Furthermore, the “Scaligerian textbook” E presents the dynasties of Byzantium beginning from allegedly 330 A.D., the list of which is omitted here. Let us recall that epochs designated in fig. 6.55 with identical symbols are duplicates, consisting of “the same events”. For example, this is relevant for the following famous wars:

1) The Trojan war of the alleged XIII century B.C.
2) The war against the Tarquinians in Rome allegedly of VI century B.C.
3) The civil war between Sulla, Pompey and Julius Caesar in Italy in the alleged I century B.C.
4) The civil war of the alleged III century A.D. in Rome.
5) The Gothic war of the middle of the alleged VI century A.D. in Italy.
6) The civil war of allegedly 901-924 A.D. in Rome.
7) The civil war of allegedly 931-954 A.D. in Rome.
8) The war in the beginning of the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century A.D.
9) The war in Europe and, in particular, in Italy of the middle of the XIII century A.D. Seizure of Constantinople, the fall of the Hohenstaufens, establishment of the House of Anjou.
This last war of the XIII century a.d. is probably the mediaeval original of all other “ancient” wars noted in the Scaligerian chronicle E with the conditional symbol \( T \) in fig. 6.55. Let us present a curious table we composed using our methods. It lists the main characters of the indicated nine duplicate wars superposed over one other.

In other words, all the characters indicated in the table with the letter “a” are each other’s duplicates.

Likewise, all the characters marked in the table with the letter “b” are also duplicates.

All the characters of the series “c” are duplicates as well, or the phantom reflections of the same mediaeval character.

Finally, all the characters indicated with the letter “d” appear to be duplicates as well.

The details of identification of these “ancient” and mediaeval characters and their form-codes are related in the following chapters and in Chron2.

1. The Trojan war of the alleged XIII century b.c.
   - 1-a. Odysseus = Ulysses or Ulysses, possibly a.k.a. Achilles.
   - 1-b. Agamemnon.
   - ••• 1-c. Achilles.
   - •••• 1-d. Patroclus.

2. The Tarquinian war of the alleged VI century b.c. in Rome.
   - 2-a. Lartius + Martius Coriolanus.
   - ••• 2-b. Tarquin the Proud.
   - •••• 2-c. Valerius.
   - ••••• 2-d. Junius, son of Marcus Brutus.

3. The Civil war of the alleged I century b.c. in Rome.
   - 3-a. Lucius Sulla and Cicero(n) (NRCC, if read in reverse).
   - ••• 3-b. Pompey the Great.
   - •••• 3-c. Julius Caesar.
   - ••••• 3-d. Marcus Brutus.

4. The civil war in Rome of the alleged III century a.d.
   - 4-a. Lucius Aurelianus.
   - ••• 4-b. Diocletian the Great.
   - •••• 4-c. Constantius Chlorus.
   - ••••• 4-d. ?

5. The Gothic war of the alleged VI century a.d. in Rome.
   - ••••• 5-b. Justinian and Theodora.
   - ••••• 5-c. Velizarius.
   - •••••• 5-d. John II.

6. The civil war in Rome, allegedly in 901-924 a.d.
   - ••••••• 6-a. Alberic I (?) and Marocius (?) .
   - ••••••• 6-b. Theophilactus and Theodora I.
   - ••••••• 6-c. Alberic I.
   - ••••••••• 6-d. John X.

7. The civil war in Rome allegedly in 931-954 a.d.
   - ••••••••• 7-a. ?
   - ••••••••• 7-b. Hugo and Theodora II.
   - ••••••••• 7-c. Alberic II.
   - •••••••••••• 7-d. John XI.

8. The beginning of the Holy Roman Empire of German nation of the X-XIII century a.d.
   - ••••••••••••• 8-b. Otto III.
   - ••••••••••••••••• 8-c. Alberic II.
   - ••••••••••••••••••• 8-d. ?

9. The war in Europe and Italy of the XIII century a.d. The fall of the mediaeval city of Troy in Italy.
   - •••••••••••••• 9-a. Charles of Anjou, NRCC, see below.
   - •••••••••••••• 9-b. Innocent IV.
   - ••••••••••••••••• 9-c. Charles of Anjou (?) .
   - ••••••••••••••••••• 9-d. John XXI.

The same table is conveniently represented in a somewhat different way. We list the four groups of duplicate characters, assigning numbers 1 through 9 to the wars they are described in by the “Scaligerian textbook”. Roughly speaking, each of the four characters was “multiplied” as a result of the chronologists’ errors – but only on the paper! – in approximately nine copies.

- a-1. Odysseus = Ulysses or Ulysses, possibly a.k.a. Achilles.
- ••• a-2. Lartius + Martius Coriolanus.
- •••• a-3. Lucius Sulla and Cicero(N) (NRCC, if read in reverse).
- ••••• a-4. Lucius Aurelianus.
However, as all these pieces were collated into one diagram, a serious error occurred. The four copies of the same short chronicle $S_1$ or $S_0$ (q.v. above) actually describing the same history of Europe and Mediterranean, were perceived as different chronicles describing different events. Because of this, four almost identical chronicles were collated not in parallel as they should have been, but rather in succession, with shifts by 333, 1053, and 1778 years, on the average. As a result, from the “short chronicle” $S$, they obtained the artificial “extended Scaligerian chronicle” $E$. This was actually how the contemporary textbook on the ancient and mediaeval history appeared. We tried to fathom the reasons that could have lead to such confusion and generate such shifts. Since the analysis of this material requires significant historical digressions, we will discuss it in the subsequent volumes of the present edition.

9. IDENTIFICATION OF THE “ANCIENT” BIBLICAL HISTORY WITH THE MEDIAEVAL EUROPEAN HISTORY

The “Scaligerian textbook” features other pieces, differing from the European-Asian chronicle $E$, which contain phantom duplicates and are also a sum, or a collation of several “shifted chronicles”. This, for example, is pertinent to the history described in the Bible. We have already reported many phantom duplicates revealed in the Bible. See the linear chronicle $B$ in fig. 6.55. In the description of this chronicle we intentionally used the same letter symbols as in that of the “European” chronicle $E$. The thing is that the Biblical chronicle $B$ proves to be virtually identical with the part of European chronicle $E$ describing the European-Asian mediaeval history of the XI-XVI century. In a more accurate presentation it looks like this:

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
T & K & T & T & N & T & (\text{the chronicle } B) \\
\hline
R & S & R & P & S & \\
\hline
S & \\
\hline
R & \\
\end{array}
$$

Fig. 6.55 shows the identification of the Biblical chronicle $B$ with the part of the Scaligerian European chronicle $E$ with regard to the time scale.

In our opinion, the discovered decomposition of the “Scaligerian textbook” into a sum of the three indicated shifts is naturally explained by the inevitable process of creating a global chronology and the history of antiquity, which started in late Middle Ages of the XVI-XVII century. Moreover, it was for the first time that the historical material accumulated by that time – separate texts, chronicles, etc. – was put in order.
It is evident that the so-called historical part of the Bible, the Old Testament, is identified with a part of the Scaligerian “European textbook” $E$ in the range from 850 B.C. to 1400 A.D. However, since the Bible appeared to contain many phantom duplicates, then the Old Testament, likewise “Scaliger’s textbook” $E$, can be completely restored from its smaller part — namely, the part to the right of 900 A.D. on the time axis. Furthermore, the entire Old Testament, as well as the entire Bible and the entire “chronicle $E$”, can actually be restored from the part describing the mediæval events of 1000-1600 A.D. Moreover, the New Testament probably describes events occurring in the XI century A.D. in the New Rome, Constantinople.

In particular, the structure of discovered duplicates leads to the conclusion that the epoch of Christ, or the XI century A.D. according to the new chronology, was reflected in the religious history of Italy of the XI century as “the epoch of Pope Gregory Hildebrand”. As we have already noted, the name Hild-Brand could mean Ablaze With Gold. In the Scaligerian interpretation of the world history, it is the epoch of Hildebrand, or Pope Gregory VII, who instigated the era of crusades, is marked by the well-known schism of churches around 1054 A.D., and gives birth to the new reformist “church of Hildebrand” in Europe. However, the actual Pope Gregory Hildebrand should not be thought to have been the Christ of the Gospel. Rather on the contrary, the story about the activity of “Pope Hildebrand” in the Scaligerian version of the history of Italy was only a reflection of the actual Evangelical events of the XI century A.D. — though not in Italy, but most likely in the New Rome, or Constantinople = Jerusalem of that time. For more detail, see CHRON6 and CHRON6.

We discovered the identification of the Biblical chronicle $B$ with a part of the Scaligerian European chronicle $E$ as a result of applying the empirico-statistical procedures as described above. Let us demonstrate this identification on the example of the volume graphs compared with the help of the coefficient $p(X,Y)$. Let us examine the period from 800 B.C. until 1300 A.D. in the Scaligerian history of Italy and Europe as a whole.

We assumed the sum of two fundamental monographs, based on the “ancient” and mediaeval documents streamlined according to the Scaligerian chronology, to be the “chronicle $X$ describing the flow of events in the range from 800 B.C. until 1300 A.D. These are The Description of the Roman History and the Source Study by B. Niese ([579]), and The History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages, a multi-volume work by F. Gregorovius ([196]). In doing so, the book by Niese covers an epoch from allegedly 800 B.C. to 552 A.D., and the book by Gregorovius – 300 A.D. up to 1300 A.D. By joining and collating these two books in their common interval of 300-552 A.D., we obtain the final “chronicle $X$ covering the total of 2100 years, from 800 B.C. to 1300 A.D.

This summary text $X$ contains a fairly detailed chronological scale — of course, a Scaligerian one — which makes it possible to calculate the volume function $\text{vol} X(T)$. For the calculation of the volume function on the overall interval of 300-552 A.D. in which the books by Niese and Gregorovius are identified with each other, we took the arithmetical value of their per annum volumes, so that none of the books would stand out, both being equally correct.

This “chronicle $X$” was then broken up into the separate fragments $X(T)$, which made it possible to plot the volume graph of “chapters” $X(T)$ along the entire 2100 year range from 800 B.C. until 1300 A.D.

Let us now examine the Old Testament in order to plot a volume graph of “chapters” for it and compare this graph to the appropriate graph for the Scaligerian European chronicle $X$. The problem is that the Bible doesn’t contain a detailed enough timescale. However, as we have already mentioned, it is possible to break up the Bible into virtually unambiguous “generation chapters” $B(T)$, where the ordinal number $T$ varies from 1 to 218. Let us examine the first 137 “generation chapters”, from the Genesis up to 2 Kings. As 1-2 Samuel + 1-2 Kings actually duplicate 1-2 Chronicles, then “chapters” 138-167 duplicate “chapters” 98-137, therefore are of no interest to us now. “Chapters” 103-137 are described in 1-2 Samuel + 1-2 Kings with detailed chronological indications, making it possible to quite accurately determine the length of the time interval described therein — 341 year. See a more detailed definition of this interval in [904] and [908]. The same duration of this period is indicated in [72].

For the remaining Biblical generation chapters numbered 1-102, there are no such detailed chronological indications in the Bible. Therefore, to determine the length of time interval described therein, we had
to act without sufficient precision. The analysis of “chapters” 1-102 showed that virtually each of them, while describing events of one generation, connects it with some central character – “ruler”. Duration of his “reign” can be accepted as the “duration of generation”. We have already noted that an average duration of ancient and mediaeval reigns as calculated by us on the basis of chronological tables ([76]), is 17.1 years, or 17 years if rounded.

This average value makes it possible to approximately estimate the period “covered” by 102 Biblical generations: \( \frac{102}{17} = 1734 \).

Thus, the Biblical generation chapters 1-137, or the historical part of the Old Testament minus the books with moralistic content, can be considered to describe a historical period of approximately 2075 years long, since 1734 + 341 = 2075 years. This figure, as we see, appears to be very close to 2100, or the length of the Scaligerian European period as described in “chronicle” X.

Therefore, the epochs of an approximately identical length can assumed to be described in “chronicles” X and the Bible B. That is why, while comparing their volume functions, one can simply identify these time intervals with each other sans compressions or stretches. In other words, both of these “chronicles” can be attributed to the same time scale.

Now let us compare the volume functions \( \text{vol \, X}(T) \) and \( \text{vol \, B}(T) \) calculated for “the Roman chronicle” X and the Bible B. Let us assume the fragmentation of the entire range from 800 B.C. until 1300 A.D. into 19 fragments as the simplest time scale common for both texts. These fragments naturally appear on the time axis if we mark the locations of all duplicates of series \( \{T\} \) that we discovered earlier during the statistical analysis of the Bible. Duplicates of the type \( \{T\} \) are fragments of the Bible, each one covering a relatively small time interval. By indicating them on the time axis we obtain a set of “points \( \{T\} \)”, which can be used as boundaries of 19 fragments. The boundaries of the obtained fragments appear to be approximately set by the following Scaligerian dates:

- 800 B.C., 770, 750, 520, 509, 380, 100 B.C., 14 A.D., 98, 235, 305, 493, 552, 715, 901, 1002, 1054, 1250, 1263, 1300 A.D.

The “points \( \{T\} \)”, or the duplicates of the series \( \{T\} \), divide the Bible – more precisely, the historical part of the Old Testament – into 19 blocks. The volume of each one was calculated.

We have thus obtained an appropriate fragmentation of the sequence of “generation chapters” composing the chronicle B, into the following 19 groups:

1) the period of the alleged years 800-770 B.C. is not described in the Bible;
2) the period of the alleged years 770-750 B.C. corresponds to “generation chapter” number 1;
3) the period of the alleged years 750-520 B.C. corresponds to “chapters” 2-14;
4) the period of the alleged years 520-509 B.C. corresponds to “chapter” 15;
5) the period of the alleged years 509-380 B.C. corresponds to “chapters” 16-23;
6) the period of the alleged years 380-100 B.C. corresponds to “chapters” 24-39;
7) the period the alleged years from 100 B.C. to 14 A.D. corresponds to “chapters” 40-46;
8) the period of the alleged years 14-98 A.D. corresponds to “chapters” 47-50;
9) the period of the alleged years 98-235 A.D. corresponds to “chapters” 51-59;
10) the period of the alleged years 235-305 A.D. corresponds to “chapters” 60-62;
11) the period of the alleged years 305-493 A.D. corresponds to “chapters” 63-73;
12) the period of the alleged years 493-552 A.D. corresponds to “chapters” 74-78;
13) the period of the alleged years 552-715 A.D. corresponds to “chapters” 79-88;
14) the period of the alleged years 715-901 A.D. corresponds to “chapters” 89-97;
15) the period of the alleged years 901-1002 A.D. corresponds to “chapters” 98-102, 141, 142;
16) the period of the alleged years 1002-1054 A.D. corresponds to “chapters” 143-147;
17) the period of the alleged years 1054-1250 A.D. corresponds to “chapters” 148-162;
18) the period of the alleged years 1250-1268 A.D. corresponds to “chapter” 163;
19) the period of the alleged years 1268-1300 A.D. corresponds to “chapters” 164-167.

At the end of the list we made use of the fact that Biblical “chapters” 141-167 duplicate “chapters” 103-137. Thus, we introduced the same time scale in both “chronicles”: \( X = \) the Scaligerian textbook and \( B = \)
the Bible. After this, volumes of fragments describing each of the 19 listed fragments were calculated. The volume of each fragment was averaged, or divided into the length of the described time period measured in generations. For example, the volume of the Biblical generation chapters 2-14, describing the time interval number 1, equals 59 verses. The length of this interval is 13 generations. Consequently, the average value of volume per one generation equals 59/13 = 4.54. See the graphs in fig. 6.59. All local maxima, or the peaks of both volume graphs, are marked in black.

Let us recall that in order to apply the principle of correlation of maxima, we need not worry about the value of the volume function amplitude. Only the peak distribution is of importance – that of the points of local maxima. Therefore, it does not matter in what units the volume should be measured. In the Bible, for example, we measured the volume in verses, while in the books by Niese and Gregorovius – in pages and fractions of a page.

It is amazing that all the peaks, except for one, occur in the same points. It is also important that all the duplicate epochs \( T \) indicated in fig. 6.59 by triangles virtually coincide with the peaks of the non-averaged volume graph for the “chapters” of the Bible, calculated for the “generations” 1-137.

Thus, it is distinctly evident that all the local maxima, except for one, are reached simultaneously, on the same intervals. A vivid correlation of the “Biblical local maxima” and the “Roman local maxima” is available. See its quantitative expression below. Consequently, the two texts we compare – namely, the “chapters” 1-137 of the Bible and the “Roman chronicle” \( X \) – are dependent. This, as we already know, can indicate the description of virtually the same flow of events therein.

It is noteworthy that all the duplicate repetitions of series \( \{T\} \) indicated by triangles in fig. 6.59 virtually coincide with the local maxima points of the non-averaged volume function of the Bible, calculated for generation chapters 1-137. In particular, we discover that all the duplicates of series \( \{T\} \) stand out against an overall background of the Biblical “generation chapters”, at least because they cause explicit local jumps and splashes of the volume function.
Following the procedure of local maxima makes it possible to estimate the quantitative proximity of these two series of local maxima points: the “Biblical” and the “Roman”. Let us calculate the lengths of segments into which the sequence of numbers 1, 2, …, 19 is divided by these points. We will obtain the two following vectors \( a(X) \) and \( a(B) \). Namely,

\[ a(X) = (1, 2, 3, 2, 3, 3, 1), \quad a(B) = (1, 2, 4, 2, 2, 3, 3, 1). \]

The calculation returns \( \rho(X, B) = 1.4 \times 10^{-4} \), which indicates the dependence between “chapters” 1-137 of the Bible and the “Roman chronicle” \( X \) for the number of local maxima equaling 8. Let us note that for non-coincident vectors of local maxima in a discrete, integer model, q.v. above, the proximity of vectors we discovered is virtually ideal. The only divergence occurring here is by one unit in two coordinates.

As we will see below, this statistical identification of allegedly ancient “historical part” of the Bible with European-Asian history of the Middle Ages is confirmed by the results of other independent procedures.

Let us explain now why, in reference to the discovered identification of the Biblical history with the Eurasian history of the III-XVI century A.D., we speak about the latter as a partially phantom history. As we have seen, our methods commanded a further shift of Scaliger’s entire Biblical history by at least 1800 years forwards. Moreover, the initial events described in the Bible supposedly occur in the III-IV century A.D., while all of the more recent Biblical events develop until the XV-XVI century A.D. However, this result is far from being final. The point is that the Eurasian history of the III-XI century A.D. is also a phantom in itself, composed of reflection duplicates of the original events from the epoch of the XI-XVII century A.D. As we shall see below, the original events are mostly located between the XIII-XVII century A.D. Furthermore, we revealed many other phantom duplicates in the Bible. That is why the Biblical chronology should be substantially truncated, after which it should fit into the range of the XI-XVI century A.D. perfectly.

Below we will describe the further development of the empirico-statistical methods, based on the principle of frequency damping.

Thus, the maxima correlation principle leads to the conclusion that the “Roman chronicle” \( X \) and the Bible \( B \) apparently describe the same events. This certainly does contradict the established viewpoint on the content of these “chronicles” and the corresponding historical epochs.

The appearing mutual identification of the described historical events in the Scaligerian “chronicle” \( X \) and in the Old Testament \( B \) means, in particular, the identification of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, described in the Biblical 1-2 Samuel + 1-2 Kings and 1-2 Chronicles, with the part of the Holy Roman Empire of the alleged years 962-1300 A.D. It agrees with the independent identification obtained earlier on the basis of independent procedure of duplicate dynasty detection. These dynasties are identified with each other as a result of the coefficient \( c(a, b) \) being anomalously infinitesimal, which indicates a dependence between dynasties. Let us recall again that all the chronological results obtained by the methods described concur with each other well, which is a serious argument in favour of the objectivity of the duplicate system discovered.

The identification of the Biblical events with the events of the European (Italo-German) and Eastern-European history reveals the following identifications in particular. The famous events from the reign of the Biblical king Sedekiah, the wars against the pharaoh and against Nebuchadnezzar, the collapse of the Kingdom of Judah, the seizure of Jerusalem and the Babylonian captivity, are superposed over the events of the end of the XIII century A.D. in Italy. Namely, the war in Italy, the seizure of Rome, the transfer of the pontificate from Rome to the city of Avignon in France, the complete subordination of the Papacy to the French crown, or the so-called “captivity of the Papacy”. The 70-year Babylonian captivity in the Bible is a reflection of the well-known 70-year Avignon captivity of Popes in 1305-1376 A.D. ([76]). Further Biblical events described in the books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther, such as the return to Jerusalem and “the restoration of the temple”, – are partial reflections of the corresponding events in Byzantium and Italy in 1376-1410 A.D.: the “return” of the Papal throne to Rome, and certain other major events from the Russian history, or that of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XV-XVI century A.D. See CHRON 6.

For the convenience of comparing the Biblical and the European events, we shall present an interpretation of the letter symbols of the “chronicle” \( B = \) the
Bible, indicating the backbone of a relevant Biblical legend for each letter.

In this way, the chronicle B, i.e., the Old Testament in the Bible =

Duplicate T = the legend about Adam and Eve.

Duplicate K = Cain and Abel, Enosh, Irad, Mehujael, Methuselah, Lamech, Seth, Enosh, Cainan, Mahalalel, Jared.

Duplicate T = Noah, “the Flood”, the death and the revival of the humanity.

Duplicate N = Shem, Ham, Japheth, “sons of Japheth”.

Duplicate T = “the Tower of Babel”, scattering of peoples.


Duplicate T = Abraham, Sarah, the “struggle” against the pharaoh.

Duplicate K = Abraham, Aran, the division into two kingdoms, main Biblical patriarchs – Isaac, Isav, Jacob, Judas, Joseph.

Duplicate T = the history of Joseph in Egypt, serving the pharaoh, the “legend of a wife”.

Duplicate T = Moses, the war against the pharaoh, the Exodus, creation of the laws of Moses.

Duplicate N/P/R = the death of Moses, Joshua son of Nun, war and the conquest of “the promised land”, as well as the story of “the judges”.

Duplicate T = the sons of Benjamin, the war.

Duplicate T = Ruth, Saul, Samuel, David.

The Original and Duplicate (K, R, P) = kingdoms of Israel and Judah.

The Original and Duplicate T = the wars against the pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar, the fall of the kingdom of Judah, the beginning of the Babylonian captivity (the analogue of the well-known “Avignon captivity of Popes”), the destruction of Jerusalem.

The Original and the Duplicate (S, N) = the Babylonian captivity, the return from the 70 year captivity, the new “foundation of the temple” and the restoration of Jerusalem.

To identify these events with their European counterparts, one should turn to fig. 6.55, fig. 6.56, fig. 6.57, fig. 6.58 on which the chronicle B, or the Biblical Old Testament, is depicted on the top, and compare its symbols with the content of appropriate “European symbols”.

10. OUR HYPOTHESIS: HISTORY AS DESCRIBED IN SURVIVING CHRONICLES ONLY BEGINS IN CA. THE X CENTURY A.D.

We know nothing of the events that took place before the X century A.D.

Let us summarize somewhat. The disintegration of the global chronological map – i.e. the “Scaligerian textbook” of ancient history – that we discovered leads to a very important assertion. Namely, nearly the entire part of the Scaligerian textbook preceding 900 or 1000 A.D. consists of phantom duplicates. Their mediaeval originals are in the time interval of 900-1600 A.D. In particular, each event described by the Scaligerian textbook preceding 900 A.D. is a sum of several (mostly, two, three, four) later mediaeval events. In order to determine the exact years of those events, we need to draw a vertical segment on the global chronological map and mark the events that it would intercept on four chronicle lines S₁, S₂, S₃, S₄.

In other words, the Scaligerian textbook is a stratified chronicle pasting together four virtually identical pieces shifted in relation to one another.

The “Scaligerian textbook” contains no unexpected duplicates starting with the XVI century A.D. and later. Certain phantom duplicates do exist in the time interval between 900 and 1300 A.D., such as the module S, q.v. in fig. 6.55. Its mediaeval original, namely, the Empire of Habsburgs (Nov-Gorod?), supercedes 1300 A.D. In particular, the part of the Scaligerian textbook describing the period between 1000-1300 A.D., is a “sum”, or a collation of two chronicles: a certain actual chronicle describing real events of 1000-1300 A.D. (that chronicle must have been fairly scanty), and an actual chronicle describing the events of the Habsburg epoch of 1300-1600.

In general, the outline for the global chronology of Europe was created in the XVI-XVII century, in the works of J. Scaliger and D. Petavius. It is here that the last period S ends, having gone back in time due to chronological errors and spanning the phantom “ancient” duplicates – this is very important. See letters S on the Scaligerian chronological map, fig. 6.55, fig. 6.56, fig. 6.57 and fig. 6.58. We shall reiterate that the entire Scaligerian chronological map is actually a stratified document. Many events considered “antique”
nowadays are actually made up of certain later medi-
aeval events described in the descended chronicles $S_2$, $S_3$, $S_4$ identified with the chronicle $S_1$. The application
of our empirico-statistical methods to the period of
1600-2000 a.D. has detected no phantom duplicates,
which proves the chronological outline of 1600-2000
to be reliable as a whole. The “Scaligerian textbook”
originated from a shorter chronicle $S_0$ as a result of
chronological errors that we refer to later, as well as,
apparently, intentional distortions of the mediaeval
history. See Chron5, Chron6, Chron7.

The effect that we discovered might possibly be ex-
plained in two ways. One is that all reiterated paral-
leisms we found are sets of accidents. From this “ac-
cidental” stance, we can estimate the probability of all
the coincidences that we discover. This is what we
have done on the basis of statistical methods. The
probability thereof turned out to be fairly small,
which allows us to put forth the hypothesis that all
repeating coincidences that we have discovered are by
no means accidental.

This brings us to the second explanation we be-
lieve to deserve a closer study. The discovered disin-
tegration of the Scaligerian textbook into the sum of
four short chronicles is not accidental at all. Quite the
opposite, we have come across traces of a fairly de-
liberate creation of artificially elongated “history”,
which the chronologists of the XVI-XVII century
were actively involved in.

The division of the Scaligerian “history textbook”
into four short chronicles gives us a preliminary an-
ter to the two following fundamental questions:
1) what was the actual history like?
and
2) how and why did it give birth to the “Scaligerian
textbook”?

Apparently, actual history, – that is, the history de-
scribed in written sources that have reached to our
time, – begins from ca. the X-XI century a.D. and on.
Facts preceding the X century are fairly scanty, lo-
cated between 300-1000 a.D. Virtually all epochs
placed by the Scaligerian textbook before the X cen-
tury a.D. are various phantom reflections of the events
of the X-XVI century a.D. The Biblical story – that
is, all the events of both the Old and the New Testa-
ment – fits into the interval between the X century
a.D. and XVI century a.D.

11. AUTHENTIC HISTORY ONLY BEGINS
IN XVII CENTURY A.D.

The history of the XI-XVI century is largely
distorted. Many dates of the XI-XVI century
require correction

The chronological outline, q.v. in fig. 6.55, leads to
the need for “shifting” certain events of the X-XIII cen-
tury forwards by approximately 330 or 360 years, since
these could be the events of the Habsburg epoch of the
XIV-XVII century. Furthermore, fig. 6.55 proves that
the Scaligerian datings can be relied upon from the
beginning of the XVII (seventeenth!) century a.D. only.
The history of the XIV-XVI century is largely distorted.
The alteration of dates might not be as considerable
as in the earlier epochs; however, the Scaligerian school
introduced major distortions into the interpretation of
many important events of the XIV-XVI century. We
shall describe them in Chron5, Chron6, Chron7.

Finally, the actual count of “years of our time” start-
ing from 1053 a.D., and not from the “rounded date
of 1000 a.D.”, might add at least 50 years to the dates
of books considered published in the XV-XVI century.
The same applies to the dates of life of kings, military
commanders, writers, poets, painters and sculptors
who had lived in the XIV-XVI century. Many of them
may have lived 50 years closer to our time.

12. THE RADICAL DISTINCTION OF OUR
CHRONOLOGICAL CONCEPT FROM
THE VERSION OF N. A. MOROZOV

Our concept as stated above is approximately as dif-
ferent from the version of N. A. Morozov as his con-
cept is from that of Scaliger. For example, according
to N. A. Morozov, the main Biblical events took place
in the III-V century a.D., which is about one thousand
years later than the Scaligerian dating. The results of
our methods place these events in the XI-XVI century
a.D., which is about a millennium later than N. A.
Morozov presumed.

We shall conclude by an example of how the sys-
tem of three chronological shifts that the author of
this work discovered helps resolve certain historical
mysteries. We shall remind that the Almagest ex-
Explicitly refers to the observations made at the time of Antoninus Pius, the emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. Contemporary historians consider this emperor to be an “ancient” one, who is supposed to have reigned in the II century A.D. At the same time, the astronomical facts in the *Almagest* explicitly refer to the XI-XVI century A.D., as well as the completion dates of the *Almagest*, q.v. in CHRON3. There is no contradiction, though. Let us turn to the chronological map in fig. 6.55. If the total shift is $1053 + 333 = 1386$, then the “ancient” emperor Antoninus Pius appears exactly in the XVI century, superposed on the period of 1524-1547 A.D. We shall remind the reader that the Scaligerian dating of the reign of emperor Pius is 138-161 A.D. ([76]).

It is very interesting that the “ancient” Antoninus Pius is superposed precisely over the epoch of the first editions of the *Almagest*. The first Latin edition took place in 1537, the Greek one – in 1538, the “transla-
tion” of the Trapezund one – in 1528, and so on, all this during the reign of “Antoninus Pius” as named in the *Almagest*. The author of the Latin edition deceived no one by inserting the name of the ruler in whose time the observations were made into the text.

We have a marvellous opportunity to verify this result in another independent way. Since the Second Roman Empire of the alleged I-III century A.D. identifies with the Empire of the alleged X-XIII century, and the Empire of the Habsburgs, q.v. above, we can try and directly identify the emperor of the Habsburg (Novgorod?) epoch with the name of Pius. The epoch immediately preceding the first publications of the *Almagest* – the beginning of XVI century, – is covered by the famous emperor Maximilian I, 1493-1519. It must have been in his time that the astronomical observations were carried out, provided the book was published right after its completion. The full name of this emperor turns out to comprise the following formula-
tion: Maximilian Kaiser *Pius* Augustus. See the engraving by A. Dürer, fig. 6.60. A slightly different version of the same print by A. Dürer is shown on fig. 6.61.

Thus, we can see a good concurrence between various methods.

Similarly, in the wake of chronological shifts stated above the epoch of the “ancient” Alberti and mediæval Vitruvius identify with each other perfectly.


#### 13.1. Chronological shift of a thousand years as the consequence of the fallacious dating of Jesus Christ’s life

The chronological shifts that we discovered could be explained by mistakes made by mediaeval chronologists of the XVI-XVII century a.d. in their dating of the mediaeval events. The first cause for the mistakes was the imperfect recording of dates in the Middle Ages. A serious mistake the mediaeval chronologists made was the erroneous dating of the Nativity or the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ. They made, give or take a little, a mistake of one thousand years, shifting the life of Jesus Christ from the XI century a.d. into the I century a.d. According to fig. 6.55, “the beginning of the new era” actually occurs in 1053 a.d. This millenarian shift generated a major confusion in the dating of many other documents which counted years “since the Nativity of Jesus Christ”. As a result, mediaeval events of the X-XVII century a.d. as described in those chronicles were erroneously dated and slid one thousand years backwards. Just how could such a major dating error happen?

We shall formulate a hypothesis which can explain the cause for the appearance of certain chronological shifts. Our idea can be encapsulated as follows.

1) Initially, dates were recorded as certain verbal phrases and formulations, which were later abbreviated.

2) Initial meanings of abbreviations were then forgotten.

3) Later chronologists suggested that these letters be regarded not as abbreviations of certain names, but as notations of numerals. May we remind that letters used to stand for figures as well.

4) Substituting letters for digits (by standard rules), chronologists would obtain erroneous “datings”, fundamentally different from the original.

5) Since there were many abbreviated formulations, a number of chronological shifts appeared.

6) Each wrong decryption would generate a chronological shift of its own.

The following example illustrates this idea fairly well.

#### 13.2. The letter “X” formerly denoted the name of Christ, but was later proclaimed to stand for the figure of ten. The letter “I” formerly denoted the name of Jesus, but was later proclaimed to be the indication of one thousand

One of the main chronological shifts by 1053 years, or by about 1000 years, could have risen from the comparison of the two different methods of recording dates by the later chronologists.

The first method: abbreviated form of recording. For instance, “the III century since Christ” could be recorded briefly as “X.III”, “X” being the first letter of the Greek word XPICTOC (Christ). The letter “X” is one of the prevalent mediaeval anagrams for the name of Christ. Thus, the phrase “Christ’s Ist century”, when abbreviated, could read as “X.I”, the phrase “Christ’s IInd century” could read as “X.II”, and so on. These abbreviations may possibly have caused the appearance of the contemporary designation of centuries. However, as of a certain later time the mediaeval chronologists suggested that the letter “X” in the beginning of a date should be regarded as the figure of “ten”. Such interpretation automatically adds a thousand years to the initial date. Thus, an erroneous date appears, a thousand years more ancient than the real one.

This hypothesis of ours concurs well with the famous fact that the mediaeval “Italians designated centuries by hundreds: trecento (or the 300’s) – the XIV century, quattrocento (or the 400’s) – the XV century, cinquecento (or the 500’s) – the XVI century” ([242], page 25). However, these names of centuries point directly at the beginning of count from exactly the XI century a.d., because they ignore the currently accepted addition of an “extra millennium”. Hence, the medi-
aeval Italians appear to know nothing about this millennium. As we now understand, there was a very simple reason for it – this “extra thousand years” has never existed.

Facing this effect of “ignoring the extra millennium”, contemporary historians usually avoid explaining it. At best, they simply note the fact itself, occasionally referring to it as a “convenient tool”. They say dates were easier to write this way. They say, “In the XV-XVI century dating, hundreds and even thousands of years would quite often be omitted” ([102], page 117). As it occurs to us, mediaeval chronologists would honestly write: year 150 from Christ, or year 200 from Christ, meaning – in the modern chronology – year 1150 or 1200 A.D. It was only later that the Scaligerite chronologists declared these “small dates” to require a necessary addition of a thousand years, – in certain cases, even several thousand years. This was how they would make mediaeval events look “more ancient”.

Furthermore, the Latin letter “I” – the first one in Iesus, the Greek spelling of the name Jesus – originally could be an abbreviated version thereof. Thus, the year 1300, for instance, might have originally meant I.300, that is, “year 300 since Jesus” written the Greek way. This recording method conforms with the previous one, because I300 = year 300 of Jesus = year 300 from the beginning of the XI century A.D. In this respect, we believe the next important fact to be worthy of special attention. In mediaeval documents, especially those of the XIV-XVII century, with dates written in letters, the first letters believed today to symbolize “large numbers” turned out to be separated from the last ones recording tens or hundreds by dots. A few of numerous examples are cited below.

1) The title page of the book printed in Venice, allegedly in 1528. The date is written as {M.D.XXVIII.}, or with separating dots, q.v. in fig. 6.62.
2) Map of the world by Joachim von Watt, allegedly of 1534. The date is written as {M.D.XXXIIII.}, that is with separating dots, q.v. in fig. 6.63 and fig. 6.64.
3) The title page of the book by Johannes Drusius, allegedly printed in 1583. The date is written down as {M.D.LXXXIII.}, or with the separating dots, q.v. in fig. 6.65.
4) Publisher’s sigil of Lodevic Elsevir. The date, allegedly 1597, is written as {(I).I).XCVII.}, – with separating dots, as well as crescents facing left and right used for Latin letters “M” and “D”, fig. 6.66. This is a very interesting example, because the left band also has a recording of the date in “Arabic” digits. The alleged date of the year 1597 is transcribed as I.597 (or I.595), fig. 6.67. Besides the dot separating the first “figure” from the remaining digits, we also see this figure of “one” clearly written as the Latin letter “I”, or the first letter of the name Iesus (Jesus).
5) The date “1630” is written with right and left crescents on the title pages of printed books presented on fig. 6.68 and fig. 6.69. By the way, the title of the second book is quite curious – Russia or Moscovia, also known as Tartaria ([35], page 55).
6) The date transcription of the alleged year 1506 on a print by Altdorfer, a German painter, q.v. in fig. 6.70, is of the utmost interest. We present our drawing of this date on fig. 6.71. The first figure of “one” is separated from the remaining digits by a dot, and clearly written as the Latin letter “I”, i.e. as the first letter of the name Jesus (Jesus). Meanwhile, the way the alleged figure of 5 is written down looks very much
7) The recording of the date year 1524 on a print by Albrecht Dürer, q.v. in fig. 6.72 and fig. 6.73 (i.524.), is truly striking. We can see the first letter not only separated from the remaining digits by a dot, but also quite explicitly transcribed as the Latin letter “i” with a dot! In other words, like the first letter in the name *Iesus*. In this case, the letter “i” is surrounded by dots on both sides. Another similar example of transcribing dates with the usage of Latin letter “i” instead of digit 1 widely accepted nowadays (to stand for the alleged extra millenium) is presented on fig. 6.73a and fig. 6.73b. This is an ancient engraving like a 7. Perhaps the date here is not 1506, but 1706? How reliable is the dating of engravings and paintings ascribed to Altdorfer, who had allegedly lived in the XVI century? Could he have lived later?

Fig. 6.63. The date (the alleged year 1534) is written as “M. D. XXXIII.”, with divisive dots. Taken from [1009], page 71.

Fig. 6.64. Fragment saying “M. D. XXXIII.”. Taken from [1009], page 71.

Fig. 6.65. The date (the alleged year 1583) written as “M. D. LXXXIII.”, with divisive dots. Taken from [35], page 29.
portraying Berthold Schwartz, the inventor of gunpowder. The photograph of the print was kindly provided by A. M. Isakov.

8) So, let us repeat: in old recordings of dates like “1520”, the first digit 1 apparently originated as the letter “I” – the first letter of the name Jesus (Jesus) – initially written at the beginning of a date. This is to say, the date used to look like “The year 520 since Jesus”, or, in short, 1520. Later it was forgotten, or made forgotten, and the letter “I” was perceived as the symbol for “one thousand”. Eventually, they replaced “year 520 since Jesus” by “year one thousand five hundred twenty”, thus producing a chronological shift by one thousand years and transferring the Nativity of Jesus from XI century to the I. We can still trace this former meaning of the digit 1.

N. S. Kellin reports of an ecumenical, poly-confessional church, with the stars and the stripes on the spire, in the campus of the Harvard University in Boston (USA). A memorial plaque reads:

*This stone from the fabric of St. Savior’s Church. Southwark. London now the Cathedral Church of that Diocese commemorates the Baptism of John Harvard there on November 6, J607.*

Year 1607 is recorded as J607. That means Jesus-607; in other words, “year 607 since Jesus”, which refers to the Nativity of Jesus Christ in the XI century. Note that the presence of the letter “J” – the first letter of the name Jesus (instead of “I”), – is yet another argument in favour of our hypothesis.

N. S. Kellin discovered another example in the Cloister castle, New York, USA – a mediaeval castle purchased by Rockefeller in Roussillon, France, and transported to the USA, along with various collections from different European countries; in particular, Evangelical, Biblical and hagiographical scenes painted on glass circles of 20-25 centimetres in diameter, of German origin. The condition of those miniatures is excellent. One work is dated as J532. Historians now tend to decipher that date as 1532 a.d., while we see another recording J-532, or “the year 532 since Jesus”.

Thus, the mediaeval tradition of recording three-digit dates from the Nativity of Jesus Christ in the form of J*** explicitly points at the name Jesus, or Jesus Christ, automatically indicating the date of his Nativity as the XI century.
9) A vivid example of the mediaeval recording of dates as J*** is shown in fig. 6.74 – an engraving by Georg Pencz, a XVI century painter. He records the date 1548 as J548, fig. 6.75.

There was yet another method of recording dates: words “since the Nativity of Jesus Christ” written completely and not as one-letter substitutes – i.e. “III century since the Nativity of Christ”, not “X.III century”. Over the course of time, the knowledge of the letters “X” and “I” in the beginning of above-mentioned formulae being the first letters of the names XPICTOC (Christ) and Iesus (Jesus) was lost. Instead, chronologists assigned their numeric values to those letters. Let us recall that letters were formerly used to denote digits. Thus, chronologists declared “X” to stand for “ten”, and “I” for “one”. As a result, phrases like “X.III” or “1.300” became perceived as “the thirteenth century” or “one thousand three hundred years”.

According to our reconstruction, Jesus Christ lived in the XI century A.D. and was known in the Scali- gerian history of that period as Pope Gregory Hildebrand, or Ablaze With Gold. Later, historians assigned to him “ordinal number VII”, so we know him now as Pope Gregory “VII”, q.v. in fig. 6.76. It is noteworthy that a dove is depicted to the right of the head of Gregory “VII”. Let us recall that the dove is a famous Evangelical image of the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the portrait of Gregory “VII” available nowadays bears an explicit trace of the Gospel, which, as we are becoming aware now, is perfectly natural.

Fig. 6.68. The date 1630 on the title page of the book titled *The Republic of Holland* is written with left- and right-sided crescents. Taken from [35], page 49.

Fig. 6.69. The date 1630 on the title page of the book suggestively enough titled *Russia or Moscovia, also known as Tartaria* is written with left- and right-sided crescents. Taken from [35], page 55.
Fig. 6.70. The alleged date 1506 on an engraving by the German artist Altdorfer. The first “figure of one” is separated with a dot and visibly written as the Roman letter I, or the first letter of the name Jesus (Iesus). The alleged figure of 5 is written as a figure of 7. Could the year have been 1706 and not 1506? Could Altdorfer have lived later than the XVI century? Taken from [1203], No. 2.

Fig. 6.71. Our drawn copy of the date from Altdorfer’s engraving ([1203], No. 2).

Fig. 6.72. The alleged date 1524 written as “i. 524.” on an engraving by Albrecht Dürer – that is, the first letter is clearly seen as the Roman dotted “i”, or the first letter of the name Jesus (Iesus). Taken from [714], page 22.

Fig. 6.73. Fragment of the inscription from Dürer’s engraving ([714], page 22). The drawn parts are ours.
Fig. 6.73a. An old engraving portraying Berthold Schwarz, the inventor of gunpowder. The date on the engraving is written with the Roman letter “i” instead of the figure of 1 used today. Taken from [1121:1], an inset following the title page of the book.

Fig. 6.73b. A close-in of the date from the engraving portraying Berthold Schwarz. We can clearly see the Roman “i” instead of 1. Taken from [1121:1], an inset following the title page of the book.

Fig. 6.74. An engraving by Georg Pencz, a XVI century painter. The alleged date 1548 on this engraving is written as J548, with the first letter of the name Jesus used in lieu of the first “digit”. Taken from [714], page 30.

Fig. 6.75. Fragment with the date from the engraving by Pencz ([714], page 30). The drawn parts are ours.

Fig. 6.76. An ancient miniature portraying “Pope Gregory VII Hildebrand”, which translates as “ablaze with gold”. Taken from [492], Volume 1, page 59.
“Hildebrand” (Ablaze With Gold?) is considered to have been born in 1020 A.D. and been Pope from 1073 till 1085 ([196]). His portraits, most probably of a later origin, are shown in fig. 6.77 and fig. 6.78. The Nativity of Christ apparently took place in the middle of the XI century, but certain documents could have erroneously shifted this event backwards and assigned it to the beginning of the XI century. This could have resulted in a further shift – by roughly 1050 or 1000 years – of certain documents using the detailed way of recording dates, “since the Nativity of Christ the III century”, instead of the abbreviation “X.III century”. In other words, the shift by 1050 or 1000 years might have been the difference between the detailed and abbreviated method of recording dates. The chronological shift generated by this mistake must have constituted about 1000 years. This error is clearly visible in the Scaligerian chronology! What we see is one of its main shifts, q.v. on the global chronological map above.

We shall reiterate: for example, “the III century since Christ”, or the III century from the middle of the XI century A.D., could have been recorded both as “III century” and “X.III century”. This could have led to confusion and a chronological shift by approximately 1000 years.

13.3. Until the XVIII century, the Latin letters “I” or “J” – i.e. the first letters of the name of Jesus – were still used in several European regions to denote “one” in recording of dates

We have above come up with an idea that old documents used to refer to the name of ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ (Christ) by the first letter X in the recording of dates, which was later declared to stand for the figure of ten. In a similar way, the letter I or J used to mean the name of Jesus (Iesus), but was later declared to denote one thousand. The result: a millenarian chronological shift, casting many events of the XI-XVII century backwards in time.

We shall now present new data on this. Professor, Academician (IAELPS), Merited Employee of Oil and Gas Industry of Russian Federation, M. H. Musin has recently been so kind as to draw our attention to a very rare book from his own private library – the 1937 edition of Annales de la Société Royale d’Archéologie de Bruxelles ([1012]) contain-
ing a very interesting work by Chanoine F. Crooy *Les orfèvres de Bois-le-Duc et leurs poinçons* ([1012], pages 5-41). The book analyses several ancient brass plates with the names of XVI-XVIII century Belgian goldsmiths of Bois-le-Duc etched on them, and presents examples of their sigils. We should stress that brass plates were official records enabling one to check the authenticity of each goldsmith’s sigil. Therefore, these plates are of a special interest to us, as they reproduce the style and form of the official documents from the territory of contemporary Belgium of the XVI-XVIII century.

The book [1012] provides photographs of all those brass plates on which goldsmiths’ names are arranged in a column, with the year and a specimen sigil of the craftsman next to each name. It is the way the dates were recorded on the plates that is extremely important to us now.

Names of the first 33 Belgian craftsmen are listed without indication of any dates at all. The first date appears in the bottom right corner of the plate in fig. 6.79. Historians tell us it is the year 1642 a.d. recorded here, q.v. in fig. 6.80. However, we see absolutely clearly the Latin letter “J” – that is, the first letter of the name Jesus – in place of the figure of “one”. Thus, this date most probably stands for “year 642 since Jesus”. But in this case, counting 642 years back from 1642, we arrive at circa 1000 a.d. as the date of the Nativity of Jesus Christ.

On fig. 6.80, fig. 6.81, fig. 6.82, fig. 6.83, fig. 6.84, fig. 6.85, fig. 6.86, fig. 6.87, fig. 6.88, fig. 6.89, fig. 6.90, fig. 6.91, fig. 6.92, fig. 6.93, fig. 6.94 and fig. 6.95, we list all dates in the order they are mentioned on the Belgian plates. Namely,

J642, i607, i607, j607, i608, i615, i618, I618, i620, j620, j620, j624, i628, j63i, j63j, i635, i635, j637, j637, j64i, j642, j642, j643, J647, J644, J651, J651, j651, j652, J654, J654, J658, j659, i662, j662, j663, j663, j663, j666, j666, j666, j666, j668, j670, j671, i672, j672, j674, j676, j676, j649, J677, j677, j678, j679, j684, j685, j685, j686, j690, J692, J692, J692, J693, J693 or J695, i696, J696, J697, j703, J706, j706, j708, J708, J709, J709, j709, j7jj, J7Ji, j7ji, j7j2, j7j2, j7j2, j725, j726, j734, i735, i735, i735, j738, i742, then there is a very curious record of a date, jJ99. Most likely, it is 1744, although one is written as j, seven as J, and four as the modern “Arabic” nine. The subsequent dates are, 1745, J752, i(or j)7-53, J754, j757, j758, J758,
Fig. 6.81. XVII century dates on Belgian copper plaques. The alleged figure of 1 is written as the Roman letter “î” – see the two dates on top transcribed as i607, and the two dates in the bottom transcribed as i608 and i615; it is also written as the Roman letter “j”, qv in case of the centre date – j607. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. I/3.

Fig. 6.82. XVII century dates on Belgian copper plaques. The dates are transcribed in the following manner: i618, i620, j620, j620, j624, i628, j63i, j63j, i635, i635, j637, j637, j64i and j642. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. I/4.

Fig. 6.83. XVII century dates on Belgian copper plaques. The dates are transcribed as follows: J643, J647, J644, J65j, J65j, J65j, j652, J654, J654, J658, J659, I662 and J662. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. II/1.
Fig. 6.84. XVII century dates on Belgian copper plaques. The dates are transcribed as follows: j663, j665, j665, j666, j666, j666, j668, j670, j671, i672, i672, J674, j676 and J676. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. II/2.

Fig. 6.85. XVII century dates on Belgian copper plaques. The dates are transcribed as follows: J649, J677, J678, j679 and 1679. Mark the fact that this is the first place where we encounter the figure of one standing in the beginning, in the modern fashion. The dates to follow are: j684, j685, j685, j686, j690, J692 and J692. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. II/3.
Fig. 6.86. Dates of the XVII and early XVIII century on Belgian copper plaques. The dates are transcribed as follows: J693, J693 or J695, J696, J697, j703, J706, J706, J708, J708, J709 and J709. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. II/4.

Fig. 6.87. XVIII century dates on Belgian copper plaques. The dates are transcribed as follows: j734, i735, i735, i735, j738 and i742. As a matter of fact, the first “digit” is written as the Greek letter λ with a dot above. It is clearly visible that the date transcription had not yet been uniform by mid-XVIII century. Further one sees the date transcribed in a peculiar manner – j99. It most probably refers to 1744; however, the figure of one is transcribed as “j”, the figure of seven as “J”, and the figure of four resembles the modern Arabic 9. One also sees the following dates: 1745 transcribed as “j” (or the Greek λ), 7 (or handwritten Slavic G (ɔ)) 45, followed by i752. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. III/2.

Fig. 6.88. XVIII century dates on Belgian copper plaques. The dates are transcribed as follows: j7j0, j7j0, j7j1, j7j2, i7j2, j7j2, j7j2, j7j2, j7j2, i7j2, j7j2, j7j2 and i7j2. As a matter of fact, the first “digit” is written as the Greek letter λ with a dot above. It is clearly visible that the date transcription had not yet been uniform by mid-XVIII century. Further one sees the date transcribed in a peculiar manner – j99. It most probably refers to 1744; however, the figure of one is transcribed as “j”, the figure of seven as “J”, and the figure of four resembles the modern Arabic 9. One also sees the following dates: 1745 transcribed as “j” (or the Greek λ), 7 (or handwritten Slavic G (ɔ)) 45, followed by i752. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. III/2.

Fig. 6.89. A close-in of the date 1744 transcribed as j99, unusually enough by the modern standards – what with this being mid-XVIII century. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. III/2.
Fig. 6.90. XVIII century dates on Belgian copper plaques. The dates are transcribed as follows: i (or j) 7-53, J754, J757, J758, J7-59, j760, i (or j) 762 and i (or Greek λ) 763. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. III/3.

Fig. 6.91. XVIII century dates on Belgian copper plaques. The dates are transcribed as follows: 1764 (the first digit is written in the modern manner), j764, j768, j768 and j768. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. III/4.

Fig. 6.92. Late XVIII century dates on Belgian copper plaques. The dates are transcribed as follows: J78, J78, J783 and J785. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. IV/2.
Fig. 6.93. Late XVIII century dates on Belgian copper plaques. The dates are transcribed as follows: J789, j (looking like the Roman S) 794, J795, J796, J798, 1799. Note that the last date is transcribed with the Arabic digit 1. See the close-in on the next illustration. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. IV/4.

Fig. 6.94. Late XVIII century dates on Belgian copper plaques. The dates are transcribed as follows: j789, 1798, j790, j79j, j79j and J793. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. IV/3.

Fig. 6.95. A close-in of the last date from the Belgian tables. The first digit is already transcribed as the Arabic numeral that we are accustomed to nowadays. Taken from [1012], Appendices, Pl. IV/4.
It is absolutely clear that in the overwhelming majority of cases the figure of one was written as either the Latin “I” or the Latin “J”. This practice continued up to the end of the XVIII century; a doubtless conclusion from fig. 6.94, where the penultimate date on the plate is still written as j798 – that is, 1798 in the contemporary sense. Certain official documents in Belgium may have written the figure of one as Latin “i” or “j” even towards the end of the XIX century. However, the register of goldsmiths’ names we have come across suddenly breaks off on year 1799. We cannot tell what has been happening thereafter.

It is extremely peculiar that as of the middle of the XVIII century, an especially persistent inconsistency in the recording of dates set on in the Belgian plates. See, for example, fig. 6.89. Could it mean that someone had deliberately edited the “earlier” and more regular, or “steadier”, recordings of dates on the plates? In other words, were the plates antedated upon previously rubbed soft brass after the middle of the XVIII century, when the recording of figures had more or less settled, though still far from what is accepted nowadays?

Finally, in the last date 1799 on the plate we can see the figure of one written in the “Arabic style” usual for us, fig. 6.95.

Let us return to the very first date appearing on the Belgian plates, fig. 6.79 and fig. 6.80 – allegedly 1642 a.d. There is something strange about it. The point is, in all other cases dates on the plates form a non-decreasing sequence, while the very first date, year 1642, is obviously in the wrong place since it is followed by substantially earlier dates – namely, i607, j608, i615, and so on. How come year 1642 is about 50 years ahead? One might say there is some confusion involved, and somebody has apparently made a dating mistake – and at the same time, as it turns out, confused the name of a goldsmith, or even several goldsmiths, shifting the date back or forth by 50 years. This could possibly have happened, although in an official state document – a currency act related to gold processing, for instance, – it may look somewhat peculiar. Licensing documentation of that kind is assumed to have been kept under a vigilant watch in XVI-XVIII centuries, as is the case nowadays. Therefore, we believe the following idea to be of relevance.

We must have traced the fact that the sign of 6 formerly meant the figure of five, while the sign of 5, vice versa, meant the figure of six. Thus, the signs for five and six were switched. We have already discovered this fact and described it in detail in our book [RAR]: 4, pp. 255-266. See also Chron4, chapter 13:5. In other words, the record 1642 in earlier documents might have meant Year five hundred forty-second since Jesus, but by no means one thousand six hundred forty second, as it is believed nowadays. Nothing remains strange any more if the record J642 is interpreted like this, everything falls in due place. The first date on the Belgian plates is indeed 1542 recorded as J642 where the sign of 6 was interpreted as the figure of five. Our hypothesis is in good conformity with the opinion of contemporary Belgium historians that the first names on the brass plates date back to 1538, although this date, as far as the photographs presented in [1012] show, is not engraved on the plates ([1012], page 9). Instead, the date “year five hundred forty-second since Jesus” appears to have been engraved, q.v. in fig. 6.80, followed shortly thereafter by the dates iJ607, j608, i615, and so on. As a result, the correct chronological order is restored.

We should sum it up by stating the following. The old method of recording dates with the first letter “i” or “j” referring to a “year since Jesus” survived until the end of the XVIII century in many areas of the Western Europe. Moreover, years were counted down from the XI century a.d. Later on, while editing books on history in the XVII-XVIII century, those old dates were eliminated and replaced by those customary to our age, using the figure of 1 = one instead of letters “I” and “J”. However, in certain rarely available documents from European archives – like the list of goldsmiths in Belgium – the old dates have fortunately survived. Those rare documents convey to us the social atmosphere of the XVI-XVII century, which significantly differs from what the Scaligerite historians display to us.
13.4. How the chronological shift by 330 or 360 years could have occurred

A similar mechanism may have inchoated the chronological shift of approximately 333 years or 360 years. Chronologists might have recorded dates of the end of the XV century – the beginning of the XVI century in relative chronology, counting years from the moment of accession to the throne, for example, of the famous emperor Caesar Maximilian I, 1493-1519. We shall not elaborate which ruler was called the Great Caesar 1st, or Maximilian Kaiser the First, by the mediaeval chronologists. See CHRON7 for more details on this. The only thing important to us is that, when dating events from the first year of his accession to the throne, chronologists might have used an abbreviated recording of his name – MCL, i.e. Maxim Caesar the HeLenic. In that case, a date such as “Maximilian Caesar his third year” would appear in chronicles as MCL.III. After a while, the original meaning of the letters MCL was forgotten. The Scaligerite chronologists proposed to regard them as figures. Substituting figures for letters, they must have arrived at the “date” of 1153. This fictitious date differs from the actual one – i.e. from 1496 – by 343 years: 1496 – 1153 = 343. Thus, chronologists have automatically shifted the documents using abbreviations similar to MCL(…) to record dates by approximately 330 or 360 years backwards.

13.5. What Latin letters M, D, C in Roman dates meant originally, in the Middle Ages

13.5.1. General idea

Many “Roman dates” in old texts, epitaphs, tombstones, etc., considered mediaeval or even “ancient” nowadays, begin with Latin letters D, M, C and so on. We believe all these letters to have originally been abbreviations of various words, first letters thereof. For example,

- \( D = \text{Domini, i.e. the Lord, Divine, or} \ D = \text{Dom in terms of reigning house, dynasty;} \)
- \( M = \text{Magnus, i.e. great;} \)
- \( C = \text{Caesar, i.e. caesar, kaiser, king. And so on.} \)

Those were different methods of recording mediaeval dates in relative chronology. They might have counted years either from the beginning of the XI century, – as the Nativity of Christ, – or some great mediaeval king who had lived in the XV century, for instance. But then the original meaning of abbreviations \( D, M \) and \( C \) was forgotten. The Scaligerite chronologists attached certain numeric meanings to those letters and declared that the Latin letter \( M \) had always meant “one thousand years”, letter \( D \) – “five hundred years”, letter \( C \) – “one hundred years”, and so on. As the result, formerly correct, or comparatively “close dates” have been arbitrarily turned into “very distant dates”; mediaeval events forcibly dispatched deep into the past.

In modern times, the Latin method of recording dates, \( \text{Anno Domini (…)} \) would normally be interpreted as “Year from Incarnation of Lord (so-and-so)”, \( \text{Domini} \) translated solely as the Lord, Divine. The date of Incarnation, i.e. the Nativity of Jesus Christ, is proposed to have been meant in every case. However, the word \( \text{Domini} \) could have possibly meant the House, in terms of Reigning House, Ruling House. The word Dom (House) did have that “Imperial meaning” in Russia. Until now, the largest central cathedrals in the cities of Western Europe are called Dom. In this case, a date written as \( \text{Anno Domini (…)} \) might as well have meant “The Year of the Reigning House (so-and-so)”. That is, years of different events could have been counted from the accession of a Reigning House. This context causes an apparent ambiguity in the dating of inscriptions of this kind. The point is, different mediaeval chroniclers could mean absolutely different Reigning Houses, i.e. different regal dynasties. The major reigning Houses ascended to their thrones in the XIV century, as well as in the XV and XVI centuries. Converting dates of this kind into modern chronology shall lead us to different dates accordingly.

To sum it up, we shall list a few possible readings for the Latin recordings of dates.

- The date of the \( \text{Anno D. (…), or Anno Domini (…), or Anno D. M. type might read The Year of (Ruling) House (such-and-such). We must note that the word Anno, or year, was implied when omitted in writing.} \)
- The date of the \( \text{M. D. (…)} \) type might mean “the year of the Great House (such-and-such)”. The Latin \( M \) here is the abbreviation for Magnus, or Great.
- The date of the \( \text{M. C. (…)} \) type might mean “the year of the Great King (such-and-such)”, as \( M \) is Magnus, \( C \) is Caesar, i.e. caesar, king (czar), kaiser.
The date of the C. M. (…) type might also mean “the year of King the Great (such-and-such)”, as C may stand for caesar, king (czar), and M is Magnus, or Great.

The date of type D. (…) could mean “the year of (reigning) House (such-and-such)”. By the way, the Latin word Domini might have formerly meant not only the Lord, Divine, but also “a very large House”, i.e., again, the Great House. For example, a very big house is sometimes called Domina in Russian. This word is not considered very literary nowadays, though virtually identical to the “Latin” Domini.

Finally, the letter M might as well have meant Maria, i.e. Mother of Jesus Christ. Let us recall that in Western Europe the Virgin Mary was in some sense even more popular than Christ. Therefore, the usage of her name in the chronology of the Christian era looks perfectly natural.

13.5.2. Example: the date on the tomb of Empress Gisela

The next example makes it immediately obvious what various decodings of the same “Latin Date” lead to. The famous cathedral church in the German city of Speyer, the Speyer Dom, houses several sepulchres of the emperors of the Holy Roman Empire of German Nation assigned to the X-XIII century a.D. Conrad II, his wife Gisela, Henry III, Henry IV, and then Rudolf Habsburg (of Nov-Gorod?), etc., are allegedly buried here ([1408], page 16). The fate of those sepulchres was a dismal one. Historians report that “in 1689 the tombs were completely destroyed” ([1408], page 17).

Over and over we come across a striking fact – mass destruction and annihilation of old imperial burials turns out to have been performed in the XVII century in Russia as well as in Europe, see Chron5.

Remains of a few old tombs of the abovementioned German rulers have recently been discovered during excavations on the territory of the Speyer Dom, and later moved to the Dom and buried in a special crypt ([1408]). Unfortunately, one cannot see the old sarcophagi now, as they all have been replaced with contemporary concrete replicas – A. T. Fomenko and T. N. Fomenko witnessed that during their visit in 1998. We are familiar with such “replica practice” in what concerns the regal tombs in the Archangel Cathedral in Moscow, where the old sarcophagi of Russian Czars and Grand Dukes were covered completely with massive replicas of the Romanov epoch, so today it is impossible to read what has been originally written on the old sarcophagi, q.v. in Chron4.

In the museum of the Speyer Dom (Cathedral), in its basement, one can only see a minor remainder of metallic, apparently leaden, coating of the coffin of Empress Gisela. She is thought to have been buried in 1043 ([1408], p. 15). On a fragment of the leaden sheet, a vague part of a Latin inscription with a date has survived. We managed to read the inscription, although its integrity leaves much to be desired. It begins with:

ANNO DOM INCARN D CCCC XCVIIII-IOWNOV…

An explanatory plaque of the museum says the date is 999 a.D., 11th of November. However, this date can be read in a substantially different manner. Namely, Year (ANNO) of the House (i.e. dynasty, DOM), from the Accession (INCARN), of the House (D) four hundred (CCCC) ninety-ninth (XCVIII).

Which is “Year four hundred ninety-nine from the Accession of the House”.

Question: from the accession of which House, i.e. dynasty, should one count these 499 years? Answers can be most diverse. For example, counting from the Scaligerian date of the accession of the dynasty of the Holy Roman Empire of German Nation allegedly in the X century, Empress Gisela – and her husband Conrad II as well – were buried in the fifteenth or even the sixteenth century a.D. Counting from the Nativity of Christ in the XI century, we arrive at the sixteenth century again. Let us recall that the Holy Roman Empire allegedly of X-XIII century is a partial reflection of a later dynasty of Habsburgs of the XIV-XVI century. So this can be a circumstance to explain the late dating obtained upon our reading of the inscription.

We do not insist this is the only way to decode the inscription on the tomb of “ancient” Empress Gisela. Nonetheless, the fact that the inscription can be read in such a way as to perfectly conform to our reconstruction is hardly a mere coincidence.

13.5.3. Another example: the date on the headstone of Emperor Rudolf Habsburg

The same Speyer Dom has an old gravestone from the tomb of King Rudolf of Habsburg (Nov-Gorod?), who died in the alleged year 1291 ([1408], page 16).
See fig. 6.96. Our drawing of this inscription is in fig. 6.97, along with the translation of certain words. We can see the date recorded as

ANNO.D.N.I.MCC.X.C.I.

The Scaligerite historians suggest a reading of 1291, where M = one thousand, CC = two hundred, XCI = 91, while the combination D.N.I. is today considered to be the abbreviation of DOMINI. At the same time, the inscription can be read as follows:

Year (Anno) of the House (Domini) Great (M, i.e. Magnus) Two Hundred (CC) Ninety-One (X.C.I.).

i.e. “Year two hundred ninety-one from the accession of the Great House”. The question is as follows: what date does this inscription correspond to, according to the contemporary calendar? The answer depends on which Great House was meant: if it were e.g. the dynasty of Habsburgs (Nov-Gorod?) at the end of the XIII – beginning of the XVI century, then this would be the fifteenth or even the sixteenth century. If some other mediaeval Reigning House was implied, the date shall be somewhat different.

Let us take another look at the tombstone of Rudolf Habsburg, q.v. in fig. 6.96 and fig. 6.97. Take notice of the way the name of Habsburg is written – the carved stone reads either Habasburg or Nabasburg. The first letter looks a lot like N. We have earlier come up with the idea that the name of Habsburg was derived from the name Novy Gorod (New City), which is confirmed by the inscription on Rudolf’s gravestone since Burg is “city”, and Nabas obviously “new”. The old gravestone is probably conveying to us this
origin of the name of the Habsburgs. Unfortunately, the letter N or H is badly damaged – all other letters of the inscription have survived except for the one most interesting to us. We shall recall that the Latin H and the Russian H (N) are identical.

In his *Universal History*, Oscar Jaeger presents a drawing of this famous inscription ([304], Volume 2, page 396). The dubious letter resembles the handwritten Latin N, and is by all means virtually similar to several other letters N of the same inscription whose origins are distinctly Latin. For example, in the word *Anno* = year, fig. 6.96, fig. 6.97. The contemporary author of the drawing in the book by O. Jaeger did actually lengthen the “tail” of letter N somewhat – most probably to be able to later proclaim it the Latin letter H, if desired.

By the way, historian Oscar Jaeger reports that some fragments of the tombstone of Rudolf Habsburg were “renovated, possibly recently, when the whole memorial was restored by the order of Emperor Franz-Joseph” ([304], Volume 2, page 396). Thus, we find ourselves confronted by a phenomenon that we’re already accustomed to. *Something has been done to the memorial.* The exact nature of these changes shall remain nebulous. However, we will demonstrate what such restorations looked like sometimes on the example of the famous Cologne sarcophagus of the Magi in *Chron6*. We shall see many initial images strangely “lost”, others tendentiously *altered*. What if a similar fate befell the gravestone of Rudolf?

13.5.4. Recording of mediaeval dates was not unified everywhere even in the XVIII century

Let us return to the recording of date on the gravestone of Rudolf of Habsburg (Nov-Gorod?). Note the shape of letters in the inscription. The Latin letter M is written in much the same way as the Greek letter Ω. There are some small circles over the Ω and the letter C right next to it. There is no circle over the next C, or over the letter X. The circle does re-appear over the next letter C. These marks are absolutely certain to contain some information which might fundamentally change the meaning of the abbreviation letters.

This example illustrates the chaos that reigned in mediaeval timekeeping. There was no common, unified rule. *Until the XVIII century, the same date could have been written down in sufficiently different ways.*

Most various styles of abbreviation, notations, circles, lines and the like were used widely. It was only with the passage of quite some time that a more or less unified system was worked out.

Let us cite a very representative example. In the central marketplace of the German city of Bonn, next to the city hall, one can see an old stone column. An inscription on the plaque attached to it (fig. 6.98), has a date in the end: 1777, – q.v. in fig. 6.99. However, the date is recorded in a curious manner:

\[(D)\{LXXXVII.\]

It is easy to work out that the date in question is actually MDCCLXXVII, or 1777. However, the letter M is written as \((D)\), the letter D as \(D\). In other words, in the recordings of M and D were made with the aid
of crescents facing left and right, which makes it clear that even by the end of the XVIII century no unification of recording “Roman dates” was attained yet. True, some of the more or less common rules were indeed introduced in the XVIII century, but the traces of previous “chronicle chaos” are still evident.

In this particular case there is no confusion about the reading of the date. But the picture changes drastically when we go backwards by a hundred, two hundred, or even three hundred years. As we could see, the general outlook complexes in such cases, and various interpretations of the same old record arise.

13.5.5. Some datings of printed books and manuscripts dating from the XV-XVII century will apparently have to be moved forwards in time by at least fifty more years

We will have to revise some of the alleged datings of certain printed books published in Europe in the XV-XVII century, as well as manuscripts, paintings and drawings related to that time. Two systems were used for recording dates – Arabic and Roman figures. Thus, if a book, or a manuscript, or a painting should bear the date of 1552 written in Arabic figures, – must it necessarily mean 1552 in the modern sense, 448 years to the date of 1552 written in Arabic figures, – must it necessarily mean 1552 in the modern sense, 448 years to the back from the year 2000? Not at all. We have already found out that the figure of I.552, the Scaligerite historians of the XVII-XVIII century have automatically aged the printed books of the XVI-XVII century by 50 years.

Another example: the first page of the Geographia by Ptolemy, printed by Sebastian Münster in the alleged year 1540 ([1353]), features the year of publication written as M.D.XL. Today, M is accepted to stand for a millennium, D for five hundred years, and so forth. Substitution of these values does actually yield 1540, but the first letters separated by dots could have been the abbreviations of words related to the era of Jesus Christ. The letter M, for instance, could be the abbreviation for Megas = the greatest. Two letters, alpha and omega, were very often written on the icons of Jesus Christ. Omega or Megas meant the Great, the Greatest, possibly referring to the God – Jesus Christ. If so, then the date is the year 540 since Christ. Counting 540 years up from 1053 a.d. again, we obtain a date of 1593, or the very end of the XVI century, and not its first half. This is a radical change in the evaluation of the very publication of the Geographia by Ptolemy and allegedly “ancient” maps in it. It becomes clear why those maps display obvious traces of the Scaligerian version of history and geography. Detailed information about the Geographia by Ptolemy can be seen in Chron6.

Another possibility is that, in the recording of the date M.D.XL, only the last letters XL, or the numeral 40, stand for the actual date. The first two letters M.D. are just the opening letters of the word like the Great Sovereign = Magnus Dominus, and could mean a count of years from the beginning of some Emperor’s reign, without mention of his name. By the way, the Scaligerian history believes Dominus = Sovereign to be a common epithet for Emperors after Augustus and Tiberius ([237], page 346). Besides, D was the opening letter of the word Divine. Then the date M.D.XL can mean “the fortieth year of the Great Sovereign such-and-such”, and there’s still a need to work out what emperor in particular the publisher used for point of reference. This context further increases the ambiguity of reading lettered dates of this type. Every principality would have a Great Sovereign of its own to count the years from.

Dates of mediaeval scientific literature publications must be revised as well – the works of N. Copernicus, for instance, who had allegedly lived in 1473-1543
His works may well turn out to have been written 50 years later than we believe today. This idea is backed by the following facts. As a famous contemporary astronomer and historian Robert Newton points out, the actual “heliocentric idea gained a wide recognition only one century after the Copernicus’ works had appeared” ([614], page 328). In the seventeenth century, that is “Kepler was the first one to have truly accepted the heliocentric theory” ([614], page 328). It is therefore not entirely impossible that some works of the Kepler epoch were “shifted” by approximately 100 years “backwards” and assigned to Copernicus. Or, alternatively, N. Copernicus could have lived in the XVI-XVII century, about half a century or a whole century closer to our time, and not in the XV-XVI at all. See details in CHRON3.

We should return to the question about the dates of life of some other famous figures in politics, science and culture of the XIV-XVI century in this respect. For instance, actual lifetimes of such outstanding painters as Leonardo da Vinci, the alleged years 1452-1519 ([797], page 701), or Michelangelo, the alleged years 1475-1564 ([797], page 799), etc. are not entirely clear – perhaps fifty years closer to our time, or even more recent than that.

13.6. The foundation date of Rome of Italy

We shall reiterate that our main result at this stage is the discovery of a stratified structure of the “Scaligerian textbook of history”. One of our main primary objectives shall be the question of the veracious date of the foundation of Rome in Italy. The Scaligerian history makes us believe it occurred in the VIII century b.c. However, the dynastic parallels that we have discovered tell us something entirely different. According to Titus Livy, the foundation of Rome is linked to the names of Romulus and Remus ([482], Vol. 1). Moreover, Romulus is considered to have been the first King of the so called “regal Rome”, or the First Roman Empire in our terms. However, all three Roman Empires – the First, the Second and the Third, – turned out to be duplicates, or phantom reflections of the mediaeval Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century and, to a considerable degree, the Empire of Habsburgs of the XIV-XVI century, q.v. in fig. 6.19, fig. 6.20, fig. 6.21, fig. 6.22, fig. 6.23, fig. 6.24, fig. 6.51, fig. 6.52.

Therefore, by shifting the First Roman Empire forwards in time, and “returning it to its rightful place”, or superposing it upon the Empire of Habsburgs (Nov-Gorod?), we discover the foundation of the Italian Rome to have occurred in the end of the XIII century – beginning of the XIV century a.d. The correctness of this dating will be further confirmed by a vast number of independent sources.

13.7. A later confusion of foundation dates of the two Romes, on the Bosporus and in Italy

One of the consequences of the mentioned confusion of dates was, most probably, a mix-up of two events – the foundation of Rome on Bosporus, or Constantinople, and that of the city in Italy.

Several documents of roughly identical contents describing the same story of Rome on the Bosporus, Constantinople, or Czar-Grad (King-City), were studied by the first chronologists of the XVI-XVII century a.d. – several versions of the History by Titus Livy, for instance. Written by different people, from different viewpoints, in different languages, with the same characters under different names and nicknames. Among those were kings whose chronicles would subsequently become identified as belonging to two different epochs. A natural question of linking these documents to one another arose in the XVI-XVII century. One of the main problems that confronted the chronologists was that of what principles would such identification be based upon. One of the methods offered was apparently as follows. In many chronicles, the count of years started from “the foundation of the City” – in the History by Titus Livy, for instance. Therefore, to link a document to the mediaeval chronology it was enough to calculate the date of “the foundation of the City”. Scaligerite historians came to the conclusion that the City in question should necessarily be the Italian Rome. This is apparently incorrect – q.v. from the shifts on the global chronological map.

The foundation of Rome = Constantinople, later called the New Rome, thus became split in two: chronologically and geographically. Scaliger tells us that another “foundation of Rome” took place in the alleged year 753 b.c. – that is, one thousand years prior to the foundation of the New Rome on the Bosporus in the alleged year 330 a.d., according to
Scaliger himself. This is a demonstration of the millenarian chronological shift that began to cast medieval events back into remote past.

However, Roman history knows of not just two, but three “foundations of Rome”. The first “foundation”, dated by Scaliger to 753 B.C. and called the foundation of Rome in Italy. The second “foundation” of Rome on the Bosporus, or the New Rome, “attributed” by Scaliger to 330 A.D., which was yet another error. By the way, Rome on the Bosporus was named New because the capital was moved here from the ancient Alexandria, Egypt, and not from the Italian Rome, since the latter didn’t exist at that time.

Many mediaeval documents confuse the two Romes: in Italy and on the Bosporus. It is widely assumed that, around 330 A.D., Constantine the Great moved the capital from Rome in Italy to the Bosporus, into a settlement called Byzantium, that was officially named “the New Rome” in the alleged year 330 A.D. ([240], page 26). Later, the New Rome was called Constantinople ([240], page 26). Today, both Romes are believed to have been capitals of great empires. The citizens of the New Rome were long ago noted to have called themselves “Romans”. It was other nations that would allegedly call them Rhomaioi. Therefore, the Rhomaioi Empire turns out to have been the Roman Empire – the name that, apparently in the XVI century A.D., was moved (on paper) to Italy.

Along with the Scaligerian myth of moving the Empire’s capital from the alleged Italian Rome to the Bosporus, there is a contradictory assertion. The very same Scaligerian history refers to an inverse relocation of the Empire’s capital – from the Bosporus to Italy. This legend is apparently closer to the truth. Again, it was the emperor Constantine who is presumed to have done it in 663 A.D.; however, not Constantine I (the Great), but rather Constantine III, who allegedly didn’t accomplish his plan because he was killed in Italy ([544]). The Rome on the Bosphorus is usually thought to have been the Greek capital. However, a substantial part of Byzantine coinage, as well as Italian coinage, boasts inscriptions in Latin and not in Greek ([196]).

A famous legend about the foundation of Rome tells us the story about the simultaneous foundation of the two cities: one founded by Romulus, and the other by Remus. See the very beginning of the History by Titus Livy. The two founders bear similar names: Romulus and Remus. Then Romulus is supposed to have killed Remus, and only one Rome was left – the capital (Titus Livy, Book 1, Chapter 1). It probably is a reflection of the confusion between the two Romes. Furthermore, some ancient chronicles call the founders of both capitals not Romulus and Remus, but rather “Romus and Roma”, which makes the names of the founders virtually the same. See, for example, [938], pages 18.1.B. 170-175.

It is considered today that Rome in Italy has always been meant by the “city” from the foundation of which the year count begins in Roman chronicles. However, several mediaeval authors of the XII-XIV century A.D. turned out to be of an entirely different opinion. As per the famous crusader Villardoin, for instance, this (Rome on Bosporus) “city surpassed all others, as if it were their lord… Byzantines would willingly simply call it ‘The City’ (! – A. F.)… that is, the City by its prevalence, the only City” ([248], page 28).

Thus, the count of years “from the foundation of the City” in many old documents, most likely, refers to the Rome on the Bosporus, or Constantinople, which, according to our reconstruction, was founded earlier than the Italian Rome.

Constantine I is considered to have “transferred many establishments from Rome to Constantinople… and ordered to build… palaces ad exemplum of their [senators] – A. F.] Roman dwellings… The Byzantine Empire was still called the Roman Empire” ([248], page 28). However, the counter-influence of the New Rome on the Italian Rome is very well known and was great indeed. It is written that, “Rome of the VII and VIII centuries was a semi-Byzantine town (sic! – A. F.)… The Greek faith could be observed practised everywhere; the Greek language was used for quite a long time in official acts as well as for quotidian purposes… Norman kings would wear the magnificent vestments of Byzantine emperors with great pride” ([248], pages 31-32).

The Scaligerian history displays irritation when it mentions the so-called “fiction” to which Byzantines have been holding on for centuries on end: the Byzantines assumed they were actually Romans… The Byzantine emperors continued to behave as the only lawful emperors… Greeks turn out to be “Roman” according to all Byzantine historians… To distinguish [they did
in fact fear confusion! – A. F.] between the Western mediaeval Empire and that of Byzantium, the latter was deliberately (?! – A. F.) called the Rhomaioi or Rhomanian Empire... The name Rhomania [Romania – A. F.]… was transposed from Byzantium to Ravenna for designation of that... country of Italy” ([195], page 51).

We have a reason to clarify the confusion between the two Romes in such details. The following reconstruction is readily apparent from the global chronological map and its decomposition into the sum of four chronicles presented above. Most probably, Rome on Bosporus was founded first, called Constantinople, and later Istanbul. It happened around the X-XI century a.d., and not in 330 a.d. And only then, approximately 330 or 360 years later, i.e. around the XIV century a.d., the Italian Rome was founded. If a mediaeval chronicler of that age confused the foundation of the Rome on the Bosporus in the X-XI century a.d. with that of Rome in Italy in the XIV century a.d., a chronological shift by approximately 330 or 360 years seems possible. As a result, the chronicler would collate two chronicles together with an apparent shift and obtain a wrong lengthy history with duplicates as a consequence. And it is only today that we can detect them within the “Scaligerian textbook” with the help of statistical methods.

Quite a natural question is that of the appearance of the so-called “non-concise history” textbook. Our discovery of the decomposition of the global chronological map into the sum of four short chronicles allows us to answer this, albeit only in broad outlines so far. An approximate scheme of the new chronology – and, consequently, the new history – is obtained by moving forward and identifying all the duplicate historical periods marked with the same letter symbols with each other on the global chronological map. The following volumes of this edition will encapsulate our hypothetical reconstruction of the world history.

Upon “returning” all ancient chronicles that “went backwards” from the mediaeval period of the X-XVII century a.d. into “antiquity”, we find out that the history of Europe, the Middle East, and Egypt is covered in the same degree as the history of the “younger cultures”: Scandinavia, Russia, Japan. The “levelling of cultures” may possibly reflect a natural circumstance – a more or less simultaneous naissance of civilization in different regions of the world and their parallel evolution.

13.8. Scaliger and the Council of Trent. Creation of the Scaligerian chronology of antiquity in the XVI-XVII century

We already mentioned that phantom duplicates were only discovered on the global chronological map before “the Scaligerian era”, but not after it. Thus, we are facing yet again the fact that the activity period of Scaliger and Petavius is somehow related to our discovery of the abovementioned effects in ancient chronology and history. We shall recall that it was the fraction of Scaliger-Petavius that had rigidified and immobilized “the historical tradition” which the “the modern textbook of ancient history” is based upon. The Scaliger-Petavius version proves to have been a fruit of bloody confrontation over the issues of chronology (!) in the end of the XVI-XVII century. Moreover, the Scaligerian version turns out to be far from unique. Some other points of view had opposed it, but “lost the battle”. Here is information about some of the events of that tumultous time, the epoch of the 30 year war in Europe, chaos and anarchy.

“It suffices to recall the famous chronologist Joseph Scaliger who stood up against the Gregorian Reform, or the great Copernicus who refused to participate in its preparation that was in full swing at the Lateran Council of 1514” ([295], page 99). Nowadays, it is the shift of the equinoxial date that is considered to have been the main issue in the debates about the reform, but it was just one of many other serious issues discussed in relation to the calendar reform. Apparently, the “new historical” concept of Scaliger’s was created in a tough struggle with those who still remembered the true history and objected against an introduction of “the Scaligerian chronology”. That struggle has most probably been the reason for the famous “procrastinated” Council of Trent, which had lasted for 18 years (!), from 1545 to 1563, with several intermissions. In particular, it was where the establishment of the canon for the Biblical books was allegedly debated. However, those debates might have taken place later, in the XVII century, and subsequently made antedate the Council of Trent in order
to increase the prestige of the discoveries allagedly made in the XVII century. See details in Chron6.

One of the epicentres of the struggle in the Scaligerian era was the so-called Scaligerian Julian period. The Great Indiction is the 532 year period which is now thought to have been called Indiction in Byzantium and the Great Circle in the West. “It is hard to determine with any fair degree of precision as to when and where that temporal cycle had entered the discourse originally” ([295], page 99).

It is supposed, – although no original documents exist to prove this – that the Great Indiction was known to the Paschalian advocates of the Council of Nicaea in the alleged IV century a.d. ([295], page 99). A modification of that very Great Indiction, namely, the period of 7980 years ([295], page 105), is also in existence. This cycle is also considered “ancient”; however, as it turns out, “this ancient cycle appears to have been included in the chronological science only towards the end of the XVI century under the name of “the Julian period”. This notion was introduced into academic circulation by the outstanding encyclopaedist and chronologist… Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609) in his treatise *The New Treatise on Improving the Count of Time*…

The work was published in 1583, almost simultaneously [! – A. F.] with the Gregorian Reform, of which the scholar [Scaliger – A. F.] remained a fundamental adversary for the rest of his life. [This is in re establishing the global chronology and a calendar of the ancient world – A. F.]. Resting upon the works of the Byzantine chronologists, heirs of the Alexandrian school, Scaliger insisted that only the Julian calendar, or chronological system, could provide a continuous count of years in the universal chronology… *Kepler was… one of the first to appreciate the advantages of the Scaligerian Julian period*” ([295], page 106).

In this respect it would be extremely important to find out what role Kepler played in the creation and “scientific justification” of the Scaligerian chronology. “Having appreciated its advantages”, fallen under the influence of J. Scaliger, and agreed with the claim of “the great antiquity” of many old books and scientific documents, the astronomer Kepler could – sincerely or not – participate in a purposeful “improvement” of the mediaeval astronomical materials, such as the *Almagest* by Ptolemy, that is, to “bring it to conformity” with the Scaligerian dating: for instance, add up an appropriate constant magnitude to the longitudes of the celestial catalogue in order to “age” the catalogue to the II century a.d., and so forth. As a professional astronomer, he must have understood what and how should be done to accomplish this very well. See details in Chron3.

We have already demonstrated the rather low level of the scientific criticisms of that time in Chron1, Chapter 1. Let us recall the kind of argumentation that J. Scaliger and his supporters used even in minor occasions – such as when the XVI century mathematicians pointed out a great error in his “argumentation” for “having solved” the issue of “the circle’s quadrature”.

A heated dispute was going on in re the Scaligerian chronology and its entire concept. Today we are told the following: “In this sense, the fact that Pope Gregory XIII acknowledged the very period [Scaligerian – A. F.], othe that neither astronomy [? – A. F.] nor chronology can do without, to be unsuitable for the calendar, is still a paradox” ([295], page 107). It would be quite edifying to bring up the archive documents of the Council of Trent, or whatever is left of them, and revise all remaining documents of that troublesome epoch relevant for the struggle over the Scaligerian chronology.

### 13.9. Two phantom “ancient” reflections of Dionysius Petavius, a mediaeval chronologist of the XVII century

The Scaligerian history knows of three famous chronologists, each one named Dionysius, separated from one another by several centuries.

- **a. The first** chronologist Dionysius allegedly died in 265 A.D. ([76]).
- **b. The second** chronologist, known as Dionysius Exiguus, who had allegedly lived in the VI century a.d. ([72], [76]). The Scaligerian history contains different versions of the date of his death: around 540 A.D. or around 556 A.D.
- **c. The third** and the last chronologist Dionysius, the famous Dionysius Petavius (1583-1652).

The two “mediaeval chronologists named Dionysius” appear to be phantom reflections of one actual
mediaeval chronologist Dionysius Petavius upon the chronological shifts of 1053 years and 1386 years. The second shift is the sum of the two main shifts by 333 years and 1053 years. Here is a brief table.

1a. According to Eusebius Pamphilus, a famous chronologist Dionysius who devoted himself to calculations related to the Easter died in the alleged year 265 A.D.

■ 1b. A famous chronologist Dionysius the Little (Exiguus) died in the alleged VI century A.D., in 540 or 556. The so-called “pearl of Easter Cycles by Dionysius” occurs allegedly in 563 A.D.

■■ 1c. A famous chronologist Dionysius Petavius (1583-1652), for many years involved with the calculations of the Easter Cycle; one of the creators of the version of chronology accepted nowadays.

2a. With a total shift by 1386 years (where 1386 = 1053 + 333), Dionysius Petavius from the XVII century is superposed over Dionysius from the alleged III century A.D. Moreover, the death of Dionysius Petavius accurately “transforms” to the death of Dionysius from the III century, because 1652 – 1386 = 266 A.D.

■ 2b. With a shift by 1053 years, Dionysius Petavius is superposed over Dionysius Exiguus from the alleged VI century A.D. Indeed, 1652 – 1053 = 599 A.D. One can’t but mention that Petavius is actually the French word petit, meaning little. Therefore Dionysius Petavius from the XVII century is merely Dionysius the Little. In Latin, Dionysius the Little from the alleged VI century was called Exiguus (exiguus) = little. Thus, both Dionysii – from the XVII and the VI century – have coinciding names.

■■ 2c. Dionysius Petavius is considered to have been a disciple of Scaliger. Scaliger and his pupils lived in France. Therefore, it is quite natural that the name “Little” sounded in France as petit and eventually turned into “Petavius”, while in the Latin texts the same name “Little” sounded like “Exiguus”. Thus, the mediaeval Dionysius Petavius turned into the “ancient” Dionysius the Little from the alleged VI century A.D.

Thus, certain documents erroneously assigned to the VI century A.D. and actually describing the life and the work of Dionysius Petavius from the XVII century have retained the correct information that in the XVII century certain authors still remembered quite well that the Nativity of Jesus Christ had actually taken place in the XI century A.D.


Here we shall describe in a greater detail the stratified structure of the global chronological map, or the “Scaligerian history treatise”, that we have discovered. We will demonstrate the superposition on each of four virtually identical “chronicles” $S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4$ in the form of a table. In other words, we indicate precisely the events constituting the epoch blocks shown on fig. 6.55. For the convenience of using this table, it is worth to continuously compare it to fig. 6.55.

$E =$ The Scaligerian “history textbook”. Dates quoted according to Scaliger.

$B =$ Bible. We have already lifted the Scaligerian dates of events listed here by 1800 years, due to our discovery of the superposition of Biblical history over the Euro-Asian mediaeval history. However, we
recall that the Biblical history has to be shifted even further forwards. More details on this in our next chapters.

- $S_2$ = “Chronicle” obtained by shifting its mediaeval original by circa 1800 (more precisely – 1778) years backwards.
- $S_3$ = “Chronicle” obtained by shifting its mediaeval original by circa 1000 (more precisely – 1053) years backwards.

1-E. Duplicate K: allegedly 1460-1236 B.C.

“Antique” Trojan Kingdom of seven kings. Greeks and Trojans

1-B. –


2-E. Duplicate T: allegedly 1236-1226 A.D. The famous Trojan War between Greeks and Trojans. The fall of Troy, the exile of the Trojans.

2-B. –

2-S$_4$. Duplicate T: allegedly 535-552 A.D. The famous Gothic War (allegedly in Italy). Expulsion of the Goths from Italy, the fall of Naples and Rome.

3-E. Duplicate N: allegedly 1226-850 B.C. Regal dynasties of “antique” Greece.

3-B. –


4-E. Duplicate T: allegedly 850-830 B.C. The second version for the dating of the Trojan War according to Hellanicus, Damastus and Aristotle ([579], p. 23). The apple of discord of Venus, the goddess of love. The Trojan War as a consequence of “the apple of discord”.

4-B. Duplicate T: allegedly 850-830 A.D. Genesis 1-3. Adam and Eve, the apple of discord, punishment and expulsion from Paradise.

- 4-S$_4$. Duplicate T: allegedly 901-924 A.D. The war in Italy. Alberic I and Theodora I. Legend about “a discordian woman”.

5-E. Duplicate T: allegedly 760-753 B.C. The foundation of Rome in Italy. Romulus and Remus, the rape of the Sabines as a version of “the legend of a rape”.


5-S$_4$. Duplicate T: allegedly 931-954 A.D. The war in Italy. Alberic II and Theodora II.

6-E. Duplicate K/R: allegedly 753-522 B.C. Titus Livy’s Regal Rome of the seven kings, the so-called First Roman Empire. The great “ancient” Greek colonization of the alleged VIII-VI century B.C.


7-B. Duplicate T: allegedly 522-509 B.C. Genesis 5-8. The legend about patriarch Noah, the Ark, the Flood, the perishing of mankind, the new Covenant. There is a partial parallelism between the legends of Noah and Moses. The Ark of the Covenant at the time of Moses and the Ark at the time of Noah. The laws of Moses and the laws of Noah.

7-S$_4$. Original and Duplicate T: 1250-1268 A.D.
The famous war in Italy; the fall of medieval Italian city Troy. Manfred, Conrad.

7-S3, Duplicate T: allegedly 535-552 A.D. The famous Gothic War in Italy. The fall of Naples and Rome. Justinian, Belisarius, Narses, the Goths and the Franks – TRN, without vowels.


8-S4, Partial Original S: 1300-1550 A.D. The Empire of the Habsburgs (Habsburg = Nov-Gorod?). Mediaeval Greece. The battles of 1316 A.D. as the original of the “ancient” battle of Marathon. Duke Walter II. The wars between the Franks and the Turks. Mohammed and the Mohammedans. The fall of Byzantium in 1453 A.D. The Ottoman Sultanate. The end of independent mediaeval Greece. The voyage of Columbus, the discovery and colonization of America, or the New World.

8-S3, Duplicate N: allegedly 552-901 A.D. The Mediaeval Papal Rome. The wars between the Romans and the Langobards allegedly in 705, 711 and further up to 765 and 769 A.D. The war in the South of Italy. Wars with Saracens. Wars with Franks in Italy.


9-S4. The end of the “chronicle” S₄.

9-S3, Duplicate T: allegedly 931-954 A.D. Wars in Italy, Alberic II and Theodora II. The “Restoration” of many “ancient” customs in the mediaeval Rome. The beginning of Holy Roman Empire of German Nation.

Then the table expands, “chronicles” S₂, S₁ and S₀ appear instead of the “chronicle S₄” which had ended. Finally, the table consists of six series of superposed duplicates. Namely,

E = The Scaligerian “history textbook”. Dates according to J. Scaliger.

B = The Bible. We have already transferred the Scaligerian dates of events listed here by approximately 1800 years forwards thanks to our discovery of the Biblical history superposed over the Eurasian mediaeval history. We recall that the Biblical history has to be shifted even further forwards. More details in the next chapters.

S₃ = Chronicle obtained by shifting its mediaeval original by circa 1000 (more precisely – 1053) years backwards.

S₂ = Chronicle obtained by shifting its mediaeval original by circa 333 or 360 years backwards.

S₁ = Chronicle obtained by several distortions in its mediaeval original, see below. We shall call the chronicle S₁ the distorted original.

S₀ = The original chronicle for all of the previous “duplicate chronicles”.

10-E. Duplicate R/K: allegedly from 23 B.C. to 235 A.D. The Second Roman Empire of the I-III century A.D. During its earliest days, such major events as the Nativity of Jesus Christ, important religious reforms, “the beginning of a new era”. Explosion of a nova called the Star of Bethlehem in the Gospel.

Haran, Abraham. The Biblical Aaron and a Christian reformer by the name of Arius may be reflections of the same actual mediaeval figure.

10- S 3. Duplicate and Original R: allegedly 965-1250 A.D. The Holy Roman Empire of German Nation of the X-XIII century A.D. At the naissance of this Empire, the most prominent religious reform of “Pope Hildebrand”, or “Pope Gregory VII”. Schism of the Christian Churches, famous supernova explosion in 1054 A.D., apparently described in the Gospel as “the Star of Bethlehem” that signified the Nativity of Jesus Christ in the XI century.

10- S 2. Duplicate K: allegedly 306-535 A.D. The Third Roman Empire of the IV-VI century A.D. A famous Christian Saint Basil the Great, or simply the Great King (king = basileus) in the alleged IV century A.D. A major religious reform; Schism of Christian Churches; “heresy of Arius” (Aaron?), i.e. the famous Arianism.

10- S 1. –

10- S 0. –

11- E. Duplicate T: allegedly 235-251 A.D. Anarchy at the end of the Second Roman Empire; The Gothic War; Julia Maesa. Then the second copy of the same Duplicate T: allegedly 270-300 A.D. Civil War allegedly of the III century A.D. in Roman Empire.

11- B. Duplicate T: allegedly 270-300 A.D. Genesis 12. Abram, Sarah, the struggle against Pharaoh, or TRN without vowels.

11- S 3. Duplicate and Original T: 1250-1268 A.D. The famous war in Italy. The fall of Naples and the mediaeval Italian Troy.


11- S 1. –

11- S 0. –

12- E. Duplicate P/K/R/S: allegedly 300-535 A.D. The Third Roman Empire of the alleged IV-VI century A.D. The split of the Empire into two kingdoms – East and West.


12- S 3. Partial original: 1273-1619 A.D. The Empire of the Habsburgs (Nov-Gorod?), “Roman Kingdom”. Eastern Romaloï Empire, or Byzantium ending in 1453 A.D. with the fall of Constantinople = New City.

12- S 2. Duplicate P: allegedly 681-887 A.D. The Carolingians; the Empire of Charlemagne (the Great King). The Eastern Roman Empire.

12- S 1. Duplicate R/K: The Third Roman Empire of the alleged IV-VI century A.D. Disintegration of the Empire into two kingdoms – the Eastern and the Western.

12- S 0. –

13- E. Duplicate T: allegedly 535-552 A.D. The famous Gothic War allegedly in Italy. The end of the Third Roman Empire.


13- S 3. The end of chronicle S 3. –

13- S 2. Duplicate T: allegedly 901-924 A.D. The Civil War in Italy. Alberic I and Theodora I.

13- S 1. Duplicate R/K: allegedly 535-552 A.D. The famous Gothic War in Italy. The exodus of the Goths from Italy.

13- S 0. –

14- E. Duplicate P/N/R: allegedly 566-901 A.D. Mediaeval Papal Rome. The Carolingians, the Empire of Charlemagne (the Great King).


14- S 2. Duplicate and Original R: allegedly
962-1250 A.D. The Holy Roman Empire of German Nation.

14-S1. Duplicate P/N: allegedly 552-901 A.D. Carlingians, the Empire of Charlemagne.

14-S0. Negligible remains of data regarding actual events of the VI-IX century A.D.

15-E. Duplicate T: allegedly 901-914-924 A.D.
The Civil War in Italy. Alberic I and Theodora I. Then, another Duplicate T: allegedly 931-954 A.D. The war in Italy. Alberic II and Theodora II.

15-B. Duplicate T: allegedly 901-924 A.D.

15-S2. Duplicate and Original T: 1250-1266 A.D. The famous war in Italy. The fall of the Hohenstaufens. The fall of the mediaeval Troy in Italy. The fall of Naples. Manfred, Charles of Anjou, Conrad (Khan-of-the-Horde?).

15-S1. Duplicate T: allegedly 901-924 A.D. The war in Italy. Alberic I and Theodora I.

15-S0. Original: Negligible remains of data regarding actual events of the X century A.D.

16-E. Duplicate and Original R/S: 960-1250 A.D.
The Holy Roman Empire of German Nation. Emperors are crowned twice: in Rome and Germany. The “two empires”, as it were.

16-B. Duplicate and Original R: 962-1250 A.D.
1 Kings 12-22, 2 Kings 1-23, 2 Chronicles 10-34. Kingdoms of Israel and Judah. Both kingdoms exist in parallel, at the same time. “Two kingdoms”.


16-S1. Duplicate and Original R: 962-1250 A.D. The Holy Roman Empire of German Nation. “Double Empire”, or one with double coronation.

16-S0. Duplicate and Original R: 962-1250 A.D. The first time any data of actual events of this epoch appear. A vague beginning of a partially correct chronology. Not much data.

17-E. Duplicate and Original T:
1250-1269 A.D. A famous war in Italy. The fall of the Hohenstaufens. The fall of the Italian Troy and the fall of Naples. Manfred, Charles of Anjou, Conrad (Khan-of-the-Horde?).

17-B. Duplicate and Original T:
1250-1268 A.D. 2 Kings 24-25, 2 Chronicles 35-36. War with the Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar. The fall of the Kingdom of Judah.

17-S1. Duplicate and Original T:
1250-1268 A.D. The war in Italy. The fall of the Hohenstaufens. The fall of the Italian Troy and the fall of Naples. Manfred, Charles of Anjou, Conrad (Khan-of-the-Horde?).

17-S0. Duplicate and Original T:
1250-1268 A.D. The war in Italy. The fall of the Hohenstaufens. The fall of the Italian Troy and the fall of Naples. Manfred, Charles of Anjou, Conrad (Khan-of-the-Horde?).

18-E. Duplicate and Original S:
1273-1619 A.D.
The Great = “Mongolian” Empire. The Habsburg (Nov-Gorod?) dynasty. The Avignon captivity of Popes in France 1305-1378 A.D., which lasted 70 years. After that, the relocation of the Holy See to the Italian Rome.
18-B. Duplicate and Original S: 1273-1600 A.D.
The Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Judith. The Babylonian captivity of Jews under the rule of “Persia” which lasted 70 years. Then – “return” to the new Jerusalem, its “restoration”.

18-S1. Duplicate and Original S: 1273-1619 A.D. The Great = “Mongolian” Empire. The Habsburg (Nov-Gorod?) dynasty. Towards the end of this period, in the XVI-XVII century, the chronologists J. Scaliger and D. Petavius have been quite active. We recall here that Petavius was most likely the original prototype for “Dionysius the Little” from the alleged VI century A.D.

18-S0. Original S: 1273-1619 A.D.

15. THE COORDINATION OF A NEW ASTRONOMICAL DATING WITH A DYNASTIC PARALLEL

The above-described shift of astronomical dating from “antiquity” into the Middle Ages appears to conform well to the basic chronological shifts by approximately 330-360, 1050, and 1800 years. We shall note here that those shifts were discovered on the basis of completely different, independent considerations – namely, as a result of analysis of repetition duplicates we revealed in the “Scaligerian textbook of history”, and above all, on the basis of the discovered dynastic parallels, or parallelisms. Those three shifts shall be referred to as “dynastic”.

We shall present a few bright examples of concurrence between astronomical and dynastic shifts (see fig. 6.100). Now we shall decode the legend we use on this diagram.

1) The Star of Bethlehem. According to the Gospel, when Jesus Christ was born, a blazing star flared in the sky, called the Star of Bethlehem. In accordance with the Scaligerian version, this flash was dated “year zero” of the new era. As demonstrated below, this flash actually occurred in 1054 A.D., but the Scaligerite
chronologists artificially shifted it backwards by 1053 years, from the XI century into the I century. We may recall that a famous supernova explosion was recorded in 1054. More details below. Thus, the difference between 1054 and “the year zero” is 1053 years, exactly equal to the value of one of three main chronological shifts on the global chronological map. That shift is in good concurrence with the independent identification of the Second Roman Empire with the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century (fig. 6.23 and fig. 6.24). The shifts we discovered should not be thought to describe certain periodicity in the distributions of dates of actual astronomical phenomena, like eclipses or explosions. We have shown earlier that the Scaligerian links of ancient documents containing descriptions of eclipses as compared to the dates of actual ancient eclipses are at a great stretch in the absolute majority of cases, therefore, it may no way be an astronomical proof.

2) Total eclipse at the time of the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ. We have already recalled that, according to the early Christian tradition, at the time of the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ either a solar or a lunar eclipse occurred. The Scaligerian chronology offers the dating of 33 a.d. for that eclipse. However, as we noted, this eclipse doesn’t fit into the description of the original sources ([544], Volume 1). An accurate dating provides two possibilities: either the lunar eclipse of 1075 a.d., or a solar eclipse of 1086 ([906], [601]). (See Chron2, Chapter 2.) In this case, the shift of dates originating here is approximately 1050 years as well – in other words, coincides with the second basic chronological shift of 1050 years. This shift conforms well to an independent identification of the Second Roman Empire with the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century (fig. 6.23 and fig. 6.24).

3) The Apocalypse. The Scaligerian date for creation of this Biblical book is the I-II century a.d. ([76], [765]). Our new astronomical dating of the Apocalypse in compliance with the horoscope contained therein (see above), yields 1486 a.d. The chronological shift here is approximately of 1300-1350 years – i.e., approximately equal to the sum of the first and the second basic chronological shifts by 330-360 years and 1000-1050 years.

4) Jesus Christ. In the Scaligerian version, Jesus Christ lived in the I century a.d. According to our results, he had lived in the XI century a.d. (see the global chronological map above). The chronological shift here is one of 1053 years (see details below). This shift conforms well to an independent dynastic parallelism superposing the Second Roman Empire over the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century (fig. 6.23, fig. 6.24). Apparently, a reflection of Jesus Christ in the secular-religious “Roman” history of the XI century was “Pope Hildebrand”, a.k.a. Gregory VII. (See details below, in Chron2, Chapter 2.)

5) Explosions of Stars. It is very important that the three main chronological shifts by approximately 330, 1050, and 1800 years conform well to the astronomical data of irregular character – we mean, phenomena different from eclipses that take place with certain periodicity and are in this sense regular, or can be calculated. The explosions of stars are an important example of irregular phenomena. Three chronological shifts become apparent in the distribution of the Scaligerian dates of nova and supernova explosions. The dates of “ancient explosions” appear to be obtained from shifting the dates of actual mediaeval explosions by approximately 333 years, 1053 years, or 1778 years downwards. In particular, the dates of all explosions allegedly of 900 b.c. – 390 a.d. are obtained from the dates of explosions of the X-XIII century by shifting them 1053 years backwards. More details on this in Chron2, Chapter 2. In the Fig.6.100 you can observe only one of such examples. The explosion of the alleged year of 186 a.d. “is obtained” from an actual explosion of 1230 a.d. by shifting it backwards by 1044 years, which virtually coincides with the second chronological shift of 1050 years.

6) Thucydides. The Scaligerian history dates the three eclipses described by the “antique” Thucydides back to the V century, namely, the years 431, 424 and 413 a.d. Upon precise astronomical dating all three are lifted to the XI or the XII century a.d. (see Chron1, Chapter 1). Thus, the dates in this case are shifted by 1470 or 1560 years. This is probably the difference between the second and the third basic shifts, as 1800 – 330 = 1470 years.

7) Titus Livy. Scaligerite chronologists dated the eclipse described by Titus Livy in his History (LIV, 36, 1) back to the middle of the II century a.d., allegedly 168 a.d. Upon precise astronomical dating it
was identified with the eclipse of 955 A.D., or that of 1020 A.D. The value of the shift forwards is either 1120 years or 1188 years. That is close to the second chronological shift of 1050 years.

8) Ptolemy’s *Almagest*. Ptolemy’s *Almagest* is considered to have been compiled in the time of the “ancient” Roman Emperor Antoninus Pius (allegedly 138–161 A.D.), in the second year of his reign. However in our dating, the star catalog *Almagest* dates back to a completely different epoch, namely, the VII–XIV century A.D. (see Chron1). By precession of longitudes, the Latin edition of *Almagest* dates back to approximately the XV–XVI century A.D. Thus, the dates are shifted forwards by about a millennium in the first case and about 1400 years in the second case — that is, either the second chronological shift by 1050 years, or the sum of the first shift with the second, 350 + 1050 = 1400, is manifested here. It is interesting that the epoch of the first editions of the *Almagest* — allegedly around 1530 A.D. — differs from 140 A.D. (that is, the 2nd year of the reign of Antoninus Pius) by approximately 1390–1400 years as well. It should be noted that upon lifting the dates, the “ancient” Antoninus Pius is superposed, in accordance with independent dynastic parallelisms, over the epoch of the first *Almagest* editions of the alleged years 1528, 1537, 1538, 1542, 1551, and so on. Immediately before this time, in 1493–1519, Maximilian I Pius Augustus, a famous Emperor, reigned in the Empire of the Habsburgs (Nov–Gorod?) (fig. 6.60 and fig. 6.61).

9) *Zodiacs of Dendera*. The Scaligerian dating of the Round and Long *Zodiacs* in the Dendera Temple in Egypt — allegedly circa 30 B.C. (or 54–68 A.D.) and the alleged years 14–37 A.D. The exact astronomical solution is completely different — namely, 1185 A.D. for the Round *Zodiac* and 1168 A.D. for the Long *Zodiac* (see Chron1, chapter 2:5.4). Therefore, a shift forwards by approximately 1150–1200 years may be observed.

10) *Horoscopes of Athribis*. Scaligerite historians dated the two horoscopes of Athribis discovered by Flinders Petrie, a famous Egyptologist, back to circa 52 and 59 A.D. However, the exact astronomical solution yields 1230 and 1268 A.D., respectively (see Chron1, chapter 2:5.4). The shift amounts to about 1200 years here.

---

We refer to a curious effect we discovered after a thorough analysis of *Chronological Tables* by J. Blair ([76]), compiled at the end of the XVIII century — the beginning of the XIX century. These tables are of the utmost value to us since they were written at the time when the Scaligerian history had just been formulated. The *Tables* of Blair deliver a chronological version still fairly close to the one offered by Scaliger and his school from the end of the XVI — the beginning of the XVII century. Therefore, these tables vividly demonstrate the principles that the Scaligerian history was based on primarily. From this standpoint, later chronological tables are “worse” than those of Blair and other similar ones from the XVII–XVIII century, in the sense that the later tables are “too smooth”. Historians of the XIX–XX century had “polished them”, filling enormous gaps and cracks with a host of minor details, keeping the rough layout of the Scaligerian chronology intact. As a result, many traces of the artificial extension of chronology, showing through in the *Tables* by J. Blair, for instance, were glossed over and covered up by many insignificant details in subsequent tables. As a result, the “break points” in the Scaligerian chronology were covered with a thick layer of “historical concrete” of the XIX–XX century.

Therefore, a practical conclusion: if we wish to recreate the original mechanism of the Scaligerian chronology of the XVI–XVII century, we should analyse the *early* tables of the XVII–XVIII century, like the tables of Blair ([76]) — a material much more *primordial* than what we are facing nowadays in the later, levelled tables.

Thus, let us commence the analysis of the *Tables* by Blair ([76]). The full title of his work published in Moscow in 1808 is, *The Tables Chronological, Embracing All Parts of the World History Year to Year from the Creation to the XIX Century, Published in English by John Blair, a Member of Royal Society of London*. They embrace the history of mankind since the alleged year 4004 B.C. until the XIX century. The *Tables* by Blair divide all kingdoms listed therein into
two types — those which have year-to-year annals of their own, and those whose chronicles didn’t survive until the modern times, known only for having been mentioned in the documents of some other “kingdoms featured in annals”.

We shall pay our foremost attention to the “featured kingdoms” as well as the different ways of keeping count of years in ancient times, i.e. different eras, etc. In fact, it is this “system of eras” “tidied up” by Scaliger and his disciples that constitutes the framework of the contemporary version of chronology.

The complete list of the main “featured kingdoms” with dynastic currents for which at least partial data is available can be seen in fig. 6.101 and 6.102. In doing so, we retained the terminology of the Tables by Blair ([76]). As for the alleged VI-VIII century, we have only shown the principal kingdoms listed in [76]. Minor kingdoms dated by Blair after the VI-VIII century A.D., were not marked, to avoid bulking the picture. However, the list of “Blair’s kingdoms” allegedly pre-dating the V century A.D. is presented in full.

Let us now revert to the basic “ancient” systems of chronology as presented by Blair and described in contemporary commentaries on chronology. In the Scaligerian chronology, these eras turn out to have often been “forgotten”, sometimes for several centuries, then again “revived” in their alleged former state. The basic ones are:

1) The “ancient” count by Olympiads, begun allegedly in 776 B.C. ([76], table 1).

The Olympic Games, in honour of which the count by Olympiads was established, were introduced by the Dactyls for the first time in the alleged year 1453 B.C.

Then the Games were forgotten.
Then restored by Hercules in 1222 B.C.
Then forgotten once again.
Restored by Iphitus and Lycurgus allegedly in 884 B.C.

However, it suddenly becomes clear that the use of the Games for the count of time started only in the alleged year 776 B.C. By the way, certain other Games – e.g., Isthmian, Nemean, Pythian – were likewise forgotten and restored several times in the Scaligerian chronology. In accordance with the *Tables* by Blair, the count of years by Olympiads stopped around 1 A.D. (!), therefore, it had lasted for about 776 years: allegedly since 776 B.C. till 0 A.D., and was forgotten thereafter. In general, the disagreement between chronologists regarding the year that the Olympiads were first used for count of time (see below) amounted to almost *five hundred years*.

A few examples of demonstrating this chronological chaos. According to Blair ([76]), the count by Olympiads and the count *from the foundation of the City* began approximately at the same time. Rome in Italy is considered today to have been meant as “The City”, which is probably incorrect (see CHRON5). Hence the count of time by Olympiads has allegedly begun in the middle of the VIII century B.C., according to Blair. Our contemporary historian S. Lourier claims that “at the epoch of Xenophon (i.e. allegedly in the V-IV centuries B.C. – A. F.) count by Olympiads hasn’t existed yet; Timaeus, a Sicilian historian, introduced it for the first time around 264 B.C.” ([447], p. 224). According to Lourier, the “ancient” Timaeus first introduced the count of time by Olympiads *512 years after the first Olympiad*, allegedly dated back to 776 B.C. The resulting disagreement between historians amounts to *five hundred years*, give or take a little.

Thus, whenever an old document quotes the count of time by Olympiads, one should make it clear what particular absolute date is used by the chronologist for reference. Depending on the choice, dates can fluctuate by *five hundred years*!

---

Fig. 6.102. The version of the global chronology of “ancient” kingdoms as given by J. Blair’s *Chronological Tables* ([76]). The strange chronological gap is plainly observable. Second part of the graph.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>Burgundian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Gothic in Spain</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>Kings in Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>2nd period of the Roman episcopacy</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>Eastern Roman Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Roman pontificate, papacy</td>
<td>1449</td>
<td>Introduction of Greek language in England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>VI c.</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>Kings in Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>526</td>
<td>Dionysius the Little</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>Kings in Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
<td>The count of years after the era of Hejira</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Fig. 6.102. The version of the global chronology of “ancient” kingdoms as given by J. Blair’s *Chronological Tables* ([76]). The strange chronological gap is plainly observable. Second part of the graph.*
By the way, N. A. Morozov came up with an idea in [544] that the count by Olympiads, or four-year periods, simply coincides with a very familiar Julian way of counting years in which four-year periods are marked by the system of bissextiles, that is, the Julian calendar considers every fourth year to be a leap one. This hypothesis indicates that the count by Olympiads had not existed before Julius Caesar, who had introduced the Julian calendar. Hence even in the Scaligerian chronology, the Olympiads/Julian count of years appeared not earlier than the I century a.d., and by no means in the monstrously ancient epoch of Hercules, the “ancient” hero. In accordance with our reconstruction, by which Julius Caesar does not appear before the XI century a.d., the count by Olympiads could not have been introduced before the XI century a.d. and, most probably, coincides with the Christian count of years from the Nativity of Jesus Christ, which, in our reconstruction, began at around 1000 a.d. or 1053 a.d., or the year of the Nativity of Jesus Christ in the XI century.

Thus, the reasons of disagreement between different historians regarding the starting point of count of years by Olympiads become clear. The count by Olympiads must have originated with the Nativity of Jesus Christ in the XI century and continued for several hundred years, without any of the numerous “oblivions and revivals”. It was a consequence of “making copies of the chronicles” in the Scaligerian history that the same actual event – the beginning of Olympiads – was “made copies of” (on paper!) and “moved” deep into the past. As a result, the later historians, looking at the duplicate reiterations in the Scaligerian textbook, forgetting the reasons for its appearance, and assuming the air of extreme significance, started debating the “oblivions” and “renewals” of Olympiads, look for reasons, and propose involved theories. Hercules or the Dactyls. Or, Iphitus and Lycurgus. In general, a huge new “sphere of activity” that they have discovered.

2) The “ancient” count of years from the foundation of the City. This chronology allegedly originated around 753 B.C. ([76], table 5). But then we are told that this date was established by Varro, a Roman, only in the I century, which is allegedly 700 years (!) after the foundation of Rome in Italy, according to the Scaligerian chronology. The count of years “from the foundation of the City” ends in the alleged III century a.d., – namely, in the decade of 250-260 a.d. ([76]), the time of civil wars in Rome of the alleged middle of the III century a.d. Blair reports, “Most of the chronicles start [at that time – A. F.] counting years from the foundation of Rome” ([76], table 15). We recall that the Scaligerian identification of the “City” as the Italian Rome founded allegedly in 753 B.C. is only a hypothesis. In Chron 5 we justify the idea that it was the New Rome on the Bosporus, i.e. Constantinople, that was called the City. Constantinople is widely thought to have been founded around 300 a.d. and consecrated in 330 a.d. Thus, even in the Scaligerian chronology, substitution of Rome on the Bosporus for the Italian Rome leads to a millenarian shift of dates counted “from the foundation of the City” in some chronicles. The famous History by Titus Livy is an example thereof.

It is noteworthy that the count of years “from the foundation of the City” in the Scaligerian chronology comes to an end just at the junction of two duplicate empires, – namely, the Second Roman Empire and the Third Roman Empire. See [76] and figs. 6.101, 6.102.

3) The count of years from the Nativity of Jesus Christ. In the Scaligerian chronology, this count was allegedly used for the first time in 747 a.d., i.e. seven hundred years after the death of Jesus Christ in the I century according to Scaliger ([76]), and two hundred years after the calculations of Dyonisius the Little, who lived in the alleged VI century a.d. and who was the first to calculate the date of Jesus Christ’s Crucifixion. Then we encounter the familiar “oblivions and revivals” of eras. We are told that, after the first mention of the era from the Nativity of Jesus Christ “in an official document of 742 a.d., this era goes out of use again and begins to be mentioned every now and then only in the X century a.d., and only since 1431 (i.e. the fifteenth century! – A. F.) is it regularly recorded in Papal epistles, with a parallel count of years from ‘the creation of the world’ ([744], p. 52). It is fairly notable that secular chronicles acquired the era from the Nativity of Jesus Christ even later than that. Historians report it to have been fixed in Germany as well as in France only in the XVI century, in Russia – only in 1700, in England, even later – in 1752 ([744], p. 52). Thus, even after the introduction of the Scaligerian chronology, a more or less regular use of the era from the Nativity of Jesus Christ can be spoken of only as of the XV century.
Previous, rather infrequent “mentions” of that era in the documents allegedly earlier than the X-XI century A.D. are, most likely, the results of the Scaligerian duplication of chronicles and shifting them deep into the past. As a result, the actual mediaeval mentions of that era in the documents of the XI-XVII century “appeared as phantoms” allegedly in the VI century and in the VIII century. Looking at those phantoms, the late historians began to build theories – for example, about Dionysius the Little of the alleged VI century A.D. We will answer in the following way. As mentioned above, “Dionysius the Little from the VI century” is actually nothing but a phantom reflection of the actual mediaeval Dionysius Petavius (i.e. actually Little = petit) from the XVI-XVII century A.D. Hence, Dionysius Petavius = Dionysius the Little turns out to have apparently been the first to have correctly calculated the date of Jesus Christ’s Crucifixion approximately six hundred years before his own time.

As we understand now, he was absolutely right, since by counting six hundred years back from the XVI-XVII century we obtain exactly the XI century A.D. when, in accordance with our reconstruction, Jesus Christ actually lived and was crucified.

So, returning to fig. 6.101 and fig. 6.102, we can see that in the Scaligerian history, two basic “antique” counts of years – by Olympiads and from the foundation of the City – went out of use at least 500 years before the first and the only official mention of the era from the Nativity of Jesus Christ in the document allegedly of the year 742, the dating of which, as we have said, is rather dubious.

4) The “ancient” count of years from the Genesis. This era is thought to be closely connected with the Bible, therefore entirely depending on the dates of the Biblical events. Since these dates are transferred forwards into the Middle Ages, as a result of the new empirico-statistical dating methods, therefore, this count of years is most probably of a mediaeval or even late mediaeval origin and began, according to our reconstruction, not earlier than the X-XI century A.D. For the dating of Biblical events, see Chron6.

5) The count of years in the era of Hejira. This Arabic chronology is believed to have started in 622 A.D. ([76], table 19), and closely linked to the dating of the Koran and described therein. Therefore, it is most likely of a later origin too, begun in the X-XI century or even later.

The following important fact is obvious on the fig. 6.101 and fig. 6.102. In the Scaligerian chronology, all kingdoms except two are split into two classes – those which existed entirely before the beginning of the new era, and those which existed entirely after the beginning of the new era. Only two kingdoms – the Roman Empire and Parthian Kingdom – cross the range from 0 to 260 A.D. The beginning of the new era turns out to have had strangely destructive properties – out of many “ancient” kingdoms, only two have safely crossed that “perilous interval” from 0 to 260 A.D.

However, there is no continuous information on Parthian dynasties ([76]). Hence, that kingdom cannot possibly serve as a chronological link and the “collation” of various eras.

As for the other kingdom – the Roman Empire – we can say the following. It is the Second Roman Empire that fits into the range between 0 and 260 A.D. perfectly. Its end, namely 260-270 A.D., perfectly coincides with the end of that “perilous interval” 0-260 A.D. that we have just discovered. Moreover, it is very obvious from the fig. 6.101 and fig. 6.102 that the decade of 260-270 A.D., or the very collation point of the Second and the Third Roman Empires, is not covered by any Olympic count of years, neither the one from the foundation of the City, nor the count of years from the Nativity of Jesus Christ, which, as historians say, “has not existed” yet. According to the Scaligerian chronology, the count of years from the foundation of the City comes to an end, the count by Olympiads ended allegedly 250 years before that. The Christian method of counting years has not begun yet, not even been invented – there’re a few several hundred years left to go.

Then, in accordance with the results of statistic methods, the Second Roman Empire is the duplicate of the Third Roman Empire. In this relation, both of them are, in their turn, nothing but phantom reflections of the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century and the Empire of the Habsburgs (Nov-Gorod?) of the XIV-XVI century; fig. 6.11, fig. 6.12, fig. 6.12a, fig. 6.19, fig. 6.20, fig. 6.21, fig. 6.22, fig. 6.23, fig. 6.24. Hence, Roman history of the alleged I-III century A.D. is not original, but rather a “phantom”. It must
be lifted and identified with at least the Third Roman Empire, but actually with later kingdoms of the X-XIII century, and of the XIV-XVI century.

Furthermore, the Roman episcopacy partly falls into that “perilous interval” of 0-260 A.D. But Papal history of 68-141 A.D. is considered to be an absolute legend of the Scaligerian history ([492], p. 312). Blair writes, “Until expiration of this century [i.e. the beginning of the II century A.D. – A. F.]… this column [i.e. the list of Roman Popes – A. F.] is completely obscure” ([76], table 13). The next Papal period of 68-141 A.D. is not independent, but only a phantom reflection of the Papal period of the alleged years 314-536 A.D., fig. 6.16; moreover, both of them are reflections of a much later Papal history. Thus, the first period of the Roman episcopacy, when moved forwards, is identified with its second period. Consequently, we discover that the epoch of 300 years from 30 B.C. to 270 A.D. in the Scaligerian chronology is an area of complete chronological silence of the documents. In that period, according to the Scaligerian chronology, there is not a single kingdom with its own independent dynastic current.

The epoch from 30 B.C. to 270 A.D. in the Scaligerian chronology ends with a gap. We recall that the two main “ancient counts of years” of that period—the era from the foundation of the City and the Diocletian era allegedly begun in 284 A.D. – do not agree ([76]). Between them there is a chronological lapse, a gap of at least 20 years. We repeat that no count of years from the Nativity of Jesus Christ is in question yet.

**Conclusion.** The place of the collation of several duplicate chronicles is obvious in the Scaligerian chronology—the epoch of the alleged years 0-260 A.D. In the XVI-XVII century, someone allocated several phantom duplicate chronicles along the axis of time and pasted them together in one “textbook”, quite roughly at that. They didn’t even bother to cover up the place of sewing with any era, having probably decided it would work well as it was. As the result, the false “beginning of a new era” in the alleged year zero split up the Scaligerian history “in two”, fig. 6.101 and fig. 6.102. Enter many “antique” kingdoms before the beginning of the new era, as well as many mediaeval kingdoms after the beginning of the new era, while around the beginning of that very new era there appeared a strange lapse that we discover today with our new methods, analysing the whole structure of the Scaligerian chronology.