who fights in the name of Christ. I.e. Christopher, who goes into battle under the banner of Christ. Bringing to the nations the name and the legacy of Christ. This corresponds with the

essence of the Crusades of the early XIII century whose goal was to punish those guilty in the crucifixion of Andronicus-Christ. These are Horde campaigns described by the 'classical authors' as the Trojan War.

The ancient references to the gladiatorial games being established exactly by the ET-RUSCANS, i.e. the Russians, according to our results, become clear [RI], ch.12.

Following the victory in the Trojan War it was in 'Ancient' Rome, i.e. in Russia, where the religious festivities were established, spreading from the metropoly to the provinces of the Empire. The Et-ruscans = Russians celebrated the victory over the enemies of Andronicus-Christ. It is clear that the celebration in honour of the victory was established by the victors, and not by the defeated side.

It turns out that there were women-gladiators [589:1], p.121. It is not surprising, since in the Trojan War there were both men and women among the victors and the defeated.

So, in the arenas of the circuses-churches the two groups of Gladiators = Christ bearers came together. Some represented the Hordians, the others – their enemies. They fought to the death. The gladiatorial games originated within the Royal Christianity, practiced by the czars, who succeeded Andronicus-Christ. At first in Czar-Grad, and later in Russia-Horde after the capital of the Empire was moved there in the XIII century. The Royal Christianity is known to us today as 'ancient paganism', when bloody sacrifice was practiced, including those of humans. One of those sacrifices was the Gladiatorial = Christ bearing Games, the religious pageants. Today all the participants of the Games are called the Gladiators. However, earlier, most likely, only those who represented Horde –Cossacks avenging Christ were called thus. The warriors representing those people who crucified Christ might have been called differently. It's for a reason that the gladiators came under different groups. The name of one of them – Retiarii – clearly points to Rat' (army), Horde. The Retiarii probably represented the Horde-avengers. Another group under the name of Murrillones brings to mind the name of Myrmidon. Thus were called the 'ancient' warriors Achilles-Svyatoslav, who participated in the Trojan War [NOR]. In this way the very names of the gladiator castes reflect the events of the Trojan War.

The history of the Gladiator Games shows that they were not GAMES in the modern meaning of the word. They were not considered as a contest of agility. The commentators correctly identified the key element of the Games: 'Closer than anything else to the Gladiatorial Games is the 'trial by combat', in which the guilt of the accused was decided by way of armed combat. The defeated had to admit his guilt or die. The victor was considered not guilty. The combats were usually conducted with the real weapons and in the presence of an audience' [589:1], p.8-9.



Originally the Gladiator Games were replaying 'combat by trial' between those guilty in the execution of Andronicus-Christ and the crusaders. The Trojan War is the act of revenge. There were both judges and accused. This war could have been viewed as God's retribution to those guilty.

From the descriptions of the Gladiator Games it is clear that they were an important public event. Large (sometimes enormous) sums of money were spent. Special schools for gladiators were established. One can see what a great importance the czars-khans of the 'Mongol' Empire placed on the Trojan War being cemented in the people's memory, as it was the Trojan War which prompted the emergence of this gigantic Empire. The rulers constantly reminded their subjects of that.

After the Battle of Kulikovo, when Dmitry Donskoi = Constantine the Great gained victory over the Royal Christianity, he made Apostolic Christianity the state religion. The radical reform inflicted a blow to the Gladiator Games too. They were declared 'pagan' and were banned: 'The end of the gladiator games is directly connected with the adoption of Christianity (under Constantine – Author)' [589:1], p.22.

The Gladiator games were irrevocably banned under the emperor Honorius.

According to our analysis, it took place in the late XIV – early XV cc. Gradually the Gladiator Games and the gladiators in general were forgotten. Up until the middle of the XVIII century 'the gladiators were of no interest and it's likely that very few people knew anything about them at all. A new surge of interest towards this subject was caused by the discovery of the objects of gladiatorial weaponry in Pompeii in 1766' [589:1], p.5.

Thus, the Gladiator Games were abolished as the 'relic of paganism', i.e. of Royal Christianity. Human sacrifice was forbidden in Apostolic Christianity. The enormous 'ancient' circuses-churches were abandoned and began to dilapidate. 'Pagan' Gladiator contests became a thing of the past. They were replaced by the more peaceful religious mystery plays. Where Christ's death was represented with the conventional acting devices (red paint in place of blood, etc.)

Besides the gladiator contests, where the two groups of warriors would fight, on the circuses-churches' arenas combat with animals took place – lions, bulls, bears, wild boars. Could it be that fighting animals was originally of a religious nature?

The answer is probably as follows. In the XIII-XIV cc. the emperors who followed Royal Christianity, persecuted the Apostolic Christians. They were baited with animals and set on fire, notably, in full view of the public. The Scaligerian history speaks of it as the 'persecution of the first Christians' allegedly in the I-II cc. In fact it took place in the XIII century in the epoch of the Trojan War. That is why when after some time the czars established the religious Gladiator Games, there were two kinds

of the bloody performances provisioned for in them . The first – the fight between two groups of warriors representing Passions of Christ, his execution and the Trojan War as revenge. The second type – the warriors fighting wild animals. Here they represented the hunting of the Apostolic Christians as admonition.

The reports from the 'ancient' sources become clear telling us that 'frequently among the condemned (from whom the gladiators were also recruited – Author) were the CHRISTIANS REFUSING TO BESTOW GOD LIKE HONORS UPON THE EMPEROR' [589:1], p.163. It is all clear. The Gladiator contests with the animals is a form of execution of the Apostolic Christians who renounced the divinity of the Roman emperors, beside Andronicus-Christ.

#### **44. WHAT WE LEARNT ABOUT THE XVI-XVII CC. FROM THE 'ANCIENT' SOURCES.**

In [fig.70](#) we sum up our studies of the 'ancient' epoch of Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian, Titus and Domitian. There is demonstrated an overlapping between the Roman Emperors and the Russian czars and rulers [RI], ch.12.

Galba <---> Simeon + Prince Dmitry (under Feodor Ioannovich),

Otho <---> Boris Godunov,

Vitellius <---> False Dmitry I,

Vespasian <---> Vasilli Shuisky,

Titus <---> Skopin-Shuisky

Domitian <---> False Dmitry II + Mikhail Romanov and also: King Herod + Andronicus-Christ.

Slanting broken arrows on the picture represent the overlapping of the 'ancient' and Russian rulers. The 'ancient' biography of Domitian is split into four parts, marked in [fig.70](#) by the numbers 1,2,3,4.

Part 1 describes False Dmitry II, part 2 – Mikhail Romanov; part 3 describes King Herod from the XII century; part 4 tells us of Andronicus-Christ from the XII century. Feodor Ioannovich is lightly reflected in the works of the 'ancient classics'. Possibly as a result of circumstances, is made note of in the Romanov version as well. Feodor was perceived as a weak ruler who was under the strong influence of Boris Godunov. Probably for the 'ancient' authors Feodor's reign was 'covered' with the reign of Boris Godunov, who is reflected in their accounts under the name of Emperor Otho. On the other hand during Feodor's reign the infamous murder of Prince Dmitry took place, which was brought to the notice of the 'ancient' chroniclers and which was described by them in detail [RI]. As a result, Boris Godunov's strong personality and Dmitry's death, which astounded many, obscured the 'fainter Feodor Ioannovich in the eyes of

the 'ancient' chroniclers.

In the epoch, reflected in [fig.70](#), the correspondence between the duration of the reigns is greatly distorted. It is clear. As the subject matter is the Time of Troubles, the descriptions of which are muddled up and also distorted by the Romanov historians. Chaos in history bred chaos in the chronicles. At the same time the overall duration of the Time of Troubles – approximately 30 years – is the same both in the 'ancient' and in the Russian sources. Here we speak of the epoch of the 1584 -1613. After all the chronology generally survives, though the details got substantially deformed.

In [fig.71](#) and [fig.72](#) is represented a scheme of parallelism found by us, between the Russian czars-khans of 1530-1620 and the 'Ancient' Roman emperors of the Second Roman Empire of allegedly I century. We can clearly see that beginning with Fedor Ioannovich Russia-Horde plunges into the gravest strife. If prior to 1584 the correspondence of the durations of the reigns on the whole is not bad, then post 1584 the chroniclers start to get seriously confused. In particular, they 'compress' in time some of the reigns [RI], ch.12.

In [fig.73](#) it is shown which epochs of the Russian-Horde history are described by Suetonius and Tacitus. Above are marked the reigns from Ivan IV to Mikhail Romanov. Below is indicated under which names they were reflected in works by Suetonius and Tacitus. Starting with a short biography of Augustus, Tacitus in detail tells us the story of the 'Ancient' Rome, i.e. Russia-Horde from the Seven Boyars of the first half of the XVI century to Vasily Shuiskii (Vespasian) and Skopin-Shuiskii (Titus). The Emperor Mikhail Romanov (Domitian) is not reflected by Tacitus any more. In other words, Cornelius Tacitus cut his narration short approximately at the year 1610.

Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus spans a slightly longer time interval. He begins with Julius Caesar and Augustus. Then he moves on to Tiberius (Ivan the Terrible) and continues his narration up to Domitian (Mikhail Romanov). Thus Suetonius advances slightly further than Tacitus, about ten years, and stops approximately at the year 1620, having illuminated the first part of Mikhail Romanov's reign.

The two initial biographies – of Julius Caesar and Augustus – in the book by Suetonius are represented on the left in [fig.73](#) by two triangles. In a similar way on the right are marked the fragments from his book referring to the last two plots from Domitian's 'biography'. To recap, here are described King Herod and Andronicus-Christ. In this place Suetonius skips back in time: from the XVII century into the XII century.

Besides, in [fig.73](#) there is also shown 'volume (in years) of the description' by Suetonius of the various emperors-czars. To clarify. Suetonius' book consists of 12

'biographies', from Julius Caesar to Domitian. We calculated the volume (in pages) of each 'biography'. Having divided the resulting volume of life description by the number of years which each given czar reigned (according to the chronology of the Russian history) we received an average number of pages allocated by Suetonius for each year of his reign, [fig.73](#). For example, the volume of description about Tiberius is not great, but, let's say, about Caligula – rather large. Here we fall back on the fact that the Roman emperors are the reflections of the Russian czars. That is why, when calculating, the reign duration was taken as specified in the Russian sources.

In the case with Tacitus we did not calculate the volume of accounts, as in his work the life stories of the emperors are closely intertwined, and it is difficult to calculate their volume. That is why in [fig.73](#) the chronological disposition of Tacitus' work is represented by a horizontal line of uniform thickness.

So, as it follows from [fig.73](#), the main bulk of books by Suetonius and Tacitus is dedicated to the second half of the XVI – early XVII century. Beyond this epoch remain just the biographies of Caesar, Augustus and the last part of Domitian's 'biography'. All these fragments date from the second half of the XII to early XIII century.

We can see that for Suetonius, Tacitus and Flavius the events of the XVI-XVII cc. were vital. They wrote keenly, taking everything close to heart. It is understandable. They lived in the turbulent times of the Reformation and the events of their generations and the preceding one's were of the utmost importance to them.

In [fig.74](#) see the general picture of the parallelism which we discovered [RI], ch.12.

On the left are depicted the Second Rome and the Third Roman Empires spanning the period from the I century BC to the middle of the VI century (in Scaligerian dating).

On the right there is shown the chronology of Czar-Grad and the Russian-Horde Kingdom from 1000 to 1620. Between the dates on the right and on the left there is an approximately 1050 years shift. It is one of the main shifts discovered by A.T.Fomenko [1v], [2v]. To remind, the Second Rome and the Third Rome are the phantom reflections of the 'Mongol' Empire of the XIII-XVII cc. Therefore they duplicate each other to a great extent.

In [fig. 74](#) we can see that with a shift of approximately 1050 years the dates of the Battle of Kulikovo of 1380 and the 'ancient' battle between Constantine and Maxentius of allegedly 312 perfectly coincide [TsRIM], [ZA].

THE CONCLUSIONS. The 'Ancient' Roman history of the I century is a phantom reflection of the events of the XVI-XVII cc. unfolded in Russia-Horde, the metropoly of the Great Empire. The Russian sovereign rulers – 'Ivan the Terrible', Dmitry, Godunov, 'False Dmitry', Vasily Shuisky, Prince Skopin-Shuisky, czar Mikhail

Romanov – reflected in the 'ancient world' are the famous emperors Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian, Titus and Domitian.

The works of Publius Cornelius Tacitus, Gaius Suetonius Tranquillus and Titus Flavius Josephus narrate the events of the XVI-XVII cc. unfolding mainly in Russia-Horde and Western Europe. These 'ancient writers' lived in the epoch of the XVII century. The events of the Reformation mattered deeply to them. They witnessed the grandiose turning point in history – the breakup of the Great Empire.

## **45. THE 'MOST ANCIENT' IRANIAN EPIC POEM SHAHNAMEH IS THE CHRONICLE OF THE GREAT EMPIRE OF XII-XVII CC.**

The poet Ferdowsi is considered to be the author of the 'ancient' long epic poem – Persian Shahnameh (six large volumes in the academic edition) – the crowning glory of world culture. The surviving manuscripts of Shahnameh happen to be written not earlier than the XIII-XIV cc [ShAH], ch.1. The full text allegedly was created in the XV century. Beginning with the XVI century allegedly the Shahnameh epic poem becomes fairly well-known. Europe became acquainted with the epic poem only in the XVIII century. However, even in the XIX century various versions of Shahnameh were still circulating. Taking into account our knowledge of the dates shifting by 100, 300, 400 years, it appears that the epic poem Shahnameh was compiled and eventually written down not earlier than the XVI-XVII cc. It was based on the Persian legends of the XII-XVI cc. We are told that the original sources, which Shahnameh is based on, were 'for some reason' destroyed. It is possible that the editors who were creating Shahnameh in the XVII-XVIII cc. based it on the Old Iranian chronicles and adapted them in the Reformist way. We are already familiar with this by the example of Herodotus, Plutarch, Thucydides, Tacitus, Titus Livy, Suetonius, Xenophon, Aristophanes and others. After editing, the old texts were either destroyed (in order to conceal the true story), or were treated as worthless rubbish, and therefore the chronicles were abandoned and soon disintegrated.

The epic poem Shahnameh is sometimes called Iranian and sometimes Persian. We use both terms without disputing them.

We discovered that the beginning of Shahnameh consists of the seven repeated accounts about one and the same Emperor Andronicus-Christ. He is reflected as the 'ancient' Iranian kings: Abu-Mansur, Keyumars, Siyamak, Jamshid, Merdas, Zahhak,

Fereydun. Whereas the Iranian king Husheng is Achilles, aka Siegfried. To remind you, Achilles and Siegfried are the reflections of the Grand Prince Sviatoslav.

The Battle of Kulikovo of 1380 turns out to be one of the most famous events in the Old Iranian chronicle of the Empire. The 'ancient' Iranian king Fereydun is the reflection of the Russian Prince Dmitry Donskoy. Furthermore, the well-known inventor of gun powder – Berthold Schwarz – is the reflection of The Venerable Sergius of Radonezh (Sergey Radonezhsky), who invented gunpowder and cannons, on the pages of the Western-European chronicles. The legendary 'ancient' Iranian Kave the Blacksmith is also the reflection of Sergius of Radonezh.

'Ancient' Iranian heroes Zal and young Rustam are two other partial reflections of the Emperor Andronicus-Christ (Andrey Bogolyubskii) from the XII century. The legend of Zal and Rudaba is a reflection of the legend of the Holy Spirit, Christ and Virgin Mary Mother of God. The Annunciation, Immaculate Conception and caesarean section are all mentioned in the Shahnameh. The young Rustam is described as the 'Greek Hercules', i.e. once again as Andronicus-Christ.

The four reflections of the story of Esther (Elena Volshanka) from the XVI and also Ivan the Terrible's Livonian War appeared on the pages of the 'ancient' Persian epic poem Shahnameh. Besides, Ferdowsi describes Andrey Kurbsky's betrayal and the construction of Moscow as The Empire's capital. Where adult Rustam is the reflection of Ivan the Terrible and his son Sohrab is the reflection of Ivan the Young, Ivan the Terrible's son.

The story of Prince Kurbsky is given a detailed account by Ferdowsi as a tale of 'Siyavush' who changed sides from his king to his opponents. It takes place in the beginning of the Livonian War between Ivan the Terrible and Western Europe, which was reflected in Shahnameh. It also describes the fear of Western Europe before the invasion of Ivan the Terrible's army and the treachery of Prince Kurbsky.

The construction of Moscow – as a capital – by Ivan the Terrible is described in the Shahnameh as the creation of the Turanian capital 'Gong', and also the building of the city of 'Siavashgird' ("the round city of Siavash", and Gong ("Giant") Castle –Tr.)

Furthermore the Livonian War and the Times of Troubles in Russia in the XVI-XVII cc. are described by Ferdowsi as the 'ancient' wars between Iran and Tiran. The Turanian King Afrasiab is a reflection of Ivan the Terrible and Boris Godunov. The Russian-Horde Prince Dmitry, falsely declared by the Romanovs as an Impostor, is presented in the Shahnameh as the rightful 'ancient' king Kai (or Kay) Khosrow. Besides, information about Ivan the Terrible (= Vasili the Blessed) are incorporated

into the ending of the story about Kai Khosrow once again. Several reflections of the Livonian War and several reflections of the correspondence between Ivan the Terrible and Andrey Kurbsky on the pages of the Shahnameh are very interesting.

The Madness of Kai Khosrow is the madness of Ivan the Terrible = the biblical Nebuchadnezzar = the Emperor Charles. King Khosrow displaying and then giving his treasures away is a famous scene shortly preceding Ivan the 'Terrible's death [ShAH], ch.6. The Iranian story of the most 'ancient' king Gushtasp is another narration about False Dmitry from the early XVII century [ShAH], ch.7. The construction of the 'Crystal Town' under Persian king Lohrasp (Ivan the 'Terrible') is the erection of the Moscow Kremlin.

The 'ancient' Zoroastrianism is Royal Christianity of the XII-XIII cc. and the Russian Orthodox Christianity up until the XVII century. Presumably Zoro-astr = Czar of the East is another reflection of Andronicus-Christ. Perhaps, the name Zar=Astr was interpreted also as Czar-Star, as ASTRA means a 'star'. It is appropriate for Christ, who sometimes was called the Sun, and with whose Nativity the flare of the Star of Bethlehem is associated. This star was included in the symbol of Czar-Grad and later became a part of the Symbolism of Islam: a crescent and a star.

So, the ancient Persian (P-Russian) Cult of Fire originated in Royal Christianity of the XII-XIII cc. and was an important part of the Russian Orthodox Christianity up until the XVII century. It was abolished after the XVII century church reform in Russia. But in some provinces of the Great Empire, in particular on the territory of modern Iran (Persia), it has transformed, absorbed some local traditions and existed up until the XIX-XX cc., giving rise to the contemporary sects of Zoroastrianism. Today the archaeologists and historians when discovering traces of the cult in Iran and its neighbouring countries erroneously date them to the deepest antiquity and think that it was here that at some point that Zoroastrianism originated. It is a misconception based on the incorrect Scaligerian chronology and geography.

The Iranian Prince Goshtasp – the son of Lohrasp (Ivan the 'Terrible') – is Prince Dmitry, who was later declared by the Romanovs to be an Imposter. The Prince's flight from his motherland to its enemies. The Prince's wandering. The marriage of the fugitive prince to a daughter of the foreign ruler. The 'ancient' Princess Ketayun (or Myrin?) is Marina Mnishek from the XVII century.

Unlike the Romanov version the Iranian Epos clearly states that the fugitive Prince Goshtasp (Dmitry) was never an imposter. He was a genuine prince, a son of the king Lohrasp. This perfectly corresponds with our results, according to which 'False' Dmitry was the true son of Ivan the Terrible. Thus we yet again catch the Romanov

editors red handed. The distortion introduced by them vividly surfaces when compared with the independent sources.

The beginning of the military invasion of Dmitry into Russia in the XVII century is described in the Shahnameh as the 'Goshtasp slaying a wolf-dragon', and also as the 'second fight of Goshtasp with the dragon'.

Prince Goshtasp returns to Iran, replaces Lohrasp and becomes the King of Iran. Here is given an account of the Time of Troubles in Russia: the sudden death of Boris Godunov and seizure of power by False Dmitry. It could also be a 'peculiar' handover of power to Simeon Bekbulatovich.

Introduction of a new religion - Zoroastrianism - in Iran, which bred disturbance and discontent among the people. It is the reflection of the attempts to introduce Catholicism to Russia in the early XVII century under False Dmitry or the reflection of the story of Esther from the XVI century, when power was seized by the heretics in Russia.

The emergence of Iskandar = Alexander the Great in the epoch of Goshtasp – is the reflection of the sultan Suleiman the Magnificent from the XVI century.

The 'ancient' Persian description of the life of Eskandar (Alexander the Great) is the sum of several layers: first – Andronicus-Christ from the XII century, then – biblical Moses from the XV century and Sultan Mehmed the Conqueror from the XV century, and finally Suleiman the Magnificent from the XVI century.

The siege and conquest of biblical Jericho = Czar-Grad on the Bosphorus with the use of cannons reflected in the life description of Iskandar = Alexander the Great. At the same time we found out what is the famous 'iron wall to defend against Gog and Magog' built by Alexander the Great?

The final part of the 'most ancient' Shahnameh narrates about the events of the XVII-XVIII cc., [fig.75](#), [fig.76](#) [ShAH], ch.9.

## **46. FORTY NINE REFLECTIONS OF IVAN THE TERRIBLE WHICH WE DISCOVERED IN THE SCALIGERIAN HISTORY.**

IVAN IV VASILIEVICH THE TERRIBLE 1533-1547-1584. In fact under the one name the 'Terrible' there are four Czars-Khans put together. They are – Ivan IV 1547-1553, then Dmitry 1553-1563, then Ivan V 1563-1572, and finally Simeon (Sain-



Bulat) Bekbulatovich (the royal name - Ivan) 1572-1584 [4v]. The following personas are the phantom reflections.

1) IVAN III VASILIEVICH GROZNY (THE TERRIBLE) THE GREAT 1462-1505.

2) VASILI BLAZHENY (BASIL THE BLESSED OR FOOL FOR CHRIST) (aka PARFENII YURODIVY (THE HOLY FOOL) – allegedly Ivan The Terrible's pseudonym), i.e. THE BLESSED CZAR (and also holy IVAN THE BLESSED, Moscow miracle-worker – is the reflection of Ivan IV (1547-1553). Czar Ivan IV in the end of his life, in 1553, fell ill, withdrew from state affairs and became a blessed fool. [4], [6v].

3) VSEVOLOD 1139-1146 in Kievan Rus' (Kiev Russia). The reflection of Ivan IV 1547-1553. This is the first phase of the 'Terrible Czar' [4v].

4) IZYASLAV 1146-1155 (1154) in Kievan Rus'. The reflection of minor Dmitry 1553-1563. This is the second phase of the 'Terrible Czar'.

6) YURI DOLGORUKIY 1148-1157 (partial) in Kievan Rus'. The reflection of adolescent Czar Ivan; during his reign the Zakharyin-Yurievs and the oprichnina 1563-1572. This is the third phase of the 'Terrible Czar'.

4) MSTISLAV IZYASLAVOVICH + IZYASLAV DAVYDOVICH 1157-1169 in Kievan Rus'. The reflection of Simeon-Ivan 1572-1584. This is the fourth and final phase of the 'Terrible'.

5) VASILI III (partial) – the Russian-Horde Czar-Khan, the XV century [6v].

6) IVAN OVCHINA (Obolenskii-Telepnev) (partial), Elena Glinskaya's favourite, the XV century [6v].

7) VSEVOLOD YAROSLAVICH, erroneously dated to the XI century [4], [7v1].

8) CASIMIR LITOVSKY (CASIMIR OF LITHUANIA) [4v], [7v1]. 9) CHARLES V 1519-1556 according to [304], v.3, p.27, or 1519-1558 according to [76]. Allegedly 'Western-European' Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire [6].

10) FERDINAND of HABSBURG 1558-1564 according to [76].

11) MAXIMILLIAN II 1564-1576, the reflection of Khan Simeon [7v1].

12) FREDERICK I BARBAROSSA – the 'German' Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, allegedly years 1125-1152-1190 [6v].

13) FREDERICK II – the German Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, allegedly years 1194-1211-1250 [6v].

- 14) FREDERICK III of HABSBURG 1440-1493 according to [76], [7v1].
- 15) NEBUCHADNEZZAR – a famous 'ancient' Assyrian and Babylonian king, described in the Bible [6v].
- 16) ARTAXERXES I LONGIMANUS (= DOLGORUKII (translates as LONG HAND) (his other names are: ASVER, ASSWER (or Ahasverus? Achashverosh? Ahasweros?) AND ASSUERUS) – famous 'ancient' king of Persia. Described in the Bible [6v].
- 17) ARTAXERXES II MNEMON (ARSICAS, OARSES) – king of Persia, allegedly a 'grandson' of King Artaxerxes Longimanus (Artaxerxes I). Described by Plutarch [6v].
- 18) PTOLEMY II PHILADELPHUS (partial) – 'ancient-Egypt' king [6v].
- 19) QUETZALCOATL – Mediaeval king of the American K'iche' Maya Indians and a Toltec king [ZA], ch.8.
- 20) BELSHAZZAR (OR BALTHAZAR) – a king of Babylon and Persia who 'saw the writing on the wall'. Described in the Bible [6v]. 21) THE ELDER who made an attempt to falsely accuse the beautiful Susanna of promiscuity (or Shoshana). Described in the Bible Book of Daniel [6v].
- 22) TIMUR - TAMERLANE (partial) – the famous conqueror [6v].
- 23) MEHMED II THE CONQUEROR (partial, the XV century [6v], [PRRK], ch.4.
- 24) HENRY II DUKE OF ORLEANS – King of France, the XVI century [7v1].
- 25) HENRY VIII (A BLUEBEARD) – the English king (1509-1547) [7v1], [ShEK], ch.5.
- 26) MAXIMILIAN II - as Western-European reflection of Khan Simeon-Ivan Beckbulatovich [7v1].
- 27) In the history of 'Ancient' Rome Ivan the Terrible is reflected as a 'quartet'; of famous emperors: TIBERIUS + CALIGULA + CLAUDIUS + NERO [1v]. Essentially parallels between them are as follows; (though here and there is some confusion), see paragraphs 28-31: Ivan Blazhenny (the Blessed) 1547-1553; Dmitry Ivanovich 1553-1563; Ivan Ivanovich 1563-1572; Simeon-Ivan Beckbulatovich 1572-1584. It appears that in the 'classic ancient' literature they are reflected as:
  - 28) TIBERIUS, allegedly (years) 14-37,
  - 29) CALIGULA, allegedly (years) 37-41,

30) CLAUDIUS, allegedly (years) 41-54,

31) NERO, allegedly (years) 54-68.

Certain elements of 'Ivan the Terrible's life descriptions are fantastically played out between these four phantoms sometimes in a contravention of chronology. But on the whole the stream of the main events remained intact [RI].

32) HENRY IV, allegedly 1053-1106 [1v].

33) PARIKSHIT – the 'ancient' Indian rajah, a king of the Ikshvaku dynasty. Described in the Indian Epic the Mahabharata [KAZ], ch.1.

34) CAMBYSES - a famous king of 'ancient' Persia (son of Cyrus). Described by Herodotus [za], ch.5. To clarify. Cambyses (or Cyrus), the king of Persia – is Ivan the Terrible or Ivan the Younger, and the Egyptian princess Nitesis is Esther = Elena Voloshanka. The successful Egyptian campaign of 'ancient' Cambyses is either the conquest of Czar-Grad in 1453 or the conquest of Kazan in 1552. The siege and crushing defeat of Memphis by king Cambyses is the siege and defeat of Kazan by Ivan the Terrible. The destiny of Psammetichus, king of Egypt is the reflection of the fate of Khan Ediger of Kazan who was captured by Ivan the Terrible. The treason of 'ancient' Phanes is Prince Kurbskys treason. Cambyses' insanity is the 'madness' of Ivan the Terrible. King Cambyses' failed military campaigns is the unsuccessful Livonian War of Ivan the Terrible. Death of Prince Dmitry – Ivan the Terrible's co-ruler – is described by Herodotus as Smerdis' death, who was seated at the royal throne in Cambyses' 'dream'. The story of the Russian metropolitan Phillip was also vividly reflected on the pages of Herodotus' 'Histories'. Hordian False Dmitry from the early XVII century and the beginning of the Times of Troubles in Russia-Horde was described by Herodotus in considerable detail.

It is curious that Herodotus' point of view on 'False' Dmitry is close to that of the Romanovs'. It appears that the Western-European Herodotus used a version invented by the Romanovs for both external and domestic use. By the way, Dmitry's mother, in monasticism Marfa, and Marina Mnisheck from the XVII century, False Dmitry's wife, are both described by 'classic' Herodotus in his famous 'Histories' under the same name of Fedima, the wife of False Smerdis. Preksasp, an 'ancient' Persian, whom Herodotus is telling us about, is also the reflection of Vasili Shuisky and clerk Timofei Osipov from early XVII century.

Finally, the 'classic' story by Herodotus about the death of a noble Persian Intaphrenes is a story about the death of the famous Prince Skopin-Shuisky in 1610.

35) XERXES – the famous 'ancient' Persian king (the king of kings) [ZA], ch.7. The famous Greco-Persian war of allegedly the V century BC and Xerxes' failed punitive campaign in Hellas – is the lost Livonian war of Ivan the Terrible from the XVI century. Consequently the last three books of the 'Histories' by Herodotus were devoted to the second, but this time a more detailed account of Ivan the Terrible's Livonian war.

To elaborate. The preliminary suppression of the revolt in Egypt is Ivan the Terrible's conquest of Kazan. The debates between Xerxes' councillors on the expedience of the campaign in Hellas are the debates in Ivan the Terrible's court on the subjects of the declaration of the Livonian war. The short lived accession to the Russian throne of Simeon Beckbulatovich is the temporary accession to the Persian throne of Artabanus. Xerxes' famous bridge crossing the Hellespont is Ivan the Terrible's crossing of the Volga. The death of the 300 famous Spartans of king Leonidas is the death of the Mediaeval detachment of the knights (the members of the Livonian order) of commander-in-chief Philipp Bell. 'Ancient' Thermopylae is the Western-European Fellin (Viljandi castle – Tr.). Spartan King Leonidas is the German commander in chief Philip Bell, and the perished Spartans are perished German knights. 'Ancient' traitor Demaratus at Xerxes' court is Prince Andrey Kurbsky who betrayed Ivan the Terrible. The Spartan King Cleomenes is another reflection of Ivan the Terrible.

The famous Cossack chieftain Yermak Timofeyev from the second half of the XVI century was described by Herodotus as a Spartan Prince Dorieus, a half-brother to King Cleomenes = Ivan the Terrible. The heart of the chronicle account of Yermak's conquest of Siberia is the colonization of America by Russia and the Ottoman Empire (Atamania) in the XV-XVI cc.

Xerxes' retreat from Hellas is Ivan the Terrible's army's retreat from Livonia. The Persians' defeat in the Battle of Plataea is the defeat of the Russians at Polotsk. Death of the Persian general Mardonius is the death of notorious Malyuta Skuratov. He is the very same biblical Holofernes. The 'ancient' Persian Tiribaz during the rule of Artaxerxes is another reflection of Prince Andrey Kurbsky in the pages of Plutarch.

36) ARTABANUS – the chief official of Xerxes, who was temporarily enthroned by Xerxes, is a reflection of Khan Simeon Beckbulatovich, i.e. 'the fourth period of the Terrible Czar' [ZA], ch.7.

37) CLEOMENES – 'ancient' Spartan king. Described by Herodotus [ZA], ch.7.

- 38) JUAN (KHAN) MILLAN – an old mad astrologer, who authoritatively influenced' Governor Diego Velasquez during the expedition of conquistador Cortes (Ataman Yermak) to America [ZA], ch.8.
- 39) FRANCESCILIO – 'an old lunatic' who 'strongly influenced' the Governor Diego Velasquez. Mentioned by Bernal Diaz [ZA], ch.8.
- 40) INCITATUS – THE 'HORSE' of the Roman emperor Caligula, which he 'introduced to the senate'. It is the reflection of Khan Simeon Beckbulatovich (of Ivan the Terrible) [RI], ch.5.
- 41) GALBA (partial) – 'Ancient' Roman Emperor [RI], ch.7.
- 42) ROSTAM or RUSTAM (partial) is the epic Persian 'ancient' hero. Described in the Epic of Shahnameh [ShAH], ch.5.
- 43) KEY KAVUS – 'ancient' Iranian shah (a mythological shah of Iran) [ShAH], ch.5.
- 44) AFRASIAB (partial) – 'ancient' shah of Turan. Described in the Epic Shahnameh [ShAH], ch.5.
- 45) KAI KHOSROW (OR KAY KHOSROW) – 'ancient' Iranian shah [ShAH], ch.5.
- 46) LOHRASP (partial) – 'ancient' Iranian shah, Khan Simeon Beckbulatovich's duplicate, i.e. the 'fourth period' of Ivan the Terrible, ch.5.
- 47) KING LEAR (LEIR) – 'ancient' English ruler described by Geoffrey of Monmouth (Latin: Galfridus Monemutensis – Tr.) and Shakespeare [ShAK], ch.1.
- 48) THE FOOL, who accompanies King Lear is the reflection of Parfeny Yurodivy (Parthenius the Fool-in-Christ) - the name given to Ivan the Terrible at Baptising (Vasily Blazhenny – Basil the Blessed or Holy Fool for Christ). Later the historians erroneously decided that this name was Ivan the Terrible's 'pseudonym' [ShAK], ch.1.
- 49) DUKE OF ALBANY (partial) - a contemporary of King Lear, [ShAK], ch.1.

## **47. FOURTEEN REFLECTIONS OF THE LAWFUL WIFE OF IVAN THE TERRIBLE.**

'Either Seven or six wives of Ivan the Terrible' (Anastasia Zakharyina Romanova; Princess Kucenej, who after her baptism into the Russian Orthodox Christianity, took the name of Maria; Marfa Sobakina; Anna Koltovskaya; Anna Vasilchikova; Vasilisa Melentyeva; Maria Dolgorukaya; Maria Nagaya) are: ONE wife of Ivan IV the Terrible – Anastasia Romanova, b) THREE wives of his son Ivan Ivanovich, c) ONE

wife of Czar Fedor – Irina Godunova, d) ONE or TWO wives of Khan Simeon-Ivan. The following characters are the phantom reflections:

- 1) SOFIA PALAIOLOGINA – the wife of Ivan III the Terrible, pushed aside by Elena Voloshanka [6v].
- 2) VASHTI – the 'ancient' queen, the wife of the King Artaxerxes of Persia, later she was pushed aside by Esther [6v].
- 3) STATEIRA – the first wife of Artaxerxes II Mnemon, allegedly a 'grandson' of King Artaxerxes Makrocheir of Persia. Described by Plutarch.
- 4) CATHERINE DE MEDICI – the famous Queen consort of the 'French' King Henry II, pushed aside by Diane de Poitiers, XVI century [7v1].
- 5) ELIZABETH (I) TUDOR – the famous 'English' queen, 1533-1603 [7v1].
- 6) CATHERINE OF ARAGON (1485 – 1536 Queen from 1509) – wife of the 'English' King Henry VIII, pushed aside by Anne Boleyn (Esther) [7v1], [ShEK], ch.5.
- 7) THE WIFE OF KING CAMBYSES I (OR CYRUS), pushed aside by a young beauty–hetaerae Nitesis (Esther). Described by Herodotus [ZA], ch.5
- 8) (CLAUDIA) OCTAVIA – a noble 'ancient' Roman lady, loyal wife of Emperor Nero (Ivan the Terrible) [RI], ch.2.
- 9) PASIPHAE – the wife of 'ancient' Cretan King Minos [RI], ch.2.
- 10) AGRIPPINA – the wife of Roman Emperor Tiberius [RI], ch.3.
- 11) LAWFUL WIFE of Roman Emperor Caligula [RI], ch.5.
- 12) PLAUTIA URGULANILLA or AELIA PAETINA – two lawful wives of Roman Emperor Claudius, pushed aside later on by the promiscuous Messalina [RI], ch.6.
- 13) JARIREH - a lawful wife of the 'ancient' Iranian Siavash, pushed aside by Ferigees. Described in Epos Shahnameh [ShAKh), ch.5.
- 14) CORDELIA – King Lear's 'daughter', pushed aside by her two 'sisters'. Described by Geoffrey of Monmouth and Shakespeare [ShAK), ch.1.

## **48. THIRTY EIGHT REFLECTIONS OF ELENA VOLOSHANKA = BIBLICAL ESTHER.**

ELENA STEFANOVNA VOLOSHANKA – wife of Czarevich Ivan the Young, son of Czar Ivan III the Terrible [6v]. Her phantom reflections are the following characters.

- 1)ESTHER (HADASSAH) – a Jewess, adopted daughter and a relative of Mordecai, a new wife of Artaxerxes after the banishment of Queen Vashti. Described in the Bible [6v].
- 2)ATOSSA – the second wife of Artaxerxes Mnemnon who replaced Statira. Replaced by Plutarch [6].
- 3)JUDITH – a Jewess, who killed Assyrian general Holofernes. Described in the Bible [6v].
- 4)YAEL – a Jewess, who killed general Sisera(a duplicate of Holofernes) having driven a tent peg (with a mallet) through his temple. Described in the Bible [6v].
- 5)ELENA GLINSKAYA (partial), the wife of Russian Czar-Khan Vasili III, a 'young Lithuanian' [6v].
- 6)WIFE OF YAROPOLK AND VLADIMIR, the Russian princes, allegedly the X century [6v].
- 7)SUSANNA – Biblical beauty, whose honour was besmirched by the two old judges. Described in the Old Testament Book of Daniel [6v].
- 8)JEZEBEL (partial) – Queen of Israel. Described in the Bible [7v1].
- 9)DIANE DE POITIERS, the former Countess de Brézé, the wife of the Grand Sénéchal of Normandy and later – the infamous lover of Henry II, who 'pushed aside' Catherine de Medici [7v1].
- 10)MARY STUART – well-known Queen of Scotland (1542-1587)[7v1].
- 11)ANNE BOLEYN (1507-1536, Queen of England from 1533), originally a lady-in-waiting to Catherine of Aragon, and then a lover and a wife of King Henry VIII 'of England'. She replaced Catherine of Aragon [7v1], [ShAK].
- 12)FROG PRINCESS, at first a lover, and then a wife of the 'Ancient' Indian maharaja Parikshit (= Ivan the Terrible). Described in the Indian Epic the Mahabharata [KAZ], ch.1.
- 13)ISTAR = ISHTAR (ASTARTE) – THE 'Ancient' Babylonian goddess, allegedly the third millennia BC [KAZ], ch.1.
- 14)SUKANYA – the ' Ancient' Indian princess, the honour of which was attempted by the two demigods Ashwini Kumaras. Described in the Indian Epos the Mahabharata [KAZ], ch.1.

- 15)NITETIS – a foreigner-Egyptian, who pushed aside the wife of the King Cambyses (or Cyrus) and became his concubine and wife. Described by Herodotus [ZA], ch.5.
- 16)ATOSSA – a cunning wife of the 'Ancient' Persian King Cambyses II. Described by Herodotus [ZA], ch.5.
- 17)'ANCIENT' NOBLE WOMAN, connected with the death of a Persian military commander Mardonius in Xerxes' army - is the Old Testament Judith, who killed the Assyrian Holofernes = Malyuta Skuratov [ZA], ch.7.
- 18) ARTAINTA – lover of King Xerxes (a young wife of his son Darius), for whom Xerxes sets aside his lawful wife. Described by Herodotus [ZA], ch.7.
- 19)ASENATH (ASENITH) – WIFE OF THE Egyptian courtier (a priest and a prince) Potiphar (Potipherah), second in command after pharaoh in Ancient Egypt. Asenath wished to seduce Biblical Joseph the Fair, but failed. Described in the Bible. Some consider Asenath to be a wife of Joseph and a daughter of Potiphar [PE], ch.5.
- 20)ZULEIKA or RA'IL – wife of Kitfir or Itfir (Biblical Potiphar). Slandered by her Joseph the Fair finds himself in prison. Zuleika is a character from the Arabic and Persian Epic Literature [PE], ch.5.
- 21)AGRIPPINA (partial) – mother of Roman Emperor Nero – the reflection of Elena Glinskaya, mother of Ivan the Terrible. She is also partially – Esther [RI], ch.2.
- 22)POPPAEA SABINA – 'Ancient' Roman noble woman, who pushed aside Octavia, the lawful wife of Emperor Nero (Ivan the Terrible) [RI], ch.2.
- 23)EUNUCH SPORUS 'wife' of Roman Emperor Nero [RI], ch.2.
- 24)ARIADNE – daughter of 'ancient' King Minos [RI], ch.2.
- 25)JULIA – the second wife of Roman Emperor Tiberius, who pushed aside his first wife Agrippina [RI], ch.3.
- 26)DRUSILLA – lover and then wife to Emperor Tiberius, his cousin [RI], ch.5.
- 27)(CASSIUS) CHAEREA – Roman tribune with 'female passwords', who organized a plot against Emperor Caligula and murdered him. Duplicate of the story of Judith who slayed Biblical Holofernes [RI], ch.5.
- 28)VALERIA MESSALINA – well-known harlot, wife of Emperor Claudius, who pushed aside his two previous wives [RI], ch.6.
- 29)FAUSTA – a cunning wife of Emperor Constantine the Great [ShAKh], ch.3.



30)TACHMINA – 'Ancient' Iranian princess, who seduced Rostam the hero (Ivan the Terrible).Described in the Iranian-Persian Epic Shahnameh.

31)GORDAFARID – a cunning Iranian beauty- female warrior, duplicate of Esther and Judith [ShAKh], ch.5.

32)TURANINA BEAUTY, mother of the hero Siavash. Duplicate of the story of Susanna=Esther [ShAKh], ch.5.

33)SUDABEH – wife of the Shah, Kay Kavus, who fell in love with his son and unsuccessfully tries to seduce Siavash. Duplicate of the Biblical story of Joseph the Fair [ShAKh], ch.5.

34)FERIGEES – a new Turanian wife of Iranian Prince Siavash, who pushed aside his lawful wife [ShAKh], ch.5.

35)MENIJEH – beloved of 'Ancient' Iranian knight Bijan [ShAKh], ch.5.

36)GONERIL AND REGAN – the two 'daughters' of King Lear – correspond with a 'bad couple': Elene Voloshanka (aka Biblical Esther) and Ivan the Young, the son of Ivan the Terrible. Here the English chroniclers 'turned' (on paper) a man into a woman [ShAK], ch.1.

37)The last years of CORDELIA'S rule (partial) in the description by Geoffrey of Monmouth (but not by Shakespeare!) – is a version of the story of Elena Glinskaya, i.e. the reflection of Esther (Elena Voloshanka) [ShAK], ch.1.

38) GERTRUDE (partial) – mother of Prince Hamlet. Described by Saxo Grammaticus and William Shakespeare [ShAK], ch.2.

## **49. ELEVEN REFLECTIONS OF ANDREY KURBSKY.**

Prince ANDREY KURBSKY, originally a friend, but later the enemy of Ivan IV the Terrible. The following characters are his phantom reflections.

1)ACHIOR – Assyrian military official who betrayed Nebuchadnezzar and general Holophernes. Described in the Bible in the Book of Judith [6v].

2)MAURICE OF SAXONY – Elector. At first he was one of the closest supporters of Emperor Charles V, but later became his enemy [7v1].

3)PHANES – a military commander of the 'Ancient' Persian King Cambyses, who betrayed him during the conquest of Egypt. Described by Herodotus [ZA], ch.5.

- 4) DEMARATUS – 'ancient' courtier, traitor in the court of King Xerxes of Persia. He betrayed the king during the war between the Persians and the Greeks [ZA], ch.7.
- 5) DEMARATUS, the son of Ariston, the second Spartan King, who was at the head of the Lacedaemonian army together with Cleomenes (= Ivan the Terrible). Later Demaratus became the enemy of King Cleomenes. Described by Herodotus [ZA], ch.7.
- 6) TIRIBAZ – 'ancient' Persian courtier under Artaxerxes, who betrayed the king. Described by Herodotus [ZA], ch.7.
- 7) CORBULO – 'Ancient' Roman military commander in the army of Emperor Nero during the seizure of Artaxata (= Kazan) [RI], ch.2.
- 8) And once again CORBULO, but this time in the biography of Emperor Claudius, yet another reflection of Ivan the Terrible [RI], ch.6.
- 9) VINDEK – 'ancient' military commander, who betrayed Nero [RI], ch.2.
- 10) ARTABANUS (partial) – King of Parthia. His correspondence with Tiberius [RI], ch.3.
- 11) SIAVASH (PARTIAL) – Iranian Prince, defecting from his king to his enemies. Correspondence between Siavash (=Kurbasky) and the Shah Kay Kavus (= Ivan the Terrible) [ShAKh], ch.5.

## **50. THE ASTRONOMICAL DATING OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY.**

1. (1513) HERCULES ZODIAC GP – TWELVE LABOURS OF HERCULES. It appears that the 'classical' descriptions of labours of Hercules recorded the details of the location of the planets in the Zodiac. The Myths of Europa, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact: 17-21 November 1513 [GRK], ch.2.
2. (1524) ZODIAC PD OF GIUSTO FROM PADUA = THE BAPTISTERY ZODIAC.  
Depicted on the Christian fresco, which is a part of the painting in the dome drum of the Baptistery. Italy, Padua, the Baptistery, allegedly 1378. In fact: the 7 March 1524 [TsRIM]ch.1.
3. (1526) ZODIAC PG OF IVAN IV THE TERRIBLE. Russia, Moscow. The zodiac is depicted on the Czar's throne. It is portable royal throne in the form of an armchair with armrests entirely covered with carved plates of ivory. The throne is kept in the Armoury Chamber of the Moscow Kremlin. The astronomical dating of the

horoscope: 9 February 1526 [RI], ch.2, [ERIZ]. Compiling Birthday horoscopes was popular in XVI-XVII cc. in Western Europe. The astrologers were exceptionally zealous in compiling horoscopes for the rulers. That is why it is most likely that in this case on the Czar's throne a horoscope for his birthday is also depicted. It appears that Czar Ivan IV was born on the 9 February 1526. But then it emerges that Ivan IV was born four years earlier than is thought today. This fact points out that the Russian chronicles in existence today are the later editions manufactured in the XVII-XVIII cc. amongst the narrow circle of forgers. The Romanovs, the usurpers, required such a version of Russian history, one which would justify their right to the throne and would simultaneously compliment the all European programme of historical distortion. The Romanovs of the XVII-XVIII cc. were the Western minions on the Russian throne and depended entirely on West Europe.

4. (1546) ZODIAC DP OF HENRY II AND DIANE DE POITIERS. Depicted on the old French Gobelin tapestry. France, allegedly circa 1550. Astronomical dating: 28 February – 1 March 1546 [ERIZ].

5. (1586 or 1289) ZODIAC RS FROM PHARAOH RAMSES VI TOMB. The image on the ceiling of the burial chamber. 'Ancient' Egypt, Luxor, the Valley of the Kings, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact – the first solution: 4-5 February 1289; the second solution: 20-21 February according to Julian Calendar 1586 [NHE].

# **Chapter 7. THE EPOCH OF THE XVII CENTURY.**

## **1. THE FAILED ATTEMPT OF THE RESTORATION AND THE NEW HEIGHT OF THE UNREST. THE ROMANOVS RISE TO POWER.**

For some time the revolt in Russia-Horde is worn down. The Oprichnina is destroyed and the Horde power is temporarily, for approximately 25-30 years, restored under the rule of the branch of the old Horde dynasty. It comprises – Simeon-Ivan, followed by Feodor Ivanovich, and then Boris 'Godunov'.

However it was too late. The Protestants firmly established themselves at the Russian-Horde royal court. It is shortly followed by a new large scale revolt of the early XVII c. The Protestant party regains power once again. The royal throne is seized by the Romanovs, their undisguised minion. But resistance of the remnants of Russia-Horde continues up until the end of the XVIII c. (Pugachev's Rebellion).

Horde's penultimate attempt to return to power was the so called 'Razin Uprising', which in fact was a war between the two splinter-states of the former Empire.

Namely between Moscow state, where the Romanovs (the rebel boyars) were already in power, and the South Russian Astrakhan state, where the descendants of the Horde dynasty still remained in command. Stepan Timofeyevich Razin was Commander of the Astrakhan Horde army. The Romanovs heavily relied on the military support of Western Europe. Their most reliable troops were Reiter regiments, streltsy (riflemen) comprised of Western mercenaries [4v1], ch.9:4. The war ends with the defeat of the Horde army and the incorporation of the Astrakhan Czardom to Moscow.

Nevertheless there still remained a vast Russian Horde Kingdom cutting across the whole of Siberia, the Far East and the most significant part of the North American continent. It was called Muscovite (or Russian) Tartary. It was conquered by the Romanovs and the United States only at the end of the XVIII c., following the Romanovs' victory over 'Pugachev' [4v1], ch.11:2.

Thus, in 1605 The Time of Troubles began in Russia. In 1613 a sharp turning point took place – the pro-Western dynasty of the Romanovs-Zakharyin-Yurievs' ascent to the throne.

The Romanovs banished the Cossack Horde from Moscovy. This was the end of the Old Russian dynasty. The remains of the defiant troops of the Old Empire were pushed away from Moscovy. As a result today we see the Cossack regions not in the centre of Russia, but far away. All of these Cossack regions are the legacy of Russia-

Horde. For example, Kazakhstan is simply Cossack-Stan, i.e. a Cossack region, a Cossack site.

As a result of the Romanovs' open pro-Western policy and the weakening of Russia itself, the 'Mongol' Empire splits into several states – Russia, Turkey, Austria, Germany, Italy, Poland, Switzerland, Denmark, France, Spain, Egypt, England, Middle East, Persia, China, Japan, India, America and some other European, Asian and African countries, [fig.77](#).

## **2. THE TURNING OF THE ROMANOV'S RUSSIA AND TURKEY AGAINST EACH OTHER AS THE TWO HALVES OF THE FORMER EMPIRE.**

But for Western Europe there still existed the danger of overcoming the crisis in Russia. The success of the Reformation rebellion was not secured and largely depended on the caprice of the Moscow Czar Romanov, though he was the ally of Western Europe. He might be a supporter today, but tomorrow he might change his mind. Besides there is still Turkey, which wasn't subjected to any damaging defeat at all.

Western Europe – the epicentre of the rebellion – does its best not to allow even a possibility of the restoration of the Great Empire. Not being capable of succeeding it via a military route, the Western politicians emphasised the diplomatic work. They wanted to split the former union of Russia and the Ottoman Empire (Atamania), and to set them against each other.

Let us recall that Russia and The Ottoman Empire up until the XVII c. were parts of the same state. In particular, Zaporozhean Cossacks freely moved between Russia and Turkey serving in turn the Czar or the sultan, without considering such changes to be treacherous.

In the end the relations between Russia and Turkey got spoiled, but not in the least on religious grounds. In Russia, prior to the Romanovs, Muslims were not persecuted, and the Russian Orthodox were not persecuted in The Ottoman Empire. But as soon as the Romanovs' regime strengthened, they started the wars with Turkey which lasted with intervals over the entire 300 years of the Romanovs' reign. It was for the purpose of the ideological support of these wars that the slogan 'archetypal religious discord' between the two countries was introduced.

Let's remember that the famous Turkish Janissaries, the elite infantry units that formed the Ottoman Sultan's household troops, consisted mainly of the Balkan Slavs [4v1]. The popular belief, that allegedly they were 'taken captive as infants', is not accurate. As in Russia at that time, the conscription of one tenth of the population into

the Cossack army was a lawful 'tagma'— a part of the national service, similar rules presumably applied in the Ottoman Empire. 'Taken captives' has nothing to do with it.

### **3. DIPLOMATIC SUCCESS OF THE REFORMATION.**

So, the Romanovs come to power in Russia. The tension of Russian military pressure on Western Europe is lifted. Peter I is 'cutting a window through to Europe' and subjects life in Russia to the Western fashion in many ways. The idea of the Western superiority over Russia is being embedded into the consciousness of the Russian population. In the field of science, culture, etc. The German historians of the late XIX c. wrote: 'Peter interfered even into the family and public life. He banned FEMALE TOWER-CHAMBERS ('TEREM') and wouldn't tolerate the former CUSTOM OF WOMEN COVERING THEIR FACES. He demanded that women were not kept under lock and key in an Asiatic manner, but would walk about freely in the European manner... He also introduced European customs in Public life and arranged balls and assemblies according to the French fashion. Moreover he commanded the boyars to wear Western-European clothes in order to transform both their domestic and social life TO CHANGE THE NATION'S ENTIRE WAY OF LIFE according to one of the English diplomats, and to make his people truly European, or, according to Peter's OWN EXPRESSION in the presence of the Danish ambassador Jens Juel in 1710: 'TO TURN CATTLE INTO PEOPLE'... in a nutshell, THERE HARDLY EXISTED ANY CUSTOM WHICH PETER WOULD NOT WISH TO TRANSFORM... in order to shock his people out of its barbaric state' as soon as possible. [336], v.5, p.569-570.

Beginning with the XVIII c. various 'educators' continuously hammer in to us: it is necessary to turn cattle into people. Along the way we shall note that there are many reasons to believe that the authentic Czar Peter I was replaced during his well-known 'journey to the West'. See our book 'Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great: the Czar fictitious and the Czar false'.

The Romanovs re-wrote the history of Russia. In particular, the Russian-Horde army was declared to be an evil foreign power, which conquered not just Western Europe – now it is only mentioned in passing – but allegedly Russia itself. The descendants of the Mighty = the 'Mongols' = the Scythians, in England were respectfully called the Scots (Scots – Scythians), i.e. the very noble Scottish [4v2], ch.6:11. But in occupied Russia the triumphant victors squeamishly called the population bestial, i.e. filthy beasts.

At the same time they try to consign to oblivion those facts clearly showing that in

the epoch of the XIII-XIV cc. Western Europe was still a sparsely populated and undeveloped land – see Ioannes Malalas and Mauro Orbini. All these lands were colonized and populated by Russia-Horde during the 'Mongol' conquest. Only then there started developing industrial crafts, science, culture, hygiene; see in [5v1], ch.12:4.4, a chapter called: 'When did they begin to wash hands before eating?' In it we cite some information put forward by the historians on this interesting subject. Apparently, they started to wash hands before eating comparatively recently, only with the arrival of the 'Mongols' [457:1], p.216-217.

#### **4. BY DISTORTING HISTORY THE WESTERN CHRONOLOGISTS MOVE THE UNPLEASANT EVENTS INTO THE PAST.**

Following the retreat of the Horde and Ottoman Empire from Western Europe, the chronologists attempted to erase from the historical memory all the still fresh but, from a European standpoint, unpalatable recollections. These events were pushed back into the distant past, where they would be less painful.

Ultimately, it's as if the historians were saying that anything could have occurred in the past. But since then no one at any time conquered Europe in such a barbaric way. And even if they did have to pay tax, it was mainly done by some very ancient Romans to some very ancient Goths and the long gone, more ancient Huns. And anyway, is it even worth recollecting? Since then everything has changed. The mediaeval and modern Europe is culture, progress and finesse and the East remained the same wild Horde as it was before.

And in order for the public opinion to come to terms with these 'truths' for many years they devised historic literary and film epics. Visually and persuasively making us understand how, for example, 'the early mediaeval Eastern barbarian Attila the Hun only through his ignorance dared to challenge The Great Western Rome. But in the very end having marvelled at Italian culture, and cowed by Roman might, he turns back, shamefully fleeing to the refuge of the barren steppes.

According to the Romanovs' version of Russian history, a huge gap appeared in place of the XV century. It was filled up with duplicates from the XVI century. The historians 'plugged the hole' which appeared during the editorial cleansing of the chronicles. This is precisely why the life story of Ivan III the Terrible is to a great degree the reflection of the events which took place a century later, under Ivan IV the Terrible.

The word NATION originated most likely from a Russian word NASHI (meaning OURS). After the split, the Empire was thus called 'our own', i.e. the people who

found themselves inside one fragment of the Empire often hostile to the world around it. That is exactly the time when 'insiders' and 'outsiders' appeared. Earlier, in the 'Mongol' time there was nothing of the kind. Everyone was a subject of one Empire and obeyed one Khan-emperor. But following the Time of Troubles the terms 'insiders' and 'outsiders' acquired a special meaning. A battle for the vast Imperial succession commences. Rivers of blood are shed. Political and religious boundaries emerge dividing the nations. Until now, for instance, in English there is a word spelled NATION, i.e. 'NASHI'. The English NATIONALITY = national identity, citizenship, nation, allegiance; it could have originated from the Russian: NASHI LYUDI = OUR PEOPLE. It well corresponds with the definition of 'national identity' [7v2].

## **5. THE LAST EMPERORS OF THE GREAT EMPIRE = THE RUSSIAN CZARS-KHANS OF THE EARLY XVII CENTURY.**

&& BORIS GODUNOV.

BORIS FEDOROVICH 'GODUNOV' 1598-1605 ACCORDING TO [362]. He was a son of the previous Czar Fedor Ivanovich. Godunov's story is badly distorted by the Romanovs [4v1]. Czar Boris 'Godunov' is not at all an old experienced politician. He is still a very young person. His characteristics, ascribed to him by the Romanovs and so familiar to us today, should refer not to him, but to Dmitry Godunov, his uncle on his mother's side. According to our reconstruction it was Dmitry Godunov who was a brother of Irina Godunov, the wife of Czar Fedor Ioannovich. Czaritsa Irina was not the sister of Boris 'Godunov', but HIS MOTHER. Thus, Boris Fedorovich 'Godunov' is the LEGITIMATE SON AND HEIR of Czar Fedor Ivanovich.

Initially it was a peaceful reign with no major domestic revolts. The government of Boris Fedorovich tries to succeed in the Livonian war via diplomatic means, being supported, in particular, by England.

Then the Troubles begin. Czar Boris is poisoned and dies young, leaving an heir – an infant son, Fedor Borisovich, his wife Maria and their daughter Ksenia. The conspirators count on Dmitry Ivanovich, the son of Czar Ivan Ivanovich, who was removed from power in 1572. Dmitry Ivanovich was forced to become a monk, but managed to escape to Poland. He tried to seize the power by military means with the assistance of the Polish mercenaries, but was defeated by the army of Boris Fedorovich. However the plotters poisoned Czar Boris Godunov in the capital and cleared the way to the throne for Dmitry Ivanovich.



&& FEDOR BORISOVICH.

FEDOR BORISOVICH, 1605. As a boy became the Czar after the death of his father Boris Fedorovich. Was soon murdered together with his mother by the plotters.

&& DMITRY IVANOVICH, 'FALSE DMITRY'.

DMITRY IVANOVICH (FALSE DMITRY) THE 'IMPOSTER', 'THIEF' 1605-1610. A son of Czar Ivan Ivanovich who was stripped of his authority in 1572. He was forced to take monastic vows, but escaped to Poland and began his struggle for power. He seized the throne as a result of the plot and the palace coup d'état. A year later, in 1606, he was deposed by the supporters of Vasily Ivanovich Shuisky, also a member of the royal house. The reign of Dmitry Ivanovich and the simultaneous reign of Vasily Shuisky is the epoch of the largest dynastic revolt in Russia, the civil war and chaos. In the Romanov history Dmitry is called an 'imposter' and a 'thief'. Notably the 'imposter' and the 'thief' are presented as two separate people. He was murdered in 1610.

The infamous story of Dmitry the 'Imposter' always produced a strange impression on researchers [183], v.2, p.97. Everything becomes clear in the New Chronology. This person was indeed a Czarevich (a prince) and his name was in fact Dmitry Ivanovich. He was a son of Czar Ivan Ivanovich, who reigned from 1563 to 1572 and was then deposed. Czar Ivan Ivanovich was brought up in the Zakharyin-Romanovs family, who ruled the state on his behalf, as Ivan Ivanovich himself was still very young (see above). As we can see the son of Ivan Ivanovich, Czarevich Dmitry Ivanovich (the future 'False Dmitry') was also brought up in the family of the Romanovs. In order to prevent Dmitry ascending the throne, he was forced to take monastic vows, as the becoming a monk, according to the old Russian tradition, denied the right to take the throne.

But – a reader might object – Czarevich Dmitry, as it's well-known, was murdered in Uglich. Does it mean that under the name of Dmitry Ivanovich there was still an imposter? No, it does not.

It is thought that under Ivan the 'Terrible', there were allegedly TWO separate princes with the same name: Dmitry Ivanovich. They were both children of Ivan the 'Terrible'. One death occurred due to a nurses' negligence, who drowned the child in 1563. The second – the infamous Uglich tragedy allegedly of 1591 [4v].

In our opinion there was ONLY ONE death of Czarevich Dmitry Ivanovich in 1563. However subsequently, during the rule of Vasily Shuisky, a false version of Czarevich Dmitry's murder in Uglich in 1591 (generally accepted today) was set in motion. The purpose of this fabrication is clear. Czar Vasily Shuisky endeavoured to present his rival Dmitry Ivanovich as an 'IMPOSTER'. To achieve this it was declared that the

true Czarevich Dmitry was allegedly murdered as a boy in Uglich. Therefore the Czar, who fights against Shuisky is none other, but an imposter.

In fact it was a completely different Czarevich Dmitry Ivanovich who died – he was the son of Czar Ivan Vasilievich and a brother to Czar Ivan Ivanovich, the father of 'False Dmitry'. He was an uncle to his namesake the 'imposter' Dmitry Ivanovich, whom Shuisky was fighting against. Using the coincidence between the names, the death of one of them was attributed to the other. Thus the true Czar Dmitry Ivanovich was declared an 'IMPOSTER'.

The entire story of Czarevich Dmitry's death could have been composed in Moscow. 'There are reasons to believe that Uglich's source became a victim to a retrospective appraisal of events [777], p.72. To put it simply, it was a FORGERY.

We'll elaborate. The falsification was based on a crafty SUBSTITUTION. The Shuiskys deliberately mixed up (on paper) Czarevich Dmitry Ivanovich, who died in 1563, and Czarevich Dmitry Ivanovich the 'Imposter', who by no means died as a child, but on the contrary jostled with Vasily Shuisky for power at that very time. The exchange was cunning. The thing is, that Czarevich Dmitry, who died in 1563, as we show in our book 'The Expulsion of the Czars' ('Izgnaniye Czarei'), WAS ALREADY A CONSECRATED SAINT AND POPULAR AMONG THE PEOPLE by the time of this fraud. The Shuiskys SLYLY used the identical names of the two princes – the dead and the living one. They attributed the holy name of Saint Dmitry Ivanovich which was widely popular among the people and who died in 1563, to their contemporary Czarevich Dmitry Ivanovich. Shifting (on paper) the death of Saint Czarevich approximately 30 years forward – from 1563 to allegedly 1591. Thus they turned (again on paper) their living and healthy rival Dmitry Ivanovich into the Czarevich who allegedly had died in childhood. Following which the living Czarevich Dmitry Ivanovich naturally turned into an 'Imposter' (according to them). As he allegedly had already died a long time ago!

At first this fraud was necessary for Czar Vasily Shuisky in 1606. But later the Romanovs used it very cunningly. Moreover, they directly participated in this fraud. It was none other, but Feodor Nikitich Romanov, the future Patriarch Filaret, who went to Uglich to unveil Czarevich Dmitry's remains [988:00], article 'Filaret, the Russian patriarch'.

In the Cathedral of the Archangel of the Moscow Kremlin there was allegedly a fragment kept of the grave-stone of Czarevich Dmitry Ivanovich. It was most likely a modern replica. Please see our theory on the burial of Czarevich Dmitry in Egypt in [5v2], ch.7:5. We are referring to the famous 'pharaoh' Tutankhamun burial site discovered by Howard Carter in the first quarter of the XX century. Most likely the

young Tutankhamun is the very Dmitry, buried in the Horde Imperial cemetery in the early XVII century. It was one of the last burials of the Russian Horde khans there.

&& VASILY SHUYISKY AND THE ROMANOVS.

VASILY IVANOVICH SHUISKY 1606-1610 according to [362]. Ascended the throne in 1606 as the result of the plot and rebellion against Czar Dmitry Ivanovich. There were two Royal courts formed in the country – one of Vasily Ivanovich in Moscow and the other the court of Dmitry Ivanovich not far from Moscow, in Tushino. Dynastic embroilment and chaos stirred. Shuisky made an attempt to establish a new dynasty – as a branch of the Old Russian Horde dynasty, which the Shuiskys belonged to. This attempt failed.

Thus, 'False Dmitry I' – is the true Czarevich Dmitry, the son of Czar Ivan. From the very beginning of Dmitry's struggle for the throne EVERYONE WHO SAW TOOK HIM FOR CZAREVICH. The Polish aristocracy, the Polish King, the Russian boyars, crowds of people in Putyvl and other cities and at last his own mother – Czaritsa Maria Nagaya, by this time the nun Marfa [777], [183], v.2.

But the historians do not believe the numerous claims of the contemporaries that Dmitry is the real son of Czar Ivan, and proclaim all of the eyewitnesses to be either gullible simpletons or pretenders. Russian history was finalised under the Romanovs. They purposefully declared Dmitry to be the imposter and 'False Dmitry'. Why? The answer is simple. It appeared that Dmitry, who did become a Czar and who was of the royal descent, HAD A SON. The Romanov historians dubbed him a 'little thief'. Following Dmitry's death his son should have succeeded him. But the Romanovs were very keen on grasping power themselves. They usurped the throne even while Dmitry's son was still alive. Hence ELECTING MIKHAIL ROMANOV TO BECOME THE CZAR HAPPENED SIMPLY TO BE UNLAWFUL, as the son of the actual former Czar was still alive. There was only one way out for the Romanovs – to declare Dmitry as an 'imposter', which was immediately done. However, there still remained one more obstacle – Dmitry's living son. The problem was easily solved. The Romanovs cold bloodedly hanged the boy on the Spassky Gate.

It is indeed a complicated point in Russian history. And for the Romanovs dynasty it is the key moment. The Romanovs needed a proof of the legitimacy of their enthronement. They solved the problem via means which were clear and readily available to them.

We have mentioned above that Czarevich Dmitry was enthroned as a result of the boyars' plot which deposed Czar Boris. However the boyars regarded the Czarevich only as interim figure. The head of the plot was Shuisky, who himself was striving for power. That is why Czarevich Dmitry was merely in the way. Soon after Dmitry's

coronation the palace coup d'état took place. It is thought that as a result Dmitry was killed. Vasily Shuisky ascends to the throne.

In this plot the Romanovs acted most likely on Shuisky's side, as Feodor Romanov, the future Patriarch Philaret, brought back from exile, was appointed Patriarch of Moscow.

Our point of view: CZAR DMITRY WAS NOT KILLED AND MANAGED TO ESCAPE. Czaritsa Marfa was presented with someone else's body. That is why it was disfigured, in order for it to be impossible to identify the murdered person. And in order to irreversibly remove traces, the body was burnt [436], p.288.

Thus Czar Dmitry remained alive after the coup. It should be expected that he will take centre stage once again. Indeed, soon in the very same town of Putyvl, which was previously Dmitry the first's headquarters, there EMERGES 'FALSE DMITRY II'. The first time 'FALSE DMITRY' was seen by crowds of people. It appears that the same crowds of people having seen 'False Dmitry II' 'ONCE AGAIN RECOGNISED HIM AS CZAR DMITRY!' 'Having gathered the people in Putyvl, Shakhovskoy presented a new contender and claimed that in Moscow the traitors had MURDERED SOME GERMAN INSTEAD OF DMITRY AND DMITRY IS STILL ALIVE, and that the people should rebel against Shuisky' [183], v.2, p.125.

'FALSE DMITRY II' IS THE VERY SAME CZAR DMITRY, AKA 'FALSE DMITRY I'. Soon after Marina Mnishek gave birth to a son of 'False Dmitry II', whom the Romanovs were quick to call a 'little thief'. 'False Dmitry II' himself was nicknamed 'Tushinsky Thief'. Thus acknowledging that it was 'False Dmitry's II' son. It was this very child who was later killed by the Romanovs – and hanged from the Spassky Gate. In order to eliminate the legitimate successor to Czar Dmitry.

Marina Mnishek's behaviour becomes clear. After the death of 'False Dmitry II' SHE DID NOT LEAVE RUSSIA AND STAYED BY HER SON'S SIDE, CONTINUED TO FIGHT FOR THE RUSSIAN THRONE with the aid of the troops loyal to her, headed by Zarutsky. No wonder. She knew for sure that her son was a legitimate successor to the Russian Czar Dmitry. But if he was a son of some rootless 'Tushinsky thief' then it would have been more sensible to immediately leave the tumultuous country. In which Mikhail Romanov had already assumed power. She ought to have fled to her native Poland. She had such an opportunity. But instead she set off to Volga, Don, Yaik River, TO JOIN THE COSSACKS [1.83], v.2, p.158. The brave woman was fighting for her own rights and for the rights of her son – the legitimate heir to the Horde throne.

A war between Zarutsky and Marina with the Romanovs began. This is one of the most obscure parts in Russian history. It is most likely that the description of this war

known today was invented by the victorious Romanovs who won this war [436, p.769-778. Represented by the Romanov historians it looks like a battle of the Romanovs, the legitimate rulers 'against the thieves'.

It is possible that Czar Dmitry Ivanovich had not yet been killed at this point. In which case he was executed by the Romanovs later. His execution was later passed off as the execution of Zarutzky. The suspicion increases by the fact, that following Zarutsky's execution there immediately emerges allegedly the second Zarutsky, about whom nothing was known earlier for some reason. More specifically, onstage enters the ataman of The Cherkasy Malorosy Cossacks, 'A certain Zakhar Zarutsky, possibly a brother or a relative of Ivan' [436], p.779. Most likely there was nonetheless just the one Zarutsky, and Horde Czar Dmitry Ivanovich was there with Marina Mnishek, whom later on the Romanovs cunningly called Zarutsky, in order to avert suspicion of regicide, which clearly suggests itself.

The army of Zarutsky (Czar Dmitry?) and Marina Mnishek were crushed by the Romanovs.

## **6. THE CROSS AND THE CRESCENT MOON WITH A STAR.**

The crescent moon with a star is an old symbol of Czar-Grad [6v1]. It owes its origin to the blaze of the star of Bethlehem and to the solar eclipse which are associated with the Nativity of Christ and the crucifixion of Andronicus Christ. Today the crescent moon with a star is perceived exclusively as a Muslim symbol. However, up until the end of the XVII century a crescent moon with a star adorned, for example, the spire of the huge Christian St. Stephen's Cathedral in Vienna. The crescent moon was removed from the spire (and replaced with a cross) only in 1685 [6v1], ch.5.

A star inscribed into a crescent moon was a form of the Christian cross, [pic.13](#). A cross in the shape of a star – 8- or 6-pointed, for example, - is known in mediaeval iconography. Such images of the crosses-stars can be seen on the walls of the famous St. Sophia Cathedral in Kiev. It turns out that a cross with a crescent moon on the domes of the Russian cathedrals and a Turkish crescent moon with a star, symbolising a cross, are just the **VARIOUS FORMS OF THE SAME CHRISTIAN SYMBOL!** The universal symbol of the Great Empire acquired a slightly different form in Russia and Turkey. When the Empire fragmented in the XVII century the Christian cross remained with the Christians and the Christian crescent moon with a star – with the Muslims. The Christian six-pointed star – with the Jews.

Is there a crescent moon present in the old Russian coat of arms? For example, in the coat of arms of the Russian cities? Many readers would probably think that nothing

of the kind existed in Russia, as today it is very rarely that one might see such a Russian coat of arms.

Nevertheless let us open a fundamental edition [162] dedicated to the coats of arms of the Russian cities entered into the complete body of laws of the Russian Empire from 1649 to 1900. A book [162] for each coat of arms indicates the date of it being established. The majority of the dates refer to the XVII-XIX cc., however, reportedly, the majority of the coats of arms date back to an earlier age.

It appears that in the old coats of arms of the Russian cities the symbol of the crescent moon with a cross = a star was present. Notably, very vividly expressed. For example, the coats of arms of several cities in the Chernigov region consists of a large crescent moon with a cross inserted in it. Sometimes there is a star placed near a cross. There are quite a few such examples – we counted at least 29 coats of arms [4v1], ch.10. The crosses with the crescent moons, i.e. the crescent moons with a star = cross (see [fig.13](#), bottom left) are, for example, high on the domes of the Moscow Kremlin. Now the presence of numerous crescent moons with a cross (a star) on the domes of the Christian churches becomes clear.

## **7. THE DOUBLE-HEADED EAGLE AND THE CRESCENT MOON WITH A STAR-CROSS.**

Why did a two-headed eagle become the symbol of the Empire? After all, the two-headed creatures very rarely occur in nature, except as an anomaly. It is clear, that the symbol of the Imperial two-headed eagle was determined by some reasons far removed from the study of nature.

Let us refer to the exceptional and fascinating engravings by Albrecht Dürer, comprising his famous Arch of Maximilian I, known as Ehrenpforte [1067].

In [fig.78](#) there is presented one of the coats of arms on Dürer's Ehrenpforte. It is perfectly clear, that here is depicted a crescent moon with rays emanating from it. At the same time it is apparent that these are the upturned wings of an eagle. The rays are the feathers of a bird. There is no head of an eagle here. So, THE TWO-HEADED EAGLE, MOST LIKELY, SYMBOLISES THE CRESCENT MOON WITH A STAR, OR, THE CRESCENT MOON WITH A CROSS, WHICH IS THE SAME THING, as a star was often depicted in the form of a cross. The two heads of the eagle looking in opposite directions – is one of the forms of a star-cross, resting on the crescent-wings of the eagle, [fig.79,fig.80](#). See [4v2], ch.2. The two-headed eagle with the wings raised upwards - is one of the forms of the Christian cross, 8- or 6-ended. Aka, we'll repeat, - the Ottoman crescent moon with a star.

## 8. THE ARABIC INSCRIPTIONS ON RUSSIAN WEAPONRY.

Before the end of the XVI century Russia, Ottoman Empire and Persia were all parts of the single Horde Empire. That is why there surely must have existed common cultural traditions. In particular, the similar weaponry production and ornamentation techniques. Despite the emerging religious split between Christianity and Islam in the XVI century, the state and military traditions of the XVI-XVII cc. must have still been very close.

Sure enough up until the middle of the XVII century, i.e. already in the epoch of the Romanovs, THE RUSSIAN CRAFTSMEN still decorated the weapons – even the Royal ones! – with ARABIC INSCRIPTIONS. It was only in the second half of the XVII century they were probably told that they were no longer allowed to do so. After that the Russian weapons with Arabic inscriptions disappeared. However, Russian Royal weaponry with Arabic inscriptions emblazoned with gold, diamonds and other precious stones produced by the best craftsmen of the Armoury Chamber, were preserved, in view of its material value. But most of the 'Russian-Arabic' weaponry were moved to the storerooms, see Appendix 5 in [6v3]. But today, when all of this is forgotten, some of this 'dangerous weaponry' is displayed in the museums. For instance, in the Kremlin Armoury Chamber. Here, for example, is the ceremonial helmet of the Moscow Czars made of damascene steel called 'Jericho cap' ('State helmet' – Tr.), i.e. Jericho cap, [fig.81](#). However, in order to see the ARABIC INSCRIPTION ON THE RUSSIAN WEAPONRY you have to be very attentive. As the explanatory signs don't say anything about such 'improper' engravings. And the exhibits are often displayed in such a way that the Arabic engravings are barely discernible [4v2], ch.1.

Weapons with the Arabic inscriptions were being forged not only, and quite possibly, not as much in Turkey. In the Christian Russia UP UNTIL THE MIDDLE OF THE XVII CENTURY they liked to ornament the weaponry with the Arabic script. The sabre of Prince Mstislavsky, who was Ivan the Terrible's commander, was adorned with Arabic aphorisms [187], p.207. One of the aphorisms goes: 'There will be strong protection in the battle' [187], p.207. There is also a Russian inscription on the sabre stating the identity of the owner [187], p.207.

So why today are the Russian weaponry with the Arabic inscriptions always attributed to a non-Russian origin, usually Turkish or Persian? In those cases, when the Russian work is completely obvious, it is considered that the inexperienced and ignorant Russian craftsmen copied the wonderful Eastern and Western pieces in an apprentice-like fashion. Alleging that they mechanically transferred them, like some

'beautiful pictures' onto the magnificent weapons of the Russian Czars and commanders without understanding their meaning. And they proudly wore and showed off those strange aphorisms which were incomprehensible to them. Accompanied by the reserved and incredulous smiles of the learned Arabs and even more learned Europeans.

This is not true. In the epoch of the XVI and even the XVII cc. a great many of the Russian-Horde weaponry with the Arabic engravings were produced, it seems, in Russia-Horde, which in the XV-XVI cc. constituted a whole with the Ottoman Empire=Atamania. Later, a considerable part of the weaponry made in Moscow, Tula, Urals and the Russian weapons in general was cunningly declared to be either 'damascene', 'Eastern' or 'Western'. An opinion formed, that allegedly in that epoch the Russians carried mainly foreign weapons. As, purportedly, there were very, very little home-made weapons and they were of poor quality, though it is obvious that any military power fought using its home grown weaponry. That said, they forgot that Mediaeval Damascus was T-Moscow, i.e. the name of Moscow with the definite article T (denoting respect).

They also made weaponry with LATIN inscriptions in Russia. Or at least they used the Latin letters. As, for example, the precious Damask steel sabre made by the RUSSIAN craftsman Ilya Prosvit in 1618 [187], p.156-157.

The historians reassure us that the Arabic inscriptions are present on the old Russian weapons only because they were presented as the gifts to the Russian Czars and the Russian warriors by foreigners, who wrote in Arabic. This explanation is incorrect. Moreover, it appears that THE RUSSIAN CZARS THEMSELVES PRESENTED THE FOREIGNERS WITH GIFTS OF WEAPONRY ADORNED WITH ARABIC INSCRIPTIONS [4v2], ch.1.

Everything said about the Arabic inscriptions on the Russian weaponry does not only refer to the Kremlin Armoury Chamber. For example, in the museum of Alexandrovskaya Sloboda, the modern town of Alexandrov in the Raspyatskaya (the Crucifixion) Church-belfry there is exhibited the armoury of a Russian warrior – chain mail, a shield, a helmet, [fig.82](#). The museum sign informs us, that this is Russian armour. Indeed, the entire helmet is covered with the depiction of exotic animals, horsemen, birds carried out in the Russian style, reminiscent of the famous engravings on the walls of the white-stone cathedrals of Vladimir and Suzdal Russia. The nose guard of the helmet ends above with a 4-ended - cross. All of which unmistakably points to the Russian origin of the helmet. At the same time there is a clear wide band inscription in Arabic running round it. Next to the helmet there is the shield. Once again there is a wide band inscription in Arabic running along the edge



of the shield [4v2], ch.1. And this is a Russian shield!

The same sort of thing is in Moscow museum-reserve 'Kolomenskoye'. There are exhibited two old Russian military helmets [4v2], ch.1. Both of them have the inscriptions in Arabic and only in Arabic! And so on.

So, on the Russian Mediaeval weapons the inscriptions survived, which today are perceived as Arabic. Should you pay attention to it just once, you immediately begin to stumble across such examples at every step. This astonishing fact does not fit into the traditional version of the Romanov history. Just this one fact is enough to understand that the history of Russia of the pre-Romanov epoch was completely different than it is presented to us today.

## **9. EVEN IN THE XVII CENTURY THE RUSSIAN TEXTS WERE SOMETIMES WRITTEN WITH ARABIC LETTERS.**

Even in the XVII c. in Russia they still used a variety of alphabets to write down the Russian texts. The perfect example is the travelling notes, 'kept by Paul of Aleppo' (Paul, Archdeacon of Aleppo) – the talented ecclesiastical writer of the mid XVII century, who accompanied his father everywhere,

Patriarch Macarios III of Antioch. In 1656 the Patriarch visited Russia for the first time and was in Moscow... On the invitation of Czar Alexey Mikhailovich the Primate of the Antioch Church he visited The Savvino-Storozhevsky Monastery' [422], p.94.

When accompanying the Patriarch, Paul of Aleppo made detailed notes, a trip report of a kind. Maybe such were the rules of the Patriarchy in that time. The notes survive to our day and are considered as remarkably valuable testimonies of the epoch of Alexey Mikhailovich [422].

The question is what language was the text written in? For our contemporaries brought up on the Scaligerian-Romanov history the answer would seem to be obvious. One must suppose that Orthodox Christian Paul of Aleppo, the son of the Orthodox Christian Patriarch of Antioch, who arrived to Orthodox Christian Russia to visit Orthodox Christian Czar Alexey Mikhailovich would write his report either in Russian or in Greek. At the very least in Latin. Which, admittedly would have been odd. But apparently the ACCOUNTS ARE WRITTEN IN ARABIC [422], p.95.

Further on it becomes even more intriguing. The Orthodox author of the XVII century freely alternates between Arabic and Russian, but at the same time he writes down a RUSSIAN TEXT WITH ARABIC LETTERS [422], p.98-99. Thus it unexpectedly becomes clear that in the epoch of Alexey Mikhailovich a RUSSIAN

TEXT COULD HAVE EASILY BEEN WRITTEN DOWN IN RUSSIAN, BUT USING ARABIC LETTERS.

The very fact, that Paul Aleppo's accounts, written in Arabic and Russian, but using Arabic letters survive, means that it was carefully preserved as an important official document.

But today we are assured that the writing of such documents in Arabic must definitely indicate their Muslim origin. At the same time the Antioch Patriarchy was considered one of the most important centres of the Orthodox Church. We can see that in the XVII century the picture was different from the way it is presented to us today [4v2], ch.1.

Another example is the famous writing - The Journey Beyond Three Seas (Khozheniye za tri morya) by Afanasy Nikitin. The text was written by an Orthodox Christian. 'The Journey' was mainly written in Russian. However from time to time Afanasy Nikitin freely and fluently changes into Turkic and even Arabic languages. Then, in the equally flowing way he changes back to the Russian language [4v2], ch.1. It is obvious, that he himself, as do his readers, knows several languages. But this is not the main thing. The main thing this is that the Turkic or the Arabic languages are used by Afanasy Nikitin for the RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHRISTIAN PRAYERS! Or, if you will, for the Islamic-Orthodox Christian prayers. However strange this combination of words may sound in our times.

## **10. THE RUSSIAN BILINGUAL COINS.**

Apparently on the 'Heads' side (of the Russian coins of the XIV century – Auth.) there is ALWAYS A COPY FROM THE TATAR COIN... On the reverse side of these coins there is ALWAYS an inscription the 'Grand Prince's seal' or 'Prince's seal and the image of the sealing wax itself. Possibly, soon after, they started adding the name of a Grand Prince... Hence it is necessary to conclude that ALL THE FIRST RUSSIAN COINS HAD TWO NAMES ON THEM' [309], p.33.

The numismatic historians call these coins 'double named'. I.e. on one side there is a name of a Tatar Khan, and on the other – of a Russian prince. It's true though, that, allegedly, due to their illiteracy the Russian money makers often put down the name of a wrong Khan [309], p.33.

Our explanation is simple. All of these coins are not double named, but bilingual. Meaning that on the coin there was printed a name of one ruler – who was simultaneously a Khan and a grand prince. But it was written in two languages – Russian and Tatar.

## **11. THE HORDE EMPIRE BROKE UP.**

The 1610-1613 strife lasted for three years. The change of dynasties takes place. Mikhail Romanov mounts the throne, 1613-1645. The very name of a new dynasty – the Romanovs probably meant at that point NEW ROME. It is likely the new rulers tried to emphasise the difference from ROME OLD, i.e. from the Russian-Horde Empire of the XIV-XVI cc.

In Western Europe the former 'Mongol' governors who had split off from the metropoly enter a fierce battle for lands and dominance. Wars break out which today are known to us as the 'Reformation wars'. During this epoch, instead of the previous point of view: 'All the lands in one and undivided Empire belong to the Czar-Khan and are divided by him', a new ideology of the split emerges: 'This is our territory, we are the masters here and do not take orders from anyone'; 'We are better than the others'; 'We have lived here before you, so return these lands to us'; 'Our achievements are better than yours (our ships are better than yours, our science is better than yours...); 'We are sophisticated, you are 'ignorant', etc. The new unscrupulous ideology of the reformers was reflected in the cynical book 'The Prince' attributed to Machiavelli. A frenzied acrimonious carve up of the territories of the legacy of the Great Empire stretched on for decades. Rivers of blood were spilt. Today the true reason for the carve up - fight is forgotten. The historians bring the entire matter down to alleged religious squabbling.

The network of the 'Mongol' fortifications, which for a long time provided stability and order in the Empire, is destroyed. Primarily the reformers struck the blow on the Cathar = Scythian castles of the West Europe and on the Crusader castles-fortifications of the Middle East – in Syria, etc. They preferred to destroy the former mighty military fortifications in the Imperial provinces seething with revolt, fearing that in a few days they might fall in the hands of their enemies once again. The mighty Hordian castles were blown up with gun powder.

## **12. THE ANNIHILATION OF THE CATHARS-SCYTHIANS.**

The struggle of the Reformation of the XVI-XVII cc. with the splinters of the Horde Empire is very well illustrated by the annihilation of the Cathars in France. The history of the Cathars is one of the most breath-taking and mysterious chapters of the Middle Ages.

Allegedly in the X-XI cc. in Western Europe and in particular in France there emerged a new Christian movement, the supporters of which became known as the Cathars (the Cathari), and also the Albigenses (or Albigeois). It is thought that the

religion of the Cathars was Christian [6.2], ch.1. However, it differs from the Orthodox Christianity and Catholicism of today in its details. It was declared to be heretical.

It is widely thought that the Cathar heresy widely spread and met with the opposition from the Catholic Church. In the first half of allegedly the XIII century the crusades were organised against the Cathars. They fought back tooth and claw, but they were defeated, their mighty fortresses were destroyed. Allegedly since the XIV c. they 'exit the stage'. However up until now the south of France is called 'Cathar Country'. Very little remains from them today. But whatever is left is very impressive. In the first place – the mighty castles-fortresses in the cities, on top of the mountains and cliffs which controlled the trade and military routes. The magnificent fortifications received the name of the 'Cathar Castles'.

As we demonstrate in [6v2], ch.1, the Cathars are the Scythians of the Volga river, who came to France in the XIV c. from Russia-Horde during the 'Mongol' conquest. They settled down here and, as the colonizers, created the ruling class. Their religion was Christian.

In the epoch of the Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. the Cathars = Scythians, having partially mixed with the local population, created a unique culture, built the cities, cathedrals, fortresses, some of which are still called Cathar. In the end of the XVI-beginning of the XVII cc. during the revolt of the Reformation in West Europe, the Cathars – Scythians were defeated in a gruelling war.

Later their story was 'transported' from the XIV-XVI cc. into the XI-XIII cc. In addition it was declared that the Cathar = Scythian Gothic cathedrals starting as early as the XIII century, i.e. from the very start of their construction, allegedly were 'genuinely Catholic'. In its later Reformation sense. This was a falsification. The Bulgarian = Volga Orthodox Christian religion of the Cathars = Scythians was proclaimed to be 'heresy'.

The dramatic events of the history of the Cathars = Scythians found their way onto the pages of the Bible. For example the story of Count Simon (Osman) de Montfort, (Earl of Leicester) (aka 'ancient' Pyrrhus) under the name of ABIMELECH, is briefly described in the Old Testament Book of Judges, ch.9. Various 'ancient' authors of the XVI-XVII cc. gave their account of it. For example, Plutarch = Petrarch [6v2], ch.1. Some of the Empire's provinces resisted the split and tried to restore the former unity. Siberia, the Far East and a part of the North America were governed by the Horde up until the middle of the XVIII century. In the West the conservative Imperial climate was particularly strong in Spain and England. In the East and South, where there was no rebellion, the former Imperial regions took up an antagonistic position towards the

West and the pro-Western Romanovs. We mean Siberia, the Far East, America, China, Japan, Turkey, Egypt, Iran and Hindustan.

### **13. THE REBELS STRIVE TO PREVENT THE RESURRECTION OF THE GREAT EMPIRE.**

Aiming to establish their rights to the territory ceased and divided between themselves, the usurpers-rebels in Europe and the Romanovs in Russia re-write history. The Great Empire is wiped off the pages of the chronicles. The adulterated Scaligerian chronology is being created making the dates of a great number of events artificially older. Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609) and Dionysius Petavius (1583-1652) are considered to be its creators. Though it is not very clear if in fact they were the authors of the works attributed to them or their names were cunningly made use of. Creating a self-serving version of history, the new authorities strived to prove their allegedly 'ancient origins' and non-existent alleged hereditary rights to the throne. A great many newly-minted Crowns, which were declared 'independent from time immemorial' appeared in the XVIIc on the ruins of the Empire – in France, Germany, Italy, England, etc. They were in conflict with each other for a long time.

The theory of the Indo-European languages originating from the distant India occupies an important place in the Scaligerian history. Where India is perceived in the modern sense, as a country situated on the Hindustan peninsula (the Indian Subcontinent). It is considered that the proto-languages originated here and permeate many countries. We do not see any reasons for objections except one. Where was that 'ancient India' situated in reality, where did the Indo-European languages originate from? And when? According to our results it is Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc. The reformists quickly invent and energetically introduce the new languages based on the former Imperial state Church-Slavonic language and the local dialects in the provinces which acquired their independence. For example, French, German, Spanish, English and also 'ancient' Latin and 'ancient' Greek. This allowed the rebels to build language barriers between the populations of the newly-formed states. Their purpose is clear: to destroy the unity between the nations of the Empire. In the face of the newly established religious and linguistic barriers, former bonds began to break. It is all described in the Bible as 'the confusion of tongues' following 'the Babel pandemonium'. The invention of the new languages allowed the reformists to speed up the process of the casting into oblivion of the memory of the Great Empire to prevent its restoration. But as these new languages inevitably incorporated a significant layer from the former Imperial state Slavonic language, the numerous Slavonic traces can be found in them even today [7v2].

The process of the dissimilation of languages was also spurred on by the state activities. The settled Imperial governors began to introduce the alphabets into their territories, change grammar, invent new fonts and vowel marking, new reading rules. For example, in some places they introduced the way of reading 'not the way it is spelled. A great example of this is French. Let's say it is spelled Foix – the name of the Cathar city (a town not far from Toulouse, pronounced as Fwa. They strived to distance themselves as soon as possible from the Slavonic language and Slavonic writing.

In schools they introduced the study of the recently invented languages and in a generation or two the old language and writing were forgotten by the majority of the population. The old books written in Slavonic language with the old characters became incomprehensible. Not being reproduced they gradually became obsolete. In the West things were happening particularly fast, as this process was brought to the level of a national programme. The Index of Forbidden Books was introduced. Previous history, books, writing and also 'heretics' were thrown on the fire. In the end of the XVI – beginning of the XVII cc. the formerly united Christianity began to splinter into several branches, including via the efforts of the reformists. In time there formed separate religions: Orthodox Christianity, Catholicism, Protestantism, Islam, Judaism, Buddhism, etc. The former unity was forgotten and in some cases gave way to feuding. This was quite convenient for the usurpers who came to power. In order to keep hold of the recently created and still unstable local thrones they strived to split the previously united population of the Empire into antagonistic groups. The subjects were deceived by pointing at the neighbouring peoples and being told that: 'We were always different'; 'We always spoke different languages'; 'We always had different faith'; 'We never married gentiles (we never took adherents of different faith as our wives)'. All of which was untrue. In the XVII-XVIII cc. in place of the former imperial idea of the world united under the sole supreme power with the limited power in places (at the local level), a new principle was introduced: in my own state I rule as I will. In the times of the Empire, on the contrary, there always existed a possibility that the supreme Czar-Khan arrives and the governors would have to answer for their actions. This curbed the arbitrary actions of the local authorities in places, which wasn't very popular with some of the Imperial officials. Thus the grounds for the Reformation were created.

## **14. HOW THE ROMANOVS DESTROYED THE HISTORY OF THE HORDE.**

The Cathedral of the Archangel in the Moscow Kremlin could have told us a lot of things about the old Russian history, as it was declared to be the official burial vault of the Russian Grand Princes and Czars including the first Romanovs. Today there are approximately 50 tombs in the cathedral. It is thought that here were buried all the Moscow Grand Dukes beginning with Ivan Kalita.

However those tombs, which today can be seen in the cathedral, are the brick tombstones made in the XVII century under the first Romanovs [552], p.24. I.e. at the time when the old frescos removed from the cathedral walls and vaults and new ones were painted in their place. It is thought that 'burials were made in white stone sarcophaguses, which were lowered into the ground under the floor. In the first half of the XVII century at the burial site they erected brick tombstones with white stone slabs ornamented with Slavonic inscriptions. At the beginning of the XX century the tombstones were placed in glazed cases made of bronze' [552], p.25-26.

Thus the old tombstones slabs, beneath which there were supposed to be the burial site, were bricked up! At the same time they assure us that the inscriptions on the old slabs were reproduced precisely on the brick tombstones made by the Romanovs. Unfortunately, it is very difficult to verify this. To do so would require dismantling the massive modern constructions. It is only natural to question the authenticity of these 'royal burials' after the facts we have learnt about the barbaric destruction of the cathedral's frescos by the Romanovs [4v2], ch.2.

Today, situated in the basement of The Cathedral of the Archangel there are also the sarcophaguses of the Russian queens (Czaritzas) which were moved here in the XX century from the Kremlin cemetery, which was destroyed during the construction of the modern buildings. However, as we have shown in [4v2], ch.2, the Romanovs, in the middle of the XVII century, simply either used the anonymous tombs of nuns or removed the names from some other tombs and then passed them off as the 'tombs of the Russian queens'. They wished to establish some 'material evidence' to support their false version of history. The true burial sites of the Russian-Horde queens were, most likely, destroyed. That is if the graves were located on the territory of Moscow at all and not in the Royal cemetery in African Egypt. But the Romanovs needed to produce something to 'demonstrate' as proof of the image of Russian history they had painted. And it is in the XVII century the Romanov historians and archaeologists 'happily discovered' allegedly authentic tombs of Yaroslav the Wise (Mudry), Saint Vladimir (Svyatoy) etc. And their colleagues in Moscow at this very time were

working hard on the creation of a 'presentable Royal necropolis of the XI-XVI cc'. in the Archangel Cathedral in the Moscow Kremlin.

More specifically, having received the order from above, they were hastily producing the 'old Royal burial sites'. It has to be said, rather carelessly. It seems they simply arrived at the monastery cemetery and decide to turn it into the alleged cemetery of the 'pre-Romanov queens'. The name signs of the nuns were cut off. The tombstones bearing the new 'appropriate signs' were placed on top. Then they buried under each tombstone an old coffin. But as the coffins were buried, the officers-executants who were fulfilling this task didn't make those signs very thoroughly. Is it worth trying so hard if all of it was to be immediately buried under the ground?! In some cases they altogether forgot to make a sign on the tomb. In two cases they have missed, possibly by an oversight, the names of the simple nuns scratched with a nail on the old coffins. Thus, with such audacity there was created a false 'necropolis of the queens' in the Moscow Kremlin. We will repeat that there was no necropolis in Moscow in the pre-Romanov epoch. The Russian-Horde Czars and Czaritzas of the XIV-XVI cc. were transported to African Egypt to be buried in the Imperial cemetery.

The less distinguished ones were buried in Russia. But having assumed power the Romanovs did their best to destroy those old sarcophaguses which could have revealed the true story of the pre-Romanov Russia-Horde. What we are presented with today as 'antiquity' is either the Romanov modern replicas or the poor coffins of common people, presented by the Romanov historians as the 'Royal burial sites'.

Moreover, the Romanovs started using the old Russian white stoned tombs as building materials [62], p.297; [4v2], ch.2. This was a clear manifestation of the Romanovs' attitude towards Russian history. In everyday life builders would hardly go to a cemetery in search for the building materials and take the tombstones for that purpose, in order to build an apartment block out of them. Would you want to live in a building like that? Such things were always considered an insult to the memory of the deceased. It did happen sometimes, but exactly as a token of the disrespect towards those who were buried beneath those gravestones. This is amply demonstrated in the Romanovs' actions.

Apparently between 1632 and 1636 there the CHANGES IN THE TYPE OF BURIALS THAT OCCURRED IN RUSSIA. This refers at least to the royal burials. Before 1632 the first Romanovs still buried their queens according to the old tradition customary in Russia-Horde. But then, as we show in [4v2], ch.2., the Romanovs change the type of burial. Starting with 1636 they were burying in a different way. So we unexpectedly came across a serious fact. The change in the type of the burial is a



major religious-social reform. It signifies the fundamental turning point in the life of the Russian society in the middle of the XVII century. Surprisingly nothing is said about this major event in Russian history.

Thus we come across the very same borderline – the XVII century, which separates the falsified history from the more or less accurate one. It is extremely difficult to surmount the barrier of the XVII century – very little true archaeological evidence and written records from earlier than the XVII century survive. In the colonies of the Great Empire, in Western Europe, the former imperial cathedrals and constructions were on the whole also destroyed. However the Western reformers who came to power decided to preserve the Gothic architectural style of the 'Mongol' temples in their own new buildings, having only declared it to be ancient and exclusively their own, allegedly purely Western-European [4v2], ch.2:47. A shock wave of the historical reconstruction with the total 'elimination of all traces' swept through occupied Russia of the XVII century. Not only the architectural style was changed, but also the very nature of the burials.

## **15. WHY THE NAME OF 'NOVGOROD' TAKEN AWAY FROM YAROSLAVL WAS MOVED TO THE NORTH-WEST, TO LAKE ILMEN?**

As we have already said the Veliky Novgorod of the chronicles is Yaroslavl upon Volga. To be precise, the name of the entire region including a number of cities, Rostov and Suzdal in particular. But in the epoch of the XVII century the name 'Novgorod' was taken away from Yaroslavl and given to a small town, a former town-district, a small fort in the North West of Russia, by lake Ilmen, by the mouth of the river called VOLKHOV. Why was it here that the famous name of Novgorod was moved to – on paper and on the maps – and at the time the name of VOLGA with it? As it is absolutely clear that VOLKHOV is a slightly distorted version of the name VOLGA.

The answers may differ. However, there is one that appears worthy of serious consideration. Let us turn to the old maps of Moscow drawn by the Western cartographers and travellers of the XVI-XVII cc. There emerges a curious fact. Northern Dvina River and its vicinities are rather well depicted on these maps [TsRIM], ch.1. It is clear that the Western cartographers knew those regions, where the Western merchants and trading ships would arrive via the Northern shipping route, quite well. They went up Dvina River and the other rivers of that region, eventually reaching Yaroslavl – the major centre of that epoch.

But Vladimir and Suzdal Russia, the suburbs of Moscow and the territories to the South and West of Yaroslavl on the whole, the Western cartographers had noticeably poorer knowledge of. They had difficulties even with Moscow. I.e. the capital of Russia in the XVI century! For instance, on that very map by S.Herberstein, allegedly of the year 1546, the city of Moscow is not indicated at all. There was written only the name of the land – MOSCOWIA [TsRIM], ch.1. A city near the Moscow river was drawn, but without a name. The other cities, however, were indicated and named.

It proves that the Western cartographers of the XVI century were getting confused about the location of Moscow, the capital of Russia. They knew roughly that it was situated 'somewhere there, far away', but they had trouble telling where exactly. That is why they nominally drew a large territory 'Moscowia'. Inside this territory they tentatively depicted a town, not quite understanding where exactly it was located. The same story was with Vladimir, another old capital of Russia-Horde.

Most likely in the epoch of the XIV-XVI c. the Russian-Horde authorities simply didn't allow the foreigners inside the country further than Yaroslavl and the merchant cities along the Volga river. The Horde acted in a comprehensible way. You are welcome to come and trade, but your entrance into the land where the Czar's quarters is situated is either forbidden or highly restricted. As the regions to the South and West of Yaroslavl were Vladimir and Suzdal Russia, the metropoly of the Empire. These lands were strictly guarded.

That is why the Western cartographers had to use on the whole only some vague stories about which towns, rivers and lakes are situated in the vast metropoly of the Empire, which was inaccessible to them. To draw a map based on such conversations was not simple of course. So Vladimir and Suzdal Russia on the maps of S.Herberstein and the other cartographers were possibly drawn in the quiet of European offices based on the snippets of the incidental information.

Let's go back to the 'problem of Novgorod'. Let's have a look at the map of S.Herberstein, [fig.83](#). We can see that the Mologa river is shown INCORRECTLY. Instead of a 'loop' the Western Europeans depicted the river practically as a straight line starting not far from the lake Ilmen and flowing straight towards the Volga river. This is a first-rate blunder. In fact the Mologa meanders in a loop beginning in Vladimir and Suzdal Russia and flowing into the Volga river a little bit above Yaroslavl [TsRIM], ch.1. At the same time S.Herberstein says correctly, that THE MOLOGA RIVER 'FLOWS FROM THE LANDS OF VELIKY NOVGOROD' [161], p.153.

That is why the Western merchants and travellers having arrived to Volga at the mouth of Mologa near Kholopii Gorod (Town of Serves) understood that going up the Mologa river they would soon find themselves in the Czar's quarters of Velikii Novgorod. S Novgorod was not just another town, but an entire region of towns. That is why if you go up the Mologa river, at first you need to move TOWARDS THE NORTH WEST. However later, going up Mologa further, you need to turn South or even East, and as a result the ship will return to the Yaroslavl, i.e. Novgorod lands.

Thus the Westerners CORRECTLY informed their cartographers, that the Czar's headquarters in Velikii Novgorod was situated upstream of the Mologa river. The only thing left to do was to draw this river on the map. That is where the cartographers were faced with difficulties. They knew for sure that going upstream on the Mologa from Volga, the ship would at first go NORTH WEST. But they had no idea how the river would act further. They were not allowed as far as that. So the cartographers decided to merely CONTINUE THE LINE OF THE RIVER STRAIGHT TO THE NORTH WEST. The way it is drawn on the map of Herberstein. Having made this fundamental mistake, the cartographers 'stretched' the Mologa river as far as the lake Ilmen. And they erroneously decided that Mologa's source is located there. After that they confidently DREW HERE THE CZAR'S VELIKI NOVGOROD, 'at the riverhead of Mologa'. Thus the annalistic royal Novgorod was 'driven back' far to the North West.

The Romanovs dynasty was pro-western not only by blood, but also by their original spirit. That is why the Western chronicles and maps, which replaced either the destroyed or the edited chronicles and maps of the 'Mongol' Empire, provided the basis to the Romanov geography and history. As we can see on the Western maps Velikii Novgorod is erroneously drawn near the lake Ilmen. There was nothing left for the Romanov historians to do, but to place here 'on the ground' the geographical Novgorodian names, which they have read from the Russian chronicles. In particular, they had to call a shabby town-district with a prison 'Velikii Novgorod'. This was an isolated place, desolate swampland, wolves, frogs, snakes and mosquitos. The mistake once firmly consolidated, it acquired an authoritative appearance, and overgrew with the other distortions. In the XX century Moscow archaeologists arrived here in order to 'even better confirm the chronicles'. To see the outcome of this 'activity' see [4v1], ch.2:11-12.

## **16. THE COAT OF ARMS OF THE RUSSIAN-HORDE EMPIRE OF THE XVI CENTURY.**

The coat of arms of the Russian Empire has changed over the course of time. It is interesting to see what it looked like in the XVI-XVII cc., during the epoch of the Horde Empire and immediately after its break up in the XVII century. According to [162] four old depictions survive of the Imperial emblem of the XVI-XVII cc. [4v2], ch.2. Namely:

- 1) The state seal of Czar Ivan the Terrible (Ioann Grozny). Here surrounding the two headed eagle on the face side of the seal there are 12 emblem-seals [162], p. VIII and [568], p.161. See [fig.84](#), [fig.85](#).
- 2) The depiction of the coat-of-arms on the throne of Mikhail Fedorovich.
- 3) The coat-of arms on the silver plate of the Czar Aleksey Mikhailovich.
- 4) The depiction of the coat of arms of the Empire from the diary of Korb (Joanne Georgio Korb 'DNEVNIK PUTESHESTVIYA V MOSKOVIYU'- "A Diary of the Travel to Moscovy [Russia]") (1698 and 1699)) who in 1698-1699 accompanied the Austrian ambassador of the Habsburgs, sent to Moscow. Here are already depicted the 32 coat-of-arms of the Czardom, not including the Moscow coat-of-arms, [fig.86](#).

Let's look at the national coat of arms of the Horde Empire of the XVI century, [fig.84](#). It is considered to be the earliest of the four previously mentioned. The 12 regions-kingdoms surrounding the two headed eagle on this emblem are intriguing. They are listed in the inscription [161], p.VIII:

'Grand Sovereign Czar and Grand Prince of All Russia Ivan Vasilyevich ,Czar of Vladimir, Grand Prince of Moscow, and Novgorod; Czar of Kazan; Czar of Astrakhan; sovereign of Pskov; Grand Prince of Smolensk; Grand Prince of Tver; Grand Prince of Yugra region, Grand Prince of Perm, Grand Prince of Vyatka, Grand Prince of Bulgaria and the other territories, Sovereign and Grand Prince of Novai Gorod (New Town) of the Nizovskii Zemli (Nizovskii Lands); Sovereign and Grand Prince of Chernigov'.

It turns out that the entire Empire consisted of 12 Czardom-regions, reflected in the Bible as the 12 tribes of Israel [6]. It was exactly the 12 Israeli tribes = files who set off for the conquest of 'The Promised Land'. As it is shown in [6v1], ch.5, it took place in the XV century. These 12 tribes originated in Russia and the Ottoman Empire and settled across the world. I.e.in Southern and Western Europe, Africa, Asia and America.

Among the 12 kingdom-regions there were also the indigenous Russian-Hordian ones. For example, Velikii Novgorod, which in the coat-of-arms is rightly combined

with Moscow and Vladimir. Or, for example, the Kazan Czarndom, the Astrakhan kingdom, Smolensk Grand Duchy, etc.

An interesting question arises. Shouldn't there also be the territories of Western and Southern Europe as well as Constantinople conquered by the Ottomans comprising the 'Mongol' Empire? I.e. Asia Minor, Egypt and other neighbouring countries. Where are they in the coat of arms of the Russian-Horde Empire of the XVI century? Could it be that we have stumbled across a contradiction? No, it turns out that everything is fine.

## **17. TWELVE CZARDOM - TRIBES IN THE RUSSIAN COAT OF ARMS OF THE XVI CENTURY ON THE MAP OF EUROPE.**

In [4v2], ch.2, we were able establish – which territories of the Empire corresponded with the emblems specified on the state seal of the XVI century. We will mark those places on the map of Europe where the capitals of the 12 Czarndom -regions indicated on the face side of the seal were situated, [fig.87](#). The dots and figures in bold represent the 12 Czarndoms-tribes positioned around the two-headed eagle.

1) Velikii Novgorod, including Vladimir and Moscow. I.e. Vladimir and Suzdal Russia. 2) Czarndom of Kazan 3) Astrakhan Czarndom. 4) Pskov republic = Prussia, Central and North Germany. 5) Grand Principality of Smolensk. 6) The Principality of Great Perm = Tiverian Principality with its capital in Czar-Grad on the Bosphorus. 7) Grand Principality of Yugra = Hungary 8) The Principality of Great Perm = German-Austrian. 9) Grand Principality of Vyatka = Spanish-Vatican. 10) Grand Principality of Bulgaria. 11) Grand Principality of Nizovye = Nizhegorodskoye Principality. 12) Grand Principality of Chernigov.

In [fig.87](#) you can see that these Biblical kingdoms-tribes are arranged in groups. Except for the last two tribes, added to the Coat of Arms after the words 'and the other territories'.

1st group – are the Czarndoms along the Volga river: Velikii Novgorod, Kazan, Astrakhan.

2nd group – is West Russia: Pskov or Pleskov = Prussia, Smolensk = White Russia (Belya Rus) or Blue Russia (Blue Rus).

3rd group – is West and South Europe: Czar-Grad, Hungary, Austria, Spain, Italy, Bulgaria.

4th group – two more Russian Princedoms – Nizhnii Novgorod and Chernigov.

Thus in the coat of arms of Russia-Horde of the XVI century there is depicted a significant part of the Empire. But not all of it. Some of the Northern provinces were not included (Sweden, for example), distant Eastern lands (Japan, for example) and the distant Western territories (England, for example). The overseas colonies in America also were not included [6v2], ch.6. However, England and Sweden are included in the other Russian emblems.

In [fig.86](#) we see the Russian emblem of the Romanov epoch of the end of the XVII century [162], p.XI. On the eagle's wings from left to right there are the Coats of Arms of: Kiev, Novgorod, Astrakhan, Moscow, Siberia, Kazan, Vladimir. Inside the oval clockwise from the top are the Coats of Arms of: Pskovsky, Tverskoi, Podolsky, Permsky, Bulgarsky, Chernigovsky, Polotsky, Yaroslavsky, Udorsky, Kondiisky, Mstislavsky, Iversky, Kabardinsky, of Chersky and Gorsky Territories, Cartalinsky, Sveisky, Vitebsky, Obdorsky, Belozersky, Rostovsky, Ryazansky, Novgorod-Nizovsky, yatsky, Yugorsky, Volynsky, Smolensky.

Here the number of the Coats of Arms is significantly greater than in the 'Mongol' emblem of the XVI century. There appear mysterious Czardoms, such as Udorsky, Kondiisky and Obdorsky. Besides, the princedoms Iversky and Cartalinsky are named. One of them - Cartalinsky Czardom is, possibly, Georgia. In which case Iversky Czardom is Spain. We don't mean to say that at the end of the XVII century Spain still belonged to the Russian Empire. The Romanovs, quite simply, took the old Hordian Coat of Arms, where among others were named the distant Czardoms which used to belong to Russia-Horde in the XV-XVI cc. This 'Mongol' emblem was more detailed than the one we have discussed earlier.

That is why we can see here such well-known Czardoms as Sveisky, i.e. Swiss (Sweden). It is followed by Iversky, i.e. Spain. Then there is Yugorsky Czardom, i.e. Hungary. Then - Bulgarian. And lastly there is Permsky, i.e. Austrian Czardom. Let's go back to the three new, at first glance unclear names in the 'Mongol' emblem: Udorsky, Kondiisky and Obdorsky princedoms. As we show in [4v2], ch.2, the answer is as follows:

The mysterious Udorsky Princedom is 'the Mongolian' lands on the border of the present day Germany and Poland, where the river Oder flows.

The British Isles = England, or the Isle of Crete are named as Kontiisky island on the coat of arms of Russia-Horde.

Mysterious Obdora is a town and may be even the entire territory in Spain. Or in

Thrace. And it could also possibly be in France, if we remember that THRACE and FRANCE are just the two versions of the same name. Latin C would read as TS or K.

## **18. ON THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND.**

As we have shown in [4v2], the 'ancient' chronicles in existence today describe the Czar-Grad Czardom of the XII-XV cc. and the Horde Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. The historians erroneously date these chronicles as deep 'antiquity', earlier than the XII century. Roughly speaking the 'ancient' English chronicles are the Romaic and 'Mongol' chronicles transferred to England during its conquest by the Horde and interweaved into the insular English history.

The actual written history of England which provides the accounts of the events SPECIFICALLY ON THIS ISLAND, begins only in the XI century. There are very few fragments of the XI-XIII century which survive. Then on top there was applied a layer of the events telling us about Czar-Grad and the Great Empire. The combination of the insular-English and Romaic-'Mongolian' layers gave us the modern textbook of the history of England of the XI-XVI cc.

The history of England as we know it today which truly reflects the native English insular events, only begins with the XVI-XVII cc. i.e. unalloyed with the Czar-Grad or Mongolian' events. Roughly speaking beginning with the XVI-XVII cc. the Scaligerian version of the history of England is more or less correct, see [fig.88](#).

In the XIII century the waves of the Crusades overwhelm Romea. The Crusader states emerge here. Both the local population and the crusaders get mixed up in them. Cultural life flourishes, the chronicles are written.

At the beginning of the XIV century the 'Mongol' conquest takes place. Then, in 1453 under the attack of the Ottomans who came from Russia-Horde, Constantinople fell. Byzantium is destroyed; crowds of its people leave the country. Many rich people, intellectuals and aristocrats leave for Europe, including for the island of England. These fugitives of the XIV-XV cc. take with them the Czar-Grad chronicles as a memory of the true history of Romea and Horde. In the XIV century a gigantic Horde Empire emerges. On the island of England appears another of its provinces with its governors subordinate to Russia and the Ottoman Empire. The chronicles which are written during this time on the island reflect not so much the local events, as the life of the whole Empire and its Hordian metropoly.

Some time passes. They start writing THEIR OWN history on the island of England, and in the XVI-XVII cc. the 'new' history of 'ancient' England is created. This is a part of global 'Reformation'. The old chronicles are being re-written in England as

well. A lot of the true history of the XIV-XVI cc. has been forgotten. The English historians of the XVI-XVII cc. declare the old Romaic and Hordian-Ottomanian chronicles edited by them to be the documents of the allegedly insular English history. They make them the basis for the 'ancient' history of the British Isles. Big chunks of the history of Romea and the 'Mongol' Empire which unfolded on the vast territories of Eurasia, are transferred on paper to the comparatively small British Isles and their surroundings. Many major events inevitably become smaller, as if shrunk in size. The Hordian Czars of the Empire turn under the quill of the English editors into the local island rulers. The Great Empire disappears from the pages of the edited chronicles. And those accounts which they didn't succeed in destroying, are moved to the past with the aid of the false chronology, transforming them into the 'most ancient myths'.

As a result in the XVI-XVII cc. there emerge the English chronicles in the style of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 'The History of the Britons' by Nennius, etc. Soon this fresh version of the 'ancient' English history solidifies like a monument. In the XIX-XX cc. it becomes only slightly clarified and lacquered over. And today, when discovering with the aid of mathematical methods astonishing duplicates inside the 'English textbook', we begin to understand that the actual English history is considerably shorter [4v2].

It is possible that the Reformers moved the stolen treasury of the Empire to England. They didn't want to take a chance of keeping it in Europe, weary of the restoration of Russia-Horde. At first they tried to create a new metropoly in Vienna, Austria by installing their string puppets there under the pompous name of the 'Habsburgs'. Nothing came of it. This 'Empire' was short-lived. That is why the Hordian money was taken as far away as possible to the distant English isles (where under Ivan the Terrible Elena Voloshanka = Esther = Mary Stuart was exiled to and executed). Having seized the vast treasures of the Horde, the English rebels acquired influence and created the 'English Empire', which existed for some time.

## **19. HOW THE LATER WESTERN EUROPEANS BEGAN TO DEPICT THE HORDIANS.**

In the XVI-XVII cc. they began re-writing the history. The attitude towards the 'Tatar Mongols' also changed. They were now painted purely with black colours.

In [fig.89](#).there is shown an illumination from The Chronica Majora by Matthew Parris, allegedly of the XIII century. It depicts a leisurely dinner of the 'Tatar Mongols'.

Under the picture there is a caption: 'The Tatars are eating human flesh'. They are



roasting a human corpse on a turnspit. Next to it there are cut off human heads and arms. Indicating that such are the 'Mongolian' customs. Savages, cannibals. A far cry from the enlightened and sensitive Western Europeans [4v2], ch.6.

Just about the same was said about the 'Tatar Mongols', calling them the Scythians. Thus, for example, Solinus Gaius Julius reasons with confidence: 'The Scythians of the inland regions lead a rough lifestyle, they live in caves... They love battles. They drink blood from the wounds of the slayed. Glory grows with the number of murders, and not to kill anyone is a disgrace'. Quoted from [953], p.219.

All such provocative leaflets like these are the Western European propaganda of the Reformation epoch. Among the same kind of 'horror stories' is the creation of the character of a wicked Russian bear intimidating Europe. In regards to the name of URSUS under which the bear is depicted in the old maps, the historians inform us: 'The Hereford Mappa Mundi could probably shed the light onto the origin of the English stereotype of the 'Russian bear' which was widely spread during the Elizabethan epoch... There were attempts to raise this Elizabethan stereotype to the symbolism of the early Christian tradition, WHERE BOTH THE NORTH AND THE BEAR WERE ASSOCIATED WITH THE IDEA OF EVIL... Finally, both filthy beasts (a bear and a monkey – Author) are the components of the diet of the 'TURKOMEN OF THE GOG AND MAGOG DESCENT' [953], p.230. The very name of the bear itself – URSUS is just one of the versions of the pronunciation of the word RUSS, Russian.

## **20. WHEN THE WORKS ATTRIBUTED TO DURER WERE CREATED.**

In [5v1], ch.14:3, we show that the works of art attributed to the artist of allegedly the XV-XVI cc. Albrecht Durer were most likely created a century later – in the XVII century. It appears that EXACTLY IN THE XVII CENTURY OCCURS THE PEAK OF DISCOVERING BOTH THE ORIGINAL WORKS OF DURER AND THE NUMEROUS 'COPIES' AND 'IMITATIONS'. They write: 'Not long before 1600 the demand on Durer's prints (his engravings – Author) became so great, that the market was swamped with the engravings and other imitations. This copying carried on almost continually during the 18th century' [1117], p.130. It emerges that the first list of Durer's graphic art appears only in the XVIII century (!) by (Heinrich Hüsgen, 1745-1847).

The Reformers of the XVII century were destroying not only the state structures of the Horde Empire, but its manifestations in art, sculpture, literature and science. A

sweeping blow was also dealt on the legacy of the Imperial artist A.Durer. Something similar was inflicted on the cartographer Gerardus Mercator [7v1], ch.7.

Later the fire of the coup died down, emotions were placated. Following the success of the Reformation there was a need in the new Germany of the XVII century to create the 'great German history', allegedly independent from the former one – the 'Mongolian'. They decided also to create a new history of art, literature and architecture. Free of the 'detrimental' tradition of the Horde Empire. They remembered of A.Durer and decided to create on the basis of the glorious, but already forgotten name, a 'new Durer of the Reformation'. His earlier paintings perished. Burnt in the fires of the Reformation. Oh well, said the Reformers, it's for the best, as they were improper. We will paint the new – proper ones. 'Durer's second birth' was naturally cleared of the memories of the 'Mongol' Empire. As envisioned by the Reformers Durer was supposed to become a 'typical European' in the 'progressive' meaning of the XVII century. So Durer was declared the 'great supporter of the Reformation' [1117],p.104. They kept repeating it until present day. But is it true? Durer, the Empire's artist of the XVI century, hardly supported the anti-government coup, aimed primarily against the Empire, which he served faithfully all his life [5v1], ch.14:3.

## **21. THE ALMAGEST BY CLAUDIUS PTOLEMY.**

Of course as it has already been said, the important result of the New Chronology is as follows. The star catalogue of the famous 'Almagest' by Ptolemy was created in the interval between year 600 to year 1300, and by no means in the II century [3v1].

The dating method which we suggested was successfully tested on a number of the well-known star catalogues, in particular those of - Ulugh Beg, Al-Sufi, Tycho Brahe and Johannes Hevelius. In all cases the traditionally known dating of the old catalogues – with the exception of the Almagest catalogue – were confirmed by our method. The Almagest catalogue turned out to be the single exception. It means that the traditional dating of Ptolemy's life contains an error of several hundred or even more, a thousand years.

Almagest is an encyclopaedia, where several hundred years' worth of astronomical observations are collected. The earliest of them date to the epoch not earlier than the X century. The observations up until the XVI century could have been included in the Almagest. This encyclopaedia reflects the current and changing state of astronomical science. The final version was published in the XVI century.

Editions of the Almagest prior to the XVI century, even if they existed, didn't reach us. In the XVII century, during the falsification of history, the Almagest, which was important for the chronology, was significantly re-worked. It was published 'post factum', listing erroneous dates. It included the fabricated 'ancient observations', which in fact were the results of the THEORETICAL CALCULATIONS ACCORDING TO THE MEDIAEVAL ASTRONOMICAL THEORY OF THE XVII CENTURY. It is presented in the Almagest. Thus one of the whales of the Scaligerian chronology was created.

The coordinates of the planets, position of the Sun, the Moon and etc. were calculated into the past. Then the calculated astronomical phenomenon were declared to be 'observed' and were included into the Almagest: 'A such-and-such astronomer in a such-and-such (calculated!) year observed this and that'. But as the astronomical theory of the XVII century was not so precise as today, the evaluations made according to the modern formulas reveal the fraud. As was discovered by the well-known astrophysicist Robert Newton [3v1].

So, THE ALMAGEST AS WE KNOW IT TODAY WAS CREATED IN THE XVII CENTURY. Its creators presented this book to be 'ancient' in order to lay it as a foundation of the Scaligerian chronology which was in the process of being created in precisely that very epoch. THAT IS WHY THOSE ASTRONOMICAL PHENOMENA WHICH COULD HAVE BEEN COMPUTED INTO THE PAST ACCORDING TO THE THEORY OF THE XVII CENTURY WERE DATED IN THE ALMAGEST ALREADY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CHRONOLOGY OF SCALIGER. Naturally, with the precision which could have been achieved with the flawed astronomical theory of the XVII century. That is why it is necessary to refer to Almagest data with great caution, when we wish to use it for the purpose of chronology. Only the data which could not have been computed in the XVII century should be used. For example the solar eclipses, the precise phases of the lunar eclipses, the star positions. However, the falsifiers of the XVII century naturally did their best so there were no such possible data left in the Almagest at our disposal. For example, 'for some reason' no solar eclipses are mentioned in the Almagest.

Going forward. The famous 'classical' astronomer Hipparchus, who lived allegedly in the II century BC [797], p.307 – is, to a great extent, a phantom reflection of the famous astronomer Tycho Brahe, who lived in the XVI century. In the beginning of the XVII century, when filling the 'distant antiquity' with the phantoms of the Mediaeval events, the historians 'split' Tycho Brahe into two as well. One of the versions of his biography was cast away into the past and there was created the 'great

astronomer Hipparchus'. Besides, in [VAT], part 1, ch.1. we show that the life description of Hipparchus also includes the ancient information about the astronomer from the XI century.

Ptolemy's Almagest was finally edited and finished only AFTER Tycho Brahe, in the epoch of Johannes Kepler (1571-1630). I.e. the Almagest, including its star catalogue, was being edited up until the beginning of the XVII century. As a result the following picture is forming.

# At first there emerged a comparatively small catalogue of Tycho Brahe – the most ancient among the star catalogues which survive to the present time.

# Followed by – a more complete 'ancient' catalogue of Claudius Ptolemy, to be more precise – its surviving version.

# Then – the even more complete catalogue of Johann Hevelius.

# And finally the even more complete catalogue of John Flamsteed.

The catalogue of Tycho Brahe appears to be the earliest and therefore the most sparse from the point of view of the quantity of stars recorded in it. Then Ptolemy or the editors of his catalogue increase the number of the observed stars. And only after that an even larger quantity of stars appear in the catalogues of Hevelius and Flamsteed.

Can we date the Almagest based on the Ptolemy's descriptions of the 21 lunar eclipses? They allegedly were observed by the astronomers in the duration of 850 years. The serious analysis of these lunar eclipses was conducted by Robert Newton [3v1]. He discovered a lot of evidence supporting the fact that MOST OF THEM ARE FORGED. Therefore we cannot consider the lunar eclipses from the Almagest to be trustworthy material for astronomical dating. Most likely this forged 'ancient list' was manufactured in the XVI-XVII cc. in order to lay the grounds for the Almagest's 'antiquity'.

THE CONCLUSION. The surviving version of the Almagest was created not by some single author-observer, but is a collective 'textbook on astronomy'. It is a collection of many individual observations, various theories, calculations and exercises on chronology belonging to different astronomers of the XI-XVII cc. The star catalogue could have been compiled by one observer in the epoch of the X-XIII cc. But the final text of the Almagest is by other authors of the XVI-XVII cc.

## **22. THE FLOURISHING, STAGNATION AND RE-FLOURISHING IN THE HISTORY OF ASTRONOMY.**

The Scaligerian history claims that 'ancient' astronomy enjoyed an unprecedented rise. However later, 'during the next three centuries after the death of Hipparchus, it was as if the history of astronomy became enshrouded in darkness' [65], p.63.

Purporting that the epoch of the greatest stagnation has started. Practically the only outburst during 300 years in the 'darkening' Greek astronomy is considered to be Ptolemy's Almagest. Today he is regarded as the 'last chord of ancient astronomy'. IT IS FOLLOWED BY A PERIOD OF PROFOUND SILENCE AND DARKNESS IN THE SCALIGERIAN HISTORY OF ASTRONOMY.

They write: 'CLASSICAL CULTURE IN DECLINE'. After the breath-taking rise of the classical culture there began a PROLONGED PERIOD OF SOME STAGNATION AND, IN SOME CASES, REGRESSION in the European continent – a timespan of more than 1000 years, which is commonly referred to as the Middle Ages... AND OVER THESE 1000 YEARS THERE WAS MADE NO SIGNIFICANT ASTRONOMICAL DISCOVERY' [395], P.73.

Our thought is simple. These 'dark ages', 'dips', 'centuries of complete silence', 'global catastrophes' appear only because the historians of the science use the incorrect chronology. In which there exist the 'ancient' mirage-reflections and the 'dark ages' between 'Classical Antiquity' and the 'Renaissance'. The new chronology removes these 'gaps' and 'sinusoids' in the development of the science and culture. So.

In the Scaligerian history of astronomy there occurs a strange phenomenon: a magnificent blossoming of the 'ancient classical' astronomy, followed by a deep millennial regression, followed by the repeated rise beginning with the XIII century.

We are assured that practically all the main breakthroughs in astronomy of the XIV-XVI cc. have been 'already discovered' more than 1000 years prior to that, in the 'Classical antiquity'. But later in some mysterious way were forgotten. Let's list the fundamental ideas allegedly discovered a long time ago by the 'classical ancient' astronomers.

Ecliptic and equatorial coordinates, methods of their calculation. Determination of the principal elements of the relative planetary inter-motion in the Solar system.

Heliocentrism - essentially the heliocentric theory of the planetary system.

Calculation of the relative distances in the Solar system – Earth – Moon – planets – stars. The forecast of the Lunar eclipses. Compilation of star catalogues. Celestial globes design. Discovery of precession. Professional astronomical instruments: astrolabe, etc. Computing the length of the sidereal year and the tropical year.

Allocation of the constellation of stars, recording of their 'image'. The question of the existence of proper motion stars.

These discoveries were made in the XII-XVII cc. But later their duplicates were dated back into the past by the incorrect chronology. There were no major 'regressions' in the history of science and culture.

## **23. GEOCENTRISM, OR THE PTOLEMAIC SYSTEM AND THE HELIOCENTRIC SYSTEM BY TYCHO BRAHE (AND COPERNICUS).**

The World system according to Tycho Brahe is shown in [fig.90](#). In the centre of the world there is the Earth around which revolves the Sun. However, the rest of the planets are already revolving round the Sun. This is the reason why today Tycho Brahe's (Tychonic) system is called Geo-Heliocentric [395], p.132. BUT IT IS PERFECTLY CLEAR, THAT IT DIFFERS FROM THE 'COPERNICUS SYSTEM' ONLY BY THE CHOICE OF THE ORIGIN OF THE COORDINATES. That's all! For, as we know from school, change of origin does not change the system of bodies in motion. Only the coordinate system changes, the point at which the observer is placed. The 'picture' changes, but not the core of the matter [3v1], ch.11.

From the point of view of kinematics, the system of Tycho Brahe (Hipparchus) is quite heliocentric. But only the centre of the coordinate system is placed at Earth. After all, the centre of the coordinates can be connected with any astronomical body of the system. IF WE MOVE THE STARTING POINT OF THE REFERENCE SYSTEM ON TYCHO BRAHE'S CHART INTO THE SUN, THEN WITHOUT ESSENTIALLY CHANGING ANYTHING WE WILL GET A 'COPERNICAN' SYSTEM'. Earth will start revolving around the Sun. Where all the other planets, according to Tycho Brahe, already revolve around the Sun. All that's missing to complete the picture according to Kepler is only the mild orbital ellipticity. Brahe still has his planets' orbits as circular. As, incidentally, does Copernicus. But this is the 'second order' effect. That is why, we will repeat, Tycho Brahe's system is in fact as good as the Copernican system. But with a different starting point of the reference system. The observer is placed at Earth, but not at the Sun.

It is clear that the idea by Tycho Brahe (Hipparchus) preceded or co-existed with the idea by Copernicus. The 'Copernican system' evolutionally follows the system by Tycho Brahe or is contemporary to it, but not at all preceding it. The final 'model' of the heliocentric system was most likely suggested only AFTER TYCHO BRAHE, in the epoch of his student Johannes Kepler. And Copernicus of the XV-XVI cc. was

accredited with its invention post factum. Thus the true chronological order of the 'world system' is as follows.

First – the Ptolemy's geocentric system. Its complex model of epicycles was formed most likely in the XV-XVI cc. Earth was placed at the centre of the universe. Based on the idea of the epicycles, stating that Earth is a fixed point, it was necessary to create a complex model of the epicycles in order to explain the movement of the planets visible from Earth. This world system was based on the 'royal' star catalogue of the XII century. Its creation is connected with the Birth of Jesus Christ in the XII century and with the flaring up of the supernova circa 1152, i.e. the Star of Bethlehem. It is possible that the first astronomers created the star catalogue in honour of Jesus. Hence the origin of the great authority of the catalogue. It existed in its more or less unchanged form until the epoch of the XVI century.

The star catalogue included by Copernicus in his book and called 'Copernicus' star catalogue', IS IN FACT THE VERY SAME PTOLEMAIC STAR CATALOGUE, HOWEVER MODIFIED FOR ANOTHER EPOCH BY CHOOSING A DIFFERENT LONGITUDE REFERENCE POINT. The Astronomy historians became aware of this fact a long time ago [395], p.109. This indicates that the astronomers of the Middle Ages kept shifting zero longitude, moving the 'catalogue date according to precession' into the epoch they required, for one reason or another. In the XV-XVI cc. the astronomers made the next step and began to develop the theory of the planets' motion, Earth and the Sun. The 'Ptolemaic system' appeared. The historians of astronomy note, that 'according to its composition the book by Copernicus GREATLY RESEMBLES the Almagest' [395], p.105. It's all correct. It was in the epoch of the XVI-XVII cc. when the final edition of the Almagest was created.

1) Simultaneously with Ptolemy's concept, in the second half of the XVI century the system of Tycho Brahe = 'ancient Hipparchus'. It is practically heliocentric. The planetary motion, apart from the Moon, is circular with the Sun in the centre. The coordinate origin is connected to Earth.

2) And finally, the heliocentric system with the coordinate origin in the Sun. There is a new idea here, but it has nothing to do with the crux of the matter. The idea is that it is not necessary to place the coordinate origin at the very same point where the observer is located. I.e. on the Earth. It could be the Sun. For the public and school education the 'picture' was simplified.

This system entered the astronomical practices possibly in the XVII century, in the epoch of Kepler. It was attributed post factum to the astronomer of the XV-XVI cc. by the name of Copernicus. He was most likely a remarkable astronomer. He could

have been the first to express in its 'raw' form the heliocentric idea with the zero point at the Sun, and not at the Earth. However, today it is very difficult to be sure what exactly he was doing. The only thing to go by on Copernicus' life and work are the XVII century texts, i.e. written 60-100 years after his death.

Most likely, both systems – by Claudius Ptolemy and by Tycho Brahe – belong to the same epoch. The systems were in competition with each other and were discussed by the astronomers. Until finally they realised that the heliocentric system by Tycho Brahe is the only correct one. However the historians unceremoniously took this fundamental discovery from Tycho Brahe and attributed it to the 'earlier' Copernicus.

## **24. IN THE XVIV-XVI CC. EUROPE RESPECTFULLY 'LOOKED UP TO' THE DISTANT AND MIGHTY CZAR-KHAN OF THE HORDE.**

We were taught that allegedly in the XIV-XVI cc. – as indeed always – Western Europe looked at Russia in a condescending manner. And allegedly deservedly so. Indeed, in the West – there is civilization and culture. And Russia is a backward and ignorant country, only having crawled out from under the Tartar and Mongol yoke with great difficulty. Of course, there is a lot of honey, bread, bacon and hemp. That is why they sometimes succeeded in luring in some skilful overseas artisans here, so they could relent and mercifully build something extraordinary in this, backward, dim Russia. The cathedrals, the palaces, the factories and the ships. The Russians naively marvelled at the craftsmanship of the foreigners, realising that they would never be able to reach such dizzy heights in those skills. Only after Peter I (the Great) the Russian mechanical and industrial arts started to develop at last, generally still being second rate. Not to mention that the Western Royal courts gazed condescendingly at the Moscow Czar, the Asiatic barbarian on the throne.

However, it was quite the reverse. In the XIV-XVI cc. there emerged the 'Mongol' Empire which included, in particular, all the West-European territories. The local rulers were the vassals to the Horde Czar-khan. The traces of their subservient state survive in the testimonies of their contemporaries [6v3], ch.1:16. Despite the fact that they underwent tendentious editing in the XVII-XVIII cc.

The remote regions of the Empire were in a different situation from the metropoly, i.e. Russia and the Ottoman Empire. The centre of the Empire was generally occupied with military matters and the development of military capability necessary to keep the vast territories under its rule. It was necessary to suppress, appease, and arbitrate. A



big army was necessary for this. A lot of energy was required to maintain the routes of communication. It was required to collect taxes, to regulate trade between the Imperial territories. That is why generally the metropolity required military servicemen and civil servants and a large administrative apparatus.

The life of the remote provinces was different. The Hordian Czar-Khan was far away. The governors ruled as his representatives. The Cossack garrisons were located nearby to maintain order. The focus was not only on the local issues, but the necessity to win favour from the metropolity. A lot depended on that. For example, the superiority over a neighbour could be achieved not only by crushing its military detachment, but also by sending fine gifts to the Horde. If the gifts were fine, then the Czar-Khan could graciously allow seizure of the neighbour's land. Especially if the latter didn't please the 'Mongol' Khan. For example, either the tax was not paid regularly by that neighbour, or the gifts he sent were unsatisfactory.

In Western Europe they were developing arts and sciences. Including those aimed at entertainment. Their industry was being created especially in the resort provinces of the Empire where the climate was favourable. In Italy, France and Spain. In Italy there developed: architecture, literature, history and singing. In England – shipbuilding. In France – its own palette. And so on (etc.)

The Hordian court of the Czar-Khan considered all of it to be its own, at their disposal. If the building of a new fleet was required, the request was sent to England. From there the best ship builders were sent to Russia. Otherwise the Imperial ships were built in England outright. If a skilful physician was required – they would call for a Frenchman, for example. If there was an urgent need to build a cathedral in Moscow – the architects from Italy were called for, as it was during the construction of the Moscow Kremlin. The architects would come straight away. Refusal was not an option. Having received the Imperial order they would answer 'Yes, Sir!' execute the order and send the specialists to the metropolity. From Italy, France, Spain, Germany, England, Africa, Asia...

At the Czar-Khan's court in Yaroslavl and later in Moscow there were probably parties of representatives from various provinces: of Englishmen, French, Germans... They fought for the right to be the first to gain the lucrative contracts. Vouching to the great Khan and his administration that their specialists were the best. The victorious party would rejoice. The significance of that province in the eyes of the Khan administration would thus increase.

Following the split of the Great Empire, when the Western territories declared themselves independent, the efforts of the local governors were aimed at 'proving' that 'it was always the way it is today'. As if purporting that the Western rulers were always independent. They wanted to wipe out the memory of the revolt, about the fact that they came to power by illegal means from the point of view of the ideology of that time. They came up with a false chronology which has cast into the past the 'Mongol' conquest under the name of the Great Transmigration of Peoples, the Slavic conquest of Europe allegedly of the IV-V cc. The recent Europe was hastily wiped out off the world map. They appropriated for themselves the history of the 'Mongol' dynasty of the XIV-XVI cc. under the name of the 'Western-European Habsburgs' [7v2], ch.3. Here, they said, are our former emperors. And we were altogether never under the authority of Moscow. Such an absurd and politically detrimental idea should not even enter one's head.

This activity coincided with the desire of the pro-Western Romanovs, who had seized the power in Russia. That is why the actions of the Romanovs and the new rulers of Europe were coordinated. And against the Ottoman Empire which was in the way of this civilizing process, it was necessary to organise the Crusade. With Russian hands and Russian blood.

The revision of the texts, chronicles and memoires was carried out. Many foreigners visited Russia in the XIV-XVI cc. That is why there still remained many original documents in Western Europe. They were sought, destroyed, edited. Then they were printed. The 'old dates' were put onto them in order to vindicate the new perspective.

But many things survived. Various details escaped the attention of the editors. Not all of them understood the task equally well, not all of them were astute. And indeed the perceptions themselves of how history should appear 'in reality' were only gradually developed by the falsifiers. That is why much of the stuff the later historians of the XIX-XX cc. would decisively cross out from an old document, the earlier editors of the XVII-XVIII cc. could have missed. Which they did!

That is why some of the works of the Western Europeans of the XVI century about Russia seem today somewhat strange. Even after being edited they do not fit the ideas which are instilled in us. Such as, for example, the well-known 'Notes on Russia' by Jerome Horsey. See details in [6v3], ch.1.

## **25. WHAT ARE THE 'SEVEN WONDERS OF THE ANCIENT WORLD' AND WHERE THEY WERE LOCATED.**

The famous seven wonders of the world are often recalled. We are persuaded that they, with the exception of the Egyptian pyramids, were destroyed in the Middle Ages. 'The seven wonders' are [572], p.135:

1) The PYRAMIDS OF Egypt: survive. 2) Hanging Gardens of Semiramida, i.e. Hanging Gardens of Babylon: destroyed. 3) Temple of Artemis at Ephesus: destroyed. 4) Statue of Zeus at Olympia: destroyed. 5) Mausoleum at Halicarnassus: destroyed. 6) Colossus of Rhodes: destroyed. 7) Colossus of Rhodes in Pharos: destroyed.

What wonders of the world did the 'ancient classical' authors speak of? They wrote, as we understand it, in the XVI-XVII cc. We managed to identify the 'seven wonders' with the constructions of the Middle Ages. For example, the 'Hanging Gardens of Semiramida, created in Moscow in the XVI century, already existed in the XVII-XVIII cc [6v2], ch.2:4.14. It appears that the rest of the 'wonders of the world' either exist until today, or were destroyed quite recently. So.

### **1) PYRAMIDS OF EGYPT**

In regards to the Egyptian pyramids we do not have any differences with the Scaligerian version. Except for the dating, of course. These gigantic constructions rightfully head the list of the 'Seven Wonders of the Ancient World'.

### **2) THE HANGING GARDENS OF SERMIRAMIDA.**

We spoke about the 'gardens of Semiramida', or about the Hanging Gardens of Babylon, in [6v2], ch.10:4.14. They are – THE FAMOUS ROYAL GARDENS ARRANGED ON THE ROOF OF THE KREMLIN PALACE IN MOSCOW (XVI-XVIII cc.). The historians and archaeologists cannot present us today with any remnants of the 'hanging gardens of Semiramida' in Asia, where Biblical Babylon was erroneously placed. They were searched for long and hard. But in vain. Having come to a standstill they declared several semi-covered earth trenches near a small town in modern Iraq to be the remains of the 'gardens of Semiramida [572], p.41. By the way, what do the hanging gardens have to do with it? Given that the gardens of Semiramida were 'hanging in the air', but did not grow in the ground.

### **3) TEMPLE OF ARTEMIS AT EPHEBUS.**

It is considered that this enormous temple, whose glory echoed throughout the ancient world, was built in Ephesus, a city in Asia Minor. But this hypothesis is erroneous. It's no coincidence that the historians and archaeologists cannot point out any distinguishable traces of the famous temple close to a place in the south of Turkey, which was precariously declared in the XIX century to be 'the great ancient Ephesus' [572], p.58. In the end, having found no remnants of the temple of Artemis projected above the surface of the ground the archaeologists began excavating.

Frankly, in seven years they haven't found much. They write this: 'THE REMAINS OF THE BEST OF THE EPHEBUS BUILDINGS – ARTEMISIONA – APPEARED TO BE INSIGNIFICANTLY SMALL ... The statue of the goddess did not survive either, its appearance is being reconstructed based on the image on a coin and using a copy found in 1956. The archaeologists and architects recreated only the plan of the famous temple with any certainty' [572], p.59.

The idea occurs to look for the famous temple of Artemis in a different place. Could it still exist? As well as the great trading city of Ephesus itself. It is likely that THE TEMPLE OF ARTEMIS AT EPHEBUS IS THE FAMOUS GIGANTIC TEMPLE OF HAGIA SOPHIA IN ISTANBUL. This magnificent construction, as we have explained above, was the first experiment in massive temple building. The huge Sophia built, most likely in the XV-XVI cc. made a strong impression on contemporaries [6v]. Even today the magnificence of the temple is striking. It is possible that in the name EPHEBUS there might be the sound of the name SOPHIA if read backwards: EPHEBUS – SOPHIA.

There is one other possibility to determine the place of the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus, which was also called the Temple of DIANA. It is cape Fiolent near Sevastopol. Legends circulated about the Temple of Diana in Crimea. In the beginning of the XIX century A.S.Pushkin was searching for its traces and found them near Saint George Monastery in Cape Fiolent. As we have found out, the genuine Grotto of the Nativity is located there [XP]. In 1152 Christ was born there. Pushkin, naturally, did not know anything about it. But it was near Saint George Monastery where he found the remains of a large 'pagan' temple and suggested that it was the Temple of Diana. In light of our discovery, the Pushkin hypothesis is even more plausible. It is precisely here, in the birth place of Christ where the majestic temple of the Blessed Virgin Mary should have stood. It is highly unlikely that the Czar-gods of the Great Empire, Christ's relatives, wouldn't have erected an appropriate temple to Diana-Mother of God near the Grotto of the Nativity. To

remind you, Diana was one of the names of the Mother of God in the times of the 'Royal' Christianity.

Today there are no remains of the Temple of Diana found near the Saint George Monastery. There are only the legends left that here once upon a time there used to be the Temple of Diana and also her grotto. Notably Diana's Grotto really exists. It is the Grotto of the Nativity, where she gave birth to Christ. Today there is the Church of the Nativity situated in the grotto. It's altar, according to the legend, was set by Apostle Andrew the First-called (St. Andrew the Apostle). I.e. by Christ himself. [TsRS].

#### **4) THE STATUE OF ZEUS AT OLYMPIA.**

What is Olympus and what kind of gods dwelled there, we discuss in [4v2], ch.2:22. 'The Olympic gods' are the Czars of the 'Mongol' Empire = Biblical Assyria = Israel. In the distant provinces people made up legends about their distant and mysterious rulers. Thus emerged the 'Ancient' Greek myths about the Olympian gods.

The 'Ancient' Greek Olympia is Velikii Novgorod = Yaroslavl of the XIV-XVI cc. Therefore the 'statue of Zeus' in Olympia is some holy object situated in Yaroslavl or nearby. The legends about this 'statue' most likely originated from the stories of the Western merchants and travellers, who visited the trade-fairs of Velikii Novgorod.

It is thought, that the 'main relic of Olympia was the legendary Temple of Zeus with the statue of the supreme god, created by one of the most genius Greek sculptors – Phidias (i.e. a certain Feodor, Fedya – Author)' [572], p.62. We would like to draw your attention to the fact, that the 'statue' was situated inside the temple. This simplifies the answer to the puzzle. The interior decoration of the Russian churches indeed contained an object which was known only in Russia and made the Russian cathedrals different from all the other ones. It is the iconostasis. In a large cathedral it is a huge construction. It rises in height to the cathedral vaults. Iconostasis separates the altar – approximately one third of cathedral's length – from the rest of a cathedral. Some of the Russian iconostases were exuberant. The iconostasis surface, free of the icons, was covered with golden engraving – leaf-gold on wood. In the main Russian cathedrals the lower rows of the icons had the golden icon plating with the precious stones, wrought silver, filigree work, gold seeded into enamel.

In the other countries the chancel screens were either not made at all, or, like in Greece, for example, it was the iconostasis which served as a chancel screen, but a rather low rising wall or a simple SCREEN (ZAVESA in Russian). There are Holy doors made in an iconostasis furnished with a SCREEN (ZAVESA). Hence the entire

iconostasis could have been perceived as a STANDING SCREEN (ZAVESA) OR STATUE-ZAVESA. Which could have easily in the telling the legends turned into the STATUE OF ZEVESA, i.e. STATUE OF ZEUS.

The historians put forward a hypothesis, that the 'Ancient Olympia was located in Greece'. However, 'there were no remnants of the legendary statue of Zeus discovered among the numerous architectural and sculptural pieces in Olympia. And nor indeed could they have been found, as it is well-known that the statue of Zeus was completely destroyed in the fire' [572], p.64.

But if the statue was completely destroyed in the fire, then, most likely, it was wooden. It is all correct. The iconostases were made of wood and adorned with gold over the wooden carving. During the fire the iconostasis could have been completely incinerated.

## **5) THE MAUSOLEUM AT HALICARNASSUS**

It is thought that this enormous temple-mausoleum was built in the city of Halicarnassus on the coast of Asia Minor as the family burial chamber for the King Mausolus and his wife Artemisia. 'Mausolus accumulated great wealth. This overabundance allowed him to build a tomb-temple for himself, it was so magnificent that it survived in the people's memory until the present day as THE UNSURPASSED EXAMPLE OF FUNERARY ARCHITECTURE. Its reputation was so great, that the Ancient Romans called all the grand monumental constructions – mausoleums... As envisioned by the architects the burial tomb of the King Mausolus WAS THE MOST LUXURIANT AND REMARKABLE STRUCTURE IN HALICARNASSUS HAD TO BE SITUATED IN THE CENTRE OF THE CITY AND BE ITS MAIN ADORNMENT' [572], P.78-79.

It is thought that the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus was destroyed. And the 'most wealthy and beautiful city' itself indeed turned into wasteland [572], p.77. Later 'in place of the ancient Halicarnassus and the mediaeval fortress-castle of St. Peter – there emerged the Turkish fortress of Bodrum' [572], p.85.

So, in the XVIII century the historians suggested that 'ancient Halicarnassus' was located somewhere in Asia Minor. They began their search. There are a lot of 'ancient classical' ruins. They declared one of such places, namely Turkish Bodrum to be 'the ruins of ancient Halicarnassus'. They began to 'dig up proof'. However without much luck.

Could it be that the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus is the gigantic temple-reliquary of the Magi, Cologne Cathedral in the German city of Cologne [6v1], ch.3.? It was built

as a mausoleum for Balthazar, Melchior and Caspar. The first two were the Magi-Kings and Caspar was inferior in rank so to speak. Could it be that Balthazar and Melchior were Mausolus and Artemisia of the 'ancient classical' writers? Incidentally the name HALICARNASSUS or HALICARNASSUS (as R and L converted into each other) is close to HALI-COLOGNE. It could have meant HOLY COLOGNE = COLONY or LIGHT COLOGNE = COLONY, as in German 'Heilig' means Holy, and 'Hell'- light, clear, bright. Alternatively HALI-COLOGNE meant GALLIC COLOGNE, or GALLIC COLONY.

It is also quite possible, that the mausoleum in Hali-CARNASSUS is a colossal Ancient Egyptian temple at KARNAK [6v3], ch.1. The temple comprises three parts, the middle of which occupies an area of approximately 30 hectares! It is possibly the largest temple in the world. According to our findings, the Temple at Karnak was the MAIN FUNERARY TEMPLE OF THE GREAT EMPIRE [6v3]. That is why it fully deserved to be called a wonder of the world. The name HALICARNASSUS or HALI-CARNASSUS itself might mean 'Sunny Karnak'. To clarify, HALI = HELIOS is the name of the God of Sun. The name of CARNASSUS can convert into KARNAK on account of the ambiguity in pronunciation of the letter 'C', which could be pronounced as [S], [K] or [Ts].

## **6) THE COLOSSUS OF RHODES**

According to the descriptions of the 'ancients' the Colossus of Rhodes is a gigantic structure cast in bronze. The word COLOSSAL, i.e. very big, originated from the word COLOSSUS.

The Colossus was made like this. At first a large mould of clay was prepared in an EARTHEN PIT. 'Creating cast bronze statues was a very labour intensive process requiring great mastery and technical skills. At first the sculptor moulded in clay... an exact copy of his bronze statue. The clay figure was a kind of nucleus, the basis of which was covered by a layer of wax, the thickness of which the sculptor wished his bronze to be... When the wax surface was ready it was again covered over with clay in such a way that the upper layer closely adhered to the wax and matched the inner nucleus exactly ... After which the mould would be heated up, causing the wax to flow out through the outlets which were left open... Bronze flowed inside the clay filling the space freed by the wax and evenly enveloping the clay nucleus... It took 500 talents of bronze and 300 talents of iron, i.e. approximately 13 tonnes of bronze and 7,8 tonnes of iron to make the Colossus' [572], p.94-95, 101.

Our thought is simple. 'The Colossus of Rhodes' is RADNY (RADA) BELL, i.e. VECHE BELL. The word RADA = assembly is the same as VECHE = assembly. The 'ancient classics' turned the word Rada in to Rhodes. All the details of casting the Colossus perfectly correspond with bell casting technology. And indeed the word 'COLOSSUS' itself is probably a slightly distorted Russian word KOLOKOL (OR COLOCOL) (meaning BELL in Russian – Translator's note). As the Latin C was pronounced both as K and as Ts, C.

The fact, that an enormous veche bell (watch bell, radny bell) Russian bell amazed the foreigners, is understandable. It was in Russia, in the metropoly of the Empire where the cast the largest bells in the world. It is clear why 'ancient' Philo of Byzantium, who probably wrote his works in the XVI-XVII cc., pays main attention to the installation of a bronze giant. It is very difficult to remove a large bell from a pit and raise it high. For example, they failed to fit the gigantic Czar-bell on display in the Moscow Kremlin, though the casting itself was successful. But the other huge bells were successfully lifted and smoothly installed.

## **7) LIGHTHOUSE OF ALEXANDRIA IN PHAROS.**

The seventh wonder of the world is a lighthouse on the island of Pharos, allegedly not far from Alexandria in Egypt. It is thought that it was built under the Ptolemaic Kings and was later destroyed. 'The lighthouse was simultaneously a fortress, where a large military garrison was located. An enormous cistern with drinking water was housed in the underground part of the tower in the event of a siege. The lighthouse was also an observation point, as the ingenious system of metallic mirrors allowed to keep the ocean space under surveillance from the tower's apex and to detect enemy ships long before they appeared in close proximity to the city. The octagonal tower was adorned with the bronze statues (bells? – Author)... Allegedly there also was a statue which pointed with its hand or arm towards the sea in the event of the emerging hostile fleet and produced a warning signal when the enemy was approaching the harbour (a bronze bell or a cannon? – Author) ... This incredible structure stood until the XIV century... This monument excited the admiration of the Arabic writers, who noted the beauty and grandeur of the ruins of this grandiose construction' [572], p.111-112, 118.

As we have already said earlier, the famous 'ancient classical' Pharos (Etruscan) Lighthouse is the well-known Ivan The Great Bell Tower in Moscow [RI], ch.7. So this wonder of the world indeed exists in present day. The Moscow 'Pillar of Ivan the Great' was described by the 'ancient classics' as well as the 'Ancient' Roman Military Column and as the famous Tower of Babel.



## **26. ABOVE GROUND AND UNDERGROUND MOSCOW IN THE TIME OF THE ROMANOVS.**

The remains of the vast underground city called 'underground Moscow' still exist. Throughout several centuries this construction has been surrounded by legends. Numerous underground corridors, tunnels, ample chambers, storage facilities, wells, staircases, connecting passages, hiding places, caved chambers, walled-up doors, flooded passages... Many of them were lined with white stone. It is thought that somewhere about here there is hidden the famous library of Ivan the Terrible and that it is possible to travel long distances along the underground tunnels below Moscow. That having entered under the ground in the city centre, it is possible to exit it far outside of Moscow. There exists a specialised occupation – Moscow diggers. They have been exploring the underground city for many years.

TODAY THE OLD PLANS AND CHARTS OF UNDERGROUND MOSCOW ARE MISSING. More importantly the Romanovs didn't have them either. It appears that to begin with the first Romanovs HAD A VERY VAGUE IDEA ABOUT THE MASSIVE SCALE OF THE UNDERGROUND CITY [851:1]. Only later the exploration and speculative excavations were begun in hope to stumble across either the treasures buried there or the royal archives, or the library of Ivan the terrible. The history of underground Moscow is described in the book by I.Y.Stelletsy [815:1].

According to our results, the Russian Czar-Khans of the XIV-XVI cc. were the Egyptian pharaohs of the Bible. Ivan the Terrible's capital in Alexandrovskaya Sloboda was presumably called Alexandria of Egypt. That is why the information about the famous 'ancient classical' (Alexandriiskaya) library of Alexandria could have been connected with it. Namely about the widely known library of Ivan the Terrible, which probably for some period of time was kept in Aleandrovskaya Sloboda [6v]. In which case the destruction of the 'ancient classical' library of Alexandria in the fire could be reflecting the true event of the destruction of Alexandrovskaya Sloboda in the Romanov epoch of the XVII century. Most likely Ivan the Terrible's library was destroyed, burnt down during the Romanov rule.

Moscow's construction as the new capital of Russia-Horde began only in the XVI century, under Ivan the 'Terrible'. Prior to that a small settlement was located there, which emerged in the place of the Battle of Kulikovo [4v1], ch.6. The battle site was considered to be holy. Here, near the mass graves of the warriors, monasteries and churches were probably initially built to commemorate the battle. The people would

come here to worship. The emerged settlement didn't develop that much. There was no capital here for a long time. Over time various cities acted as such.

The Imperial capital was moved here either from Yaroslavl (Novgorod, Biblical Nineveh) or from Suzdal (Biblical Susa or Shushan) in the middle of the XVI century due to the deep split within the ruling class of the Empire [6v1], ch.6-7. The location choice was not accidental. As the place of the Battle of Kulikovo it was considered to be holy. Here, 'over the spilt blood', on the Moscow river bank, they decided to erect a new mighty capital of the Third Rome = Israel.

Most likely they began with using the open-mining or cut and cover method, they dug out 'deep cut and cover' tunnels, arcades, service areas, chambers, wells, etc. The construction was grandiose. When the huge bulk of the soil was removed, they began to build floors. They stoned the walls of the construction pits – the future premises - with white stone. Above the stone floor - ceilings were erected. Above them the next underground storey with rooms lodgings was constructed. And so on. The underground ant-hill was growing. Its 'roof' gradually rose up until it reached ground level.

In the first place the builders pursued defensive goals. It was possible to hide in the underground city during a war or a siege. As the enemies did not know the exits from the underground passages, the appearance of the Hordians 'from beneath the earth' was completely unexpected. The system of the underground pathways was most likely top secret. The architects-creators disappeared 'into nowhere'. So they didn't breathe a word of this. The maps-plans of the underground city were a state secret. During the seizure of power by the pro-Western-Romanovs the plans were either lost during the Times of Troubles, or the Hordians destroyed them in order to leave the enemy with no advantage. In the XVII century the underground Moscow was engulfed in the gloom of oblivion. Having come into power the first Romanovs had a vague idea about underground Moscow. A chance discovery of a part of the Horde archives there was a complete revelation to them.

Having finished with the underground labyrinth the builders started the construction of the above ground 'visible' Moscow. In the centre there was erected the stone Kremlin surrounded by a mighty triple band of walls (today only one row survives). Some distance from it, surrounding the Kremlin, was the second row of strong fortifications of Kitay-gorod. The third row is known as Bely Gorod (White Town) (there is Bulvarnoye Koltso (Boulevard Ring) in its place). Then the fortifications of Zemlyanoy Gorod ("earthworks town") were created, which encompassed all the

previous ones. Nothing survived from the walls of Zemlyanoy Gorod; today there is Sadovoye coltso (Garden Ring) in its place [6v3], ch.3.

Today over ground Moscow has changed a lot in comparison with the way it looked in the XVI-XVIII cc. The system of the ring defensive constructions was entirely razed. Only their names and the old plans are left.

Nothing of the kind has been done before. The capital of the Great Empire which encompassed Eurasia, Africa and America was being created. The capital which was described in the Bible as the New Jerusalem, which was restored after the destruction of the first Gospel Jerusalem [6v2], ch.2.

## **27. UNDERGROUND MOSCOW OF THE XVI CENTURY IS THE FAMOUS EGYPTIAN LABYRINTH DESCRIBED BY 'ANCIENT' HERODOTUS AND STRABO.**

The intricate underground construction of Moscow clearly was perceived by contemporaries as a miraculous and mysterious Labyrinth, having entered which it was impossible to leave. It was dangerous to travel along the underground passages without some kind of map. The legends about this constructions spread all over the world at that time. It was underground Moscow which was described by the 'ancient' authors as the 'Egyptian Labyrinth' [6v3], ch.3. We will remind you, that Biblical Egypt is Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc [6v1], ch.4.

'Ancient' Herodotus considered the Labyrinth as the most grandiose construction in Egypt, surpassing even the pyramids. As we are starting to understand, he was right. Herodotus describes underground and above ground Moscow of the XVI century. Its scale exceeds everything which was erected in the Empire before. [6v3], ch.3.

Later they started to construct their own 'small labyrinths' in some remote regions of the 'Mongol' Empire imitating the metropoly. The Hordian governors could have demanded from their builders the creation of something similar to the Main Labyrinth of the Empire. In [6v3], ch.3 we have talked about one such imitation in African Egypt. It is possible, that in the XVII-XVIII cc. they indeed constructed something 'resembling the Main Labyrinth'. But not a very strong resemblance.

Another imitation was constructed on the island of Crete. Today it is thought, that the ancient palace in the town of Knossos was built 'in the likeness of the Labyrinth'. Notably the Greeks called it specifically the 'Labyrinth'. The historians date its construction as the deepest antiquity – the XXI century BC. There is nothing

resembling the vast unground constructions of Moscow whatsoever. Indeed there was less money in the province of the Empire than in the metropoly. And anyway it's not befitting to construct in the periphery anything more impressive than in the capital. The Khan could have been very surprised by such pompous provincial pride. So the 'Mongol' governors were cautious.

There were also some other imitations-labyrinths in the provinces of the 'Mongol' Empire. For example, the Egyptian Labyrinth (near Faiyum in North Egypt), Labyrinth of Samos, Italic Labyrinth (cuniculi) in a town of Clusium (modern Chiusi). Strabo also mentions some other labyrinths: 'Close to Nauplia there were caverns with the LABYRINTHS built in them, which were called Cyclopia' [819], viii: 6:2, p.351.

They were all built as pale imitations which couldn't hold any comparison with the capital's Main Labyrinth.

## **28. WHAT IS 'THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE TOWER OF BABEL' DESCRIBED IN THE BIBLE?**

This 'composite' topic is concise and is of a generally symbolic character. Therefore we will give just a hypothesis.

The Biblical legend about the construction of the Tower of Babel is known to everyone. It is dated by the historians as deepest antiquity. In the books [2v1], ch.5 and [6v2], ch.1:10, ch.3:5 we pointed out that the mediaeval events are partial; reflected in this legend. In the Book of Genesis it intertwined into one 'knot'.

Firstly here is reflected the Trojan War of the XII century.

Secondly, here it is reminiscent of the 'Mongol' conquest of the world in the XIV century and the second Ottoman conquest of the Promised Land in the XV century.

Thirdly, these are the events of the Reformation of the XVI-XVII cc., the Times of Troubles in Russia and the split of the 'Mongol' Empire.

In the Scaligerian history of the XVIII-XIX cc. the Biblical Babylon (Babel) was 'lost'. They write the following: 'In the beginning of the X century (allegedly – Author) to the Arabic geographer ... Babylon was known JUST AS A SMALL SETTLEMENT WHICH EMERGED IN PLACE OF THE ONCE MAGNIFICENT CAPITAL. For the scholars Babylon became merely a name, some kind of symbol, the location of which they, apparently, had the vaguest idea about [391:1], p.29.

In the New Chronology, having identified the Biblical 'Tower of Babel' with the Heops Pyramid in Egypt and Moscow-Labyrinth, we present the largest constructions of the Middle Ages which exist today. Of course, they are partially damaged.

## **29. THE BOOK OF DANIEL TELLS US THE 'STORY OF ESTHER' IN RUSSIA-HORDE OF THE XVI CENTURY.**

Apparently the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar, under which the prophet Daniel is acting, is the Czar-Khan Ivan IV the Terrible. Thus the Book of Daniel gives us an account of the turbulent events of the XVI century in Russia-Horde, the metropoly of the Empire. The famous sun eclipse described in the Book of Daniel which rang the death knell for Belshazzar (aka Balthazar), the king of Babylon, is a comet appearing before Ivan the Terrible's death in 1584.

It appears that all the paintings, frescos, miniature pictures on the subject of the Book of Daniel were created not earlier than the second half of the XVI century. Here, for example, 'Hartmann Shedel's 'World Chronicle' allegedly of 1493 [1396:1]. In it we see three Jewish youths burning in the furnaces and the prophet Daniel [1396:1], list LV, on the reverse side, meaning that the 'Chronicle' was not written until the XVI century.

The famous writing on the wall (cited in the Book of Daniel): 'Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin', ringing the death knell for Belshazzar, is probably a distorted Slavonic expression 'Znameniyе Gorysheye P-Rusinam' The main word here is ZNAMENIYE (meaning sign of things to come, portent in Russian)(Mene, Mene). The letters 'Z' and 'M' differ only in the line placement : ZNA-MENIYE = Mene-Mene. It is specified that the sign is burning (fakel – meaning 'torch' in Russian) = Tekel) and it was given to P-rusinam (Upharsin). The portent-comet was 'burning' and appeared to the Russians. There survive some depictions where the sign is reproduced in short form : 'Mene, Mene'. For example a German picture allegedly of the beginning of the XVI century [6v3], ch.4.

It appears, that the German painter of the XVI century depicting a Slavonic word ZNAMENIYE as slightly distorted MENE, MENE, knew Slavonic. Therefore Slavonic language was also understood by the spectators, the connoisseurs of his art. Could it be that the majority of the wider public spoke Slavonic? From the point of view of Scaligerian history it is strange. But according to the new chronology it is only natural. In Western Europe of the XIV-XVI cc. Slavonic language was the state Imperial language.

Next Belshazzar ordered the vessels of gold that were taken from the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar in Jerusalem to be brought to the banquet (for a thousand of his lords so that everyone can drink wine from them). The order was carried out and the Holy relics were set forth for all to see. At that point God was enraged and punished Belshazzar with death. So, the Jerusalem's treasures of Nebuchadnezzar are the richest treasures of Ivan IV the Terrible, displayed by him to his guests and the public before his death [6v3], ch.4.

The fighting of the Babylonian priests with the Prophet Daniel and his supporters – is the fighting of the Russian Orthodox Church with the heresy of the Judaizers under Ivan the IV=III the Terrible.

The Book of Daniel also mentions the 'Story of Esther', i.e. the heresy spreading in the Russian-Hordian court in the XVI century. In the Book of Daniel it is the 'Story of Susanna'.

To remind you, the wife of the Czar's son turns out to be a secret Jewess and astrologer. The Czar-Khan himself becomes very fond of her. Family conflict erupts. The Czar sends away his first wife. Her place is taken by Esther, aka Elena Voloshanka, aka Elena Glinskaya, aka Biblical Judith, aka Biblical Jael. The Czar's son dies. The throne is surrounded by a tight ring of Esther's supporters – the Judaizers, Protestants, 'Latini'. The Czar takes their side in supporting heresy. The Russian Orthodox Church strongly opposes it. The ecclesiastical conflict grows and turns into a state revolt. In the second place in the state, next to the Czar-Khan appears one of the heretics. The split in the society emerges. It is the well-known Oprichnina of the XVI century. The Czar is compelled to leave the former capital of Russia-Horde and move it to a new place. Moscow is built, described in the bible as the New Jerusalem (in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah).

Enjoying the support of the Czar-Khan, the heretics crush the enemies, named in the Bible as the 'Persians', i.e. P-Russians, the White Russians. In honour of their victory the famous Jewish celebration of Purim is established. But later the Hordian Czar-Khan repents. The Church Council is held where the heresy is condemned. The main heretics are captured, burned and exiled. The Khan's court returns to the Russian Orthodoxy. However there were serious consequences after the coup d'état in the court of Czar-Khan. In the beginning of the XVII century Rus-Horde descends into the Time of Troubles. Horde loses its control over Protestant, 'Latin', Western Europe. In the centre of Empire the pro-Western Romanovs are eager to cease power. The Empire breaks up. The Russian-Hordian dynasty is being cut down at the grassroots.

In Europe, Asia, Africa, South and North America ferocious internecine feuds flare up between the Imperial governors and between the fragments of 'Mongolia'.

The Book of Judith recounts the same events, but through the eyes of the Western 'Mongol' governors. The punitive troops of the Assyrian king lead by Holofernes invade the West in order to quell the unrest. The Jewess by the name of Judith (i.e. simply the 'Jewess') arrives to the Assyrian camp. She penetrates Holofernes' tent and, having put him off his guard by deceit, decapitates him. The Assyrian army is demoralised and is defeated. The countries of the West are saved. Just about the same thing is told in chapter 4 of the Book of Judges in the story about the commander Sisera (i.e. simply a Czar and Jael (i.e. Elena), a woman who treacherously slayed him [6v1], ch.8:13.

The Book of Daniel also describes a story of Esther (as a story of Susanna), however from the ecclesiastic, religious point of view. Roughly speaking we can say that the Book of Daniel is an 'ecclesiastic' one, the Book of Esther is an 'inter-court' one, and the Book of Judith is a 'military' one. They highlight the same exceptionally important event from the different points of view.

It appears that under the name of Daniel here is presented DANIEL, metropolitan of Moscow and of all Russia. Understandably the Book of the Old Testament pays great attention to the head of the Russian Orthodox Church. As in the basis of the events lay the religion-church conflict. The role of a women-heretic was muffled.

One of the famous stories in the Book of Daniel is an attempt to burn three Jewish youths in the 'fiery furnace' by the Babylonians. What event in Russian history can this refer to? Apparently this refers to the three main heretics burnt in a cage in Moscow in the epoch of fight against heresy of the Judaizers. These events of the XVI century with a shift of approximately a hundred years are artificially 'spread thinly' along the entire XVI century and even made it into the end of the XV century [6v1], ch. 7.

The burning of specifically three people and specifically in a 'furnace' for their faith under Ivan the Terrible is among most famous events in Russian history of the XV-XVI cc.

The peak of the struggle of the Russian Orthodox Church against heresy was the sobor (church council) in 1504. 'The main denunciator of the Judaizers was Joseph (Volotsky –Auth.). THE CHIEF PERPETRATORS Feodor Kuritsyn diak (secretary) Volk Kuritsyn, Dmitry Konoplev and Ivan Maksimov were given in charge of civil

court AND THEN BURNT AT THE STAKE IN A CAGE on the 28th December in Moscow ' [578], book 2, v.3, p.211.

This burning of the THREE HERETICS IN A CAGE also reflected in the Book of Daniel as 'burning in the fiery furnace of the three YOUTHS (OTROK – IN Russian)' (HERETICS?).

Besides the main burning at the stake of the three leaders of the heresy in 1504, there were also other executions of the minor sectarians. But they were less striking. 'The blow against heresy delivered by church council in 1504 was very strong, but however didn't root it out terminally' [578], book 2, v.3, p. 211.

Describing the burning of the three Jews, the Book of Daniel insists on all three of them allegedly miraculously surviving. The flames did not touch them, though the fire was burning all around. So how was it possible? Could it be that the Biblical authors feeling compassionate towards the three youths symbolically depicted the matter in such a way, as if God helped them? However, it is most likely that here the two events were intertwined in the Russian history of the XVI century. We have talked about one of them. To clarify which other event is mentioned in the Bible, we will go a little bit back, to the end of allegedly XV century.

Venerable St. Joseph Volotsky (Joseph of Volokolamsk) and metropolitan Gennady of Novgorod opposed the emerging heresy of the Judaizers. That said Ivan III the Terrible and a part of his court practically sabotaged the struggle against heresy standing in the way of the investigation. However under the pressure from the Russian Orthodox Church the inquiry was pushing forward albeit with difficulty.

'After such a great noise raised around the affair of the uncovering heresy, the prosecutor and investigative network was able to catch MERELY NINE PEOPLE in the whole of Novgorod and Moscow', v.1, p.496.

The Sobor's (Council's) verdict was seen considered as strangely mild. The Czar himself intervened on behalf of the heretics. Instead some kind of showcase, theatrical performance was organised. This time no one was burnt. Just several 'heretical hats' were symbolically singed onto some heads. Most likely they did their best so that no one came to any harm. It is not difficult to do. As the hats were made of birch bark. Birch bark burns fast. It's enough to dampen the hair or to put some kind of a cap under the birch bark hat so the head remained unharmed.



But the show itself gave a handle to colourful literary descriptions. One of them is in the Biblical Book of Daniel. The burning hats turned into the 'fiery furnace' (gluing this storyline onto a later one, the real burning of the three heretics in the scorching cage). But having done so it was rightly stated that the fire was burning AROUND THE CONDEMNED. In fact the birch bark was burning around the head. The fire kind of surrounded the people. And they 'walked inside it without being burnt'. The literary image was later heightened. Purporting that the fire which surrounded the youths burnt the 'bad people', Babylonians, who had stirred the flames. Those who opposed the heresy. That's what Bible says as well.

The Book of Daniel's benevolence towards the prophet and his supporters contrasts with the negative position of the Russian Orthodox Church towards the heresy of the Judaizers in Russia. It is possible that the Book of Daniel was created by the heretics surrounding the throne of the Hordian Czar-Khan, who supported the heretics for quite a long time. To put it plainly 'The Book of Daniel' was written in Russian by the Judaizers in (of) the XVI century.

As we've already said under the name of Daniel there was described Daniel the Metropolitan of Moscow and All of Russia. He occupied the highest post in the Imperial church hierarchy of the Empire and, so to say, the second place after the Czar-Khan. The metropolitan Daniel's activities correspond well with the description in the Bible [6v3], ch.4.

'The story of Esther' 1553-1584 is reflected in the past in a phantom like way. Her main duplicates are: the epoch of Ivan III the Terrible (and Elena Voloshanka) 1462-1505, and the epoch of Vasili III (and Elena Glinskaya) 1505-1533. Metropolitan Daniel's activities fall exactly to (at) the time of Vasili III.

Let's discuss the 'story of Susanna' in the Book of Daniel. This book is ecclesiastical and describes the struggle of the Russian Orthodox Church with the heresy of the Judaizers in the XVI century. The canonical part of the Book of Daniel doesn't say anything about Esther = Elena Voloshanka = Elena Glinskaya. There is no sexual story in the 'official' twelve chapters of the Book of Daniel at all. It appears that the ecclesiastical authors considered the 'female storyline' as an inter-court one, domestic, concerning only the private life of the Hordian Czar-Khan. Nevertheless the trace of a 'woman Esther' in the Book of Daniel is still present. The 13th chapter (13) about Susanna which was not considered canonical is included in the end of the Book [936], v.1, p.461. At a first glance it has nothing to do with the main theme of the Book. However here is told, although in a distorted way, a part of the story of Esther. Where the storyline had a distinctly sexual emphasis.

Susanna refused to fulfil the erotic desires of the two old judges. As a revenge they tried to smear her reputation in front of the people and declared that allegedly 'a young man came to her ... and lay with her. We were in the corner of the garden... and saw them lie together' (Book of Daniel 13:37-39. However the young boy Daniel intervened on behalf of Susanna to defend her honour, uncovered the secret scheming and lies of the old judges. Both of the corrupt judges were condemned and executed.

Thus the 'female aspect of the story of Esther' is reflected in the Book of Daniel, though very vaguely. Nevertheless here is presented one of the main storylines of the family drama of the XVI century at the court of the Hordian Czar-Khan and his co-ruler son. The sexual scene in secluded lodgings where both rulers found themselves in the young woman's bedroom in an ambiguous situation in an effort to possess her.

The particular attention of the Bible commentators towards Susanna is rather strange. What could be so especially attractive in this story? The two judges-rulers lusted after a young woman. They entered by stealth inside her place, then they besmirched her reputation, for which they were justly punished. But there are other much more important stories in the Bible which nevertheless didn't favour such close attention from the artists and authors of the XVII-XVIII cc. But for some reason they loved the story of Susanna. Now it is clear why. She was a part of the 'story of Esther' famous in certain circles, which played an important role in the split of the 'Mongol' Empire. Thus the West European artists painted the 'noble Susanna' fighting the two 'very bad' old judges. At first the commentators remembered the true meaning of the story. Then it was forgotten, but they were still obediently continued to praise Susanna by force of habit. The congregation was made to forget that in the image of Susanna there was the celebrated heretic Esther, aka a Jew Elena Voloshanka.

The Scaligerian historians date the Biblical Book of Daniel as 605-536 BC [936], v.1, p.461. They were mistaken by approximately 2100 years. The correct dating is the end of the XVI century.

Thus within the basis of the Old Testament Book of Daniel are the events in Russia-Horde of the XVI century. This is consistent with the fact that precisely in the XVI century the Russian Orthodox Church for the first time introduced the ceremonial rite of 'peshnoye deystvo'— a grand spectacular theatrical production held in a church celebrating the miraculous salvation of the three Jewish Youths from the fiery furnace.

Everything now falls into place. As we have already said the three leading Judaizing heretics were burnt at the stake on the 27th (28th) DECEMBER of allegedly 1504

[372], v.1, p.500. That is why the church connected the theatricalised 'burning of the three young men' with the Nativity of Christ also celebrated in DECEMBER. The fact that 'peshnyie' performances (costume devotions) originated exactly in the XVI century can be also explained very well. It was the time when the 'story of Esther' and the struggle of the Russian Orthodox Church against heresy has unfolded. The Church decided to commemorate it its rites 'pesnyie deistva' (Costume devotion of Fiery Furnace before Christmas Liturgy in Russian Orthodox Church). Originally the meaning of those pageants was austerey instructive. Via them in the XVI century the Russian Orthodox Church, which temporarily won, was warning its congregation in all the churches of the Empire against the re-emergence of heresy. They demonstrated punishment for state rebellion and the derogation from Orthodoxy. Punishment by fire in a cage! But later, when the Romanovs usurped the throne they reversed the meaning of the 'peshnyie deistva'. The pageant remained, but now they began to highlight the miraculous element of the salvation of the Jewish youths from the fire as God Himself was on their side. Black became white.

(The word 'Youth in Russian – 'otrok' can sound like the Russian word for Heretic 'Eretik', translators note)

Under the Romanovs 'The Book of Daniel' which had just been written was considered as giving an account of the events in Russia-Horde, which practically brought the new dynasty into power. Namely (i.e.) about the events pleasant to the Romanovs. In the XVII century The Book of Daniel was edited, in the required key, as important propaganda material which should be impressed on the minds of the congregation. The evaluation of the events of the XVI century were swapped. The heretics were declared good and the representatives of the Imperial Orthodox Church who were fighting against the heresy of the Judaizers were cast in a negative light.

As time went by in the XVIII-XIX cc. the relevance of the story faded. The 'story of Esther' became a thing of the past, forgotten. Today they don't perform 'peshnyie deistviya' in the Orthodox Church. But the instructive tableau and illustrations to the Bibles on the theme of the 'fiery furnace' were painted up until the end of the XIX century.

### **30. GOTHIC CATHEDRALS AND HORDIAN TEMPLES AND MOSQUES.**

In [4v2], ch.2:47 we talk about how the style of temples which today are known as 'gothic' are based on the architecture of the old Russian-Horde cathedrals of the XIV-XVI cc. which formed later in Western Europe. [Fig.91](#) shows the Church of Nativity

of the Blessed Virgin Mary and St. Nicholas Cathedral on Ladoga. We can see that the Hordian tradition to build cathedrals in the old 'Mongol' style, i.e. in a form of a long building with a gable roof on one side out of which rises a tower, was still alive in Russia for a long time. Some of the Islamic mosques are still built in this style, for example in Tatarstan. And also the Western 'Gothic', i.e. Goth cathedrals. They were modelled on the cathedrals of the metropoly, i.e. Russia-Horde. However, after the Romanov take-over the style of the Russian churches was replaced by a new one – the domed style, which was called the 'old Gothic' style. But in Western Europe the old Hordian style survived. Under the name of the 'Old Gothic'. Thus its initial 'Mongol' origins were obscured. Following the split of a united Christianity into several branches these architectural styles began to be considered independent. It is not true. They date back to the mutual Hordian source.

### **31. ONCE MORE ABOUT HERODOTUS.**

Here is an important conclusion we arrived at while analysing the 'Ancient' Greek chronicles and above all the famous 'Histories' by Herodotus. It turns out that there we find a vivid reflection of the epochs numbered 1,2,3,5 in [fig.92](#) [GR].

1: The epoch of Andronicus-Christ of the late XII century.

2: The epoch after Christ, when Russia-Horde and the regions of the Romaic Empire allied with it and took revenge on Czar-Grad = Jerusalem and its inhabitants = the residents of Judaea, for the crucifixion of Christ in 1185. This is the time of the Crusades of the early XIII century followed by the 'Mongol' conquest of the late XII-early XIV cc.

3: The epoch of the second Baptism of Russia-Horde and of the entire 'Mongol' Empire at the end of the XIV century, following the Battle of Kulikovo. In this battle the Apostolic Christianity led by Dmitry Donskoy, aka Emperor Constantine I the Great, won a victory over the Royal Ancestral Christianity led by Khan Mamai – aka Ivan Veniaminov or Velyaminov.

4: The Ottoman conquest is reflected exceptionally sparingly in the 'ancient' sources.

5. The epoch of the Reformation of the late XVI century – early XVII century, when the split of the Great Empire began. The unsuccessful Livonian War; the coup d'etat in the capital of the Empire, i.e. the story of Esther-Judith; the separation of Western Europe from the metropoly of the Empire.

In [fig.92](#) between the epochs 3 and 5 there is the epoch 4 – the Ottoman conquest. The curious thing is that the 'ancient' Greek authors – Thucydides, Herodotus, Plutarch and some others – omit it. They sparsely, 'through gritted teeth' speak of this second conquest of Europe by the Ottoman Empire and Russia, i.e. about the conquest of the Promised Land according to the Bible. The Western authors, which were later called 'Ancient' Greek ones, didn't like recollecting the events which were too painful for them.

These five epochs cover the main written history of the European part of the Horde Empire from the XII to the XVII cc. The epochs 1, 2, 3 and 5 are described in detail by the 'Ancient' Greeks. They were more reticent about the 4th epoch. However the 'ancient classical' authors speak effusively of the 5th epoch of the Reformation and the break-up of the Empire. As of the victory of the 'Eastern Barbarians', which they were rather happy about. That is exactly how Thucydides, Herodotus and the other 'classics authors' called the Persians (P-Russians) – THE BARBARIANS.

In [fig.61](#), [fig.62](#) and [fig.63](#) there are depicted the main parallels between the 'ancient classical' and mediaeval history. In the right column there are listed all the chapters of the 'Histories' by Herodotus. On the left there are recorded some of the various important events of the XI-XVII cc. The arrows show which of Herodotus' books they are described in.

Herodotus' descriptions of King Cambyses' desecrations of the Egyptian kings' mummies also point to the more recent origin of the text. The matter we refer to is the epoch of the Reformation. The Empire was descending into the Times of Troubles. The weakening of the central authority led to the beginning of disintegration of traditional customs and morality among the clerical workers, public servants of the Royal necropolis in African Egypt far removed from the metropoly. The former reverence of the great Khans' and their governors' mummies started to give way to contemptuous attitude. The fading of the disciplinary fear coming from the metropoly led to the desecration of the royal burial vaults. Vast treasures were searched for and found. Gold, silver, precious stones. The holy remains were brutally discarded when rummaging through the sarcophaguses and burial shrouds. This is already the XVII-XVIII cc. When Europe broke away, the rebellious governors, having arrived to Egypt, could have mocked the royal mummies on purpose in order to erase from the people's memory the recollection of the 'Mongol' Empire.

The Western European authors of the XVI-XVII cc. and the Romanovs attributed to Ivan the 'Terrible' many atrocities. The true picture of events was dramatically different. It is, of course, difficult to fully grasp the bloody tangle of the story of

Esther, Oprichnina, St.Bartholomew's night massacre of the mid XVI century. Truth and lies become entwined in the furious struggle during the break-up of the Empire. The Empire tried to suppress the revolt. But later, in the epoch of the Reformation the victors including the Romanovs shifted all the atrocities onto the defeated. They claimed that the Hordians and the Czar-Khan the 'Terrible' (Cambyses according to Herodotus) were solely to blame. They declared Russia-Horde to be the empire of evil and attached other negative labels. When the Imperial lion weakened, they with joy began to blacken the past of Russia-Horde. It will just suffice to mention the work of A.Schlichting 'A Short Tale About the Character and Cruel Government of the Moscow Tyrant Vasilevich' for example [ZA], ch.5. Fifty pages are filled with abominations which allegedly took place under Ivan the Terrible. The details of tortures and executions are savoured. They have created a 'bogyman story for grown-ups'. Similar horror stories are told to us by Herodotus when writing about Ivan the Terrible and calling him the Persian Cambyses: 'And on another occasion he ordered without good reason the seizure of twelve of the most noble Persians and buried them alive' [163], p.149.

The temporary victory of the 'good Greeks' over the Barbarian Xerxes (Ivan the Terrible) was agreeable to the Western European Herodotus and his colleagues, the 'ancient classics'. Western Europe is positively described in their works as 'beautiful Hellas', and Russia-Horde – as the 'barbarian Persia'. The attitude of the chronicler can be heard even in the choice of terminology. On one hand there are Hellenes Greeks, gallant and sophisticated, but extremely poor. On the other hand there are savage and rough, but very rich Persians. And the modest nobility of the first defeated the magnificent savageness of the second! The 'ancient' classical authors wanted to write about this subject again and again. Having already spoken about the Western-European joy of liberation in his previous books, Herodotus couldn't help it and repeatedly poured out his admiration of the victory over the 'savage East' onto the pages of the three voluminous books at the end of the 'Histories'.

We have discovered a good correspondence between the famous 'ancient' battle of Thermopylae between the Spartans and the Persians allegedly in 480 BC and the Battle between the Russians and the Germans in 1560 during the Livonian War at the town of Fellin. The historians were wrong in the dating of this well-known event by two thousand years [GR].

Hence the historians are mistaken when presenting some ravine in Greece as the famous 'annalistic Thermopylae'. This passage was called 'Thermopylae' later, in the XVII-XVIII cc. having moved here – on paper – the events of the 'ancient' war with

King Xerxes = Cossack Czar = Kaiser. Numerous tourists, who wish to bow to the memory of the 300 legendary Spartans should be taken not to modern Greece, but to the German town of Fellin or the Livonian town of Wenden.

In Herodotus' work we come across traces of the famous correspondence between Prince Kurbsky and Ivan the Terrible. To remind you, after the Prince fled to Lithuania, they exchanged a number of letters. Much research has been dedicated to them. As we have shown, this correspondence is also reflected in the Old Testament, in the Book of Judith, which also gives an account of the Livonian war of the XVI century [6v1], ch.8.

Thus Herodotus began his writing with Emperor Andronicus-Christ and drove forward the narration until the beginning of the XVII century, having talked about the Time of Troubles, about Dmitry the Imposter and Czar Vassili Shuisky. The Horde History (i.e. the Empire of the XIII-XVII cc.) has unfolded before us. The name of 'Herodotus' itself probably originated from the word ORDA (HORDE – Translator's note), in the West-European pronunciation HORDA : Horda - Herodotus.

It is quite possible that Herodotus lived either in Southern Europe or in the Mediterranean, as he had never seen a snow storm and didn't understand what it was. When narrating about Scythia, i.e. Russia-Horde, Herodotus says: 'As the extent of their land (Scythia) is very great, Colaxais, according to the Scythians, gave each of his three sons a separate kingdom, one of which was of ampler size than the other two: in this the gold was preserved. Above, to the northward of the farthest dwellers in Scythia, the country is said to be CONCEALED FROM SIGHT AND MADE IMPASSABLE BY REASON OF THE FEATHERS WHICH ARE SHED ABROAD ABUNDANTLY. THE EARTH AND AIR ARE ALIKE FULL OF THEM, AND THIS IT IS WHICH PREVENTS THE EYE FROM OBTAINING ANY VIEW OF THE REGION'. [163], P.188-189.

It is obvious that the matter he is talking about is the snow storm here. Everything is clouded over with twirling snow. Nothing can be seen even up close . A person who had never seen a snowstorm and who uses only the travel notes of the others, could have decided, that the snowflakes flying around were white bird feathers. Or he could have confused the Russian words PURGA (SNOWSTORM, BLIZARD – in Russian) and PERYA (FEATHERS – in Russian).

## **32. WHEN THE GREAT ITALIAN ARTISTS OF THE RENAISSANCE LIVED.**

In [1v] and [2v] we mention numerous accounts of the life dates of various famous Renaissance painters are in fact closer to us by approximately 100-150 years. We are speaking here in particular of Leonardo da Vinci: allegedly 1452-1519; Michelangelo: allegedly 1475-1564; A.Dürer: allegedly 1471-1528. The same conclusion results from entirely different reasons – the astronomical ones. In [GR], in the introduction, we show, that the zodiac on the ceiling of Sala dei Pontefici in Vatican was created in 1670. I.e. 150 years later, than we were led to believe. We are told, that the fresco was created in 1520-1521 by the artists Perino del Vaga and Giovanni da Udine. Notably these artists are famous not only in their own right, but also in connection with the other famous painters of allegedly early XV - late XVI cc. Therefore this constellation of the Renaissance masters shifts upwards on the timeline and finds itself in the epoch of the XVII century.

Most likely such reputed artists as Rafael, Pinturicchio, Signorelli, Botticelli and many others lived not in the XV-XVI cc., but in the XVI-XVII cc. And some – even in the XVIII century.

The dates like 'year 1520' which we encounter in old works of art could be read as follows. As it is shown in [1v], number (figure) 1 earlier meant letter I, the first letter in the name of IISUS (JESUS in Russian – Tr.). In other words the date I520 earlier meant 'year 520 from Jesus (AD)'. But Jesus Christ was born in 1152. Calculating from year 1152 up 520 years we get year 1672. Therefore in some documents the dates like 'year 1520' could have referred to the second half of the XVIII century, and not at all in the XVI century as it is thought today.

## **33. WHAT SHAKESPEARE REALLY WROTE ABOUT.**

In the book [SAK] we show that such extraordinary Shakespearian plays as 'Hamlet', 'King Lear', 'Macbeth', 'Timon of Athens', 'Henry VIII', 'Titus Andronicus' (the time of which is erroneously dated today into the distant past and placed in the wrong geographical regions) in fact give an account of real and important events. Of the XII-XVI cc. unfolding mainly in the metropoly of the Great Empire. Here we were also guided by other original sources, telling us about the very same events as Shakespeare does. In particular, upon the chronicles by Geoffrey of Monmouth, Saxo Grammaticus and Raphael Holinshed. As the result the following has emerged:



# Prince Hamlet appears to be a reflection of Andronicus-Christ (Andrei Bogolyubsky) and John the Baptist from the XII century.

# King Lear is the reflection of Khan Ivan the Terrible from the XVI century.

# King Macbeth is the reflection of the Biblical King Herod from the XII century.

# Timon of Athens is the reflection of Judas Iscariot from the XII century.

# The English King Henry VIII is another reflection of Ivan the Terrible.

# The English queen Catherine of Aragon is the reflection of the Czaritsa Sophia Palaiologina, the wife of Ivan III=IV the Terrible.

# The English queen Anne Boleyn is the reflection of Elena Voloshanka = Biblical Esther from the XVI century.

# Emperor Andronicus-Christ (Andrei Bogolyubsky) is reflected on the pages of Shakespeare under the names of: Prince Hamlet (in 'Hamlet'), McDuff (in 'Macbeth'), philosopher Apemantus (in 'Timon of Athens) and Titus Andronicus (in 'Titus Andronicus').

All of this may sound unbelievable. If you recall the events described by Shakespeare, it would seem you will not discover anything resembling Shakespeare's writing in the story of Christ or Ivan the Terrible. Indeed, having arrived at a modern theatre or cinema and listening attentively to a tragedy performed by distinguished actors, it is difficult to imagine, that in fact they, not understanding it themselves, narrate about the events of not such a distant past and of famous heroes, whose connection with Shakespeare's writings, was apparently forgotten long ago.

The reason for such a psychological fog is clear. Often we do not realise how far from the original (purely on the surface) its literary interpretation might move. A dramatist and a poet add to the ancient chronicle some made-up details and emotionally decorate a scanty plot. The literary emotions take centre stage and conceal the true essence. It gets covered by a thick dust. A rather complex analysis is required to 'wipe the dust off'. It is necessary to behave like the criminologists who untangle crimes. Moreover, without the objective guiding milestones – the New Chronology – it is often impossible to understand what was based on what, and where to look for the original.

**34. CALENDAR-ASTRONOMICAL DATING OF THE FIRST COUNCIL OF NICAEA AND CHRIST'S NATIVITY. && WHEN COMPUTUS (PASCHAL CYCLE) WAS DETERMINED.**

We will cite the summary of research by G.V.Nosovsky [6v3], ch.2. We are talking here about the two major milestones of the traditional chronology – the Nativity of Christ and the First Ecumenical Council of Nicaea, often called the Council of Nicaea. The Scaligerian version is largely based on these dates. The fact is that Scaliger built the chronology primarily as the chronology of the history of the church. Secular chronology is presented in his works as secondary, based on the synchronisms with ecclesiastical events.

Apparently both dates – The Nativity of Christ and the Council of Nicaea – were dated by Scaliger absolutely incorrectly.

In [6v3], ch.2 it is described how exactly these dates were calculated by the Mediaeval chronologists and which errors were made. What's most interesting is – WHAT DATES COME UP AS A RESULT, IF THESE ERRORS ARE CORRECTED. Also it gives an account of the true reason for the famous Gregorian calendar reform of the XVI century, after which there were two styles developed in our calendar – 'old' and 'new'.

It is thought that at the First Ecumenical Council in Nicaea in 325 the church calendar was determined compiled and approved. The Christian Church always believed this calendar, called the PASCHAL CALENDAR, to be of great importance. The Church paschal calendar-computus consists of two parts – immovable and moveable.

THE IMMOVABLE part – is a civil calendar called 'Julian Calendar' as its compilation is associated with Julius Caesar. In it the year consists of 12 months. Every fourth year an additional day is added – 29 February. The Julian calendar is closely connected with the Christian Liturgy. The 'immovable' Christian holidays are allocated according to the dates of the Julian calendar. Every year they fall on the same day of the same month of the Julian calendar.

THE MOVEABLE part of the church calendar determines the dates of the observance of Easter and some other holy days which are calculated relative to Easter. The Christian Easter and the feast days which are counted from it are MOVEABLE, as their places in the Julian calendar change from year to year, moving according to the date of the Christian Easter. The day of Easter moves within the dates of the Julian calendar according to a definite rule. This rule – 'Computus' is quite complicated and is connected to astronomical concepts.

This combination of the immovable and the moveable parts of the church calendar is called the Paschal calendar or simply Paschalia.

Thus both parts of the Paschal calendar-Computus determine the order of the church service for every day of any year. That is why the canonisation of the Paschal calendar-Computus had a pivotal significance for the church. It was Computus which provided the uniformity in the church service in many diverse locations. All the chronological problems connected with the dating of the Nativity of Christ and the history of the church calendar play an important role in our perception of not only the history of the church, but also about the entire Mediaeval Eurasia.

The two main apostolic canons of Easter are as follows:

- 1) Not to co-celebrate Easter together with the Israelites.
- 2) To celebrate Easter only following the vernal equinox.

Then, when compiling the Paschalia, the Holy Fathers of the Council of Nicaea who have established Paschalia, added two more canons. The fact is, that the first two apostolic canons do not yet clearly determine the day of Easter unequivocally. The two new canons are:

- 3) To celebrate Easter only after the first Vernal Full Moon. i.e. following the Jewish Passover, which in the Christian patristic literature was sometimes called the 'Law Passover'- i.e. Passover according to the Law of Moses, and sometimes – the '14th Lunar month of Nisan'.
- 4) Besides, to celebrate Easter not on any week day, but precisely on the first Sunday following this full moon, i.e. following the Jewish Passover (Pesach).

STATEMENT 1. The Council which established Paschal (it is thought to be the Council of Nicaea) could not have taken place earlier than 784, as only beginning with this year, due to the slow astronomical shift of the moon phases, the concurrencies of the calendar (determined by Paschal) Christian Easter and the 'lunar'('Cynthian') Jewish Passover-Full Moon had ceased. In 784 such a concurrency took place for the last time and then the dates of the Christian Easter and Jewish Passover diverged forever. Therefore the Council of Nicaea a priori could not have canonised The paschal calendar in the IV century, when the calendar Christian Easter would have coincided with the Jewish Passover eight (!) times – in the years 316, 319, 323, 343, 347, 367, 374 and 394 and five (!) times would have even fallen two days EARLIER than it (which is explicitly forbidden by 4th canon of Easter, namely – in the years 306 and 326 (i.e. allegedly in a year after the Council of Nicaea!), and also in the years 46, 350 and 370.

STATEMENT 2. The reasonable concurrence (give or take 24 hours) of the Paschal calendar Full Moons fixed at the Council of Nicaea, with the observed astronomical

full moons, existed only during the period of time from circa 700 until circa 1000. In the epoch prior to the year 700 the calculated full moons occurred always later than the Paschal ones, and after the year 1000 it was the opposite, the calculated vernal full moons, i.e. the days of the Jewish Passover according to the Paschal determination, began to take place earlier than the Paschal full moons. The beginning of the 13th Great Indiction (877) falls EXACTLY AT THE TIME OF THE IDEAL CONCURRENCES OF THE PASCHAL AND ASTRONOMICAL FULL MOONS.

This means that Computus could have been compiled only during the epoch from the VII to XI cc. AD. Therefore the dating of the Council of Nicaea which determined the Paschal calendar is possible only as the VII-XI cc., and the most likely dating is the epoch of the X-XI cc., after the year 877.

#### && THE RESULT OF THE DATINGS OF THE COUNCIL OF NICAEA.

In [6v3], ch.2, it is shown, that Computus could have been compiled:

- Not earlier than year 784 – by definition of the Christian Easter;
- Not earlier than year 700 – according to the concurrence of the paschal and astronomic Full Moons;
- Not earlier than year 700 – according to the 'Damascene palm' 'the hand of John of Damascus';
- Not earlier than 743 – according to Matthew Vlastar (lived in the XIV century), and therefore, according to the ecclesiastical tradition of the Orthodox church and the entire Russian-Byzantine tradition, the voice of which was Vlastar's.

Thus, Paschalia was not established earlier than the second half of the VIII century, and not at all in the II-V cc., as we are told. In the light of the new chronology it becomes clear, that the canonisation of Paschalia at the Council of Nicaea dates to the epoch of the XI-XIV cc. The Paschal calendar could have also easily comprised of some old astronomical formulations of the VII-XI cc., which however by that time had firmly entered ecclesiastical tradition.

#### && THE MAIN CONCLUSIONS.

# Paschalian calendar based on the events of the astronomical nature 'contains' the date of its compilation, i.e. allows the objective independent dating.

# This date appears to be significantly later than it is previously believed. It is at a distance of at least some centuries from the Scaligerian year of 325.

# It is this date in particular, and not the one accepted today (325), which was known to Matthew Vlastar in the XIV century and, therefore, is a part of the old tradition of the Orthodox Church.

## && THE NATIVITY OF CHRIST AND THE BEGINNING OF 'CURRENT ERA ('A.D.')

It is well known that since the beginning of A.D. (Anno Domini, 'Current Era') or 'era since the birth of Christ', there was no continuous yearly calculation until the current year. The first year 'A.D.' was calculated much later as the year of the Nativity of Christ. It is widely believed that originally this year was calculated by the Roman monk Dionysius Exiguus in the VI century, i.e. more than 500 years after the event he dated. Whereby Dionysius at first calculated the date of Christ's Resurrection, and then used the ecclesiastical legend, that Christ was crucified in the 31st year of his life. The Resurrection date according to Dionysius is the 25 March 5539 from Adam, and the year of the Nativity of Christ is consequently 5508 from Adam (according to the Byzantine era).

Dionysius' calculations were controversial in the West up until the XV century, and in Byzantine were never canonized.

## && THE CALENDAR HYPOTHESIS OF THE RESURRECTION'.

The ecclesiastic traditions according to the Gospels claims, that Christ was resurrected on Sunday the 25 March the next day after the Jewish Passover. Which, accordingly, fell on Saturday 24 March on that occasion. It was these very calendar-astronomical 'Paschal conditions', which we call the 'conditions of the Resurrection', that Dionysius had in mind when while calculating the dates of Christ Resurrection and Nativity. The full set of the calendar conditions associated with – the stable church tradition – the Resurrection of Christ, can be found in the 'Collection of the Holy Father's rules' of Matthew Vlastar (XIV century). He gives the following calendar regulations for the year of Christ's Resurrection:

- 1) circle for the Sun 23,
- 2) circle for the Moon 10,
- 3) the previous day, on the 24th March, the Jewish Passover took place, which is celebrated on the 14th day of the Moon (i.e. Full Moon,)
- 4) The Jewish Passover took place on Saturday, and Christ was resurrected on Sunday.

The combination of these four points we will call the calendar 'conditions of the Resurrection'. The Question: is it possible to restore the date of the Resurrection using the dates above? The answer: Yes, it is.

## && THE DATING OF THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO THE TOTAL NUMBER OF THE 'CONDITIONS OF THE RESURRECTION'.

G.G.Nosovsky conducted the computer-based calculations for each year for the period from year 100 B.C. to year 1700 A.D. The day of the vernal Full Moon (14 Moon (Nisan), or Jewish Passover) is calculated according to the Gauss algorithm and the Christian Easter, circle for the Sun and circle for the Moon – according to Computus. In the same way that Dionysius and Matthew Vlastar, we assume that the day of Resurrection was the Paschal (Easter) day according to Computus.

Statement 3. The calendar 'conditions for the Resurrection' 1-4, associated by the consistent church tradition of the XIV century with the date of the Passions and Resurrection of Christ, occurred ONLY ONCE: in 1095.

The very fact of the existence of the exact solution is absolutely crucial. If the listed conditions were the result of pure fantasy, then, most likely, we wouldn't have been able to find any exact solution throughout the historical era at all.

CONCLUSION. The Nativity of Christ (according to the erroneous traditions of the XIV century chronologists) was dated circa 1064 – 31 years before 1095.

The date of 1095 corresponds with the dating of the life of 'pope Hildebrand' ('Pope Gregory VII', born Hildebrand of Sovana – Tr.) (the phantom reflection of Christ from the XII century). This dating (the result of the erroneous mediaeval calculations) was originally restored by A.T.Fomenko with entirely different methods in [1v] and [2v1], ch.4. Thus we discovered the mediaeval tradition of erroneously dating the life of Christ to the XI century. The final dating of the Nativity of Christ which we arrived at in [TsRS] gives us the middle of the XII century, i.e. a century later. When correlating this date with the dating of Computus we can see that Computus was compiled, at least in its original version, way before Christ. Is it contradictory to the ecclesiastical history and legend? It appears to be a difficult question. In the old church text both arguments 'for' and 'against' can be found. The absolute contradiction occurs only with that outlook upon the history of the church which took shape not earlier than the XVI-XVII cc. i.e. by that time under the influence of the Scaligerian chronology.

That is why it is no probability that the dates of Resurrection and Nativity of Christ were calculated in the VI century based on the calendar situation of the year 563.

Besides, as it is shown in [6v3], ch.2, the calculation, which was used by Dionysius, itself was compiled not earlier than the XVIII century and was canonized only the IX century.

Therefore the computations of Dionysius Exiguus (Dionysius the Small), or possibly attributed to him, were carried out not earlier than the X century. And therefore 'Dionysius Exiguus' himself could not have lived earlier than the X century.

In the chapter of the 'Collection of the Holy Father's rules' by Matthew Vlastar which is related to Easter (Passover), it says that 'at present' equinox falls on the 18th March [6v3], ch.2. In fact the vernal equinox in the times of Vlastar in the XIV century fell on the 12th March. It fell on the 18th March in the VI century.

This means, that when dating Vlastar's text according to the vernal equinox we will by default arrive at the VI century! It appears, that the same later-mediaeval text was included both into the 'Rules' of Matthew Vlastar and the writing of Dionysius the Small. It is possible that this is text written by Vlastar himself or by someone of his immediate predecessors in the XIII-XIV cc. It includes the dating of the Resurrection of Christ, but nothing is said about the date of the Nativity of Christ. It is feasible, that it is the text by Vlastar which 'Dionysius the Small' used very soon after, who deducted 31 years from the date of Christ's Resurrection, arrived at the date of the 'Nativity of Christ' and presented his new era. If it took place in the XIV century, then the beginning of the systematic use of this era specifically only just since the XV century (from 1431) in the West is understandable. Subsequently, possibly in the XVII century, Dionysius' text was dated by the equinox as the VI century and there emerged the above mentioned reconstruction of his computations. The name 'Dionysius the Small' itself (Small = Exiguus in Latin), according the hypothesis expressed by A.T.Fomenko (in) [1v], ch.6:17, is simply the name of the XVII century chronologist Dionysius Petavius, who completed the construction of the Scaliger chronology. Scaliger and his students lived in France. There the name 'Small' translated as 'petit' and turned into 'Petavius'.

## **35. ASTRONOMICAL DATING OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY.**

1. (1638) THE ROMAN ZODIAC LV FROM LOUVRE. 'Ancient Rome', allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact: 12-17 June according to the Julian Calendar 1638 [DZEE].
2. (1661) ZODIAC FS IN THE SCYTHIAN CHAMBER OF THE DUKES D'ESTE. Fresco on the wall of the duke's palace (Palazzo Schifanoia – Tr.) Italy, Ferrara,

allegedly XV century. In fact: 24 June according to the Julian calendar 1661 [GRK], ch.4.

3. (1664) THE ROMAN ZODIAK RZ ON 'MARCUS AURELIUS' GEMMA. The embossed red jasper. Europe, allegedly 'Ancient' Rome. In fact: 8-9 December according to Julian calendar 1664 [DZEE].

4. (1667 or 1227) ZODIAC P1 FROM THE TOMB OF PETROSIRIS, OUTER CHAMBER. Colour image in the tomb ceiling. 'Ancient' Egypt, Dakhla oasis, allegedly 'antiquity'. In fact – first solution: 5 August 1227; second solution: 2 August according to Julian calendar 1667 [NKhE].

5. (1670) ZODIAC ZP CHAMBER PONTIFEX SALA. Grand frescos fully covered the ceiling of an ample chamber in one of the Vatican castles. Italy, Vatican, allegedly 1520-1521. In fact: 24-30 June according to the Julian calendar 1670 [GR], Introduction.

6. (1680) ZODIAC FR IN DUKES D'ESTE SCYTHIAN CHAMBER. Fresco on the wall of the duke's castle. Italy, Ferrara, allegedly 1468-1469. In fact 19 May according to Julian calendar 1680 [GRK], ch.4.

7. (1682) BRUGSCH ZODIAC, horoscope of the demotic postscripts (adscripts) BR1. Depicted on the internal surface of the wooden coffin lid. 'Ancient' Egypt, allegedly antiquity. In fact: 17 November 1682 according to Julian calendar or 18 November 1861 according to Julian calendar [NKhE].

8. (1686) ZODIAC FT IN DUKES' D'ESTE SCYTHIAN CHAMBER. Depicted on the fresco of the Virgin Mary, on the wall of the duke's castle. Italy, Ferrara, allegedly XV century. In fact: 15 October 1686 according to Julian calendar [ERIZ].



# **Chapter 8. THE EPOCH OF THE XIII CENTURY**

## **1. THE DIVISION OF THE REMAINS OF RUSSIA-HORDE BETWEEN THE ROMANOV AND THE USA, WHICH OCCURRED IN THE WRECKAGE OF THE AMERICAN TERRITORIES OF THE EMPIRE IMMEDIATELY AFTER THE ROMANOV'S VICTORY OVER 'PUGACHEV'.**

Up until the end of the XVIII century there still existed a vast Moscow Tartary – a gigantic fragment of the former Empire. Whereby according to the Encyclopaedia Britannica of 1771 Moscow Tartary WAS THE LARGEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD [1118], v.2, p.683. It is depicted on various maps of the XVIII century [4v1], ch.11. Moscow Tartary originated in the middle reaches of Volga, from Nizhny Novgorod. Thus Moscow was not far from the border with Moscow Tartary. The town of Tobolsk was pronounced its capital, the name TOBOL was underlined on several maps. A reminder that in the Bible mediaeval Russia was referred to as ROSH, MESHEKH and TUBAL, i.e. Ros, Moscow and TOBOL.

Moscow Tartary spanned the Urals, Siberia, Central Asia, The Far East, Alaska and North America. The conflict between Moscow Tartary and Romanov Russia (originally small in size) ended in the second half of the XVIII century with the famous, allegedly 'peasant', war against 'Pugachev'. The Romanovs succeeded in agreeing peace separately with Turkey and defeating the Great Tartary. Only after this the European emigrants who had settled on the Atlantic seaboard of North America, ventured West, inland over the continent. For decades they seized the North-American territories of Moscow Tartary left without any governmental authority. Today this has been beautifully, but incorrectly narrated on in the Hollywood movies about 'the very noble' white frontiersmen and the 'very bad' Indians.

As a result, in 1776 (straight after the defeat of 'Pugachev') the United States of America emerged. With the Romanovs they voraciously and speedily sliced and diced the vast territories of Moscow Tartary. Ural, Siberia, the Far East. In America – Alaska and Oregon was ceded to the Romanovs. The rest of North America – to the USA. After failing to maintain these bountiful lands, distant from St.Petersburg, and unwilling to obey the usurpers, both Oregon and Alaska were given away to the USA for a notably paltry sum. The very fact of the existence of Moscow Tartary up to the end of the XVIII century and the division of its vast territories between the

conquerors was wiped clean from the history textbooks – both in the Old and the New Worlds. Up until now the native Russian population of America is being persistently forced to forget their language and their past.

In the XVIII century there existed another 'Tartar' state – the Independent Tartary with its capital in Samarkand [1118], v.2, p.682-684. It was another large 'splinter' of Russia-Horde. Unlike Moscow Tartary, the fate of this state is known. It was conquered by the Romanovs in the middle of the XIX century. Samarkand, the capital of the Independent Tartary, was seized by the Romanovs army in 1868 [183], part 3, p.309.

Before the defeat of Pugachev the entire Siberia was on the whole a country independent of the Romanovs. As a matter of fact there were a number of states.

Only after the victory over 'Pugachev' the Romanovs began to 'place' on the map of Russia the countries' names famous in old Russian history – the countries-provinces of the 'Mongol' Empire [4v2], ch.2:20. For example, Perm and Vyatka. In fact mediaeval Perm is Germany, and mediaeval Vyatka is Italy. These names of the old Imperial provinces were on the Russian coat of arms. After the break-up of the Empire the Romanovs began the re-writing the history of Russia. In particular it was necessary to relocate these names from Western Europe to some place far off, into the wilderness. Which was done. But only after the victory over Pugachev. Notably, it was done rather quickly. The Romanovs began to replace the coats of arms of the Russian cities and regions only in the second half of the XVIII century. On the whole in 1781 [4v1], ch.10:2 and [4v2], ch.2:20. The change of the coats of arms began 6 years after the victory over Pugachev – the last independent Hordian Czar, or the military commander of the Czar of Moscow Tartary.

According to the maps of the XVIII century, the border of Moscow Tartary was very close to Moscow. Such a dangerous proximity greatly concerned the Romanovs. It is possible that it was the reason for Peter the Great to make a decision to relocate the capital further away, to the swampy coasts of the Gulf of Finland. Here the new capital was built – St. Petersburg. This location was convenient for the Romanovs. Now the capital was far away from the Hordian Tartary. Besides, in the case of an invasion from the Siberian-American Horde, it would be easier to flee to the West from St. Petersburg than from Moscow. Mind you, for some reason they didn't fear invasion from the sea to the WEST. In St.Petersburg it is possible to board a ship made ready at the doorstep of the Czar's castle and quickly embark to Western Europe - to friends and relatives, to the historical motherland of the Romanov house.

The official explanation of the Romanovs for relocating the capital of Russia from Moscow to St. Petersburg was not very convincing. They said, that Peter I was 'cutting a window through to Europe', since it was easier to trade from there. But it was possible to trade from the shores of the Gulf of Finland without moving the capital there. They could have simply built a large trading port, and a city next to it. But why did they need to make it the capital of the country?

Furthermore, Siberia becomes a place for the exiled only after the Romanovs' defeat of Pugachev at the end of the XVIII century. Prior to this they exiled people to Solovki, i.e. Solovetsky Archipelago. In any case to the North, but not to Siberia. Let us see when the regular exiles to Siberia began. In particular, Tobolsk became a place of exile only since 1790, when A.N.Radishev was exiled there [797], p.1092; [4v1], ch.11. Since then Tobolsk has become the PERMANENT place of exile. For example, the Decembrists were exiled there. But prior to 1790 over almost the entire XVIII century nobody was exiled to Tobolsk for some reason [4v1]. Ch.11. The vast governmental system of Siberian exile and Siberian hard labour was created only in the XIX century.

Everything is clear. Until the end of the XVIII century the Romanovs could not exile anyone to Siberia simply because SIBERIA DID NOT BELONG TO THEM YET. But it was part of the Russian-Hordian Tartary hostile to the Romanovs. Only having defeated 'Pugachev', the Romanovs got an opportunity to exile the convicts further – to cold Siberia. And even further – to the Far East, to the coast of the Pacific Ocean, to Sakhalin island.

Let's go back to the question of when and how the USA was established. 'During the War of independence of North America in 1775-17983... an independent state – the USA was formed' [797], p.1232. And here we realise, that it SURPRISINGLY COINCIDES WITH THE END OF THE WAR WITH 'PUGACHEV' IN RUSSIA. 'Pugachev' was crushed in 1775. Everything falls into place. 'The War of independence' in North America was the struggle with the weakening Russian Horde. The Romanovs attacked the Horde from the West. And from the East in America - it was attacked by the Americans 'fighting for independence'. Today we are told that the Americans purportedly fought for their 'independence from Britain'. In fact it was a battle for the parcelling of the vast American land of Moscow Tartary left without any central administration. In order not to miss the carve-up, the American troops were eager to get to the West and North-West. George Washington became the first president of the USA in 1776 [796], p.1232. It appears that he became the first new ruler in the American lands of the Russian Horde. The facts of the war with the

'Mongol' Horde were wiped clean from the pages of the textbooks on the American history. As was the fact of the existence of Moscow Tartaria on the whole. The war between the USA and the remains of the Horde continued up until the second half of the XIX century. Alaska, which remained Russian for a particularly long time, was 'bought' from the Romanovs by the Americans only in 1867 [797], p.1232.

Thus, the USA was established in 1776 from the American splinter of the 'Mongol' Empire.

## **2. THE CITIES OF THE URALS OF THE, ALLEGEDLY, BRONZE ERA ARE THE TRACES OF MOSCOW TARTARY, I.E. OF THE SIBERIAN AND AMERICAN STATE OF THE XV-XVIII CC.**

Relatively recently many settlements were discovered in the Southern Urals, of which Arkaim became the most famous [4v1], ch.11. The historians called them proto-cities and dated them to the Bronze era, allegedly to the XVIII-XVI cc. B.C. [33], p.9-10. They inform us that: 'Arkaim is not alone now. The archaeological explorations ... brought to light a LARGE GROUP OF SIGNIFICANT SITES SIMILAR TO THE ARKAIM COMPLEX, tentatively noted as a 'COUNTRY OF CITIES' [33], p.11. And further: 'The urbanized character... of the Sintashta-Petrovka settlements was acquired primarily as the centres of manufacturing and distribution of the METAL GOODS... a large percentage of the findings comprised the metalwork instruments and the remains of the METAL PRODUCTION. Almost all the sites have the FIXED METALURGICAL FURNACES, despite the comparatively small uncovered areas [33], p.31.

The great 'antiquity' of these settlements was proclaimed quite recently. As it turns out, the original point of view of those, who discovered those cities, was different. The discoverers considered the cities to be more recent, i.e. closer to us on the timeline [33], p.9.

A clear picture emerges from all this data. The locals didn't see anything particular mysterious in these settlements. They thought them to be the remains of some not very old cities. They are made of wood and compacted soil, so their good preservation itself indicates that not so many years have passed since their creation. It is only later that the enthusiastic worshipers of antiquity baselessly announced the enormous antiquity of these settlements. Pilgrims and tourists became frequent visitors. I.V.Ivanov informs, that 'three to four thousands sightseers, tourists-psychics,

members of religious sects, people hungry for knowledge and sometime even seeking cures of ailments, visit the conservation area on a yearly basis, during spring and autumn and make a pilgrimage to Arkaim' [33], p.13.

Most likely, these are the old Cossack settlements-fortresses of the XV-XVIII cc. which were a part of the military fortifications of Moscow Tartary. For a reason they write thus of Arkaim: 'The fortification is worthy of a MEDIAEVAL FORTRESSES' [33], p.25. The comparatively good preservation of Arkaim located in the open steppe, where the winds and the rains raze to the ground the remains of the clay, mud and wooden walls (built of earth packed into timber frames), comes into strong contradiction with the 'heralded antiquity' of these constructions [33], p.24. See [4v1].

### **3. IT APPEARS THAT 'PUGACHEV' WAS DEFEATED BY SUVOROV. LATER ON THIS FACT WAS CONCEALED.**

It turns out that A.V.Suvorov's distinguished title of 'Count of Rymnik' is not related to the geographical name of 'Rymnik' in Romania, which, as we have discovered, appeared on the map only AFTER Suvorov's victories, but to the old name of the Yaik River (at present the Ural River). It can be seen on the old maps that Yaik also used to have a second, now forgotten name – Rymnik [ShEK], ch.8. And the Urals were also called the Rymnik mountains [ShEK], ch.8. This factor radically changes the traditional belief about A.V.Suvorov's participation in the Pugachev War. It turns out that it was he who defeated Pugachev. The picture of the historical falsification carried out by the Romanovs together with the Western ruling houses becomes increasingly clear.

The history of war against 'Pugachev' as it is known today is a pure invention of the victors – the Romanovs. 'Pugachev's rebellion' was a brutal war between the Romanov Russia and the Siberian-American Russian State. This Kingdom retained the old Russian-Horde customs and had its own czar with his capital in Tobolsk. The Siberian czar was hostile towards the Romanovs, considering them illegitimate rulers of the Western part of Russia.

The Romanovs strived to possess Siberian Muscovy at all costs. They understood very well that the Russian people on the whole didn't support them and many would rather prefer the regime of Tobolsk to the Romanovs' St.Petersburg. That is why the Romanovs turned the very existence of their Siberian neighbour into a national secret.

To preserve this secret, the infamous Secret Police was created, where the executioners tortured and hanged those who 'knew too much'.

At the end of the XVIII century a major war began between the Romanov Russia and Siberian Moskovia. At first Ottoman Turkey marched out as an ally of Tobolsk. The Romanovs found themselves in a difficult position: they had to fight on two fronts at once. However on the 10 July 1774 after a series of defeats Turkey signed the peace Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca with the Romanovs which marked their defeat. Essentially it betrayed its ally – the Czar of Tobolsk. Seizing this opportunity in 1774 the Romanovs urgently mobilised their troops from the Turkish front to the Eastern Front.

A.V.Suvorov, who had recently distinguished himself in the battles with the Turks, stood at the head of these troops. With Suvorov's help, count P.I.Panin, the commander-in-chief of the Eastern Front, defeated the Siberian army of 'Pugachev'. Suvorov personally convoyed the captured 'Pugachev' from Yaik to Simbirsk. He was later brought to Moscow and executed there, after purporting that he was a common Cossack who had rebelled against the rightful rulers – the Romanovs. Most likely, it was in fact some common Cossack who was brought for the execution, but not the real Siberian war chief. It is possible that he was called 'Pugachev'. The true identity of the Siberian leader was probably kept secret by the Romanovs. The two SECRET PANELS which were set up in Kazan and Orenburg in 1773-1774, were in charge of the misrepresentation of the Pugachev war history [988:00], the article 'Pugachevshina'.

Most likely that following their defeat the remnants of the royal court at Tobolsk and its faithful troops fled to China, where they were warmly received by the Emperors of Manchuria, the distant relatives of the Hordian czars of Tobolsk, see our book 'Pegaya Orda'. The Romanovs occupied Siberia, having at first annexed it to the province of Kazan and pretended that 'it had been always been this way'. But soon they began to divide it 'after suddenly realising that it was too big'. Many old Siberian cities were wiped off the face of the earth. The majority of the names present on the maps of Siberia in the XVIII century are not there in the XIX century anymore. When the archaeologists unearthed the remnants of the Siberian cities destroyed in the XVIII century, instead of reconstructing the true history of Siberia, they declared their findings to be extremely ancient. The perfect example of this is Arkaim in the Urals, (see above).

In 1775 for the victory over Moscow Tartary Suvorov was presented with the most luxurious and expensive award among those he had received – a diamond encrusted

sword. Much to everyone's delight, it was not held a secret at that point. The Romanovs happily celebrated their victory over their severe Siberian neighbour. The victory came to the Romanovs at a price and they spared neither expense nor rewards for their victorious generals-victors.

Later however, the time came when they had to give an account of the history of the war on paper, to canonize the version for the posterity. And here they faced a difficulty. As the Romanovs were persistently hiding the very existence of their Siberian neighbour, depicting that Siberia had always belonged to them. That is why a decision was made to present the war with Tobolsk as an allegedly comparatively easy fight of government troops with a rebellious mob. Purporting, that the rebels' ringleader was a common Cossack Yemelyan Pugachev. When presented in such a light, Suvorov's achievements in defeating 'Pugachev' were an obstacle. It was clear, that a great military commander should not be fighting a crowd of ignorant peasants. He had much greater tasks, and the suppression of peasant revolts was a responsibility of the second-rate military commanders. That is why they presented the matter the following way.

Allegedly 'Pugachev' was defeated by an unknown lieutenant-colonel Michelsohn, who was made promoted to colonel for his achievement. Suvorov, they said, had nothing to do with it. He was called to the Eastern front by mistake, due to P.I.Panin's panic. Suvorov, they said, had absolutely nothing to do there. So in the end he did not fight against Pugachev.

The precious sword received by Suvorov for defeating Pugachev was clearly an obstacle to the falsifiers of history. As it bore witness to the fact that it was Suvorov who defeated Pugachev and that his victory was not came at a price. That is why they presented it as if the sword was awarded to him as reward for the success in the Turkish war and not for the victory over Pugachev. And they preferred to forget altogether about Panin's sword [ShEK], ch.8.

Some might ask why did Suvorov receive the title of Count of Rymnik rather than 'Count of Yaik' or 'Count of Ural' for the victory at Yaik=Rymnik. As Rymnik is the OLD name of Yaik. During the times of Suvorov this river was already called the Yaik river, and after 'Pugachev's' defeat it was renamed into the Ural river.

The probable reason is that in the Suvorov's epoch, under Catherine the Great, it was the 'ancient' geographical names that were very much in fashion. Thus after the annexation of Crimea in 1787 Grigory Potemkin started to be called Potemkin-Tavricheski, and not Potemkin-Crymski. Though Crimea in those days was already called Crimea, but not Tavria. But for the honorary title they used the 'ancient' name –

Tavria. Incidentally in those times many cities in the Russian Empire were either called or re-named in the 'ancient style'. For example, Feodosia (instead of the Mediaeval Kaffa), Sevastopol, Odessa, etc. It's not surprising that Suvorov also received his title 'Count of Rymnik' according to the 'ancient' name of the place, where he won his victory.

Some might like to object. They might say that the old name of the Yaik river as Rymnik is just a random coincidence with name of a small river Rymnik in Moldavia (present day Romania). Purporting that this coincidence proves nothing. Everyone knows that Suvorov became the Count of Rymnik precisely for his victory by the Romanian river Rymnik, and not at Yaik.

However, is it true, that the battle of 1789 in fact took place at Rymnik? Such is the exact coincidence in the names of two rivers in a different place – where both of the rivers are closely connected with Suvorov – seem to be improbable. Of course, it is impossible to argue the fact that nowadays there is in fact a river there called Rymnik in the place where Suvorov won his victory in 1789. It is marked on the modern maps. The question is – WAS IT CALLED THAT DURING THE BATTLE ITSELF? Or was this name craftily attached to some obscure river flowing through the battlefield ALREADY AFTER THE BATTLE. Aiming to replace the true reason for awarding Suvorov with the title of 'Count of Rymnik', and to pretend that he received this title not for the victory over Pugachev at Yaik=Rymnik, but for a different victory?

Our suspicion increases by the fact, that the Austrians who fought together with the Russians against the Turks and took part in the same battle 'at Rymnik', as it turned out, referred to it not as the 'Battle of Rymnik', but the 'Battle of Martinesti' [668:1], p.148.

Let us turn to the old maps of the XVII-XVIII cc. and see what geographical names were there at that time in the location of the 'Battle of Rymnik' of 1789? Is there any 'Rymnik' among them?

We examined hundreds of various maps including those from the book [912:2a], containing the reproductions of over 300 old maps of Russia and its vicinities of the XVII-XVIII cc. It turned out that NONE OF THE OLD MAPS KNOWN TO US CONTAIN ANY TRACES OF THE NAME 'RYMNIK' IN THE LOCATION OF THE BATTLE OF RYMNIK IN MOLDAVIA. But Fokshany, situated very close, where another important battle of 1789 took place and where Suvorov also gained a spectacular victory, was indeed marked on some of the maps of that time. Fokshany was indicated, but Rymnik was not! Notably, in the location of contemporary



'Rymnik' a number of old maps indicate another name close to that of 'Rymnik', but still essentially different from it – 'RYBNIK' [ShEK], ch.8.

But then we begin to understand the 'cooking' of the Rymnik forgery. It was carried out by the Romanovs' historians rather intelligently. They have studied the geographical situation in the vicinity of Suvorov's victories of 1789 trying to find a name similar to 'Rymnik'. It turned out that on some old maps not far from those locations, the town of 'Rybnik' was indicated. That was sufficient to publicly announce that Suvorov, 'Count of Rymnik' received his title precisely for the victory of 1789. The indication on the old maps for the place 'Rymnik' illustrates only a slip of the pen by cartographers, they say. For greater authenticity a small river flowing through the battlefield was renamed as 'Rymnik' [ShEK], ch.8.

Thus, the name 'Rymnik' emerges on the map of Moldavia (present day Romania) only due to the Romanov's forgers. They made sure to depict Suvorov's battle with the Turks in 1789 as that very Battle of Rymnik for which he received the important title of 'Count of Rymnik'. But the real battle took place in 1744 at Yaik=Rymnik. During this battle Suvorov and Panin defeated 'Pugachev's' Siberian army, and by doing so they rendered an invaluable service to the Romanov dynasty. Hence the title and many other honours they generously showered Suvorov with. For example, they began to erect the monument to Suvorov in Petersburg by royal authority of the Emperor Paul I of Russia during the lifetime of the commander. Suvorov was buried in the most important place of honour - in Alexander Nevsky Lavra, in a special burial vault designated only for relatives and close friends.

#### **4. THE ROMANOVS ENDEAVOURED TO BRING MOSCOW DOWN.**

During the epoch of Peter I the relations between Romanov Russia and the vast Moscow Tartary became especially tense. Fearing the restoration of the Horde's regime in Central Russia, the Romanovs transferred their capital to distant Petersburg, which was especially built by Peter I for this purpose. The former capital – Moscow, which was still associated in the minds of many people with Horde of the XIV-XVI cc., was assigned the role of a second-rate city [4v].

Peter I and his circle didn't like Moscow and everything connected with it. Here is an interesting detail conveyed by the French courtier Leboise. He accompanied Peter's court in Paris 1717. In his report to the French King, Leboise wrote: 'The word

'Muscovite' and even 'Muscovia' are deeply insulting for this entire court' [514], v.2, p.283.

It is clear, that a heavy political gloom was to descend onto Moscow and Moscow Kremlin. This is the exact picture that emerges from the documents of the XVIII [TsRS], ch.9.

The Romanovs not only abandoned the old Russian-Horde Kremlin of Moscow=Jerusalem, but decided to mock deride it as 'Mongol' relics. For example, they sent their jesters with their 'weddings' into the Palace of the Facets (Granovitaya Palata). Let them have fun, they said. Let us see how exactly the Romanov's buffoons and their friends danced, drank and joked in the heart of the former capital of Russia-Horde = Biblical Israel.

The old documents, which came to light after a long period of obscurity thanks to the efforts of Zabelin, inform us: 'THE PREFECT OF THE LATIN SCHOOLS AND THE PHILOSOPHY TEACHER HIEROMONK JOSEPH ARRANGED ORGANISED PLAY ACTING. IT IS POSSIBLE THAT DURING THE ARRANGEMENT OF THESE COMEDIES THERE THE FRESCOS OF THE PALACE CHAMBERS, WHICH WERE ALREADY QUITE DILAPIDATED, WERE LIME WASHED' [282:1], part 1, p.117-118.

Everything is clear. The West European 'scholars' who had swarmed across Romanov Russia (especially after Peter cut a window through into enlightened Europe, which was impressed on all of us multiple times) not only clowned around in the Russian Horde cathedrals, but also were destroying the vulnerable Hordian relics of antiquity, revelling in impunity. In particular they lime washed the old frescos in Kremlin. Later, post factum, they declared them to be extremely dilapidated. Purporting that there was nothing left to do but to lime wash them. It became clean and beautiful there. The old Russian pictures ceased to annoy the delicate Latin taste.

It is astonishing that the Romanovs abused the Moscow Kremlin up until the beginning of the XIX c inclusively. Hence one can see how great was their irritation with the former Hordian traditions and memories connected with Moscow and its Kremlin. It came to a point where in the beginning of the XIX century the Romanov administration practically exposed Kremlin to thieves and cheats! IN KREMLIN THERE APPEARED 'NESTS OF THIEVES' AND 'HOUSES OF DEBAUCHERY' [TsRS], ch.9.

## 5. ABOUT THE 'MOST ANCIENT' CHINESE HISTORY.

There are a lot of preconceptions attached to Chinese history. Today it is thought that it is exceptionally ancient, that its dating is absolutely reliable, that in many ways it precedes European history. The common misconception is that allegedly Chinese chronology is solidly based on various 'Ancient Chinese' astronomical notes, which allow us to unequivocally date the 'Ancient Chinese' events.

We analyse the Chinese astronomy and history in [5v2], [PRRK], PVAT]. We show that dating the first astronomical observations in China to allegedly the sixth millennium BC is a serious error, as the alleged reference to the sunspots on the Chinese crockery of allegedly the fourth millennium BC. The Chinese astronomy of allegedly the second millennium BC on the shells and turtle shells also belong to the same phantoms. As it becomes clear, the FIRST observatories and astronomical permanent service appeared in China not earlier than the XIX century.

THE MOST ANCIENT Chinese horoscope of the grandson of the Yellow (Huangdi) Emperor Xuanyan-shi (who allegedly ruled in 2637-2597 B.C.) in fact dates to the 6th March 1725 according to Julian calendar, i.e. the XVIII century!

It appears that the EARLIEST Chinese Yellow Emperor who introduced the epoch of the 'Great Beginning' in China is the first Manchurian dynasty Shì-Tzu-Zhang-Huángdì Shun-Chih (1644-1662), i.e. lived in the XVII century, and not at all in the 'deepest antiquity'.

The astronomical facts prove, that the MOST ANCIENT (Chinese 60-year calendar cycle) was in fact introduced for the first time not until the XIII century.

It turns out that the MOST ANCIENT Chinese solar eclipse under the Emperor Zhòng Kāng in the beginning of the Xia dynasty (who ruled allegedly in 2100-1600 B.C.) occurred on the 1st September 1644, the year of the accession of the Manchurian dynasty. Which means that the history of the Chinese solar eclipses begins only from the XVII century, and not at all in the 'deepest past'.

Furthermore, it turns out that the data about the Chinese lunar eclipses fails to either affirm, or contest any kind of chronology of China. It is absolutely useless for the purpose of the astronomical dating.

We have devoted a large section in [5v2] to the Chinese comets – the most important backbone of the Chinese chronology. We have studied the Chinese comet catalogues in detail. To conclude:

1) The only comet, based on which it could have been possible to try and attempt to prove the validity of the Chinese chronology, is Halley's Comet. The rest of the comets are absolutely useless for the verification of the chronology of China as well as of any other ancient chronology.

2) The information about the appearances of Halley's Comet in the Chinese chronicles earlier than the XV century turned out to be falsified. We have shown that they were fabricated in the XVIII-XIX cc.. This is not just our hypothesis, but a firm statement [5v2], ch.5. However we do not claim that all the Chinese records referring today to Halley's Comet were falsified. It would be enough to fabricate just ONE or TWO OBSERVATIONS of Halley's Comet for the indicated forgery. The forgery was carried out most likely between 1759 and 1835.

The early history of China up until the XV century is in fact the history of Europe, Mediterranean, including Byzantium. The historical chronicles narrating about Europe were brought to China by the Hordian conquerors not until the XIV-XV cc.

Later, after the XVII century, in China these chronicles were erroneously understood as giving an account of allegedly 'ancient Chinese history'. It was easy to make a mistake particularly because in China for writing they used hieroglyphs, i.e. simply pictures.

This type of writing was apparently brought to China from Egypt, possibly as early as in the XII-XIII cc. The understanding of the pictures-hieroglyphs intrinsically depends on the language. The same hieroglyphs are read entirely differently depending on who is reading them: a Chinese, a Japanese, a Vietnamese, etc.

The proper nouns are represented by the hieroglyphs by way of finding similar sounding hieroglyphs IN THE APPLIED LANGUAGE. Hence the spelling, and therefore the reading, contemporary to us, of an old Chinese name considerably depends on who exactly translated ORIGINALLY into the hieroglyphic script: a Japanese, a Chinese or a Korean ...

Besides, the language evolves too. A name which used to sound one way would acquire a completely different sound in several hundreds of years in the evolved language – even if the HIEROGLYPHS, which it was written with, remained the same.

## **6. WHEN AND WHY THE GREAT WALL OF CHINA WAS BUILT**

Today it is thought that construction started on the Great Wall of China in the III century B.C. for the purpose of defence against the Northern nomads [5v1]. We would like to suggest the following idea.

The Great Wall of China was most likely built as a construction defining the **BORDER BETWEEN TWO COUNTRIES**: China and Russia. It could have certainly been intended as a military fortification, but it is hardly true that the wall was used in that particular capacity. It is pointless to defend a 4000 kilometres wall [5v1], ch.6 from the attack of an enemy. Even if it stretches over 'just' one or two thousand kilometres. The wall in its present form falls short of four thousand kilometres.

The wall was built first of all to **MARK THE BORDER BETWEEN TWO COUNTRIES**, notably when they came to an agreement about the border. Presumably, to eliminate any boundary disputes in the future. And such disputes most likely did occur. Today agreed parties draw the border on a map i.e. on paper. And consider it to be sufficient. In the case of Russia and China the Chinese placed such an emphasis on this agreement that they decided to cement it not just on paper, but also 'afield', constructing the wall according to the agreed boundary. It was safer this way and, according to the Chinese, would eliminate any boundary disputes for a long time. The length of the wall itself speaks in favour of our hypothesis. Four or one-two thousand kilometres is normal for the border between two countries. But as for the purely military construction – absolutely pointless.

But the political border of China changed frequently over the duration of its allegedly more than two thousand years history. The historians are telling us so. China has united, then broke into separate regions, then lost and acquired some lands.

We can date the construction of the Wall. If we succeed in finding a political and geographical map, where the **BORDER OF CHINA GOES EXACTLY ALONG THE GREAT WALL**, this would mean, that **IT WAS EXACTLY THAT TIME, WHEN THE WALL WAS BUILT**.

Let us try to find such a map. Such maps do exist. There are a lot of them. These are the maps of the XVII-XVIII cc. For example, the map of Asia of the XVIII century, produced by the Royal Academy in Amsterdam [1019]. We can find two states on the map: Tartary – Tartarie and China – Chine. See [fig.93](#) and [fig.94](#) [5v1], ch.6. The Northern border of China follows approximately the 40th parallel. **THE WALL OF**

CHINA PRECISELY FOLLOWS THIS BORDER. Moreover, on the map the Wall is marked with a thick line and signed Muraille de la Chine, i.e. the 'tall wall of China' - translated from French.

In [5v1] we present a number of such maps. It all means that the Great Wall of China was built in XVI-XVII cc. as the political boundary between China and Russia = 'Mongol Tartary'.

Some may object: on the contrary, the border between Russia and China in the XVII century was drawn along the ancient Wall. However in this case the Wall should have been referred to in the written Russian-Chinese agreement. We haven't found such references.

So when was the Wall=Border constructed? It appears as precisely in the XVII century. It is for a reason considered that its construction 'completed' only in 1620 [544], v.6, p.121. And it might be even later [5v].

Did the Wall exist earlier than the XVII century? Most likely not. The historians tell us that China was conquered by the 'Mongols' in 1279. It became a part of the Great Empire. According to the New Chronology this took place in the XIV century [4v1], ch.2. In the Scaligerian chronology of China this event was marked in the XIV century as the MING dynasty ascending to power in 1368, i.e. the very same MONGOLS.

As we understand it now in the XIV-XVI cc. RUSSIA AND CHINA STILL COMPRISED ONE EMPIRE. Therefore there was no need to erect a Wall = Border. Such necessity emerged after the Time of Troubles in Russia, the defeat of the Russian Horde dynasty and the seizure of power by the Romanovs. They have changed the political course of Russia, subjecting the country to the western influence. Such orientation of the new dynasty led to the break of the Empire. Turkey broke off, the severe wars began with Turkey. In fact control over a substantial part of America was lost. In the very end even Alaska was lost, the last Hordian splinter in America.

China became independent. The relations between China and the Romanovs became tense and the border conflicts began. It was necessary to erect the Wall, which was carried out, most likely during the boundary disputes of the XVII century. The military conflicts flared up since the middle of the XVII century. The wars proceeded with variable success [5v1], ch.6. The descriptions of the wars survive in Khabarov's letters.

The beginning of the certain history of China (on its present day territory) falls only in the epoch of the Manchurian dynasty coming to power. I.e. the Mongol dynasty originated from Russia. The dynasty was either Russian or Tatar.

As late as in the XVIII century it was common to write MANZHOURY [5v1], ch.6, and not the 'Manchu' of today. I.e. MANGURY or MANGULY, as in China the sounds 'L' and 'R' are often indistinguishable. Thus the very name of MANZHOURY points to their origin. They were the 'MONGOLS' = the magnificent.

Incidentally, this border – the XVII century separating the epoch of the Manzhourian domination in China from the 'purely Chinese' period preceding it – coincides with the dating of the most ancient Chinese manuscripts which survive until the present day. To remind you, they date to not earlier than the XVII century [544], v.6, p.119.

The Manzhourian = 'Mongolian' rulers of China are known to consider themselves the successors of the vast Empire, which according to them spanned the entire world. If their kingdom was the splinter of the Golden Horde, then such a perception is understandable. But from the Scaligerian point of view, that before conquering China, the Manchu was a savage people who lived somewhere near the Northern Chinese border, the absurd pomposity of the Manchu sovereigns becomes not just strange, but without parallel in world history either.

## **7. PIEBALD HORDE**

When was 'ancient Chinese history' written and who by? It appears that in the XVII-XVIII cc., in China, under the Manchus, a great deal of history writing was undertaken. [151]. This activity was accompanied by disputes, witch-hunts, persecutions and the obliteration of books. The history of China was practically written under the Manchus. And it took place in the XVII-XVIII cc. [151].

In [5v2] we show, that THE CHINESE HISTORICAL LITERATURE WHICH EXISTS TODAY WAS WRITTEN AND CONSIDERABLY EDITED AFTER 1770. A lot was edited. The chronicles, lists of comets, the history of dynasties and the entire Chinese history in general.

Thus, following the Romanovs seizure of power in Russia and the crushing defeat of the Russian Horde, the surviving representatives of the Horde dynasty fled in different directions. In particular to the East. Some, however, made attempts to return to the Moscow throne. It appears that the Stepan Razin and Yemelyan Pugachev 'uprisings' were among such attempts.

But some fled to the East. The most Eastern Horde was the Piebald Horde, situated at that time along the borders of present day China. Possibly the territories occupied by it were called KITAI. And is now modern day CHINA, according to Afanasy Nikitin.

The escaped group of the Hordians was not great in number. They were the Manchus = 'Mongols'. It was probably them, who had with them a minor prince. Incidentally, the mysterious (for the historians) prince Alexei was also involved in the Razin uprising. Having rounded up troops in the Piebald Horde, they conquered China, settled there and took all the necessary measures not to be absorbed by the Romanov Russia. For that purpose, in particular, the Wall of China was created either in the middle or at the end of the XVII century.

In 1644, as they tell us, the Manchus seized, but most likely FOUNDED the city of Peking. Or as it was called then – PEZHIN from PEGAYA (means PIEBALD in Russian) Horde. A minor prince SHIH(-zu), who was brought with them from The Golden Horde, i.e. from Volga (where Stepan Razin was fighting at the time), was proclaimed the Emperor.

The conquerors forces marched off almost without any women. That is why to continue a pure Manchurian = 'Mongol' bloodline was possible only for the Emperor's court. And even then only just. In the very end the bulk of the Manchus became integrated. It happened approximately a hundred years later. Consequently the nature of the Manchurian army completely changed. By the end of the XVIII century the 'Manchurian soldiers ... have long lost their former military efficiency' [151], v.5, p.318. The Manchurian language is the language of Piebald Horde. Naturally, it is nothing like Chinese.

To conclude, THE MANCHURIAN GOLDEN HORDE IN CHINA OF THE XVII-XVIII CC. IS THE SPLINTER OF THE RUSSIAN GOLDEN HORDE. The Manchus are those 'Mongols', Russians and Tatars, who in the XVII century fled from the Romanovs.

## **8. ABOUT THE HISTORICAL SOURCES OF THE PRESENT DAY MONGOLS.**

They can tell us: but there are present-day Mongols. Living on the territory of Mongolia. What is the story of their ancient history? They must have their chronicles and annals...

Most likely, the present-day Mongols are the vestiges, the descendants of the Piebald Horde, which had conquered China in the beginning of the XVII century. Their very



name speaks of it: Mongols = Manguls = Manchurs. Therefore it is interesting to have a look at their historical sources. It is thought that there are many of them, but ALL OF THEM, EVEN ACCORDING TO THE HISTORIANS, WERE CREATED, OR TO BE MORE PRECISE, FIRST WRITTEN IN THE PERIOD FROM THE XVII TO THE XIX CC. [5v1], ch.6.

As a rule, the Mongolian chronicles, despite the fact that they were created in the XVII-XVIII cc., are brought to the Manchurian conquest. THEY CONTAIN THE OLD LEGENDS ABOUT THE QING DYNASTY. And also about Genghis Khan and his descendants ruling in 'Mongolia' [5v1], ch.6.

But these are once again the legendary recollections about the Golden Horde and famous Russian Grand Prince Georgii Danilovich. The chronicles were brought to the territory of the present-day Mongolia by the Manchurs – the natives of the Golden Horde. That is the reason why the chronicles end with the Manchurian conquest. Following that the Mongols themselves as a rule for some reason didn't compose any historical writings.

We are aware that it might be immensely difficult for our reader to part with a myth of the archaic antiquity of China and the Eastern civilisations in general. However, the impartial analysis shows that the age of the Eastern civilisation is approximately the same as the Western one.

But the written accounts in the East are in a much worse state than in the West. If in the West the majority of the surviving manuscripts and books were produced not earlier than the XVI-XVII cc. and they convey to us European history beginning with only the XI century, than in China the situation is worse. There practically all the documents were produced not earlier than the XVII-XVIII cc. That is why we would hardly be able to learn anything about the Chinese history prior to the XV-XVI cc. We would like to repeat that its final version was created only at the end of the XVIII – beginning of the XIX cc.

## **9. JAPAN.**

The second wave of the 'Mongolian-Chinese', i.e. Scythian colonisation of Japan belongs to the XVI-early XVII cc. During this time they began to break the 'Mongol' Empire into pieces. Japan, which has already been safely absorbed by The Horde earlier in the XIV-XVI (the first wave), has unwillingly become one of such splinters countries in the XVII century. Japan of that time remained faithful to the idea of the Horde Empire. As a result, in the beginning of the XVII century various demographics among the European Cossack population of Horde (and first of all of

the East Piebald Horde) moved to join their brothers on the far away Japanese islands, escaping the invasion of the pro-Western Romanovs. The unyielding Hordians-Samurais had left the mainland for ever. It is for a reason that there survive Japanese records of exactly the time the shogun Tokugawa IEYASU (1542-1616) arrived to Japan [1167:1], p.20. They possibly refer to the appearance on the Japanese islands of a new wave of Christian Cossacks under the banners of JESUS Christ, i.e. crusaders samurais-Samaritans (natives of Samara).

The period between 1624-1644 is referred to in today's version of Japanese history as 'Kan'ei period' [1167:1], p.20. I.e. the period of the KHANS. It is curious, that during this epoch Japan completely shuts itself from the outside world. Presumably, the Hordian khans, the rulers of Japan, were striving to isolate their country and to save it from the 'progressive reformers' of the XVII century, who were greedily dividing at that time the vast heritage of Horde in Eurasia and America.

Today it is thought that in the XVI-XVIII cc. in the history of Japan and particular its central region, metropoly Edo, an important role was played by the RUSUI [1167:1], p.6. The Japanese historians say: 'We should not forget about the RUSUI (Auth.), who were present in Edo from every feudal province (of Japan-Auth.). THE RUSUI HAD A HUGE INFLUENCE on the culture of both Edo metropoly, and in each regional district... The Rusui from different feudal districts cooperated with each other' [1167:1], p.6.

Speaking of the Rusui with deep respect, the contemporary Japanese historians do not specify here – who are these Rusui. Our idea is simple. The Japanese sources have preserved the records that the Japanese islands colonised by RUSSIA-Horde. The descendants of the Cossacks-Hordians were called Rusui in Japan for a rather long time. And the samurais as well.

The military regime of the samurais headed by Shogun lasted until the middle of the XIX century. The historians report that the 'Chinese cultural influence on Japan was enormous, especially in the epoch of Edo' [1167:1], p.11. As we have already pointed out, in the XIV-XVI cc. the name Kitai (China) referred to Scythia.

It has already been stated that in the samurai epoch of the XVII-XIX cc. the Japanese islands isolated themselves from the outside world. They wished to protect themselves from the Western rebels. However, by the middle of the XIX century the division of the heritage of the 'Mongol' Empire in Eurasia and America was over and the greedy gazes turned to the faraway Japanese islands, which remained the pillar of the Imperial samurai spirit. Japan's turn had come.

In the middle of the XIX century the European military ships (elusively referred to as 'merchant' in the textbooks) appeared at the shores of Japan carrying a large deployment of European troops. A military coup was underway, which led to the fall of the samurai rule. This period was later cunningly called 'the Meiji RESTORATION', i.e. meaning the return to former values [1167:1], p.104. In reality they referred to the barbaric invasion of the Hordian-Samurai Japan by the European Reformers. The last outpost of the samurais – the headquarters of the shogun in the North of Japan, in the city of Aizu-Wakamatsu was seized and savagely destroyed. The contemporary Japanese historians usually speak sparingly of this turbulent and dark era.

Thus in 1868 the Hordian-Samurai epoch came to an end. In the second half of the XIX century the Reformation swept through the vanquished country, i.e. sublimating Japanese life to the Western and American way. [1167:1], p.104. The samurais were crushed.

Over time in Japan there emerged a nostalgia for the epoch of the samurais: 'The people look back to the Edo era with much nostalgia' [1167:1], p.10. The mediaeval samurais (the Samaritans) until now remain the object of admiration and respect in Japan [5v1].

## **10. THE MAP OF THE GLOBAL HORDE EMPIRE.**

The major conquests of Russia-Horde and the Ottoman Empire –Atamania are not at all reflected on the Scaligerian map in any way. That is the reason why we had to draw the present map of the 'Mongol' Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. ourselves.

The Mighty = 'Mongol' rulers thought that the entire world should be conquered. And this plan was fully realised. Let us highlight the contours of the Russian Empire at the beginning of the XX c. on the world map with a thin red line, [fig.95](#). Let us add to it the territories which, according to the historians, were a part of the 'Mongol' Empire, or as it was called in the XVII-XVIII cc. – Great Tartary, [fig.96](#) [5v1], ch.1, ch.8.

As you can see, the Great Tartaria and the domains of the Mighty 'Mogols', i.e. 'Mongols', cover practically all of Asia and a significant chunk of Europe. It includes, in particular, the biggest part of modern China, India, Persia and Korea. Let us add to this Great Tartaria the following countries:

# The United Ottoman Empire = Atamania which was later given the name of Turkey, conquered by Tamerlane-Timur.

# A part of Egypt conquered during the 'Mongol' yellow Crusade allegedly in the XIII century.

# Eastern Europe, colonised by Baty-Khan.

These are the countries which fell under the rule of the 'Mongol' Empire according to the historians themselves.

But that is not everything. Let us add the countries which according to the mediaeval records, essentially considered themselves to be the vassals of the Great Empire. Without showing any significant armed resistance. Such as Germany, France, Italy, England, Spain, Scandinavia, i.e. virtually the whole of Western Europe. The result is indicated with the continuous bald line in [fig.95](#). These are the contours of the 'Mongol' Empire of the XIV century epoch.

Later in the XV-XVIcc. the Empire significantly expanded once again during the Hordian and Ottoman conquest of The 'Promised Land'. The overseas territories in the North and South America were annexed. These territories are included in [fig.95](#) with a dashed line [6v2], ch.6.

Inside the Empire of the XIV century (thick contour) you see the Russian Empire of the early XX century (thin contour). Here could also be added the countries which were a part of the Russian zone of influence (USSR) from 1945 to 1985. How does the territory of the 'Mongol' Empire of the XIV century differ from the territory of the Russian Empire, let's say, of the early XX century?

Not more than twice. And to think that this is several hundred years later, following the break-up of the Empire. And if we compare it to the 'zone of influence' of Russia (USSR) of the XX century in Eurasia, then the difference would be reduced to only several per cent. Not to mention that Alaska, leased out by the Romanovs to USA in 1867 under Alexander II, is comparable to Western Europe. Though it was sold so cheaply – for 7.2 million dollars [4v1].

The Great Empire was rigidly centralised. In those times the creation of such a vast monolithic Empire with real longevity was impossible – due to the inadequate means of communication, for example. That is why the Horde Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. fell apart having existed for about 300 years. But the very idea of a multinational Empire remained appealing and lived long in certain parts.

## **11. DIVISION OF THE RELIGIOUS HERITAGE OF THE EMPIRE.**

The religious and political heritage of the Empire was divided between: the WEST, with the Catholic Rome in Italy; the EAST, with the Orthodox Third Rome = Moscow; and ASIA, with the Muslim Istanbul. Moscow, Rome and Istanbul were the religious centres. Thus in the XVII-XVIII cc. the three religions, which emerged from the sole Christianity of the XII-XIV cc., divided the spheres of influence.

The city of Jerusalem in Palestine was given its name and identified with the evangelical Gospels Jerusalem not very long ago [6v2], ch.2:10. Following the break-up of the Empire the main ecclesiastical forces of the Orthodox Christianity, Catholicism, Islam and Judaism could not agree on how to keep the former name of JERUSALEM for Czar-Grad = Troy = Istanbul.

There were too many political, historical and religious conflicts there. Following the split of Christianity none of the newly formed religious branches could agree to leave the old holy Jerusalem in the hands of one of the 'sisters' as its religious centre.

In the end in order to avoid offending anyone, it was tacitly agreed to strip Czar-Grad of one of its famous ancient names – Jerusalem. And it was bestowed upon the small settlement of Al-Quds in what is today's Palestine. Where notably the very name PALESTINE, - i.e. Bely Stan (White Camp) or Babel, Babylonian Camp, - was also transferred not long before.

It took place most likely in the XVIII century. The construction of the 'Jerusalem antiquities' dates to the early XIX century, when Egypt was conquered by Napoleon and Western Europeans for the first time arrived in Palestine [6v2], ch.2. At the end of XVIII-XIX cc. Al-Quds was quickly turned into the centre of the religious veneration, to where all the corresponding Gospel and Biblical events were transferred to – on paper.

The famous mediaeval name of Troy was also taken away from Czar-Grad and declared to be 'very ancient'. However the name itself didn't travel too far. Today we are told that Homer's 'classical' Troy was in fact situated close to Istanbul. Namely on the Eastern shore of Turkey, near the southern entry to the Dardanelles. Near a town of Kum Burun [2v1], ch.5.

## **12. REWRITING AND 'FRAGMENTATION' OF THE ANCIENT HISTORY.**

To sum up. Among the Imperial splinters, which for an especially long time remained true to the idea of the united Empire, were, for example, Spain, Samurai Japan, Manchurian China and some Hordian-Cossack civilisations of America – Maya, Aztec and Inca in particular. The Hordian governors who ruled in the XVII century in China decided to break away from the usurpers-Romanovs. For that purpose in the XVII century The Great Wall of China was erected as the borderline marked point to point with low-rise walls and occasional towers.

In the XVII-XIX cc. all these pockets of resistance of the old 'Mongol' dynasties were suppressed. The Samurais-Hordians in the XIX century were crushed by the Europeans who invaded Japan. The Hordian civilizations in America were drowned in blood by the West-European reformers who intruded there in the XVII-XVIII cc. Later on all these atrocities were shifted by the historians approximately 200 years down back to the XV century and retrospectively accredited it to the rather peaceful colonisation of America by Horde-Ottoman Empire. Cunningly having called it 'the bloody Spanish Conquista'. Painted – on paper - white into black. Projected their own atrocities onto someone else.

In the XVII-XVIII cc. in West Europe the reformers fiercely suppressed the Russian = Scythian population and Slavic culture. Today textbooks evasively describe these punitive wars as the 'wars with Cathars' and are dated to several hundred years back to the XII-XIII cc.

In the XV-XVI cc. Russia-Horde = Biblical Israel and Ottoman Empire-Atamania = Biblical Judaea were the integral parts of the sole united Empire. After its break up in the XVII century the Western rebels tried to drive a wedge between Russia and Turkey, the heiress of the Ottoman Empire. They succeeded in doing so. The meaningless Russian-Turkish wars began, exhausting the brotherly nations. In doing so the rebellious Western Europe succeeded in breaking free from the rule of Russia and the Ottoman Empire. In 1826 the rebels managed to draw over the Turkish Sultan Mahmud II. He ordered to abolish the famous Janissary corps – the former Slavic guards of the Ottomans-Atamans. They were treacherously shot down at point-blank with cannon buck shot. Sultan Mahmud II demonstratively swapped his Ottoman clothing for Western-European garments and Turkey openly set its course for Western Europe. Though their 'friendship' was never to be.

The memory of the 'Mongol' Empire recedes into the past. The important part was played by the historians of the XVII-XIX cc. fulfilling the order of the new authorities, had a vested interest in preventing the restoration of the Empire. It was necessary to destroy the very memory of it as quickly as possible. The order to rewrite the entire history in the requisite key followed purely political objectives, vital both to the Western reformers and their henchmen in Russia – the Romanovs. This explains the concurrence of historic falsification practically applied according to a unified programme across different countries. The 'Imperial idea' itself began to be denounced as a 'chauvinistic' one. Russia in particular endured a great deal, as it was constantly a suspect in the attempts to restore the Empire. They didn't like Turkey either.

As a result a distorted picture of the past was created, which was being forcefully indoctrinated into the peoples psyche in the XVIII-XX cc. Scaligerian chronology which dated many events of the XI-XVI cc. back into the distant past became the main instrument of this falsification. Some of the epochs of the X-XVI cc. were submerged into a fictitious obscurity: the 'dark Middle Ages' materialised. Classical antiquity in its turn, on the contrary shimmered with the phantom reflections of the events of the XI-XVII cc. which were declared 'very ancient'. For example, the Russian civilisation in Italy was declared to be Et-ruscan and was 'consigned' into the past. As a result the surviving records of the true history are perceived today with bewilderment and sometimes even with petulance. The topsy-turvy picture of the past was perpetuated even in the mind set. Some of our contemporaries, for instance, in Russia and Turkey, perceive our reconstruction with unease and awkwardness, according to which Russia together with Ottoman Empire at some point comprised the metropolity of the global Empire. The people feel somewhat awkward in front of the citizens of other countries who forgot more profoundly their own, in fact not so distant, past.

Now, when the true picture of the XIV-XVII cc. becomes clearer, the history of the new time appears in a different light. Primarily – the history of Russia and Turkey. The role of the ideological method used against them is clear. The Reformation would have remained unfinished without the falsification of ancient history. Sooner or later in Russia and in Turkey there could have appeared the idea of the restoration of the Empire. In order to prevent this, with the aid of the skilfully developed ideological method – the false historic and chronological version – the Russian troops were dispatched into war with Turkey.

In the regions of the Empire which gained independence the memories were becoming increasingly blurred. The local historians fabricated many allegedly independent chronicles of their own 'local Empires' from virtually one and the same chronicle of the global empire. The Arabs started to think that they had THEIR OWN Arabic Empire. The Germans happened – on paper – to have THEIR OWN whole Empire of the German nation. The Chinese – THEIR OWN Heavenly Empire. The Italians – THEIR OWN Roman Empire. And so on. All these empires were allegedly different, existing in different epochs. Thus one Great Empire 'spawned' several 'small paper' Empires.

Let's discuss in more detail. We discovered multiple duplications which identify the main 'Empires of the distant past' with the 'Mongol' Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. There appeared to be 12 such major overlaps [1v], [2v]. There is nothing surprising here. The Great Empire embraced practically the entire civilised world. Its history was written down by the chroniclers of various cities including those far from the metropoly. In Europe, Asia, America and Africa. The collective history of the Empire was the 'spine' of all the local chronicles, and especially the events in the metropoly, in Russia-Horde. The local events were then superimposed upon this 'common skeleton'. They were different for different regions, but the 'skeleton' was common – the Hordian one. The sole history for the sole Empire was shattered into multiple fragments, in which however, as in a hologram, the reflected history of the entire 'Mongolia' remained frozen.

The question is under what names the czar-khans of Russia-Horde were reflected in the 'distant past'? They had many names. Every Hordian emperor is reflected in the regional chronicles under different names: biblical, 'Ancient' Roman, 'Ancient' Germanic, 'Ancient' French, 'Ancient' Italian, etc. It is of course difficult to keep in mind all the parallels which we discovered and to remember which ruler is 'identified' with another. In [KR], Appendix 2, we organised this data. It resulted in a most interesting list of the main 'phantom names' of each Hordian 'world' Emperor from the XIV-XVI cc.

The old chronicles of the Empire of the XII-XVI cc. usually started with the epoch of Andronicus-Christ, i.e. from the XII century. Following the collapse of the Empire and the artificial multiplication and division of the very same main chronicle into numerous 'provincial' ones, Andronicus-Christ 'appeared' at the beginning of the written history of various newly-emerged states. But already as, allegedly, 'their own, local' czar. He was even known by different names. However in the 'biography' of



each such 'local first czar', traces of the life description of Andronicus-Christ inevitably survived. Sometimes they were more obvious than at other times. As time went by they faded from memory. The fantasies of latter day chroniclers embellished these old accounts with elaborate and inventive detail.

To conclude, the purpose of the 'history reformation' was to prevent the restoration of the Horde Empire. People were to forget the location of its centre. It was declared that allegedly the centre was situated in 'ancient' Italy. Thus the centre moved – on paper! – to Western Europe. After that all the attempts to widen the borders of the Russian czardom, - and such attempts were often based on the subconscious striving towards the restoration of the peoples' unity, - started to look like 'Russian aggression'. The analogous attempts of Turkey – looked like the 'Turkish aggression'. Imposing false beliefs on the enemy, which to themselves were advantageous, was a rather effective technique.

The peoples of the XVII-XVIII cc. fought not only on the battlefield, but also on the pages of the history textbooks. And this is understandable. 'The historical arguments' are often launched to substantiate immediate political ideas. Unfortunately, the historical science is intertwined with the politics including that of today. This interferes with the peaceful scientific discussion of the paradoxes accumulated over time. Today it is high time to turn away from the political aims of the XVII-XVIII cc. and to adopt mutual efforts to restore to true picture.

### **13. WHY IN THE XVII-XVIII CENTURIES THEY ADMIRER CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY.**

The Scaligerian-Romanov history taught us the following interpretation of the past. They say that once upon a time in small rocky Greece there lived the eminent 'Ancient Greeks', and in the centre of the small Italic Peninsula – the wonderful 'Ancient' Romans. And in a small desolate Palestine – wonderful biblical characters. Overall they were all common people. The Biblical heroes for example lived a simple life, tended the flock, ruled the tribal clans, herded cattle from place to place, etc.

Then later the biblical and 'classical' characters allegedly exited the stage of the Middle Ages. And were forgotten for many centuries. However the 'subconscious memory' of them proved to be allegedly so persistent that after many dark centuries the entire Western Europe and even barbaric Russia 'unexpectedly remembered antiquity' and started to worship the obscure shadows of the distant past. Moreover they developed such deeply 'ancient' Greco-Roman and Biblical memories that

motivated them in their social and religious life and even in everyday life. All of this looks strange.

Our idea is simple. Russia-Horde of the XVII century and the territories of Western Europe which had just broken off (where the new states were forming: France, Germany, Italy...) were the successors of the 'Mongol' Empire, i.e. of 'Ancient' Rome = Biblical Israel. Having buried the Empire in oblivion and having declared it the kingdom of Horde-Tatar evil, at the same time its successors cherished the memories of it as of some ANCIENT beautiful Kingdom under the names of: 'Ancient' Great Rome, 'Biblical Israel'... And began to idolize the 'ancient archetypes', already forgetting that in fact these great ancestors lived quite recently (and not at all where the Scaligerian history has exiled them to). Hence the veneration with which the examples of 'Ancient' Rome and Biblical Israel began to be surrounded with from the XVII century. This is the exact reason why the palaces of the Russian czars and Western rulers of the XVII-XVIII cc. were filled with depictions of Biblical and 'classical' scenes. That is why the XVIII century is considered to be a century of worshiping 'classical antiquity'. They worshiped not some dilapidated country-pastoral fairy tales, but the recent and turbulent history of their own ancestors. Which they rightfully considered themselves to be involved in. And of which they were proud. But (in view of the changed policy) not under its true name – Great 'Mongolia' (Great 'Mongol' Empire), but under nicknames which were made to sound older – 'Ancient' Rome and 'Biblical Israel'.

The following vivid facts become clear. 'The favourite and almost exclusive subject of interior art of the XVIII century... was an emblem, an allegory, which MOST OF THE TIME were used to express the ready-made pre-fabricated images and forms of ANCIENT CLASSICAL MYTHOLOGY. This, of course, was fully established by the GENERAL NATURE of education of the XVIII century, MOSTLY BROUGHT UP ON THE CLASSICS OF THE ANCIENT AND ROMAN WORLD. The plafonds and walls in the palaces and chambers of the noblemen were covered during that time with mythological images, where the pagan deities (in fact the distorted reflections of the Horde Khans of the XIV-XVI cc. – Author), half naked... were to embody the sacred thoughts and ideas of the contemporaries. NO MONUMENT, FESTIVITY, TRIUMPHAL ENTRANCE, ILLUMINATION OR FIREWORKS, WOULD FAIL TO BE INVESTED WITH THE ALLEGORIC IMAGES SO BELOVED BY THE SOCIETY OF THAT TIME. Such was the taste which characterised the epoch.'

[282:1], part 1, p.154.

The following significant facts fit together. On the vaulted ceiling of the Kremlin

Golden Chamber 'there were depicted **KINGS OF ISRAEL** standing upright, first there is David by the doors, then is Solomon and Rehoboam by the doors into the Golden Chamber, then Abijah, Asa, Jehoshaphat and finally, the busts ... - of Uzziah, Jehoahaz and at the Dining Chamber door arch – there is Ahaz. These depictions of the standing kings somewhat served as an unmovable support for the images depicted in the heavens, in the chamber's vault, where a young czar (Ivan Vassilievich – Author), whose head was crowned with a royal wreath from from on high, from the hands of an Angel, **WAS ALSO AT THE SAME TIME RECEIVING THE ROYAL STATURE FROM THE HOST OF THE ANCIENT KINGS OF ISRAEL**' [282:1], part 1, p.161.

Everything is right. The ancient Kings of Israel depicted on the ceilings and walls of Moscow Golden Chamber were in particular the following Russian-Horde czars-khans:

# Dmitry Ivanovich Donskoi, aka Biblical King David;

# Suleiman the Magnificent, the Sultan of Judaea = Ottoman Empire, aka King Solomon);

# Georgy Danilovich = Genghis Khan, aka Biblical King Asa.

Thus the early designers of The Moscow Kremlin understood everything correctly. And accurately painted not just some hazy allegory, but the true history of Russia-Horde = Biblical Israel of the XIV-XVIII cc.

And so, there was a lot that was unusual in Moscow Kremlin from the point of view of the Scaligerian-Romanov history. But during the epoch of the XVII-XVIII cc. occupation almost all of the Horde's traces were extinguished.

Today we are being told about Kremlin of the XVI-XVII cc., mainly using the words of foreign travellers, diplomats, writers and merchants who visited Moscow and left some kind of notes. But where are the Hordian authors and documents? Much fewer of those survived. It was driven into our minds that in poor Russia they were allegedly bad at writing history down. May we question it. The Hordians wrote well and a lot. For example, they created the significant part of the Old Testament including the Pentateuch [6v]. But in the epoch of the Time of Troubles and the Romanovs pogrom-occupation they could not hold on to the major segments of their history. They took it away from us and attributed it to others. Instead they invented for us and bequeathed to us the 'gloomy Tatar yoke'. Which is still taught at school.

## **14. THE PUBLIC RIDICULE OF SOME SELECTED BOOKS OF THE HORDIAN BIBLE ORGANISED BY THE WESTERN REFORMERS WITH THE ROMANOVs.**

As we have shown in [6v], the significant part of the Old Testament was created in Russia-Horde in XIV-XVI cc. Moreover, some of the books of the Old Testament were reworked in Moscow in the first half of the XVII century. However, in the epoch of the break-up of the Empire, a struggle ensued between Horde and the Romanovs. The Bible, as a holy Imperial book was also implicated in this conflict. The Romanovs alongside their Western allies did their best to obscure the true meaning of the Old Testament books to conceal the fact that contained in them was a description of the Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. It was necessary to change the attitude towards the Old Testament, to edit it with a new viewpoint. That is why alongside the rewriting of many fragments of the Bible behind the false mask of the 'ancient text restoration' the Romanovs struck a blow upon the former Hordian-Biblical beliefs from an unexpected angle. A decision was made to ridicule the original books of the Old Testament which were being destroyed at that point in order to set the way for a new edition of the same books (under the same names) in people's consciousness. To put this important plan in action, foreigners - 'Germans', were summoned to Moscow.

'Under Czar Alexei (Mikhailovich – Author) there emerged in the palace theatrical performances... Our past ... quite unexpectedly found itself centre stage in a comedic spectacle, in a programme of similar mockery, only presented in a different way, the czars way, BESIDES IT IS OF GERMAN ORIGIN, which consequently meant that it was somehow more excusable to appear before the old piety. The Germans acted their plays from the Bible. IT SEEMED TO BE IMPOSSIBLE ACCORDING TO THE NOTIONS OF THE PAST. But such was the force of the general movement in our life (Zabelin thinks naively not understanding the very essence of the events – Author), which carried us closer and closer towards the European world... The impossible and rejected (by the severe Hordian Domostroy – Author) in one way, seemed possible and accepted by another; and during heated discussions JUST ABOUT THE LETTERS OF SCRIPTURE, THE BIBLE WAS PERFORMED IN A COMIC FASHION ON A PALATIAL STAGE. However the matter didn't seem to be particularly heinous mainly because it was PERFORMED BY THE GERMANS, i.e THE STRANGERS, UNORTHODOX, ALSO REJECTED. FOR A RUSSIAN HIMSELF IT WAS SOMEHOW UNNATURAL TO START SUCH AN UNHEARD OF THING. How would he even dare: what would the tough authorities of Domostroy said to and do to an innovator' [282:1], part 2, p.317.

We see how subtly the Romanovs acted. The blow to the old Hordian Bible was carried out at the hands of the 'Germans', purporting that you can't expect too much of them. They are not Orthodox, they are outcasts. Let them mock the 'not so correct' Bible. It is even interesting how the Germans did it. You see what fun it is, because it is a comedy. In the end scepticism and mistrust towards formerly sacred things were successfully and surreptitiously embedded into society. Instead they quickly replaced it with new ones, having edited the Biblical text in the required key. And then they made a loud statement, that: now everything is in order. We will allow no one to mock this 'reconstructed' Bible. Even the Germans. As now the reconstructed Bible suits us, i.e. the Romanovs and the Western reformers, very nicely. In particular, all the 'Northern traces' are now removed from the Old Testament and hardly anyone could guess that many biblical books are in fact telling us about Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc. And in order to kill any doubts before they could grow, as some among the not so well informed were outraged and argued, it was loudly declared that not only we have edited the Bible, but finally reconstructed its old, forgotten, definitive text written many-many years ago. On the shores of the desolate Dead Sea in Palestine, long before the beginning of our era (BC).

This shows how the Romanovs foisted their new outlook on the Biblical history. Presumably not everyone liked that at the time. Many still remembered the true history of Russia-Horde, they could see what the Biblical books of 'Esther' and 'Judith' were in fact telling them. They did not want to watch the buffoonery and ridicule which the former history was subjected to at that time. In order to break down this covert but persistent opposition, the Romanovs ORDERED THAT IT WAS OBLIGATORY FOR ALL THEIR ATTENDANTS TO BE PRESENT AT THE PERFORMANCES. Chances are that when the czar's messenger knocked on the door and politely invited you to attend 'a comedy', few would dare to refuse. The bare fact of the czar's ORDER TO TURN UP WITHOUT FAIL clearly indicates the depth of discrepancies which were tearing the society apart during that time.

It was probably considered a matter of courtesy not only to attend the biblical comedies, but also to demonstratively laugh at the grotesque Assyrians and rightly vanquished Persians. I.e. at the XVI century Hordians, recent ancestors of whom were among the audience. It was unpleasant to some of the courtiers of the XVII century Moscow, but they had to publically demonstrate their loyalty.

The underlying struggle surrounding the biblical comedies at the czar's court was intense. The Hordian opposition did its best to get its former influence back. There were grounds for hope. To remind you, at that time and up until the middle of the

XVIII century, before the defeat of 'Pugachev' in the East there existed a vast Hordian state – Moscow Tartary, which the Romanovs feared so much [4v]. It is not inconceivable that the Hordian opposition in the Kremlin hoped for the restoration of the Horde in the very heart of Russia, in Moscow. After all, the boundaries of Moscow Tartary were just a short distance away.

In any way, as soon as Alexey Mikhailovich died, THE COMEDIES CEASED AT ONCE, and the jokesters fell from grace. Domostroy and Stoglav raised their heads. But later the supporters of the horde still lost.

(Domostroy - Domestic Order; Stoglav - The Book of One Hundred Chapters is a collection of decisions of the Russian church council of 1551 that regulated canon law and ecclesiastical life in the Russian Church, especially the everyday life and mores of the Russian clergy – Translator's note)

## **15. THE RADZIVILL CHRONICLE WAS TENDENTIOUSLY EDITED.**

Today's version of the Russian history was created in the XVIII century based on the sources written and edited in the late XVII – early XVIII cc. This version was written in the epoch of Peter I, Anna Ioannovna and Elizaveta Petrovna. Following the publication of 'History' (History of the Russian State – Translator's note) by N.M.Karamzin this view point was disseminated among the public. Prior to this only a narrow circle of people were familiar with it. Gradually it was incorporated into the school curriculum.

The story of the 'most ancient' Russian Radzivill manuscript is roughly as follows. It was made in Königsberg in the early XVIII century, apparently due to Peter I visiting the city and immediately prior to this visit. Most likely some truly old chronicle of the XV-XVI cc. was used. BUT THIS ANCIENT RECORD SUFFERED SIGNIFICANT ALTERATION, before it became a part of the Radzivill chronicle [4v], ch.1. The old original was destroyed.

Königsberg 'Nestors' of the XVIII century adhered to mainly the Romanov version of the old-Russian history, outlined in the official 'Synopsis' of the XVII century. The idea was to create, or rather to forge the missing primary source, an allegedly authentic manuscript, confirming the Romanov version. Peter approved of the Königsberg job and since then the Radzivill chronicle started to be referred to as the 'most ancient Russian chronicle'. The primary source on the Russian history has 'emerged at last'.

But the activities on laying a 'scientific foundation' underpinning the court version did not end there. To fulfil the order 'according to the European standards' the historians from overseas were invited: Bayer, Schlözer, Müller and others. Fulfilling the order they were given they wrote a 'smoothed down' variant of the Romanov version meeting the requirements of contemporary science. Thus the Romanov version from the court one transformed into the 'scientific' one.

Still there were left the traces of alternations in the Radziwill manuscript [4v1], ch.1. This could have prompted unwanted questions. That is why it was necessary to keep the original manuscript away from prying eyes. Only more than hundred years later they finally published the Radziwill chronicle. Forgetting that it shouldn't be done by any means. As at that point the secret was out.

## **16. AN OVERVIEW OF THE HISTORY OF BULGARIA.**

The real Bulgarian history is known to us only since 1280. Today the years between 1396 and 1700 are considered to be the dark period of the brutal Ottoman domination. Even before 1878, [fig.97](#). Prior to 1280 there are phantom reflections of the period 1280-1700. The factitious transferral of the documents into the past denuded the epoch of years 1396-1700 and turned it into a purportedly dark time. But it has shined an eerily illusive light into the distant past. Later the allegedly dark period of 1396-1700 declared the 'grim Ottoman yoke in Bulgaria'. Many Bulgarian chronicles perished or were deliberately destroyed [6v2], ch.9.

Both in Russia and in Bulgaria the full blooded history of XIV-XVII cc. Horde named the epoch of the infinite suffering. Thus by shifting the emphasis' the history was turned on its head. The Bulgarian history of 1280-1700 should be called the khans and Ottoman's = Attaman's epoch. At that time Bulgaria was a part of the Ottoman Empire. The list of the Bulgarian khans includes both the local rulers, the Imperial governors and the khans-emperors of the entire Great Empire. This includes Batu Khan and George (Terter – Tr. note).

The period of the pro-Bulgarian khans of allegedly years 145-581 is the duplicate of the Ottoman Bulgarian epoch of years 1280-1700 which is furthest pushed back into the past. Batu Khan, for instance, was dated into the phantom VII century, i.e. 600-700 years into the past.

Another 'dark period' in Bulgarian history – the 'rule of Byzantine' in 1018-1186 – is also a phantom reflection of the Ottoman = Attaman epoch.

When the absurd wars between Romanov Russia and Turkey-Atamania began, Bulgaria turned into one of the battle grounds. The invented myth about the 'grim Turkish yoke' which was allegedly prevailing over Bulgaria since XIII century was put to good use by the European and Romanov diplomats to split Turkey into the Muslim and Christian Orthodox parts. Muslims and Orthodox Christians were set against each other.

Next we discovered that the old Bulgarian texts, for example 'The Nominalia of the Bulgarian khans', were written in exactly the same language as OLD-RUSSIAN texts (not to be confused with Church Slavonic). They are practically identical in both the language and the shape of the letters! Without a prior warning of what text it is – Old Bulgarian or Old Russian – it is unlikely one could tell them apart [6v2]. We had no problem reading it using our knowledge of Old Russian language. But it is difficult for us to understand later Bulgarian texts. Unfamiliar endings, distorted use of prepositions, a lot of new words.

It is clear. Having originated from the Old Russian in the XIV-XV cc. the Bulgarian language with time deviated from it and began to develop more or less independently. It did not get very far, however as there appeared some noticeable differences. The Bulgarians of the XIV-XVII cc. still spoke the Old Russian language. Aka – the Old Bulgarian or the former language of the 'Volga population'. The language of Russia-Horde. Practically unchanged, it was used in Bulgaria UP UNTIL THE XVIII CENTURY. The grammar was slightly changed. Very soon the new Bulgarian language began to differ from the Russian language. Though they remain close until today, complete equivalence has gone.

Why was this done? In order to draw the 'ethnically-linguistic' boundary between the Bulgarians and the Russians. They strived to deepen the split in the Empire. The fact that up until the XVIII-XIX cc. there were practically identical languages in Bulgaria and Russia clearly contradicted the Scaligerian history. Which claimed that the Bulgarians and the Russians allegedly lived as separate nations for many hundreds of years. But how then did they manage to keep similar languages for such a long time? As living separately they should have quite quickly started speaking in different ways. That is why we insist that the reform of the Bulgarian language was conducted consciously. The 'new world order' was being secured and the glaring inconsistencies in the 'Reformist' history of the Balkans was being smeared over.

The Bulgarians after arriving to Balkans among the Hordian-Ottoman army in the XIV-XV cc. were simply Russian. Up until the XVII century the ties between the Balkans and Russia remained very close. Hence the language was practically



identical. As incidentally we see in some of parts of Russia rather distant from each other.

For the remote regions of the 'Mongol' Empire which found themselves more isolated from Russia-Horde the picture could have been rather different. The language changes most slowly on the territory of its native land. There is a large homogeneous population there. But a comparatively small group of people who found themselves far from their fatherland - for instance, the Horde-Ottoman army – land in a strange linguistic environment. The language of the conquerors begins to transform significantly faster due to the foreign language setting. Probably, something of the kind happened to the Cossack troops who in the XIV-XV cc. came to Egypt, the remote regions of Western Europe, Asia and China, Japan, America and etc.

## **17. WHERE THE OTTOMANS CAME FROM.**

Today the term TURKS is tangled up in the Scaligerian history. To simplify we should say that the indigenous population of Asia Minor is called the Turks. It is thought that the Ottomans are also the Turks, as the historians trace them from Asia Minor. Allegedly they at first were attacking Constantinople from the South of Asia Minor, and then, following their unsuccessful attempts, crossed over to Europe, to the Balkans and conquered the developed European countries [455]. In the end, they turned back and succeeded in conquering Constantinople in 1453. According to our results the alleged origin of the Ottomans=Attamans from Asia Minor is the historians' error. The Ottomans came from the North, from Russia-Horde and the majority of them were Slavs, and some of them were Russian Turks. I.e. those very Turks, who still live in Russia in the Volga region.

As the Ottomans-Attamans invaded Turkey-Byzantium from the Balkans in the XV century, the contemporary population of the Balkans are primarily the descendants of those very Ottomans. This is exactly why the famous Turkish Janissaries were Slavic [5v]. It is difficult to imagine the strange picture, which today is being imposed upon us, purporting that the GUARDS – JANISSARIES, the hand-picked elite unit was entirely comprised of the 'foreigners' – the Slavs. Moreover this lasted for several centuries. Based on the structure of the ROYAL GUARD it is possible to estimate which people had the leading role in the multinational army. For example, Napoleon's guard consisted of the French.

Later, as we have already said, in the XVIII-XIX cc. the Sultan court forgot about its Slavic past. They came to terms with the disintegration of the Great Empire and

preferred to orientate themselves towards the West. Dissenting guards of the Slavs-Janissaries – 30 thousand people – were slaughtered in 1826 [336], v.5, p.176.

## **18. ABOUT THE GYPSIES.**

The Gypsies are a nomadic people, who to this day do not recognise national borders. Today, of course, there are also domicile gypsies, however the traditional way of Gypsy life is perennial travel. The existence of such people makes you think that sometime in the past all the places where they wandered were once a part of a one sole state. But then the Kingdom should have covered vast territories of Eurasia and Africa. It seems likely that its borders roughly match the borders of the Eurasian and African parts of the Great Empire. The Gypsies call themselves THE ROMANY, THE ROMAI, i.e. the citizens of the Roman Empire. Most likely, the gypsies are the surviving 'living trace' of the Empire. There was a time when a lot of people were required to maintain the numerous long caravan tracks connecting the remote territories. The contemporary gypsies are the descendants of those, who maintained those tracks. The very nature of this service suggested the constant relocation together with the caravans. Their entire existence was defined by travel. At least until the early XX century the life of nomadic gypsies was closely connected with the horses. This is some kind of reminiscence about the 'service as horsemen' on the caravan tracks. Following the split of the Empire the professional social class turned, over time, into a separate nation.

## **19. THE IDEA OF THE GREAT EMPIRE PROVED TO BE RESILIENT.**

Russia occupied by the Western Europeans in the XVII century nevertheless 'digested' the pro-Western regime of the Romanovs. The first Romanovs controlled only a small part of Central Russia. But subsequently, after the war with 'Pugachev' in 1773-1775, having secured their position on the throne and being at the head of a vast country, the Romanovs felt themselves to be the real masters of a large and wealthy state. They 'got out from under control', lost the piety towards their former owners and decided to revive the Russian Empire in the broad sense of the word. As vague recollections of the 'Mongol' Empire still existed in Russian state circles and appealed to many. Suffice to recall the famous 'Testament of Peter the Great' in which he puts forward an ambitious program of conquering the world [4v2], ch.2:7. It is not certain for sure whether this document was written by Peter himself. Some historians dispute that. But the very fact that this 'Testament' originated from Peter's court and therefore

reflected the mentality of the time is enough. Though Peter's I programme was not realised in full, however the Romanovs succeeded in reviving a part of the former Horde Empire, although on a much smaller scale. By the early XX century the Russian Empire acquired an enormous influence. Western Europe was naturally bothered by that. So maybe it is not a coincidence that the revolution, resembling the Time of Troubles in the early XVII century, took place in Russia in the beginning of the XX century.

After a prolonged global indoctrination of the people with the distorted history, an image of 'aggressive Russia' was formed, who due to its purportedly congenital malignity constantly strives to expand the sphere of its influence all over the world. The new chronology clarifies many accrued misconceptions. It becomes clear, for example, that historically the union of Russia and Turkey was the closest. Pan-Slavism and Pan-Turkism – is essentially the same thing. The Slavic conquest of allegedly the IV-V cc. and the 'Mongol' conquest of the XIII-XIV cc. are the Slavic-Turkic conquest which commenced from the banks of Volga-river. The Slavs and the Turks always found common ground in the Russian-Horde Empire.

Russia and China once had a long shared history. In the epoch of the Great Empire China was a part of it. It became independent only after it collapsed, under the Romanovs. China's animosity towards Romanovs' Russia during the Manchurian epoch can be attributed to the fact that the Manchurians left Russia-Horde. Only later the Manchurians assimilated with China and became Chinese in the modern sense [5v1], ch.6.

Vague recollections of the former Empire still exist in Western Europe. Although today people do not fully realise it, the 'Mongolian' legacy greatly influences modern life. This was vividly illustrated by the events of the XX century, when the idea of the ancient Great Empire was used by various politicians. For example, in Germany and Italy. It turned out that this idea appeals to many. On this occasion it was aimed at the war against the USSR in 1942-1945. But this leant heavily on the erroneous understanding of history.

In the reconstructed picture of the past we discovered a curious effect which we can tentatively refer to as 'the swing of the pendulum' or the 'pulsation' of the Great Empire. The 'Mongol' Empire was either expanding toward the vast borders, or temporarily diminished. There are several such pulsations which can be traced back. At first – the ancient Czar-Grad Kingdom which ended with the revolt in the XIII century. Then – the Horde Empire of the XIII-XVI which collapsed during the Revolt of the XVII century. Then – the Romanovs Russia which once again spread

significantly in many different directions. Followed by the uprising in the early XX century. Then the emerging of the USSR with a vast sphere of influence. Then a new revolt and the collapse of the USSR in 1990s...

We will repeat that the main result of our research is not the reconstruction, [fig.98](#), but the innovative approach of dating of the events. It is the chronology that forms the 'Backbone' of history and lies at the heart of the reconstruction.

## **20. THE DOUBLE-HEADED EAGLE – THE SYMBOL OF THE 'MONGOL' EMPIRE. WHY LATER IT TURNED INTO THE SINGLE-HEADED EAGLE ON THE WESTERN EUROPE'S EMBLEMS.**

**&& TWO-HEADED EAGLE IS FEATURED IN NUMEROUS MONUMENTS IN EURASIA.**

The two-headed eagle - the emblem of the Great Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. – spread all over its territory which at that time covered Eurasia and the significant parts of Africa and America. But later, during the falsification of ancient history, the imperial eagle was 'pushed back into the past' and declared to be the symbol which allegedly existed long before the XIV century. As a result beginning with the XVIII century the historians and archaeologists when stumbling across here and there onto the mediaeval depictions of the two-headed 'Mongol' eagle were compelled to date many of them 'to the deepest past'.

The 'Mongol' eagles can also be seen on the monuments of 'ancient' Egypt [7v1], ch.5. For example the images of the eagles on the temples of Karnak in Egypt. Sometimes in Egypt the heads of the eagles were depicted as the heads of snakes. This shouldn't surprise us. In Russian-Horde heraldry the eagles' heads sometimes resemble those of a snake. They even depicted a long snakes' tongue from its beak. Here, for instance, the Imperial eagle on the state seal of Ivan the Terrible, [fig.86](#) [4v2], ch.2. Two eagle-snake heads on the long necks, looking to the East and to the West.

So the images of the Imperial eagle with the snakes' heads on the temples of 'ancient' Egypt and on the seals of Russia-Horde of the XV-XVI cc. are essentially the identical. It is possible that on the early Hordian emblems which didn't survive to our day the similarity between the Russian and Egyptian heraldry was even more apparent.

The two-headed eagles on the Mediaeval and 'ancient' monuments are the Imperial symbolism of the XIV-XVI cc.

All the documents, coins and seals everywhere were adorned with a two-headed eagle. Its two heads looked East and West, which symbolised the unity of the East and the West.

The two-headed eagle reigned practically on every main mediaeval emblem in Europe. 'It is possible to list the NUMEROUS ARTEFACTS of sphragistics and numismatics of Mediaeval Europe (XII-XV cc.) on which we can see the two-headed eagle: the coins and seal of Ludwig of Bavaria, the counts of Wurzburg and counts and dukes of Savoy, the seals of King Wenceslaus of the House of Luxembourg and his seals as the Czech King Vaclav IV, the confidential seals, the coins of Bertrand III of Baux in France, the seals of the Archbishops of Cologne and Mainz in Germany, as well as the Fribourg coins of the city of Palermo, Savoy and Netherlands' [134], p.13. Etc.

&& FOLLOWING THE REFORMATION REVOLT THE MAJORITY OF THE WESTERN-EUROPEAN EAGLE-EMBLEMS' EAST FACING HEADS WERE 'CUT OFF'.

After the collapse of the Empire some of the split territories of Western Europe kept the eagle as their national symbol. As if claiming back a part of the legacy of the Roman Empire and its history. However the right head was removed. I.e. they cut off the East head of the imperial eagle, which was indicating the Eastern metropolis of the Empire. The Western Europeans only kept 'their own Western head' of the eagle-emblem. They were striving to forget as soon as possible that very recently there existed a UNITED EAST-WEST Kingdom. As a result, since the XVII-XVIII cc. the majority of the Western European 'national eagles' look Westwards with their one remaining head. For example the contemporary German eagle-emblem. In [7v1], ch.5, we can see the transformation, for instance, of the German eagle from a two-headed one in the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. into the one-headed one, after the uprising of the XVII century.

We can see the two-headed eagle on the old emblem of the German city of Cologne [7v1], ch.5. Incidentally there are turbans and pagri depicted on the eagles' heads. There is something of the kind also on the emblems of the Emperors Frederick Barbarossa and Conrad. Later these Hordian-Ottoman 'turbans' would turn into the royal crowns. We can see such 'Reformist' crowns on the eagles on the coat of arms of the Romanovs and on the coat of arms of the Habsburgs since the XVII century.

The depiction of a turban or a pagri on the old emblems of the empire was natural. The Hordian and the Ottoman czar-khans, as eventually did the Turkish sultans, often wore a turban or a pagri on their heads.

On the German map of Tyrol of 1662 we can already see a one-headed eagle looking West [7v1], ch.5. The separation of Germany and Austria from the 'Mongol' Empire became a factor and gradually it was expressed in the national symbols. It was then when the 'reformed' German one-headed eagle appeared.

At first the old symbols were 'corrected' carefully and discretely. Initially the two-headed 'Mongol' eagle was sort of cut in half to emphasise the split of the Empire in the Western and Eastern regions. There is an interesting depiction of the four eagles on the coat of arms of Berlin of 1740, [fig.99](#). The Eastern eagle remained unchanged for some time as a reminder of the former unity of the Empire. But the central, i.e. the main eagle is already confidently looking only West. 'To emphasise' above it there was depicted another Western eagle. The meaning is clear. Germany and Western Europe are breaking away from the metropoly. Eventually the Eastern eagle was removed altogether. When the danger of the revival of the Empire was considered quite slim. Out of the four Berlin eagles only one remained – the present day one-headed German eagle looking West.

There are Western-European emblems, though very few, where a one-headed eagle looks East. For example, on one of the German barons' (similar to 'barin'? – 'nobleman' in Russian – Translator's note) coats of arms [7v1], ch.5. It may be that this very family wanted to stress their devotion to the idea of the 'Mongol' Empire. Among the military Bavarian coats of arms of the barons = barins (noblemen) we can see the Ottoman crescents [7v1]. But eventually all these Imperial, loyalist factions were crushed by the rebels. Those who survived accepted the new rules of life. 'The cutting off of the eagle-emblems Eastern heads' was only one element of the 'new ideology' in Europe.

There is an interesting coat of arms on the map of year 1634 of the city of Geneva and Lake of Geneva. The one-headed eagle is looking West. But it is clear that **THERE USED TO BE A HORDIAN TWO-HEADED EAGLE IN ITS PLACE BEFORE**. In order not to spend too much time on alterations the reformers simply painted over the right half of the eagle and painted a key, [fig.100](#). It very well could be that it was done this way not only in the province of Geneva, turning the two-headed eagle into a one-headed one by violently cutting it in half. Then, when the rebellious emotions calmed down, they simply began to paint the 'Western eagle'.

As far as we could find out while analysing the coats of arms, maps and etc., the reformers always covered just the right, i.e. the eastern half of the eagle. I.e. they covered the unpleasant East. They kept only the good West for themselves.

On the map of Poland, Silesia and Bohemia of 1634 we can see a one-headed Polish eagle looking East and a one-headed Bohemian eagle looking West, [fig.101](#). On the Western eagle floating above Bohemia and Moravia RIGHT ON ITS CHEST THERE IS STILL SHINING AN ENORMOUS OTTOMAN CRESCENT [7v1], ch.5, [4v1], ch.10:2. It is possible that eventually the Bohemian and Polish reformers changed their minds and the imperial crescent which displeased them was removed. In order to forget the recent past when the Ottoman-Hordian crescent was reigning over the entire Europe. And not just Europe. It is hardly the case that anyone in today's Bohemia would remember that some time ago this country was shielded by the wings of an eagle with the Ottoman crescent on its chest.

In the symbolism of the Western Europe of the XVIII-XIX cc. amongst other things there survived in some places the two-headed eagles, but the one-headed Western eagles are still prevalent. We don't know any official Western-European emblem of any significant state of the XVII-XIX cc. where a one-headed eagle would look East. If such do exist, there must be very few.

The Romanovs kept the two-headed eagle as a symbol of their new Russia. They cherished the idea of restoring the vast Empire, but this time under their rule. In any case such intentions are being attributed to Peter I [4v2], ch.2:17.

## **21. IN THE EPOCH OF THE REFORMATION AN IMAGE OF THE 'SHIP OF FOOLS' WAS CREATED, WHICH ALL OF EUROPE WAS INDUCED TO LAUGH AT. THE REFORMERS RIDICULED THE HORDE EMPIRE.**

In the epoch of Reformation in Europe there was created a dramatic image of the 'Ship of Fools' [KAZ]. Of course in society the theme of the 'intelligent people and the fools' was widely discussed. But only in the epoch of Reformation this theme was elevated to 'national importance'. It was instilled into the public consciousness in the form of an allegory. Allegedly in 1494 a book by Sebastian Brant 'The Ship of Fools' was published. Where Brant sometimes is 'speaking of a 'ship of fools' and sometimes about the entire 'FOOLS FLEET'. [93:1], p.683.

The book is well illustrated and not just by anybody, but by A.Durer himself. However, we have shown that the works attributed to him were most likely created a

hundred years later, in XVII century. But nevertheless the illustrations for 'The Ship of Fools' were made by remarkable masters.

The book by Brant itself was chosen only as an excuse to publish a large number of the woodcuts on a topic concerning 'The Ship of Fools'. As they have little in common with the contents of the book, their meaning was reflected in the captions.

The book owes its resounding success to the woodcuts. It is clear now what 'fools' were held up to ridicule. The Great Empire, its institutions, its Christian Orthodox Faith, the Cossack = Israeli troops - which still had garrisons in Europe of XVI-XVII cc. The rebels and provocateurs still feared them. That is why they veiled the satire without pointing directly at the target of their abuse, as if they invited mockery of 'fools in general'. Indeed, there are plenty of fools around us – the 'progressive writers', the destroyers of the Empire kept saying. Officially it was difficult to accuse them of insulting the Empire. As soon as anyone was summoned to the local Imperial court (which was incidentally already submerged in the atmosphere of unrest) and told that mockery of the Hordian army for example, was unacceptable, the reformers would then evasively answer: - We didn't have anything like that in mind. This is the way we castigate 'fools in general'.

The empty rhetoric was calculated. The books, etchings, brochures, the propaganda leaflets all successfully played their role. Stealthily embedded scepticism and thinly masked appeals to defy the Empire were actively spread amongst the population. Shattering the former unity, cultural affinity, language and religion. The attempts of the remote central power to obstruct all of this would only whet the appetite of a part of the Western population towards the 'forbidden fruit' and met with the resistance of the Western governors, already infected by the idea of the revolt. It was possibly then, when this rule was firmly embedded in people's minds: if something is being forbidden, it means it is interesting. The subtext was as follows: We, the Hordian governors, so to speak 'ban' you from reading the rebellious slogans against the Empire, printed by ourselves. In fact this is the 'correct literature'.

The war against the state was concealed with the motto of 'fighting stupidity'. They counted on the fact, that they won't oppose the metropolity of the Empire if some of the Western officials would begin fighting such an obvious vice as stupidity. As it became clear later on the rebels were slowly eroding the foundations of the state. They were trying to sink the 'Ship' of the Empire. To start with they declared it the 'Ship of Fools'. They called the Empire itself – 'foolish'. And therefore there was no



point in keeping it. Let the majority of the population of Europe still be faithful to the Imperial idea, all the same the Kingdom should be split.

The image of the Ship as the symbol of the Empire sailing across the rough sea of events and controlled by the czars-khans – the 'helmsmen of the Ship' appeared probably in as early as the XIV-XVI cc. Today they sometimes speak of a Ship of a state led by the firm hand of the Ruler. About a wise helmsman who stands at the helm of the Ship. About the worthy people who firmly stand at the wheel.

'The Ship of Fools' was a GREAT SUCCESS. THE SATIRE WAS REPUBLISHED MANY TIMES AND WAS TRANSLATED INTO FOREIGN LANGUAGES... The Book served as an EXAMPLE to the other satirical and didactical works of so called 'LITERATURE ABOUT FOOLS' SPREADING IN GERMANY IN THE XVI CENTURY' [93:1], p.10.

When the Empire was split and the subversive appeals like 'The Ship of Fools' had lost their edge, they decided to properly obscure the former rebel-rousing meaning. At first subtly and then with increasing volume they were arguing that 'The Ship of Fools' was just a mediaeval joke, a collection of caricatures used by the wise authors to scourge human vices. Purporting that they were educating people in the spirit of honour and dignity. The descendants of the reformers soon forgot the past meaning of the propagandist pogrom actions and began to study them in the scholarly works as some odd expression of 'folk customs'. Here, for example, in the XVI-XVII cc. the Western Europeans all of a sudden and for no apparent reason took a fancy to contemptuously urinating over the Ottoman crescent. This custom even passed into a proverb. Why so?

The content analysis of 'The Ship of Fools' reveals some interesting facts. It appears that it is possible to lift the veil off the true essence of things by engaging the materials of the mediaeval carnivals which at first glance have nothing to do with it. Today we are being told that allegedly the Western European carnivals of the XVI-XVII cc. were regular celebrations where people simply relaxed and had fun. However, it was not like that at all. At least in the beginning. You can judge for yourself.

Apparently in the epoch of the Reformation 'The Ship of Fools' was declared to be a symbol of Hell! They were urged to take it by storm in a deadly assault [415:1], p.152-156. I.e. the 'Mongol' Empire was denounced as 'Diabolical', as the 'Empire of Evil'. Under such slogans they began to perform the propagandist shows, and then after the collapse of the Empire – the cheery carnivals as a token of the liberation of

Russia from the Ottoman Empire. 'The Ship of Fools' as a symbol of Hell is depicted on a great many pictures [KAZ], ch.2.

Incidentally, Martin Luther after all was probably the supporter of the 'Mongol' Empire, though today they reckon he was one of the reformers. His ideas and popularity was probably skilfully used after his death, having distorted and directed it to their own ends. In response to orgiastic political carnival in allegedly 1539 'Luther in his pastoral message from Wittenberg described Schembartlauf (carnival – Author's note) as A PARTICULARLY UNGODLY SHOW EXPRESSING DISREGARD TO THE GOSPELS AND THEREFOR UNDESIRABLE TO GOD. The historians note the remarkable role of the carnival of 1539 in the history of Schembartlauf. It involved not just the CURRENT RELIGIOUS AND POLITICAL ASPECT, but also an incredibly spectacular and skilful decoration of the SHIP and the entire procession' [415:1], p.153-154.

Who was placed onto the 'Ship of Fools', symbolizing the Empire? Here is the answer: 'In the buffoon house which stood on the sledge runners of the 'hell wagon' in 1520 there were ... a dancing devil, fools, women (according to a different account – a devil, a TURK-PAGAN, a jester and a naked woman)'[415:1], p.149. The organisers paraded the naked women, so it was more interesting for the crowd to watch and to gather as many spectators as possible. The main characters were intended to be the 'Turks-pagans'. They were pointing their Reformist finger at the truly 'evil people' – the Ottomans and the Hordians, who had to be banished from Europe.

So, the Ship of Fools = Hell Wagon was STORMED and seized in battle during the Western orgies. Thus, they attached politico-military meaning to the Ship = Hell. The Reformers were open and didn't hide the purpose of the propaganda which was to take up arms and destroy the 'Mongol' Empire.

Considerable funds were invested in the exuberant execution of the show - lessons. Talented directors, artists, actors, writers and politicians were summoned. Supposedly it was becoming dangerous to avoid such ideological farces. They could have accused you of 'sympathy to the Empire'. As the result these gatherings were steadily growing.

Following the collapse of the Empire the show-lessons became unnecessary. They had already played their destructive role. That is why they were abolished. 'Instead of the pagan Schembartlauf in 1649 there was introduced a special Christian day of penitence, fasting and prayers... Some element of Schembartlauf survived in the

contests and the processions of the various guilds, but as one unit it was never revived... But as early as in the XVI, XVII and XVIII cc. there still continued to be created the illustrated chronicles of Schembartlauf , WHICH COMMEMORATED ITS MISCHIEFS AND GLORY FOR ETERNITY AND WHICH HONOURED THE PATRICIANS OF NUREMBERG' [415:1], p.156.

It's all clear. The weapon which fulfilled its destiny and became unwanted was sent to a museum and was vaguely called 'sweet mischiefs and glory' purporting that they were only enjoying themselves and had some fun. Now we shall celebrate our recent past, now we have successfully burnt 'the Hell Wagon'. The Empire collapsed 'by itself' anyway. We had nothing to do with it.

## **22. HOW THE 'CORRECT ART' WAS CREATED.**

We showed that the reformers of the XVII-XVIII cc. sometimes used the well-known names of the old artists and writers of the epoch of the Empire in order to, after the ruin (or purposeful destruction) of their works, which were declared 'wrong', attribute these reputable creators to the later 'correct masterpieces' which were already created in the spirit of Scaligerian history. They did this to the works of the artists Albrecht Durer and Raffaello Santi (Raphael), cartographer Gerardus Mercator, etc. [7v]. Something of the kind was done with the playwright 'William Shakespeare' [ScHEK].

After clearing the XVI century in particular of many authentic originals, the reformers were compelled to inhabit it with phantoms. Employing 'Durer', 'Raphael', 'Mercator', 'Shakespeare' as an example... it turns out that several groups of anonymous authors worked, amongst whom there were some very talented ones. 'Ancient works' were created away from the public eye, the dating of which were deliberately moved back into the past. Anonymity was important for the success of the project. They surrendered their authorship (but not the money) for the idea which they considered very important. They created a list of 'their own geniuses', wrote 'true biographies', painted 'true portraits', declared the findings of the 'priceless relics' (a lock of hair of a great writer, the 'authentic' alabaster death mask, etc.). A big propaganda campaign was launched. Stories about 'our true geniuses' were injected into the school program and popular literature. The artists created paintings 'on the required themes', the composers created operas and oratorios. Using the modern language 'the correct authors were hyped up in any possible way'. A whirlpool of advertising was bubbling around them. They were turned into the symbols of reformation used in the ideological struggle. As well as for the 'correct' education of young people.

The newly formed Western elites which emerged from the rebellion and take-over strived to proclaim and reinforce their independence and significance as soon as possible. Not only in politics, but in fine art, literature, music, science and the military arts. Having created a required 'foundation', they immediately declared Western Europe to be the 'centre of absolutely everything'. The works were generously paid for. The money was available as after the collapse of the Great Empire the provinces stopped paying tax to Russia-Horde and the Ottoman Empire – Attamania. Besides, vast riches were moved out of Russia during the Times of Troubles in the XVII century.

Today researchers here and there stumble across the traces of this backstage activity of the reformers. For example in the case of 'Shakespeare'. But not understanding the core of the matter any longer they count the discovered facts of mystification or falsification merely as separate and isolated against the background of 'on the whole true history'. It is incorrect. The problem is much deeper. This very problem we are exposing.

### **23. THE METHOD OF WORD-MATCH BETWEEN THE LANGUAGES: WE DISCOVER WORDS FROM DIFFERENT LANGUAGES SIMILAR IN SOUND AND AT THE SAME TIME SIMILAR IN MEANING.**

After we have reconstructed the framework of the true chronology using the mathematical and astronomic methods it is interesting to look at the evolution of the languages and writing. In the 'Mongol' Empire the main languages were Slavic and Turkic. The national language was Slavic. After the collapse of the Empire the reformers decided to create new languages in the splinter regions in order to be independent of the metropolis linguistically as well.

Before then in the XVI-XVII cc. the new rulers summoned the special people who were assigned to 'invent the new languages'. That's what the science of linguistics was created for. At that point it served a practical purpose. However the hastily created languages ('ancient' Latin, 'ancient' Greek, French, English, German, Spanish, Italian, etc.) inevitably formed the basis from the Slavic language in its broadest sense. The reformers simply did not have different material. Therefore the invented languages were to bear the 'Slavic stamp' on them. In [7v2] we provided various evidence of this. Earlier the 'Slavic traces' were either ignored or played down, as the people in the XVIII-XX cc. were used to inaccurate chronology. The very thought of 'ancient' Latin originating from the Slavic language was impossible. The new chronology removes this taboo.

What methods did the reformers-'linguists' use? We have discovered several techniques. They turned out to be quite simple. We will list some of them.

# In the old times the spelling of some of the Slavonic letters was not yet established, even their position on a line was not fixed. The same letter, III (Russian letter 'Sh') for example could be spelled in different ways: on its side (it would turn into E or Э), turned upside down (it would become 'm' or handwritten 'te'). In the different regions of the Empire there also existed slightly different ways of spelling of the same Slavonic letters. At that time it didn't cause any difficulty in reading, as the population had a good command of the Slavonic language and the varying orientation of the letters did not get in the way of people understanding each other or the written texts. The linguists 'froze' many of these diverse spellings of the letters and announced them to be 'ancient' and having nothing in common with the Slavonic ones. The tradition of reading the old texts in Slavonic was thus broken. The next generation of young people who were taught in the reformist schools in a new way did not know anything about the previous rules of reading. Their parents would pass away and the carriers of the old linguistic heritage gradually disappeared. Thus the young people were quickly re-taught. And their children were certainly growing up in the atmosphere of the new reading rules. Many old texts became incomprehensible and were forgotten. For example the Et-ruscan inscriptions. You don't need a long time for such a 'progressive reform'. Just one or two generations.

Later on, when by the XIX century the openly political task of creating the 'new languages' was achieved overall, the linguists lost their national status of the reformers. In the XIX-XX cc. their role was reduced to merely preserving the newly invented languages. The linguistic science concentrated on solving their domestic issues. In the XIX-XX cc. they began the 'reconstruction of the history of the ancient languages' erroneously dating their origin (Latin for example) into the deepest antiquity. Having forgotten that all of this took place relatively recently, just 150-200 years ago.

# Another 'reformist technique' of the XVII-XVIII century is clearly seen from the example of the French language. The population was forced not to vocalize some of the letters or combinations. A present-day example: instead of Peugeot you ought to pronounce 'Pego'. As a result the spoken text became different from the old original. Such 'progressive technique' was effective as it submerged into oblivion the former Slavonic sounding of many old words.

# Previously they used to have two ways of reading: left to right (as the present-day Europeans do) and right to left (as the Arabs and the Jews do). The reformers used it

proactively. In many cases they changed the direction of reading. As a result the old Slavonic words became difficult to recognise.

# According to the Russian custom the affirmative nodding of the head meant and means now agreement and the shaking of the head left and right means denial. In the epoch of the Reformation they changed the meaning of those gestures on the territory of Bulgaria and now they nod to disagree and shake their head when agree.

We discovered various parallelisms between the SLAVONIC LANGUAGE AND LATIN. At present there are nearly 3570 Russian words in our Vocabulary of Parallelisms. Apparently at least nearly 3500 of the 'semantic groups' of the Latin words, around 2700 groups of the English words and around 1170 groups of German words originated from them. We paid particular attention to Latin which is today considered to be the foundation of many Western-European languages. Altogether there turned out to be 15800 words in our Dictionary which are presently thought to be foreign (Latin, English, et.). I.e. a total of nearly 15800 'foreign' words originated from 3570 semantic Slavonic groups in the Middle Ages. Therefore on average, approximately 4 'foreign' words originated from each Slavonic group ( $15800: 3570 = 4,4$ ).

Such an amount of primary words – around 2800 or even 3570 semantic groups, which ended up in our Vocabulary – was apparently quite sufficient for the meaningful communication between people in Mediaeval Times. That said such parallels go well beyond our discoveries.

The comparison principle which we suggested as the basis for our Dictionary of Parallelisms, is rather simple, although most likely, is quite new. We searched for the words SIMULTANEOUSLY SIMILAR IN MEANING AND SIMILAR IN SOUND, i.e. we suggested a 'method of semantic equations'. Let us specify our idea.

FIRSTLY: Looking through, for example, the Russian-Latin dictionary, we were looking for Slavonic words and Latin words, which would MEAN THE SAME THING, i.e. would HAVE THE SAME MEANING, which are usually given in the dictionary as translations of this Russian word. In other words, the 'parallel' Slavonic and Latin words should be APPROXIMATELY SIMILAR SEMANTICALLY and SOUNDING SIMILAR. We have then also processed the Latin-Russian dictionary. I.e. moving step by step through the Latin words we analysed their Russian translations, finding the parallels –SEMANTIC SIMILARITY AND AT THE SAME TIME SIMILARITY IN SOUND.

SECONDLY: having discovered the words-synonyms (Russian and Latin and vice versa Latin and Russian) which HAD THE SAME MEANING AND AT THE SAME TIME CLOSE IN SOUND, we compared their spelling, i.e. the letters and the sounds expressed by them. As a result those transitions which at some point transformed Slavonic words into Latin became more apparent. At the same time it became clear which sounds exactly transformed into which sounds, which letters 'turned upside down', which of them 'mirrored' each other, etc. As a result we often succeeded in reconstructing the transformations of the Slavonic words into Latin.

In other words, by 'equating' two words 'semantically', i.e. a Russian word and a matching Latin word, we acquire a 'semantic equation', from which we can clearly see which transitions of sounds and letters took place. The method of the semantic equations is useful when analysing the origins of many modern languages from the Slavonic root in the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc.

Some of the parallelisms were noticed by the linguists earlier, but the Scaligerian chronology which virtually banned such comparisons prevented them from assessing them and carrying out work on a full scale, similar to ours.

We paid special attention to the Slavonic-Latin parallels. As the Latin roots are present in many European Languages. THUS HAVING ESTABLISHED THE ORIGIN OF THE 'CLASSICAL LATIN' FROM THE SLAVONIC ROOT, WE ALSO AUTOMATICALLY PRESENT A NUMBER OF SLAVONIC ROOTS IN OTHER WESTERN-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES.

## **24. THE SLAVONIC LANGUAGE AND LATIN.**

It follows from the New Chronology that writing emerged more or less simultaneously with the creation of the languages. People communicated with each other not only verbally, but also in writing. The conversationalists perceived the words not only by the way they sounded, but also through their spelling. However at that time the lettering could get mixed up. This distorted the words and the sounds. People were unfamiliar with 'suffixes', 'prefixes', 'roots', etc. then. They perceived the word AS A WHOLE, the way it sounded. Only later in the XVII-XIX cc. there emerged the linguistic theories which studied the 'constituent parts' of the words.

A LARGE NUMBER OF THE SLAVONIC-LATIN matches we have discovered is of a particular importance. As both historians and linguists claim in unison that Latin is extremely ancient. Purporting that at the time, when the 'most ancient' Romans were exquisitely discussing mathematics, poetry and the fate and fortunes of the universe in the silver-tongued Latin, the rest of Eurasian peoples (with the exception

of the even more 'ancient' and exquisite Greeks) still lived cooped up in the cold caves by smoking fires. Exchanging awkward gestures and guttural sounds. Allegedly there was no mention of any Slavonic languages, let alone any Slavonic writing. This picture is fundamentally incorrect.

The linguistic theories of the origins and evolution of the languages are entirely based on the presupposed and known Scaligerian chronology. With the change of the chronology the 'theories' also radically transform. Using its own internal methods the linguistics fails to determine not only the absolute dating, but in the majority of cases – even the relative ones.

Thus in the Latin-Russian dictionary we analysed every Latin word and all the Russian translations-synonyms. Usually there are several of such translations. In a large number of cases directly amongst them we would discover a Russian word, the distortion of which sometime before had led to a corresponding Latin word. Notably, WHEN COMPARING THE RUSSIAN ORIGINAL AND ITS LATIN REFLECTION (which had the same meaning and similar sound), we discovered the typical transitions of the consonants. Such distortions can be attributed to the variation in the spelling of some letters. In the XIII-XVII cc. There were several alphabets in use, where the same letters-consonants were depicted generally in the same way, but their position on the line sometimes varied. A letter 'p' could be written as 'b', 'q', 'd', which later led to the transition of the sound 'p' into the sounds 'b', 'q', 'd'. Following the solidifying of the new Western languages originating from the Slavonic language, such variations 'ossified' and were recorded in the textbooks.

Here is an example. The Latin word 'mixtio' means 'mixture', 'mixing'. Its Slavonic original word was probably 'мешать' (sounds 'meshat', means 'to mix' in Russian). Comparing МЕШАТЬ and its Latin reflection MIXITO we discover that the Russian letter 'Ш' (Sh) transitioned here into the Latin 'X'.

Another illustration. The Latin word 'moenia' means 'city walls', 'fortification', 'tower', 'wall'. This prompts an idea that the Slavonic original here was the word 'ТѢН' (sounds like 'TYN' in Russian), where incidentally the Russian word 'СТЕНА' (sounds like 'stena', means 'a wall') originates from. When comparing ТѢН with its Latin reflection MOENIA we see that the Russian T transformed here into the Latin M. It is clear why. As the Russian 'т' spelled the same way as 'm', i.e. in a form of three sticks with a bar above, which is virtually identical with the Latin 'm'. In such form the consonant 'm' (the Russian 'т' with three sticks) became a part of some Latin words.



## 25. THE SAME WORD COULD BE READ IN DIFFERENT WAYS.

The philologists brought up on the Scaligerian Chronology think that the transitions and confusion of sounds took place mainly in the pre-writing epoch. I.e. they were determined only by different pronunciation by different people, by 'different voice-boxes'. That is why, they said, we can't speak about the possible transitions of the sounds because of the mix up in letters due to their close spelling. At the heart of this opinion is the hypothesis that the languages were formed before writing.

But according to the new chronology many languages emerged already during the epoch of writing. That is why the transitions of the sounds often appeared due to the mix up of the letters depicted on paper. The same letter written in a different way on a line could have led to the confusion of the sounds.

Such transitions of the consonants is not only possible in theory, but was discovered by us when 'solving the semantic equations'. The Scaligerian chronology turned many things upside down, including the linguistic matters.

A large number of parallels we noticed between the main, primary words of the Russian language and Latin cannot be considered accidental. A question arises: who borrowed the words from whom? What language originated from what language? Did the Latin word PEDESTAL form by merging two Russian words PIATA (heel of the foot in Russian) = PEDE and STOL (table) = STAL? Or vice versa the two old Russian words PIATA and STOL were formed by splitting a mysterious foreign PEDESTAL which appeared in Russia? In our view in this case, as in a great number of other cases, it is obvious that the Latin is borrowing from Russian.

Having said that, the meaning on the whole remained. For example, the Latin MUSCERDA = 'myshinyi pomiot' (mouse droppings), most likely formed by fusion of the Slavonic words MYSH+SRAT' (MOUSE+CRAP). Improbable that the process was in reverse: that the 'ancient' Latin sweetly sounding MUSCERDA split later into two Slavonic words МЫШИ and СРАТЬ, which began their independent lives.

We discovered another fact. Sometimes the Slavonic words turned into the 'foreign' ones as the result of rearranging the consonants inside a word when reading it incorrectly. The fact is that in the XI-XVI cc. The letter order in a word was not exactly fixed. The letters were written not strictly in sequence along the line (as we do it today), but sometimes one under the other, to the side, above or underneath each other, varying in size and slanting differently. The letters were 'put on their side',

turned around and mirrored. A word was 'drawn' in a form of a little heap of letters, the order of reading could vary. Every method of reading of a 'heap'-hieroglyph was determined by the trajectory of the eyes movement, by the order of the transition of your glance from letter to letter. Therefore it was possible to 'read' different words 'out' of the same one 'word-hieroglyph', [fig.102](#). The zigzag lines consecutively passing through the white points show various ways of reading the very same 'heap of letters' [7v2].

Here we come across the traces of the old way of recording of words in the form of the pictures-hieroglyphs, like in the Ancient Egypt. If the meaning of the text was forgotten then the complex picture could be read in different ways, which led to confusion.

We'll remind you that a word could be read both left to right and right to left. For example the Russian word КОЛОС (spike) and the Russian word ЗЛАК (cereal) could have been derived from each other when read in reverse order and exchanging S into Z (C-3). Besides, they used to write the words without vowel marking, just with the consonants. That is why the latest vowel markings of the same 'frame of consonants' could vary: kolos = KLS ---> ZLK = zlak.

Most likely, the Christian Book of Psalms and the 'Ancient' Egyptian Book of the Dead are virtually the same book, or, which is more precise, they both date back to the same primary source [5v2], ch.4:8.

The people, who were probably writing the Book of Psalms in its more or less modern form, had in front of them an old Hieroglyphic text, inscribed with 'pictures'. Their reading was ambiguous, not mono-semantic, and besides the meaning of the text was almost forgotten. Hence the intense imagery of the Book of Psalms and its continual repetitions. The same picture is described with words several times. The Book of Psalms looks unusual in comparison with the later texts, which were by then written using letters aligned in an orderly fashion. That is why today the Book of Psalms is difficult to understand in places.

The Book of Psalms was probably partially written by Christ himself. It conveys Christ's inner turmoil at the time of his persecution, then his enthronement and the last days before his execution. Some of the Psalms from the Old Church Slavonic Book of Psalms are possibly not the translations, but the ORIGINALS. We have already said that Christ for a long time lived in Russia and spoke the Slavonic language very well [TsRS], ch.3.

## **26. PAGANISM.**

Let us show an example of how the confusion in regards to the words led to some serious repercussions. The words DOL, DOLU mean: underside, lowland, valley, lower hem in a dress. According to Vladimir Dal (Explanatory Dictionary – Translator's note): DOLU means beneath, on the ground, downwards. Let us also remember the Church expression: DOLU is below, down, low; for example POKLONITSA DOLU (to bow to the ground). It is probably from here the word IDOLOPOKLONNIKI (worshippers of idols) originated, i.e. those, who 'bow low', DOLU+POKLONNIKI (those who bow low to the ground), DOLU POKLONITSA (to bow to the ground). Originally all the believers were referred to in this way, were bowing low when praying, touching the floor with their hand, and sometimes even head or forehead. Even today Muslims getting on their knees, as in the original Christianity of the XII-XV cc., when bowing touch the ground with their foreheads. The same low bows, but in a slightly different form, survive in the Russian Orthodox Church until present day. But following the religious schisms in the XVI-XVII cc. in Romanovs Russia, and in Western Europe (where the Slavonic language was still in use, though it was being forced out by the new languages like Latin) the formerly neutral word IDOLOPOKLONNIKI (idol worshippers) acquired a negative meaning. In Russia the Romanovs changed the style of the churches and the character of church life [4]. In the parts of the Great Empire which split off from it some of the original Orthodox customs were also changed in order to separate from the metropolity in the religious sense as well.

Today Catholics rarely do low prostrations. In the Western-European churches the custom of getting onto their knees during the service has disappeared. Instead long benched-seats were made in front of which there is placed a step-like panel. In the certain moments during the prayer you have to slightly touch it with your knee remaining seated. Having separated in the religious sense the Western priests condemned and changed some former Orthodox Catholic rituals. Including the direction of the sign of the cross. The Muslims, who also split off from the original Christianity, annulled crossing altogether.

The reformers used the fact that the Russian word DOLU also meant 'vile' and 'low' and tendentiously interpreted it in a negative way. As a result in the XVII-XVIII cc. the word IDOLOPOKLONNIKI in some church circles began to be disapproved of: purporting that it was they who worship the bad gods. The same was done to the word IDOL, i.e. virtually DOLU, which today is perceived as something primitive, some kind of 'wrong' deity, idol. Thus they swapped white into black and vice versa.

## **27. THE ASTRONOMICAL DATING OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY.**

1. (Year 1725) Horoscope dating to the time of the rule of the grandson of the very first Yellow Emperor of China Huangdi. Allegedly the first half of the third millennia BC. In fact: 6 March Old Style (Julian calendar) 1725, see [3v2] or our book 'Pegaya Orda' ('Piebald Horde').
2. (Year 1741) ZODIAC FZ del FALCONETTO from MANTUA. Fresco decoration on the walls of the so called 'Sala dello Zodiaco del Falconetto' (Hall of the Zodiac) in the Seconda Palazzina gia Dalla Valle. Italy, Mantua, allegedly 1520. In fact: 3-4 Julian calendar 1741 [GR], Introduction.
3. (Year 1741) ROMAN ZODIAC FA OF JUPITER. Allegedly the 'classical' stone carving. In fact: 5 June Julian calendar 1741 (ERIZ).
4. (Year 1781) ZODIAC OF URANUS RP1 IN CHAMBER OF THE COURT JUSTICE IN PADUA (Palazzo della Ragione). Frescos on the walls of the upper chamber. Italy, Padua, allegedly 1315-1317. In fact: 23-25 April 1781 [GRK], ch.4.

# Chapter 9. THE EPOCH OF THE XIX CENTURY

## 1. CRITIQUE OF SCALIGER'S CHRONOLOGY.

There is a long tradition of doubt in the accuracy of today's accepted version. Let us name just a few of the scientists who criticised the chronology of Scaliger and Petavius and who thought that the true chronology of ancient times was fundamentally different.

De Arcilla – XVI century, the professor of the University of Salamanca. The information about his research is vague. It is only known that de Arcilla argued that 'ancient' history was invented in the Middle Ages [1v].

Isaac Newton (1643-1727) – the great English scientist, mathematician and physicist. He studied chronology for many years. Published a large manuscript 'The chronology of ancient kingdoms amended' [1v].

Jean Hardouin (1646-1729) – the important French scientist, the author of a great many manuscripts on philology, theology, history, archaeology and numismatics. The director of the French Royal Library. Wrote a number of books on chronology in which he strongly criticized the entire structure of the Scaligerian chronology. According to him the majority of the 'ancient monuments' were made significantly later or are even forgeries.

Petr Nikiforovich Krekshin (1684-1763) – personal secretary of Peter I the Great. He wrote a book in which he criticized the version of the Roman History recognised today. At the time of Krekshin it was still 'very fresh' and was not perceived as something obvious [4v2], ch.2:30.

Robert Baldauf – a German philologist of the second half of the XIX – early XX cc. Private docent at the University of Basel. The author of the book 'History and Criticism' in four volumes. Based on philological grounds, he came to the conclusion that the monuments of 'ancient' literature have much later origin than it is believed and were created in the Middle Ages [1v].

Edwin Johnson (1842-1901) – the English historian. In his work he strongly criticized the Scaligerian chronology. He believed that it should be significantly shortened [1v].

Nikolai Alexandrovich Morozov (1854 – 1946) – outstanding Russian scientist-polymath. Created a breakthrough in research on chronology. Launched an extensive

critique of Scaligerian chronology and history. Proposed the ideas of several new scientific methods of analysis of chronology [1v], ch.1.

Wilhelm Kammeyer (the end of the XIX century – 1959) German scientist and a lawyer. Developed methods to determine the authenticity of the old official documents. He discovered that almost all the classical and early Mediaeval Western-European documents were the later fakes or copies. Arrived at a conclusion about the falsification of the ancient and Mediaeval history. Wrote a number of books on this subject.

Immanuel Velikovsky (1895-1979) – Doctor- psychoanalyst. He was born in Russia and lived and worked in Russia, England, Palestine, Germany and the USA. He wrote a number of books on the subject of ancient history, where relying on the research conducted by N.A.Morozov (but not citing him anywhere) he pointed out some contradictions in the history. Attempted to explain them by using the 'theory of catastrophism'. In the West he is considered to be the founder of the critical school in chronology. However, fundamentally I.Velikovsky was trying to protect the Scaligerian chronology from too many major reconstructions. The fact that in Western Europe I.Velikovsky's work on history was known better than significantly earlier and more profound works by N.A.Morozov, impeded the development of the New Chronology in the West.

To summarise, the inconsistency of the Scaligerian chronology was clearly indicated by the scientists of the XVII-XIX cc. A thesis on the falsification of the classical texts and ancient monuments was formulated. But no one except N.A.Morozov could find a way to build the correct chronology. Even he failed in creating it. His version turned out to be half baked and inherited a number of significant errors of the chronology of Scaliger-Petavius.

## **2. EVEN IN THE XVIII CENTURY THE ROMANOV'S RULE IN RUSSIA REMAINS IN MANY WAYS THE OCCUPATION OF RUSSIA BY FOREIGNERS. A LIST OF THE ACTIVE MEMBERS OF THE RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES IN THE XVIII-XIX CC.**

When the Romanov dynasty came to power the ruling class in Russia largely consisted of foreigners. The Romanov historians evasively invented a slippery 'explanation' for this. They said that the Romanovs, in good faith, summoned the learned foreigners to Russia to enlist their help in pulling the country out of the

swamp of backwardness and ignorance. To turn the Russian beasts into people, as Peter I the Great used to say [336], v.5, p.569-570.

The foreign stranglehold in Russia, continuing for the first 200 years of the Romanovs' rule, was an occupation of the former metropoly of the 'Mongol' Empire. The serfdom law was introduced by the Romanovs and was a straightforward enslavement of the native-born population on the Russian lands seized by the foreigners.

Let us address the history of the Russian Academy of Sciences. It was created in 1724 on the order of Peter I [736], book 1, p. V. We are told that Peter I 'not having found any talents in Russia' summoned the Western-European scientists, so they could enlighten the barbaric Russia and raise up successors worthy of them out of the poorly educated local young people. Amongst the scientists invited from Europe there were indeed outstanding thinkers, for example the brilliant mathematician Leonhard Euler. However they usually draw a veil over the fact that ALL the members of the Russian Academy, since 1724 up to 1742 were entirely foreign, except for Adadurov Vasili Yevdokimovich, elected to the Academy in 1733 [736], book 1. Thus PRACTICALLY THROUGHOUT THE FIRST TWENTY YEARS ONLY FOREIGNERS WERE THE RUSSIAN ACADEMICS. But even after that the OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF THE ACADEMICS WERE FOREIGN UP UNTIL 1841, when the situation eventually changed [736], book 1, p.50.

In 1841 the new 20 academics were elected. There were no foreigners among them anymore. To understand the picture on the whole we made a graph, [fig.103](#) [7v1], ch.1, where we show the percentage of foreigners among the academics of the Russian Academy of science from the moment of its founding in 1724 up to 1917. The time axial coordinate shows all the years of Academy elections. For each year we calculated the percentage of foreigners who became academics that year. In the diagram this variable is constant until the next year of elections. The question of who among the academics is foreign and who is not is solved very easily: in the edition [736] there is registered the original foreign name of each foreign member of the Academy.

In [fig.104](#) we give a smoothed graph. It is obtained from the previous one by averaging over the decades.

It can be clearly seen that predominantly up until 1841 it is foreigners who become the academics. This important fact is being 'explained' to us somewhat like this. They are saying that over the period of more than a hundred years the foreign members of the Russian Academy couldn't raise worthy successors from the Russian scientists.

With great difficulty the well-meaning and considerate foreigners searched for rare talents in the vast territories of Russia. But they found 'catastrophically little'. The barbaric Asiatic country. The forests, the snow, the bears. And so again and again they had to turn to the enlightened Europe and bring scientists of merit from there.

But the problem was not the lack of talents in Russia. At the beginning of the XVII century Russia was conquered by the foreigners who were far from being interested in the restoration of the Empire.

In [4v2], ch.2:31-32, we published materials about the difficult struggle that M.V.Lomonosov began against the academics-historians who were foreign. That is why it is so useful to understand how many academics-HISTORIANS in the Russian Academy of Sciences in the XVIII-XIX were foreign. Who created the Romanov-Miller version?

IT APPEARS THAT ALL OF THE ACADEMICS-HISTORIANS BEFORE M.V.LOMONOSOV WERE FOREIGN. There are eleven of them. Among them are such 'creators of the Russian history' as the already known to us Gerhard Friedrich Müller and Gotlib Bayer or Theophilus Siegfried (Gotlib=Theophilus Tr.Note). Thus over the first 18 years of the existence of the Academy of Sciences THE RUSSIAN HISTORY WAS WRITTEN EXCLUSIVELY BY THE FOREIGNERS-ACADEMICS. It was them who laid its fictitious foundations. Only in 1742 M.V.Lomonosov was elected an academic [736], book 1, p.14. He was the first home grown academic who was not only a naturalist, but also a historian. Having found himself in the Academy he very quickly realised what was going on. Instantly a fierce fight flared up between him and the academics-foreigners about the correct interpretation of Russian history. The resistance shown to M.B.Lomonosov was cohesive and furious.

In [fig.105](#) a graph is presented showing what percentage of the academics-historians in the Russian Academy of Sciences was comprised of foreigners. Over the period of more than a hundred years this diagram almost remains at a 100-percent. It starts falling only in the middle of the XIX century reaching zero by 1900.

Over the period of 117 years from 1724 to 1841 OUT OF THIRTY FOUR ACADEMICS-HISTORIANS THERE WERE ONLY THREE RUSSIAN ACADEMICS in the Academy of Sciences. They are – M.V.Lomonosov, J.O.Yartsov and N.G.Ustrialov [736], book 1. All the rest of the 31 academics were foreign. Thus up until the middle of the XIX century the proportion of the foreign historians in the Russian Academy exceeded ninety percent!



Over the period of more than a hundred years foreigners were in full control of the writing of the Russian history. It was them who decided which Russian documents ought to be destroyed, which – to re-write and which to preserve. The home historians were shown the door, prohibited from the archives and primary sources.

Only beginning with 1841 there started to appear a substantial numbers of home grown scientists amongst the academics-historians. But it was too late. The false foundation of the 'Russian history' was already laid and firmly imbedded in concrete by the foreigners.

The results of the 'activities' of the foreign historians is known only too well to us. Today their followers tell us with conviction that there was no navy in Russia before Peter I the Great. They allege that Peter FOR THE FIRST TIME EVER gave the order to build in Russia simple little 'boats' to start with and big ships afterwards. The historians hired by the Romanovs completely wiped out from history the colossal naval expeditions of the XV-XVI cc., when the Russian-Hordian and Ottoman=Ataman fleet colonized America for instance. And not just America. Moreover the Hordian army crossed the ocean not in some rickety canoes, but in ships with several rows of heavy artillery [6v2], ch.6. The entire Russian history prior to the XVII century was declared by the foreign historians to be the cave dwelling Middle Ages. We are being taught this way ever since. They implant this lie into young people's heads. Fortunately many traces of the truth survive.

### **3. THE FINANCIAL STRUCTURE, THE CASTS OF THE GREAT EMPIRE, THE MEDIAEVAL JUDAISM.**

Let us address an interesting question about the financial system of the Empire and about the social class of the financial treasurers. The new chronology fundamentally changes our perceptions, for example, about the place of the Hebrews in the Middle Ages. This question was of interest to many before and still is now. The common view point, that the Hebrews are the religious community which under some ill-defined circumstances scattered around the world, is hardly satisfactory. Why this and only this community dispersed and did not disappear? If the ancient Jewish state was somewhat very large, than the picture would have been clearer. Than the Jews could have survived by virtue of its multiplicity. But no, we are told that the Jewish state was very small. But so many of such small kingdoms died out. However the Hebrew community survived. Moreover it is spread over all the civilized countries. And occupies a prominent place in the social and political life, science and culture. And of course in the finance.

Let us turn to the history of the Great Empire. What place did the ancestors of the present day Jews occupy in it?

In the Empire there can be seen the idea of the ant heap or a beehive. There were established social classes, hereditary clans, which were occupied by a specific line of work. The traces of the cast Imperial system survive in India with its casts of warriors, workers, priests, etc. In recent Russian history we know at least one such an example. This social cast is a cast of priests. Until the second half of the XIX century only a son of a priest and a priest's daughter could become a priest in Russia. This law was abolished only in the XIX century. This fact was widely discussed in Russian society.

Presumably, there were casts, the professional divisions in the Russian-Horde Empire. In particular a professional class of the financial, so to say, bank officials. They operated the accounts of the Empire dispersed about Europe, Africa and America. The life of a vast Kingdom is not possible without a smooth-running financial mechanism. It comprised of not only the financial apparatus of czar-khan in Yaroslavl = Veliky Novgorod, but also the multiple accounting offices scattered all over the world from America to China [5v1], ch.12:4. It included the settlement of trade between the East and the West, the collection of taxes, the payment of salary, the control over the flow of the precious metals, the financial support to the army, etc. The work demanded a great attention to detail, specific qualification, accounting skills, suggested certain severity towards the violators of the financial regulations. Hence a tendency to build complex systems of rules which is most pronounced in the Talmud, for example. And of course the money was the 'blood' of this entire enormous Imperial system. The people who from one generation to another 'handled money' of the contemporary world developed an aspiration to always be around it. Among the people related to the monetary system of the modern world there are probably many descendants of the old imperial financial stratum. There must be many of them in the banking sphere.

It is quite possible that within one professional guild there could have formed a religious community. Which later became a part of the contemporary Judaism. In the Empire there prevailed religious tolerance and none of the religions were persecuted. They can ask us: why then there didn't emerge, for instance, 'the military religion', which all the warriors of the Empire would follow? Our answer is as follows. The kind of activity played an important role. As it is clear that the internal connections within the social stratum of the Hordian financiers, the officials in the Imperial monetary system, was considerably stronger, than, let's say, the professional ties in

the social cast of the Hordian warriors. The bankers of America of that time and the bankers of Europe of that time were connected closer than the soldiers in America and soldiers in Europe. There is nothing strange in this. Just the different nature of the activity. That is why the financial stratum was particular amongst the Imperial system. The other social strata could have been infused with different religions. But the financial guild turned out to be more homogeneous in the religious sense. However the Jews had before and still have now the religious differences.

It is clear why the Imperial financial guild didn't need any special separate state. In one sense they already had it. It was the entire Horde Empire. The present day cosmopolitanism is to some degree the legacy, the memory of a vast field of financial activity spread over all territories from America to China. Hence – a slight attachment to their birthplace, the land of their ancestors, ease in the relocation. In the epoch of the Empire all of this could be attributed to the occupation of the Imperial treasurer. The officials of the Imperial treasury often moved from one place to another, they could be assigned to work in the most remote territories. At the same time inevitably there appeared the drive for solidarity, a certain aloofness.

And so, in the XIV century the 'Mongol' Empire emerged. Its founders – the Russian-Horde czars-khans started to order the life in the immense territories. In particular, they created the monetary system of the Empire and the social stratum of people attending to it. In the XVI century Judaism was the prevailing religion within this financial stratum. Possibly not just in this social group, but within it was universal or almost universal. Due to the specific of their activity – the control over the Imperial finances – this social stratum obtained power, which was not anticipated by the founders of the Empire.

The czars-khans of that time did not realise in time the danger hanging over them. In the XVI – early XVII cc. The Empire was destroyed. The power of money blossomed on its ruins.

It becomes clear why after the collapse of the Empire in its European splinters-states, revolutions started. The implication of the events is simple. The Empire was ruined at the hands of the military Imperial governors. In Germany, France, etc. They immediately acquired absolute power on the ground, having turned into the independent kings, dukes, etc. Naively thinking that it was them who had won. They were mistaken. Now they began to deal with them one by one. Some were decapitated, some were swept away by the 'outraged people'. The driving force behind all such revolutions was money. As a result they openly declared the

domination of money over noble rank, over ancestry. This was the motto of the French revolution and of the English revolution. In the Horde Empire there ruled a principle of ancestry and gentility. Nobility was respected and entitled to power. After the revolt of the Reformation, wealth acquired precedence. Nobility withdrew into the shadows, and in some places was declared to be a negative attribute.

Our idea that the mediaeval Jews or their significant part originated from the treasurers of the Empire is supported by some sources. For example, it is said about King Wenceslaus: 'According to one of the verdicts of the Nuremberg Sejm in 1390 the King ordered the Jews (we should not forget that **THEY ALL AND ALL THEIR POSSESSIONS WERE A PART OF THE PROPERTY BELONGING TO THE TREASURY OF THE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE**) to give away all the securities and debt liabilities which they had in their possession... The Jews had to conform with the governmental order and they did: but needless to say some time later on following that financial turnaround the affairs returned back to its previous state' [304], v.2, p.449.

It is all clear. The Imperial government ordered its treasury to waive the debts of their knights. It takes place after a prolonged war. The treasury waives the debts. But it doesn't become poorer for that. Not before long everything returns to its former status quo. The Empire did become impoverished.

The situation when a Mediaeval knight demands money and not from anyone but from a Jew in particular, became a part of classic literature. Let us recall Pushkin's 'The Miser Knight'. The Knight is convinced for some reason that the Jew's money is his own, the knight's money. At the very least he has an uncontested share in it. But the Jew assures him that 'there is no money left'. A usual conversation with an accountant or a treasurer who at all costs tries to limit cash withdrawal. The knight however firmly insists on receiving the Imperial payment due to him.

It is peculiar that intrinsically the persecution of the Jews in Europe began straight after the collapse of the Horde Empire. In the Lutheran Chronograph of 1680 we read that in 1615 'the old brotherhood between the countries is restored: the Jews are ordered to leave Wornatia. It might mean some kind of segregation or banishment of the Jews in 1615, i.e. immediately following the Times of Troubles. Here it is very interestingly a passing reference to the **ANCIENT UNION OF THE COUNTRIES** of the Western Europe. As we understand it now the union was being a part of the united Empire.

Following the collapse of the Empire the majority of its officials and military, also including the frontline workers of the Imperial treasury (the Jews), found themselves

under suspicion in the Reformist Western society. There emerged the notorious ghettos in Europe.

Why is it widely thought that it is the Jews who wrote the Bible? As we see it now it is not quite right. Here we encounter the terminological confusion typical to the Middle Ages. The Biblical books were written by all sorts of different people. For example, the Old Testament was mainly written by Those Who Praise the Lord (this is the translation of the word 'Jew' into Russian) – the priests who worshiped God, who marched with the army of Horde-Atamania to conquer the world, the Promised Land. The word 'Jew' used to mean simply 'priest'. It is a modification of the Greek word Nereus (Hiereus). It easily transforms into a word Yevrey ('Jew' in Russian) due to the two way reading of the Church Slavonic letter Izhitsa. The Bible was written by the Hordian priests, i.e. the Jews. Or by Those Who Praise the Lord i.e. by the Jews.

#### **4. HOW THE EMPIRE WAS RULED.**

# There still remain the psychological traces of the fact, that Russia-Horde was the metropoly (parent state) of the Great Empire. The peoples of Russia until now are 'bad at being tamed', they still have the spirit of former liberty' alive in them, the spirit of the 'masters of the Empire'. They have quite a strong common sense, and a rather sceptical attitude towards statutory law. Striving to 'live by their own customs', 'like their ancestors'. This is only natural: as the laws were written by the Empire for the others, i.e. for the conquered provinces. On the other hand, the Russian love of freedom is combined with a deep sense of royalism which also manifested itself in the XX century. In Russia they are always ready to die for the czar, for the idea. In other civilised countries the people more readily accepting of statutory law. Possibly due to the fact that they are the descendants of not only the conquerors = the 'Mongols', but also the native subjugated population, who at some point were forced to comply with the orders of the metropoly, i.e. Russia-Horde and the Ottoman Empire.

# How did the Empire operate for 300 years, from the XIV to the XVI cc? How on earth did Russia-Horde manage to mobilise so many soldiers to colonise such vast lands? One thing is to quickly conquer the territories. To achieve this – due to the low level of population in many regions of Eurasia and America – small, well-armed and well trained army units were often enough. But it is quite a different matter to maintain the order afterwards for a lengthy period of time and to educate the local population of the entire continents. Besides, how was it possible without delay to pass

on the orders to the remote troops, administration and the bankers from the centre of Russia-Horde? As in those times there were no fast means of communication like the telegraph, the radio or the telephone. How then did a khan-czar rule the gigantic Eurasian + African + American Empire, 'over which the sun never sets'?

Firstly, beginning with the XV century there were two concurrently ruling centres established in the Empire. One was in Russia-Horde, which was also called Israel, and the other was in Czar-Grad, the capital of the Ottoman Empire (Atamania) which was also named Judea. Besides sometimes the entire Empire was called Israel or Judea, when the matter concerned respectively either the military aspects of its activities, or its hierarchic, religious aspects. Mainly Russia controlled the Western Europe and Asia, and the Ottoman Empire – the Mediterranean, the Middle East and Africa. America, which was colonised at the end of the XV century, was under the mutual control of Russia-Horde and the Ottoman Empire–Atamania.

Secondly, the important bonding agent was the common Christian religion spread by the Horde Empire = Israel all over the world at that time. The 'Mongolian' missionaries marching amongst the Israeli armies of the Crusaders = the Hordians created the affiliated Catholic branches of the Orthodox churches on colonised territories, by which they provided the spiritual unity for the Empire. The religious unity is one of the cornerstones on which the Imperial power was based over the duration of several hundred years. The united Christian church fulfilled an important state function. It was the exact reason why the Western rebels of the XVI-XVII cc. delivered the first strike on Christianity [6v2], ch.1. The 'progressive religious reform' helped to divide the czardom into bits, each of them 'got' so to say 'their own new religion': Protestantism, Catholicism, Islam, etc.

Thirdly, in the foundation of the Empire lay its professional military organisation, i.e. the Horde = Rat'. We should not assume that in every town and settlement of the Empire from China and Europe to Africa and America there was necessarily stationed a military post of the Hordians-Cossacks. There was no need for that. The small, but well-armed military units were stationed only in the major centres from which time to time they would march to the remote regions to collect taxes or for the punitive actions. Such form of control, when the professional troops appear seldom, but act fast, publicly and firmly, was particularly effective. The subject's fear of the remote central power was also of importance. The permanent presence of the Horde unit in every settlement was not necessary. There would never be enough soldiers and weapons for that. The rulers understood that a remote but imminent threat is more effective, than the permanent lodging of the troops in sight of the population.

The descendants of the Hordian conquerors formed the core of the nobility which was established locally, for example in Europe, Japan and China [5v1], ch.12:12.

The stability of the Empire rested on the extreme military superiority of the Horde which established in the XIV century and provided the very opportunity of such a grandiose colonisation of the world, the equivalent of which never took place again. In the early XIV century in Russia-Horde there commenced the industrial production of iron and gun-powder, which created the weaponry including cannons. The Cossack cavalry raised in the vast Russian steppes was an important factor. There was nothing like it outside of Russia. In fact the 'Mongol' cavalry armed with muskets and accompanied by the artillery didn't meet any resistance. As we know from the seizure of Czar-Grad in 1453, i.e. the Old Testament Jericho, [6v1], ch.5:3, when required, the heavy artillery which could quickly break any stone walls, immediately advanced upon the walls of the cities that grimly held together. However, in the majority of cases it was enough to merely demonstrate their might in order to crush any attempts at rebellion.

The speed of the delivery of the military and administrative orders was of course limited by the transportation facilities of that time. But, as the chronicles tell us, the Horde first created an effective road network with equestrian posts along them [4v1], Introduction: 3. Secondly the main task of the 'Mongol' governors from America to China was to provide order, to collect tax and to send a part of it to the metropoly. All of this didn't require petty regulations from the centre and was achieved by the local administration without having to be supported by daily orders from Moscow or Czar-Grad. The messengers were sent on matters of a grand scale and of special nature. In those cases, we can imagine, the couriers moved fast.

## **5. THE FALSIFICATION OF HISTORY IN THE XVII-XVIII CC.**

### **&& THE ROMANOV ARCHAEOLOGISTS-POGROMISTS.**

In [1v], ch.1:13.1 and [TsRIM], ch.9 we tell about the excavations in Central Russia conducted by the Romanov archaeologists of the XIX century. In particular in 1851-1854 count A.S.Uvarov, who today is mistakenly called an archaeologist, in the land of Vladimir and Suzdal excavated 7729 mounds. SEVEN THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND TWENTY NINE! It is reported: 'On entering the items to the Rumyantsevsky museum (re: the excavations of 1851-1854 – Author) they presented all in all a CHAOTIC PILE OF STUFF, as there was no accompanying inventory notes specifying which mound each item originated from. Mr.Uvarov AT A LATER

DATE compiled an inventory of the entire collection, however using just the excavation reports and PARTIALLY BY MEMORY. The grandiose excavations of 1851-1854 in the Suzdal region WILL BE GREATLY MOURNED BY SCIENCE FOR A LONG TIME and will serve as a dreadful premonition for all the enthusiasts of MASS EXCAVATIONS. So much sadder is the LOSS OF THE VLADIMIR MOUNDS in that they present the ONLY material to answer the question about which Russian tribe in particular laid the foundation of the Velikorossy (The Great Russians – in the Pre-Soviet time the Russians were officially called Velikorossy (Great Russia), the Ukrainians – Malorossy (Little Russia), the Belorussian were called the same name as today the Belorussian (White Russia) – Translator's note) ... THE LOSS OF THESE MOUNDS CANNOT BE COMPENSATED BY ANYTHING' [305:0], p.89-90.

There were some days, when UP TO 80 OR MORE MOUNDS WERE OPENED UP. That was not the scientific research, but a deliberate demolition. Our analysis allows us to state the following:

# Count A.S.Uvarov and P.S.Saveliev over a period of at least four years in the middle of the XIX century organised and headed a deliberate destruction of the old Russian-Horde mounds in Central Russia, authorized by the Imperial Edict. I.e. at the very heart of the former 'Mongol Empire'.

# The Russian-Horde mounds were mercilessly razed to the ground and the burials inside them were destroyed there and then. Hundreds of workers were summoned for the purpose. There was no trace of any 'scientific research' there.

# Almost no detailed documents reporting on this pogrom survive. They 'disappeared' mysteriously. A few of them which are presented to us today were written post factum.

# A small amount of unearthed items were preserved for the museums. So there was something to demonstrate and to give an account for. Purporting, that these were the results of their meticulous scientific activities. Alleging, that they have found something nonetheless, though really not a lot. Most of the genuine findings which could tell us a lot about our history, were destroyed straight away in the field. Or hidden in the deep storages.

Today we cannot even imagine how many mounds turned out to exist in Russia. THOUSANDS AND THOUSANDS were destroyed by the Romanovs administrators. Nevertheless in the XIX century there was still a lot left. For example, 'Mr.Nefyodov who opened up one mound in the same area and reporting that he



counted up to 200 mounds over the distance of 3 versts (0.6629 mile – Tr.)' [305:0], p.93. But soon they got to them too. Needless to say they were all ruthlessly razed to the ground.

Only vague rumours reached out time and recollections of some numerous mounds along Tver downstream of Volga, the mounds of Uglich, the mounds of Murom, etc. [305:0], p.94-95. Where are they now? They are gone. No trace of them. Not afield, not in the documents. Where are the findings unearthed from them?

CONCLUSION. In the second half of the XIX century the Romanov administrators, archaeologists and historians destroyed many thousands of the Russian-Horde burial mounds. Most likely they were razed to the ground deliberately in order to conceal the traces of the true history of the XIII-XVI cc. Today we are being cynically told with a wry smile: you see, there are no mounds and opulent burials in Russia, our history is poor, doesn't come close to the history of the West, the East, the North or the South.

&& THEY WRITE 'THE NEW ANCIENT HISTORY'

To support the version of Scaliger-Petavius in Europe there was created a 'scientific school of history', which 'adjusted accordingly' all the documents that came to its attention. After the main body of the conflicting documents were either destroyed or edited, the 'odd' documents emerging from time to time were interpreted as 'Mediaeval ignorance'. Until now the main body of the documents which the modern historical version is based on are comprised of the Western-European texts. They have all undergone the editing of the XVII-XVIII cc. – a fact which is often concealed. On the other hand the Old Russian, Turkic and Arabic primary sources occupy only a supportive secondary place in the history science. They allegedly contain 'a lot of nonsense'. We are told that you should approach them carefully. In fact they are not being edited as thoroughly.'

Most thoroughly the reformers worked on the history of the XV-XVI cc. Due to the clear reasons – this is the epoch of the rise of the 'Mongol' Empire. There is almost nothing left from the true history of that epoch in the history textbooks. The empty space which was freed up was to be urgently filled up. This filling was taken place in the offices of the historians of the XVII-XVIII cc. That is why it is not surprising that the epoch of the XV-XVI cc. to a great extent is populated by phantoms, the reflections of the events descended here from the XVI-XVII cc. Any falsifier either consciously or subconsciously uses imagery from the surrounding reality. The books of the allegedly XVI century were printed or re-printed in the XVII-XVIII cc. The

false dates of the XVI or even the XV cc. were deliberately stamped on them. The great examples of this are the Bibles, see in [6v]. Another great example is Ptolemy's Almagest [3v1], and also his Geography [6v2], ch.7. Many of the authentic books of the XV-XVI cc. had a clear 'Imperial stamp' on them. For example the dedication to the Russian Emperor-Khan. Naturally it was all eliminated in the re-prints of the XVII-XVIII cc. Everything concerning the former Imperial history was edited in the texts.

The history of Western Europe was presented this way. The Russian-Horde khan was declared exclusively the Western-European 'Habsburg Austrian Emperor'. Thus the many deeds of the entire Great Empire was automatically attributed only to Western Europe. The major historical facts – for example, the existence of the Emperor in Europe, the former unity of Europe under his rule, a strong Slavic presence in Europe, etc. – partially remained on the pages of the textbooks. But their presentation was significantly distorted [7v1], ch.1.

The Western rulers of the XVI century, remaining faithful to the 'Mongol' Empire were declared reactionary. For instance, Duke of Alba (Fernando A'lvarez de Toledo, duque de...; 1507-1582), the 'Spanish commander, the Governor of Netherland' [797], p.44. is treated as a monster, who 'drowned the progressive liberation movement in blood'. This 'Dyak Belo-Rus' (whose name was later on pronounced as Duke Alba-Rus, i.e. Duke Alva-Rez) was most likely one of the governors of the Empire fighting the Reformation. In [fig.106](#) we show the title page of a book called 'THE MIRROR OF THE SPANISH TYRANNY' allegedly first published in 1596. The Duke of Alba and Don Juan of Austria were depicted as the main tyrants 'brutally supressing progress'. On top above them the publishers placed a portrait of a 'very bad king' Philipp II. The book represented a very important study guide for the education of the Europeans of the XVI-XVII cc. in the required spirit. On the title page there is a clear picture of the bad rulers torturing the good people. The book was re-published in 1620 and 1638 [330], v.3.

Here is what the Encyclopaedia says of the King Philipp II of Spain (1527-1598): 'His policy promoted the strengthening of the Spanish AUTOCRACY'. HE INTENSIFIED OPPRESSION IN THE NETHERLANDS. He supported the inquisition' [797], p.1406. On the whole, a bad ruler. A great oppressor.

**&& THEY COMPOSE 'THE ANCIENT SOURCES'**

Where do we know the works of the 'ancient' writers from? Here is a detailed review by professor V.V.Bolotov in the 'Lectures on the history of the ancient church' [83].

Technically he touches upon only the sources concerning the history of the church. But the great majority of the mediaeval texts, in one way or another concerned church history. In general the Scaligerian version is built primarily on the church sources [72], [76].

In the history of the print publications of the 'ancient' sources, what stands out is the fact that from the very beginning they were not disconnected or random, the way it should be under the normal course of events when, with the rise of publishing, certain books which were copied beforehand, began to be published. In one place someone should have published one book. In another place another publisher should have independently printed another book. And so on. Only later there appear digesters who collect separate publications and on that basis publish the FUNDAMENTAL MULTIVOLUME COLLECTIONS. Contrary to that, if the ancient falsified history and the old texts are edited and forged accordingly, then the picture of the published editions most likely will be the reverse. I.e. immediately there would be published multivolume editions of the 'correct books'. Where they would be published in one or two centres, but not randomly. Each centre would focus on one strand. In order to easier control the falsification. And then, based on such an officially approved body of publications, there would emerge isolated editions, which would be reprints of certain individual books allowed by the censors.

It is the second scenario that we witness when we see the publishing of the 'ancient' texts of the XVII-XIX cc. [83]. As it's clear now, we see an organised forgery. For example, 'the writings of the holy fathers and the ecclesiastical writers FROM THE VERY BEGINNING WERE PUBLISHED AS MULTIVOLUME EDITIONS' [83], v.1, p.118. In the middle of the XIX century came out 'The Patrologia' by the French priest J.P.Migne comprising of several hundred volumes: 221 volumes of the Latin writers and 161 of the Greek writers. Since then all the researchers mainly use the Migne's publication as the manuscripts and earlier publications as a rule are either inaccessible or 'inconvenient' [83], v.1, p.119.

A logical question is: based on what sources did priest Migne publish his 'The Patrologia'? Apparently he simply republished the editions of the XVII-XVIII cc. produced by the Benedictine order [83], v.1, p.120. He republished it in a more convenient, contemporary format. 'The value of Migne's 'The Patrologia' first of all is that it is practical and easy to use. Migne freed the world from the tomes of the Benedictine monks, which were very uncomfortable to use, incidentally due to the enormous format... He would usually take the best Benedictine edition ... when

necessary adding the works (published by the later scientists) lacking the Benedictine holy fathers which was published by the later scientists' [83], v.1, p.120.

Consequently, the PRIMARY SOURCE is not Migne's publication, but the Benedictine one. Migne simply republished it. The Benedictines on the other hand didn't just reprint the ancient manuscripts. It is well known that THEY FUNDAMENTALLY CORRECTED IT. For example, 'if a holy father cited a place from the Scripture DISCORDANT with the Vatican canons, the Benedictine considered such a place to be an error and 'CORRECTED IT PEACEFULLY' either according to the Sistine edition of the Bible (in the writings of the Greek Fathers) or according to Vulgata versio (in the writings of the Latin Fathers)' [83], v.1, p.121.

To conclude, in the XVII-XVIII cc. in one and the same centre, and only there, the Benedictines fundamentally edited and published all the writings of the holy fathers of the Church. In particular, the Benedictines would check all the quotations according to the Bible. When the quotations differ from the contemporary Bible they would 'adjust them'. It is not surprising that when opening today any edition of the old text quoting the Bible we will see that the quotations correspond to the contemporary Biblical canon. And we begin to think that the canon existed exactly like this for a very-very long time. As it is being quoted so accurately by the 'ancient' authors. BUT IN FACT IT IS A FAKE. As we read not the original old text, but its adaptation by the Benedictine monks. If not altogether a forgery of the XVII-XIX cc. This refers to not just one or two, but THOUSANDS of the old texts. The amount of the volumes itself published by Migne 'based on the Benedictines' – there are almost 400 of such volumes! – shows the scale of 'activity'.

If the manufacturing of the writings by the holy fathers was assigned to the Benedictines, then the publication of the Lives of the Saints was entrusted to the Jesuit order of Bollandists. These are the 'Flemish Jesuits headed by Bolland, who died in 1665' [83], v.1, p.136, 137. From 1643 to 1794 there were 53 volumes of 'The Lives' published. I.e. one central monopoly was established in regards to this ecclesiastical historical direction.

As we can see 'the manufacturing of the true history' was assigned to several departments simultaneously. One was specialising in the history of the church. Another – in the descriptions of the lives. And so on. Supposedly they would have meetings of the 'historic departments' where their work would be coordinated. The further instructions would be given...

The leaders of the 'historic project' would work on the most important cases themselves. For instance, 'The Chronicle' by Eusebius Pamphili for which 'the Greeks ACCORDING TO THE TRADITION LOST the Greek original' [83], v.1, p.145, was 'reconstructed' by Scaliger personally. Though the historians say, that Scaliger only 'attempted to restore' the Chronicle. But he allegedly failed. So he gave it up. But later in 1787 the Chronicle by Eusebius Pamphili was 'found' anyway. In the Armenian translation. I.e. it was found a hundred years later after Scaliger 'attempted to restore' the text by Eusebius Pamphili. It is most likely that in 1787 they found a text written by Scaliger himself. And immediately declared it the 'original' Chronicle by Eusebius Pamphili. The suspicions of forgery increase by the look itself of the 'discovered Chronicle'. It was written allegedly on parchment which was very valuable due to its high cost. At the same time the chronological tables by 'Eusebius Pamphili' look exactly like the tables published by the Scaligerian school in the XVII-XVIII cc. The pages take the form of numerous vertical columns. Each of them related to the chronology of a single country or a certain 'stream of events'. Notably almost all the space on the parchment remained apparently EMPTY, as there were few known events. As Bolotov points out, the scribes could hardly correctly copy the text in such a format over the period of 600 years [83], v.1, p.145. It's all clear. Such a format of the tables emerged only in the XVII century. The genuine Chronicle by Eusebius Pamphili (which did probably exist, but in some other form) was most likely destroyed. And in its place they offered us a forgery of the XVII century.

This 'activity' is by no means inoffensive. Apparently 'around THREE QUARTERS OF THOSE DATES WHICH THE HISTORIANS HAVE IN THEIR POSSESSION FOR THE CORRESPONDING PERIOD OF TIME ORIGINATE FROM THE CHRONICLE BY Eusebius Pamphili [83], v.1, p.151. I.e. as we understand, they are based on the dating which was suggested by Scaliger in the XVIII century without any proof. Today these dates remain unfounded.

&& AFTER THE EMPIRE.

History and chronology turned into a powerful ideological weapon with lasting effect, successfully used against Russia and Turkey. It disorientated, disabled the opposition, changed the value system, and imbedded an inferiority complex. In the XVII century there was made an attempt to divide Russia-Horde into many small states. But afterwards many of them still merged around the former centre. The Romanov Empire appeared. Starting from the XVII-XVIII cc. the idea of the cultural superiority of Western Europe over Russian and Turkey is being enforced. For example the German historians of the late XIX century, the authors of the

multivolume 'History of humankind' openly write in a chapter under the eloquent name (expressively called) 'The Russian antagonism towards civilization': 'The mistake of the (Russian – Author) people was that it WAS ACCUSTOMED TO ROUGHNESS, accepted it as its NATIONAL IDENTITY and stopped understanding the value of culture... Russia, who should have had hundreds of Higher Schools, doesn't want to do anything for itself and purposefully kept its population in ignorance... The foreigners who find themselves in Russia look down on the Russian people due to their cultural backwardness...The Russian people were poor and always remained this way as they were uneducated. ..Russia desperately needs another Peter the Great who could forcibly TEAR IT AWAY from the primordial gloom. Russia, instead, due to its ANIMOSITY TOWARDS CULTURE earned itself more than one fierce enemy' [336], v.5, p.599-601.

Pan-Turkism has deep roots in the very same Great Empire. This is the memory of the peoples of the Turkic languages that at some stage, not so long ago, they were a part of the united Empire. The Turks left Russia-Horde and on the wave of the 'Mongol' conquest settled all over Eurasia. In Russia the Turkic, Tatar language was spread much wider than today, but the Romanovs suppressed it heavily. Despite that there still remain many Turkic speaking peoples in Russia now.

The question frequently arises – where does Russia refer to: Europe or Asia? Both Europe and Asia were in their time conquered by Russia-Horde. That is why many 'purely Eastern' customs are simply the forgotten Russian-Hordian ones. Both Europe and Asia were a part of the Russian-Ottoman Empire. The population of the provinces to a great extent – the native nobility in particular – consisted of the descendants of the Russian-Hordian conquerors of the XIII-XIV cc. Russia-Horde successfully oriented towards both West and East. Trade was organised between the East and the West, which took place in Russia. The taxes from this trade went to the treasury of the Empire. Such was the indirect, gentle way of tax collection of the entire Empire. This is one example of how Russia manipulated its geographical position between the East and the West and its influence over them to its advantage. Russia is neither the East nor the West. Russia has its own history which greatly differs from the history of its neighbours. Having been, together with the Ottoman Empire, the master of the Eurasia and the significant part of America, it had close connections with both the East and the West. It's not a coincidence that the two-headed eagle was always a Russian emblem. It looked both to the East and to the West.

The idea of the wars of religion emerged in the epoch of the Reformation as a concept of destroying a unified state. The visionaries of the split in the XVI-XVII cc.

understood it very well and used it 'in practice'. They began to advocate the separation from the 'Mongol' Empire, referring allegedly to the religious tensions. But the religious policy of the Empire formerly was very different. There reigned the principle of religious tolerance and state's non-interference into the sphere of the religious matters. In the czardom there co-existed various branches of the original unified Christianity, each being under the protection of the czar-khan. But this didn't lead to the religious wars until the Reformation revolt erupted at the end of the XVI-XVII cc. Religious slogans were used for the first time to split the united czardom.

Orthodox Christianity and Islam split later than it is common to believe. These two branches of the originally united religion retained their close affinity the longest. The various traces of their closeness in the XV-XVI cc. can be found in many documents. Particularly, in Turkey and Iran. Opposing Orthodox Christianity and Catholicism on one hand to Islam on the other is a manoeuvre successfully used in order to play off Russia against Turkey in the XVII-XVIII cc. Once again a form of the west's struggle against Russia-Horde.

Here is an example of the role of the language and culture in the history of a nation. As we understand it now the contemporary population of Germany are descendants of the Slavs who were the conquerors of the XIII-XIV cc. They spoke Slavonic at some point, but now they speak a different language. It is impossible to preserve a people, having changed its language and its culture. This will become a different people. The more the new language and the new culture would be removed from the former ones, the more the new nation would differ from the former one. Such programs are being realised via educating the youth at school.

## **6. THE CZAR-GRAD KINGDOM OF THE XI-XII CC. AND THE HORDE EMPIRE OF THE XIII-XVI CC. ARE THE ARCHETYPES OF ALL THE MAIN 'ANCIENT KINGDOMS' IN THE SCALIGERIAN HISTORY.**

We discovered that the 'emperors of the Western-Roman Empire', i.e. the Habsburgs up until the XVI century turned out to be merely the phantom reflections of the Great Russian czars-khans who ruled until the end of the XVI century in Western Europe. All the Western-European rulers were the vassals of them in particular. Only after the victory of the Reformation the Western governors found themselves at the head of the independent states which formed in Europe (Germany, France, England, Spain, Italy, etc.).

Of course, it was impossible to completely wipe out the 'former' dependence from the Russian czars-khans. Noticeable traces remained in Western history purportedly as purely formal vassal dependence of all, or nearly all the Western rulers from the Habsburg, the Emperor of the Western Roman Empire. It is true though, that a certain oddity remained. This dependence which lasted several hundred years suddenly disappears in the XVII century without a trace. And this is understandable. The Austrian rulers were simply 'appointed' by the rebellious Western Europe of the XVI-XVII cc. to play the part of an old Imperial dynasty. Though in the XVII century the status of the Austrian Habsburg was no different from, let's say, the French or the English Kings.

The Habsburg of the XIV-XVI cc. was on the other hand the almighty Russian czar-khan ruling in Veliky Novgorod – Yaroslavl. He truly was the Emperor for all the governors – the kings and the dukes of the West. And not just formally – as it is presented today in the Scaligerian history of the Habsburgs – but the real sovereign of the single superpower. Only the late Habsburgs: from the late XVI to the early XVII cc. are the Western rulers of Austria. Which emerged as one of the splinters of the 'Mongol' Empire.

Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc. and the Czar-Grad kingdom of the XI – the early XIII cc. are crucial for practically all 'ancient' Scaligerian history. Here is a list of the main phantom reflections of the Russian czars-khans of the 1276-1600.

- 1) The 'ancient' Russian history of allegedly the X-XIII cc.
- 2) The Habsburg Empire of 1273-1600.
- 3) The Holy Roman Empire of allegedly the X-XIII cc.
- 4) The 'ancient' Kingdom of Israel, according to the Bible.
- 5) The 'ancient' Kingdom of Judah, according to the Bible.
- 6) The Third Roman empire allegedly of the III-VI cc.
- 7) The Second Roman Empire allegedly of the I century BC – III century.
- 8) The Czar Rome = The First Roman empire allegedly of the VIII-VI cc. BC.
- 9) The 'Zero' Byzantine Empire allegedly of the 330-553 and the first half of the First Byzantine Empire allegedly of the 553-700.
- 10) The first half of the Byzantine Empire allegedly of the 830-980.
- 11) The first half of the Third Byzantine Empire allegedly of 1150- 1300.



12) The history of Mediaeval England allegedly of the 400-1327.

13) The Empire of the Carolingian Empire allegedly of the 680-890.

The proponents of today's accepted version of history react angrily to the evidence that many well-known 'classical' heroes were Russian. Or the 'ancient' Et-Ruscan, i.e. once again Russian [5v]. The surviving facts are sorely received, facts which indicate that 'Ancient' Rome is actually Russia-Horde XIII-XVI cc. I.e. the 'ancient' Roman emperors were in fact the Russian-Horde czars-khans.

The cause of such an acute reaction is clear. After the collapse of the Great Russian-Horde Empire in Western Europe and some other former imperial provinces there formed a hostile and at the same time fearful attitude towards Russia. See the reasons for that above. The clearly surviving 'Russian footprint' in the Scaligerian history (surviving despite numerous attempts to 'cleanse' the documents) has been presently removed from scientific circles. The historians pretend that there is no 'Russian footprint' at all. But if somewhere such information still breaks through, they disregard it.

## **7. 'RUSSIA – THE HOMELAND OF ELEPHANTS'.**

Sometimes it is asked whether it is a coincidence that our reconstruction, according to which for a long time Russia was the metropoly of the Great Empire, appeared specifically in Russia. Could it simply be a consequence of the authors' unnecessarily patriotic view of ancient history? Is it possible they believe in a reconstruction created in Russia? If it was thought of in England, France or, even better, in America – then it would be a different matter. It goes without saying that in that case it should have been received with great respect, and they would have begun studying it immediately.

We will answer this. It is not surprising that the correct reconstruction of the epoch of the 'Mongol' Empire emerged specifically in its former metropoly. As it is in the metropoly that the memory of the Empire of the XIV-XVI cc. survived for longer than anywhere else. Here there more old books, documents and monuments, somewhat dilapidated remains of the old traditions. Here survive the traces of the view 'from the inside', from the centre of the Empire. However in the other countries, the former provinces of the Empire, only the traces of the view 'from the outside' remained. Also undoubtedly valuable, but insufficient on their own. That is why it is easier to create the true reconstruction in the former metropoly. It is not surprising that it appeared specifically in Russia. This does not prove that the authors of this

book are biased or that our theory is invalid. And it is not a reason for dismissing it out of hand. In other words, if we are right, then it should have happened exactly this way: the reconstruction should have appeared specifically in Russia. That is what happened.

Another objection from the people who don't want to get to the heart of the matter, in short can be formulated like this. This contemptuous statement can be heard often. Again, they say, you have Russia as the homeland of the elephants. But ultimately it contains some manipulation. There are certainly no elephants in present day Russia. But the word 'Russia' radically changed its meaning over the past several hundred years. Sometime before the entire 'Mongol' Empire was called RUSSIA (RUS' or ROSSIA), i.e. RASSEYANIE (DISSIPATION – Russian). Where elephants were certainly not unusual. For example, India and Africa were a part of the Empire.

That is why, strictly speaking, Russia was indeed the homeland of the elephants. However odd it might sound today.

Such sardonic slogans were first heard in the epoch of the XVIII-XIX cc., when to a great extent the memory of Russia-Horde of the XIV-XVI cc. was eliminated. The purpose of these contemptuous statements was to eradicate from the conscience of the Russian people the last memories, which were no longer supported by neither documents nor the Romanov history. These memories still existed, and in order to extinguish them they used ridicule.

The Russian history in its now recognisable form was first published by N.M.Karamzin. The 'History' by Prince M.Sherbatov, written slightly earlier, was fundamentally different. But it was not republished since the middle of the XIX century and today it has been ultimately withdrawn from circulation. Is it a coincidence that the 'History' by Karamzin saw the light only after the Moscow Tartary was crushed? I.e. following the victory over 'Pugachev'? Most likely, it is not. Only when it became clear that there was no going back, the composing of the final version of the 'correct Russian history' commenced.

## **8. THE GUNPOWDER AND THE CANONS.**

As we understand it now, the gunpowder and the canon were invented in Russia-Horde = Scythia = China in the XIV century. This added even more power to the Cossack = Israel troops. The Horde corps (the Biblical tribes) for a long time achieved an overwhelming advantage in the battle fields. The mortar guns, howitzer weapons, arquebuses, blunderbusses, muskets, hand cannons, etc. decimated the

enemy and spread panic. The Russian field artillery batteries spread, together with the troops, all over Europe. That is why all the canons of the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. across the Empire were Hordian. This being said the imperial masters could make them not just in the metropoly – in Russia-Horde, but also 'locally', i.e. in Western Europe, Asia, Africa, America, etc.

After the collapse of the Empire all of this Horde weaponry was seized by the rebels of the epoch of the Reformation and proudly (though erroneously) declared to be 'their own invention'. Thus, in particular, there emerged (on paper) the genius 'Western European Berthold Schwartz' – the phantom reflection of St.Sergii Radonezhsky (Bartholomew) [ShAKh]. Today in many museums of Eurasia there are exhibited the old firearms of the epoch of the XIV-XVI cc. declaring the canons to be 'locally-made' or 'of local invention'. Having forgotten that some time ago (though not that long ago) these canons were a part of the Horde Cossack armies which were stationed all over Eurasia and America and under the control of the central command. We will repeat, that at the same time many imperial weapons were in fact manufactured 'on site', i.e. where the Cossack troops were stationed. In this sense they can be called the 'locally-made weaponry'.

Later on the information about the Horde canons 'multiplied' under the quills of the chroniclers and were partially cast back into the remote past. These phantoms were called by the historians, for instance, 'the Greek fire'. In fact it was 'the Christian fire'. I.e. the weaponry created by the Apostolic Christians.

The first firearms were made from wood [KR]. This great invention by Sergii Radonezhsky was handed to Prince Dmitry Donskoy, i.e. the 'classic' emperor Constantine the Great, before the Battle of Kulikovo. In [ZA], ch.3 we cite a vivid description of a canon by 'classic' Thucydides which today is considered by the historians some mysterious 'liquid fire', erupting from a wooden barrel (allegedly in the V century BC).

Best of all the historians like to discuss the mysterious 'ancient Greek fire', forgetting the true past of the XIV-XVI cc. The old chroniclers fascinated and daunted by the canons by often missed the point (which in the beginning was strictly confidential). That is why the 'classical authors' coloured the reality with bright fantasies: fire breathing dragons, flying fiery snakes, etc. The modern historians do their best to interpret these 'visions' and give them some common sense, but are afraid to pronounce a word 'canon', categorically banned by the Scaligerian chronology in regards to 'antiquity'.

With the collapse of the 'Mongol' Empire the Horde workshops were destroyed during the rebellion of the Reformation in its former provinces and the art of producing good quality canons was lost for some time. Many Horde-Imperial weapons were destroyed during the rebellion. Europe was engulfed in the flames of the bloody feuds. The Horde = Israel artillery production was in ruins. All this led to the return of the wooden canons in some areas. The weapons were also made in haste out of different kinds of materials, depending on what was available. The rebels fiercely shredded to pieces the legacy of the Horde Empire. Everyone desperately needed the canons.

In the XVII century the Russian artillery pool was badly damaged. Very little is left. But even that which survives is impressive. We recommend visiting the interesting Museum of Artillery in St. Petersburg, where in particular the old Russian weaponry is exhibited.

To conclude, when analysing the history of firearms, it becomes clear that it is waste of some contemporary publication (like the fundamental and interesting book by U.Karman [336]) to tendentiously allocate just several patronizing paragraphs to the Russian artillery, giving the main attention to the Western-European armament. In fact the picture was the opposite. The centre of the canon production was in Russia-Horde.

## **9. THE ASTRONOMIC DATING OF THE NEW CHRONOLOGY.**

1. (1821) The HOROSCOPE in the 'ancient' Iranian Epos Shahnameh dating to the reign of Shah Kay-Khosrow, allegedly 'classical antiquity'. The horoscope has four solutions, but the following date fits the best:

17-19 April according to Julian calendar (Old style) 1821 [ShAKh], ch.5.

2. (1841) THE ZODIAC OF BRUGSCH, a horoscope 'without the staffs', BR2. It is depicted on the inside of the wooden coffin-lid. 'Ancient' Egypt, allegedly 'classical antiquity'. In fact: 6-7 October according to Julian calendar (Old Style calendar) 1841 [NKhE].

3. (1853) THE ZODIAC OF BRUGSCH, a horoscope 'in boats', BR3. It is depicted on the inside of the wooden coffin-lid. 'Ancient' Egypt, allegedly 'classical antiquity'. In fact: 15 February according to Julian calendar (Old Style) 1853 [NKhE].

4. (1861) THE ZODIAC OF BRUGSCH, a horoscope of the demotic scriptures, BR1. It is depicted on the inside of the wooden coffin-lid. 'Ancient' Egypt, allegedly 'classical antiquity'. In fact: 18 November according to Gregorian calendar (New

Style) 1861 or 17 November according to Gregorian calendar (New Style) 1682 [NKhE].

To conclude, we completed a brief overview of the reconstruction. Finally we would like to repeat an important thought which we began this book with and which lies in the basis of our research: 'THE TRUTH CAN BE COMPUTED'.