CHAPTER 21

Ecclesiastical history

1. HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

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

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

Thus, according to our reconstruction, the epoch of the XV-XVI century marks the schism of the formerly united Christian church into three branches – Orthodox Christianity, Catholicism and Judaism. Islam became independent from the Orthodox tradition even later – in the XVI-XVII century. Therefore, the mediaeval Western Sources that tell us about "Muslims", "Agarians" and "Saracens" are often referring to the Orthodox Christians – Russians in particular, since Islam and Orthodox Christianity had still been a single religion.

2. CHRIST FROM ANTIOCHIA

Here's a fragment from a modern textbook on history: "Christopher, Patriarch of Antiochia, baptised Isa at birth, was killed in Antiochia, during an anti-Byzantine uprising, on 22 May 967 A.D." ([465], page 196). He was run through by a spear, likewise Christ, which is emphasised in a number of chronicles. Bear in mind that the spear that pierced the body of Christ on the cross was believed to be kept in Antiochia by the crusaders of the First Crusade.

Isa Christopher is very obviously a version of the name Jesus Christ. We shall obviously find no Evangelical accounts of crucifixion and resurrection in the biography of Isa Christopher, otherwise more recent editors and chronologists would instantly recognise him as Christ and date the events in question to the I century A.D. Nevertheless, many details of the Evangelical account are present here as well – for instance,

the solar eclipse, which is presumed to have accompanied the crucifixion of Christ, according to the Gospels and a number of other ecclesiastical texts. A very fitting total eclipse of the sun is mentioned in the Byzantine chronicle under 968 – very close to the murder of Christopher ([465], page 187, Comment 72). We must emphasise that a total eclipse on the sun observable from a single populated location is a very rare event.

Moreover, as was the case with Christ, the "Christopher eclipse" was accompanied by a powerful earthquake and a rain that many believed to herald a new deluge: "A strange rain, which had made the Byzantines afraid that it might herald a new deluge, fell on 5 June 968" ([465], page 186, Comment 57; also page 39). The murder of Christopher was followed by a three-year siege of Antiochia by the Romean, or Byzantine, troops of Emperor Nicephorus (Victorious) Phocas. After the conquest of the city, a large number of holy objects were found there, all of them associated with Christ ([465], pages 41 and 46). Leo Deacon, the Byzantine historian, tells us explicitly that Emperor Nicephorus had launched a military campaign to Palestine ([465], page 40). It is hard not to recognize this campaign as the one launched to Palestine by Emperor Tiberius right after the Crucifixion, which is recorded in a number of mediaeval ecclesiastical chronicles considered apocryphal today (see the "Letter of Pilate to Tiberius" in the "Passions of Christ", for instance).

Let us quote the comment of a modern historian that concerns the data about the Palestinian campaign of Nicephorus: "The troops of Nicephorus never reached Palestine; it might be mentioned in order to make the campaigns attain religious symbolism… Although the ideas of crusades weren't all that popular in Byzantium, Nicephorus, for one, was affected by them greatly – a long time before the Western crusaders" ([465], page 186, comment 63).

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

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

The Scaligerian version of chronology dates the tale of Christopher to the end of the X century. However, there is a shift of 100 years inherent in the Byzantine chronology of Scaliger, which makes many of the events that predate the XI century in Byzantine history reflections of events that took place a century later. This is why the story of Christ needs to be transposed 100 years forward, which shall place it in the 1060's, which is the very epoch of Christ, according to our reconstruction.

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

Antiochia is presumed to have been captured by the Western European crusaders exclusively, without the participation of the Romean (or "Byzantine") troops. However, there are historical records of the city of Tyre, which is right next to Antiochia, taken by Egyptian troops in 1094, also after a 3-year siege: "In 1094, the Fatymid army [Fatymids is the name that historians use for the dynasty that presumably ruled in Alexandria during that epoch; in reality, the army in question belonged to the Romean, or Roman Emperors, also known as Pharaohs – Auth.] marched

to the North, laying this seaport [Tyre – Auth.] under siege and taking it by storm 3 years later, looting the city utterly" ([287], page 34). Let us also recollect the fact that "Tyre" translates as "Czar", or "Czar-Grad"; therefore, Tyre had been a capital city, likewise Antiochia. Most probably, Antiochia and Tyre are but two different names of a single city – for example, Constantinople had also been known as Czar-Grad.

Most likely, the conquest of Constantinople in 1098 and the conquest of Tyre by the Egyptians in 1094 is the very same event dating to the epoch of the First Crusade.

3. REPORTS OF THE XI CENTURY EVENTS AS ENCOUNTERED IN THE RUSSIAN CHRONICLES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

However, if Deacon is referring to Jesus Christ, it is easy enough to understand what Deacon means – he alludes to the Second Coming in the usual mediaeval style.

4. ORIENTAL VERSIONS OF CHRISTIANITY

According to our reconstruction, Christianity came to India, China and Japan during the Great = "Mongolian" conquest of the XIV-XV century. A propos, we have a few phonetic similarities here - Krishna and Christ, Delhi and Delphi etc.

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

The lifetime of the first Buddha, or the Indian

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The theory of metempsychosis was considered heretical; it was presumed to have originated in Greece and ascribed to Pythagoras. For instance, the oeuvre entitled "A Brief Revision of All Heresies by St. Epiphanos, Bishop of Crete", which had even been included in the main ecclesiastical almanacs, mentions metempsychosis in the very beginning:

"The Pythagoreans, also known as the Peripathetics, reject the unity and the will of the Lord, and also forbid sacrifices to the gods. Pythagoras had preached that no living being could be eaten, and that one also needed to abstain from alcohol … [unclear place]… Pythagoras had also taught that the souls incarnated into the bodies of other living beings after leaving the dying bodies" ([430]).

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

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

1) Barbarism, or no religion tradition.
2) Scythian Heresy – worship of the ancestral and animistic spirits.
3) Hellenistic Heresy – polytheism.
4) Judaism – denial of the new Testament.

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

5.
THE CREATION OF THE BIBLICAL CANON AND ITS CHRONOLOGY

5.1. The esoteric history of the Biblical canons

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

One of the main results of the statistical chronology (as related by A. T. Fomenko in CHRON1 and CHRON2) claims that the Old and the New Testament of the Bible refer to the same epoch chronologically. The two testaments reflect the two traditions that had coexisted and developed side by side. Moreover, they had remained the same tradition for a while before becoming split in two.

In CHRON1 and CHRON2 we demonstrate that the historical books of the Old Testament, such as the Books of Judges, Samuel, Kings and Chronicles refer to the European history of the XI-XVI century A.D.

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

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

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

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

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

The famous specialist in ecclesiastical history, A. V. Kartashev, tells us the following: "The Ostrog Bible of 1580-1581 is the first printed Bible in the entire Eastern Orthodox world, just as the first handwritten Bible in Russia had been the one … compiled in 1490 by Gennadiy, the Archbishop of Novgorod" ([372], Volume 1, page 600).

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

The few manuscripts of the Bible that are dated to the epochs that precede the Trident Council were only found in the XIX-XX century. Their datings are pure propaganda and have nothing to do with reality (see CHRON6 for more details).

The editing of the Old Testament in order to make it closer to the Hebraic interpretation in the modern sense of the word continued well into the XIX century (see more on this in comments to [845]). A comparison of the Biblical texts of the XVI-XVII century to the modern Bible reveal the emphasis of the edi-

tors: in the Book of Psalms "Christ" is replaced by the "Anointed One", a "bishop" becomes a "man of power", an "altar", a "davir" and so on. The editors were obviously removing Christian symbolism and terminology from the Old Testament.

As an example, let us compare the respective fragments that refer to the decorations of the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem after the text of the Ostrog Bible, published by Ivan Fyodorov at the very end of the XVI century ([621]) and the modern Synodal translation. We see that the description given by the Ostrog Bible could also refer to the decorations of an orthodox Christian church. We see references to an altar, which is separated from the rest of the temple by a wall, also known as the iconostasis, the text describes a "*kiot*", or the place where the most revered icons are kept in Orthodox temples. The temple itself is called a church. The authors of the Synodal translation have tried their best in order to make the description of Solomon's temple resemble a Christian church as little as humanly possible. In general, the texts of both Bibles contain significant discrepancies. The fact that the more recent edition is also the most tendentious is perfectly obvious. See more about the editing of the Bible in the XVI-XVII century in CHRON6.

5.2. Evangelical events reflected in the Old Testament

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

5.2.1. The Nicaean Council in the Old Testament

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

a. The Bible.
■ *b. The Middle Ages.*

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

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

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

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

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

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

dispute between the Orthodox Church and the Judaists.

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

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

5.2.2. Christ and Elisha

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

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

"And it came to pass, as they were burying a man, that, behold, they spied a band of men; and they cast the man into the sepulchre of Elisha: and when the man was let down, and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived, and stood up on his feet" (II Kings 13:21). This is the transformation of the famous Christian story of Christ rising from the dead, which has transformed into a bizarre tail of how somebody has risen from the sepulchre of Elisha. The character in question is most likely to identify as Jesus Christ.

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

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

The possibility of Elisha and Christ identifying as the same person was also pointed out by N. A. Morozov in [544].