

approximately). This means that the now accepted Scaliger's chronology based on non-critical usage of sources and requires an accurate examination by the methods of modern science. This work has been done by A. T. Fomenko, who constructed the "optimal statistical chronology" of the ancient and medieval world. The present work confirms the conclusions of A. T. Fomenko [21], [318].

*2.4. Dates for the First Easter from the reduced set of the First Easter conditions.* Let us look more closely at the First Easter conditions (1)–(4). They are not all equivalent. The conditions (3) and (4) are known from many sources and constitute a stable tradition (see quotations, for example, in [335]). The conditions (1) and (2) look like specific calendar instructions. What can we obtain if we try to satisfy only the conditions (3) and (4)?

*Statement 4. The First Easter conditions (3) and (4) are satisfied only in the following years in the interval 100 B.C.–1700 A.D.:*

- 1) 43 B.C.,
- 2) 53 A.D.,
- 3) 137 A.D.,
- 4) 479 A.D.,
- 5) 574 A.D.,
- 6) 658 A.D.,
- 7) 753 A.D.,
- 8) 848 A.D.,
- 9) 1095 A.D. (satisfies the entire set of conditions (1)–(4)),
- 10) 1190 A.D.

One can easily see that this list contains no solution satisfying the chronologists of the Scaliger school. Thus, we can make the following conclusion.

The popular legend (tradition), clearly reflected in the Gospel according to St. John (the first three Gospels in the New Testament mention the First Easter conditions quite vaguely; the Gospel according to St. John does not admit different interpretations) and in the works of numerous ecclesiastical writers, can not be conformed with the date of the birth of Christ near 1 A.D. In order to obtain such a concordance, it is necessary to move the date of the birth of Christ back by not less than 70 years or forward by not less than 20 years.

*2.5. On the lifetime of Dionysius Exiguus.* It is supposed that Dionysius the Little have lived in the 6th century and made his calculations in the following way:

"There exists a conjecture [173] that Dionysius, as he composed his era, took into account the legend that Christ had died in the 31st year of his life and was resurrected on March 25 ... The year 279 of the Diocletian era (563 A.D.) was the nearest when, according to Dionysius, the Easter fell on March 25 again. Comparing his calculations with the New Testament, Dionysius could suggest that ... the First Easter had been celebrated 532 years before the year 279 of the Diocletian era ... that is, that the year 279 of the Diocletian era is the same as the year 563 from the birth of Christ" [335, p. 242].

Dionysius supposedly conducted all these arguments and calculations working with the Easter Book. Having discovered that in the contemporary year 563 (the year 279 of the Diocletian era) the First Easter conditions held, he made a 532-year shift back (the duration of the great indiction, the shift after which the Easter Book entirely recurs) and got the date for the First Easter. But he did not know