“Dark Ages” in mediaeval history

1. THE MYSTERIOUS RENAISSANCE OF THE “CLASSICAL AGE” IN MEDIAEVAL ROME

1.1. The lugubrious “Dark Ages” in Europe that presumably succeeded the beauteous “Classical Age”

As we can see from the global chronological map as arranged in the sum of the three shifts, nearly all documents considered “ancient” and describing events that allegedly occurred prior to 900 A.D. in Scaligerian datings are probably phantom duplicates of the originals referring to the events of the X-XVII century A.D. One may question the availability of “space” for the “classical age” in mediaeval history – that is, whether our attempt to place the “ancient” events in the Middle Ages might fail due to its being “filled up” with occurrences that we already know of. This doesn’t seem to be the case, as a detailed analysis shows us.

Firstly, the epochs that were deemed different are identified as one and the same. Consider, for example, the superpositions of royal dynasties whose similarity had remained previously unnoted. Secondly, many mediaeval periods in the Scaligerian history are said to be “concealed by tenebrosity.” Now we are beginning to understand why. The respective mediaeval documents describing these epochs were deliberately “set backwards in time” by the Scaligerian chronologists. The withdrawal of these documents immersed a great number of mediaeval periods into artificial darkness.

The historians of the XVIII-XIX century gave rise to the peculiar concept that the mediaeval period was that of the “Dark Ages.” The “great achievements of the classical age” are said to have faced utter decline and vanished. Scientific thought presumably “rolls all the way back into the Stone Age.” The great literary works of “antiquity” are all supposed to have been kept stashed away as dead weight until their resurfacing during the Renaissance ([333], page 161). Moreover, these “antique” texts were allegedly kept by ignorant monks whose prime responsibility was, as we are now told, the destruction of “heathen literature.”

The absolute majority of the top ranking clergy is presumably illiterate ([333], page 166). The great achievements of “ancient” astronomy – the eclipse theory, the computation of planet ephemeredes, etc. – are reported to be completely forgotten. And the famous Cosmas Indicopleustes, who is supposed to have lived in the VI century A.D. and researched the movement of the Sun and the stars, honestly believes that the Universe is a box whose centre contains a flat Earth, washed by the Ocean and supporting the bulk of mount Ararat. Apart from this, the lid of the box is studded with stellar nails. There are four angels in the corners of the box that produce wind. This is the level of scientific cosmography of the Middle Ages (see CHRON3, Chapter 11:6.3).

Money coinage is allegedly forgotten, the art of
architecture rendered unnecessary, and an “overall cultural degradation” spread far and wide ([333], page 167). And so on, and so forth.

Of course, the Scaligerian mediaeval history mentions certain achievements of the period, but they are usually given commentary along the lines of: “But even these sudden flashes of intellectual work represented random events singular in their occurrence” ([333], page 169). We are being convinced that “ancient” Latin in its brilliance “degrades” in an odd manner and transforms into a clumsy and squalid lingo, which only manages to regain splendour during the Renaissance – and that over a short period of time – and becomes widely used as a scientific language ([333]).

Without a doubt, there are reasons for such a lurid picture if we are to rely upon the Scaligerian chronology. But we want to give another explanation to this hypothetical “deluge of barbarity” that is presumed to have overwhelmed Europe, Asia, and Africa in the early Middle Ages. We are of the opinion that what we see isn’t a degradation of “the great legacy of the past” but, rather, the naissance of civilization that gradually created all the cultural and historical values, which were cast far back into the past due to the chronological errors that lit a spectral light in the “classical age” and left many mediaeval periods bare.

The contemporary mediaeval history of Rome unravels a great many controversies and blatantly obvious parallels with the “Classical age” which, under close surveillance, may well be explained by the distortion of the concept of the role played by the Middle Ages. Let us throw a cursory glance at the history of Rome. Why Rome in particular? The reason is that the Scaligerian history credits the Roman chronology to be of utmost importance (see Chron1, Chapter 1).

We shall begin with an intriguing detail. The famous Chronicles of Orosius inform us of the fact that “Aeneas had left Troy and gone to Rome” (!). Moreover, the “ancient” Orosius adds that he was told this in school. Let us explain. Such a voyage of Aeneas, who took part in the Trojan war, makes the Scaligerian history 400-500 years shorter (also see Chron1, Chapter 1).

The fragmentary history of “ancient” Greece made a certain impact on the formation of the Roman chronology in the days of yore. The historian N. Radzig points out that “the heroic deeds of Aeneas in Italy and the fate of his offspring comprised the Roman pre-history of Rome… Initially this pre-history wasn’t very long: it called Romulus the grandson of Aeneas [this is the root of the 500-year discrepancy with the contemporary Scaligerian history, as mentioned in Chron1, Chapter 1 – A. F.]; however, later on, when the Roman annalists acquainted themselves with the Greek chronology, they invented a whole sequence of Albanian rulers… Proud patrician clans got into the habit of tracing their ancestry all the way back to the companions of Aeneas, and the clan of Julius directly to the son of Aeneas, whose name was arbitrarily altered for some reason” ([719], page 8)

N. Radzig is honestly perplexed by such “ignorant endeavours of the Roman chronographers.” However, below we shall demonstrate the amazing parallels in events as well as statistics that identify the classical Trojan War of the alleged XIII century B.C. with the Gothic war of the alleged VI century A.D. that raged in Italy and the New Rome, as well as the Italian war of the alleged XIII century A.D. The Roman annalists were therefore correct in their claims that the Trojan War marks the actual beginning of the mediaeval Roman history in the XIII century A.D.

We shall give a brief overview of the mediaeval history of Rome that is based in particular on the fundamental six-volume work of the German historian F. Gregorovius ([196]). The significance of this work lies in the fact that it actually consists of a large number of mediaeval documents that have been meticulously compiled by Gregorovius, along with his scrupulous and accurate comments on the matter.

Gregorovius writes that “ever since the decline of the Gothic state [which supposedly occurred in the VI century a.d. – A. F.], the ancient Gothic rule came to absolute ruination. Laws, monuments, and even historical recollections had all fallen into oblivion” ([196], Volume 2, pages 3-4).

The mandatory chronological sublation of secular chronicles from the mediaeval Roman history – the History of Titus Livy, for example, which had been declared “ancient history” – made Rome a completely ecclesiastical city from the point of view of the Scaligerian and modern history. F. Gregorovius writes that “Rome had miraculously transformed into a monastery.” This mysterious transformation of “secular ancient Rome” (let us remind the reader of the iron legions and the in-
flexible heroes of the days of yore) into the “mediaeval ecclesiastical Rome” had been proclaimed as “one of the greatest and most amazing metamorphoses in the history of humanity.” ([196], Volume 2, pages 3-6).

It is significant that almost all of the political and civil institutions that comprise “the quintessence of ancient Rome” according to the Scaligerian history were present at “the rise of mediaeval Rome.” Medieval evidence of Rome is extremely scarce in the Scaligerian chronology. Gregorovius tells us that “the events of the years to follow remain unknown to us, since the chronicles of that age are as monosyllabic and blear as the epoch itself, and they only tell us of disasters and afflictions” ([196], Volume 2, page 21) – all of this coming from the author of a fundamental historical tractate ([196]).

The following is told of the events of the middle of the alleged IX century a.d.: “the historians of Roman history have to contend themselves with the annals of the Frankish chronographers in what concerns this period which contain rather meagre information, as well as Papal biographies that only contain indications of what buildings were erected and what donations made. There is no hope for a historian to present a picture of the city’s civil life of the period” ([196], Volume 3, page 58).

Further, we learn that: “a great many ecclesial acts and regestae were kept in the Papal archive… The loss of these treasures [or their arbitrary transfer into “antiquity” – A. F.] that have perished without a trace in the XII or the XIII century (which resulted in a great gap in our knowledge of the time).” ([196], Volume 3, page 121)

All of this appears to mean that the overwhelming portion of surviving documents pertinent to the history of the mediaeval Italian Rome belong to the XI century, or even to the post-XI century period.

F. Gregorovius writes that “if all of these regestae had been in our possession… there is no doubt that the history of the city of Rome between the VIII and the X century [three hundred years, that is – A. F.] would instantly become illuminated by a different, and much brighter light” ([196], Volume 3, page 131, comment 30).

He writes further:

“Not a single scribe can be found who would care to immortalize the dramatic history of the city in writing. Germany, France, and even Southern Italy… have provided us with a great many chronicles; however, the Roman monks have been so indifferent to the fate of their city that the events of that epoch remain utterly nebulous”. ([196], Volume 3, pages 125-126)

It is assumed that “at the same time, the papacy carried on with its ancient chronicles with vehemence” ([196], Volume 3, pages 125-126). However, this is only a hypothesis of the Scaligerian history.

This Papal chronicle – or, rather, its late version we’re being offered today – is by no means continuous. It demonstrates gigantic gaps. “The biography of Nicholas I (who is supposed to have lived in the IX century a.d. – A. F) marks the point where the Papal books cease to be kept, and we shall have many a chance to regret the lack of this source in our presentation of the history of the city” ([196], Volume 3, page 127).

1.2. Parallels between “antiquity” and the Middle Ages that are known to historians, but misinterpreted by them

The surviving fragments of mediaeval Roman chronicles tell us of the facts that clearly testify to the “Classical” nature of certain events in their modern interpretation. In such cases the historians join their voices in unison and begin to tell us of the revival of ancient recollections, Classical reminiscences, imitations of antiquity, etc. F. Gregorovius, for one, writes that “certain X century Romans that we encounter have very strangely-sounding names. They draw our attention in their revival of certain ancient artefacts in our imagination” ([196], Volume 3, page 316). If we’re to say the same thing differently, in a simpler manner, it turns out that many mediaeval Romans bore names that are considered “ancient” nowadays. This makes the “Classical Age” just another way of referring to the Middle Ages.

The Scaligerian history often discussed the issue of the existence of the Senate and the Consulate in mediaeval Rome. On one hand, these famous political institutions are considered to have been pertinent to “ancient” Rome exclusively, which had allegedly been destroyed in the alleged V-VI century a.d. with the decline of the Third Western Roman Empire; on the other hand, some of the mediaeval chronicles that have reached our time occasionally make references to the existence of a senate, senators, consuls, tribunes,
and praetors in *mediaeval* Rome. Those titles, grades, and offices are clearly “ancient.” There’s even a “schism” of sorts in the Scaligerian history where one part of the Roman historians considers these “ancient” institutions to have continued existing in the Middle Ages as well. Others – the majority that F. Gregorovius himself adhered to – were certain that the mediaeval Romans were using these “ancient” terms by sheer force of habit, without ascribing the “original meaning” to them, and only keeping them as a “pleasant memento” of the greatness of “ancient Rome.”

F. Gregorovius descants upon the same, telling us that “they [the mediaeval Romans – A. F.] call upon the ancient graves for help, the ones that already became legends, and invoke the shadows of the consuls, tribunes, and senators that haunt this eternal city throughout all of the Middle Ages as if they were real [sic! – A. F.”] (196), Volume 3, page 349.

Also: “Consul’s rank is frequently mentioned in the X century documents” ([196], Volume 3, page 409, comment 20). In the alleged X century “the Emperor [Otto – A. F.] had tried to revive the long-forgotten *Roman customs*” ([196], Volume 3, page 388). In particular, Otto III “bore titles that have been created in imitation of the titles of the ancient Roman triumphators” ([196], Volume 3, pages 395-396). Gregorovius has got the following to say about the description of the mediaeval Rome contained in a well-known mediaeval tractate titled *Graphia*: “the future and the past in the *Graphia* are all mixed up” ([196], Volume 3, page 458, comment 7).

Below we find that “this is precisely what we actually see in Otto III, who had passionately introduced the surviving remnants of the Roman Empire, such as the ranks, the garments, and the ideas of the days of the Empire’s existence into his *mediaeval* state where all of it had looked [from the point of view of modern historians – A. F.] as patches… The will to sanitize the barbaric epoch with such reminiscing was a widespread phenomenon [sic! – A. F.]… The keeping of the priceless Papal book which had been interrupted at the biography of Stephan V was resumed in Rome in the X century [our take is that it was most probably inchoated and not resumed, and that this event occurred a lot later than the X century – A. F.] – that is, in the shape of short tables referred to as “catalogues”… The catalogues only contain the names of the popes, information about their origins, times of reign, and the odd occasional brief summary of individual events. Nothing provides better evidence of the barbarity of the X century Rome than the famous *Liber Pontificalis* continued in its primary and extremely imperfect form” ([196], Volume 3, pages 458, 427, 431)

Mediaeval chronicles contain a large number of facts that contradict the Scaligerian chronology and prove the existence of the three shifts in the Scaligerian chronological map that we have discovered. Furthermore, Ferdinand Gregorovius, having extensive and detailed knowledge of both “ancient” and mediaeval history of Europe (he had been one of the greatest specialists in the Scaligerian history of Europe, after all), kept on running into parallels between “ancient” and mediaeval events, some of which were blatantly obvious, that seemed extremely bizarre to him. Gregorovius points them out, and, possibly feeling vague qualms about them, attempts to provide an explanation. However, such “explanations” most often take the shape of nebulous expatiations concerning the profundity of the “law of historical recurrences.” The readers should not be surprised, and, above all, are implored not to pay any attention.

It is, however, most significant that nearly all of such parallels discovered by F. Gregorovius fit perfectly into our scheme of the three chronological shifts of 330, 1050, and 1800 years respectively. In other words, the historian Gregorovius, who had been raised on the Scaligerian tradition, “discovers” the parallels between the “Classical Age” and the Middle Ages exactly where they are supposed to be according to the general picture of chronological duplicates as described in *Chron1*, Chapter 6. We shall be citing some of these “Gregorovian parallels” later on.

So, we learn that “Noah [the Biblical patriarch! – A. F.] had founded a city near Rome, and called it with his own name; Noah’s sons Janus, Japhet, and Camesus built a city called Janiculus on the Palatina… Janus lived near Palatina, and later built the town of Saturnia near Capitolia together with Nimrod [sic! – A. F.”] ([196], Volume 3, page 437). “In the Middle Ages there had even been a monument at Nerva’s forum [in Rome – A. F.] called *Noah’s Ark*” ([196], Volume 3, page 461, comment 26).

All of these presumed “absurdities” (a presumption only made within the Scaligerian historical real-
ity tunnel) completely fit the superposition that we have discovered, of the kingdoms of Israel and Judaea onto the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century and onto the Habsburg (could that name have been derived from “New Town,” or “Nov-Gorod” in Russian?) empire of the XIV-XVI century. See more on the lifetime of the Biblical Noah and his most probable identity in Chron6.

Another example of such a “sottise” (according to Scaliger and company) is that “it is well-known that the Franks have considered themselves to have been the descendants of the Trojans” ([196], Volume 3, page 361, comment 28).

In general, Gregorovius points out that “only this Classical spirit that had prevailed in the city during all of the Middle Ages can explain a large number of historical events” ([196], Volume 3, page 443). It appears that the first lists of Roman monuments – compiled in the XII century A.D. at the earliest, as we’re being told nowadays – are “an amazing mixture of correct and incorrect monument names” ([196], Volume 3, page 447). A typical example of de-facto identification of “antiquity” with the Middle Ages is as follows:

“It [the St. Serge Church – A. F.] had been consecrated to St. Bacchus as well as St. Serge; the name of that saint sounds strange for this ancient pagan area; however, in Rome in was hardly exceptional, since amongst the Roman saints [the mediaeval Christian saints, that is – A. F.] we once again find the names of other ancient gods and heroes, such as St. Achilles, St. Quirinus, St. Dionysius, St. Hyppolitus and St. Hermesus”. ([196], Volume 3, page 447)

All of these mediaeval Christian saints – Achilles, Quirinus, Hermesus and others – have then been arbitrarily transposed into times immemorial, where they have transformed into the allegedly pagan “ancient” gods and demigods: Achilles, Quirinus, Hermesus, etc.

1.3. Mediaeval Roman legislators convene in the presumably destroyed “ancient” Capitol

F. Gregorovius tells us that the history of the famous architectural monuments of Italian Rome cannot be traced further back in time than the XI-XIII centuries A.D. with any degree of certainty at all.

Let us quote an example:

“During a long period of time (after the “Classical” age is supposed to have finished), we don’t seem to encounter the name of the Capitol; it simply disappears from the annals of history [apparently, due to the fact that Capitol hadn’t been built yet – A. F.]; despite the fact that the Graphia tells us that the walls of the Capitol were adorned with glass and gold [which is post-X century information – A. F.], there is no description of the temple… the imperial forums, once full of grace, have drowned in taciturnity… [which means they haven’t been built yet, either – A. F.], apart from the forum of Trajan; the forum of Augustus was encumbered with ruins to such an extent, and had so many trees growing there, that people used to call it an enchanted garden”. ([196], Volume 3, pages 447-448).

Apparently, the forum of Augustus hadn’t been built, either, and the place had been grown over with virgin vegetation.

Complete chaos reigns in the mediaeval names of the monuments of Italian Rome – a perfect hodge-podge of “ancient” and mediaeval names. For instance, “the Vestal temple had once been considered to have been a temple of Hercules Victor, and is considered to have been a temple of Cybele by the modern archaeologists; however, this goddess shall, naturally [? – A. F.] have to make place for some other deity, which, in its turn, shall be dethroned after some other archaeological revolution”. ([196], Volume 3, pages 469-470)

All of these confused re-identifications and the general welter resemble a helpless game rather than scientific statements with a basis. This shows us how flimsy the foundations of the “archaeological identifications” that we’re offered nowadays really are.

F. Gregorovius proceeds to tell us that “for over 500 years this area remained perfectly obtenebrated [Capitol and its environs – A. F.]… Only the oral tradition allowed it to attain historical significance once again [sic! – A. F.] and become the centre of the city’s political activity, when the spirit of civil independence awoke. In the XI century the Capitol had already been the centre of all purely civil matters”. ([196], Volume 4, page 391)

We cannot help asking about whether any of this really could have happened among the ruins. After all,
the Scaligerian history assures us that Capitol had been destroyed way back in the past, and had stood unaltered all these years “in a semi-obliterated state” ([196], Volume 4).

And further on we also read that “the halidom of the Roman Empire resurrected in the memories of the Romans, animated conventions of the nobility and the populace alike occurred among the ruins of the Capitol [sic! – A. F.].” Later on, in the epoch of Benzo, Gregory VII and Gelasius II, the Romans were summoned to the very same Capitol during high-wrought prefect elections, when the consent of the populace had been required for the election of Calixtus II, or when the Romans had to be called to arms. It is possible, that the city prefect also had lodgements in the Capitol [slept under the stars? – A. F.], since the prefect appointed by Henry IV had lived here. Furthermore, the litigations also occurred in a palace located in the Capitol [amidst ruins as well, or what? – A. F.]” ([196], Volume 4, page 391).

It goes on like this. The bundle of oddities and absurdities gets ever larger. However, the sole reason for their existence is the certainty of the modern historian that all things “Classical” had turned to dust aeons ago.

Is it possible to assume – even hypothetically – that all of these meetings, conventions, counsels, elections, debates, the discussions of documents and their storage, official state pronouncements, the signings of official papers and so on, occurred amongst old ruins grown over with weeds and reeds, and not in a special building that had been constructed for this very purpose, and precisely in this epoch – the Middle Ages? The destruction occurred a long time later – there were enough “waves of destruction” in the Italian Rome of the XIV-XVI century.

The Scaliger tradition obfuscates the history presented to F. Gregorovius to such an extent that Gregorovius – one of the most serious “documented” historians of the history of Rome and the Middle Ages in general – carries on with his narration apparently unaware of how ludicrous the picture that he offers really is, and to what extent it contradicts common sense.

He writes that “sitting on the prostrated columns of Jupiter or under the vaults of the state archive, amidst shattered statues and memorial plaques, the Capitoline monk, the predacious consul, and the ignorant senator could sense amazement and meditate on the vicissitudes of life” ([196], Volume 4, pages 391-392).

Altogether failing to notice the comical impossibility of such legislative assemblies, Gregorovius carries on telling us that “the mitred senators in their brocade mantles came to the Capitol ruins with only the vaguest idea of the fact that in the days of yore the statesmen ratified laws here, and the orators gave speeches... No flout is more appalling and horrendous than the one suffered by Rome!… amongst the marble blocks [and the senators gathering for sessions in their midst, as we may well add – A. F.] there grazed herds of goats, and so a part of the Capitol received the name of Goat Hill... like the Roman forum that became dubbed The Cattle-Run [a senatorial one, perhaps? – A. F.].” ([196], Volume 4, pages 393-39).

Gregorovius cites a mediaeval description of the Capitol in order to prove the sad Scaligerian picture of the decline of Rome, which had remained the only original source up until the XII century A.D. or even later ([196], Volume 4, page 394). The most amazing fact is that this old text that occupies an entire page of a large-format modern book says not a word about destructions of any kind, describing the mediaeval Capitol as a functioning political centre of mediaeval Rome instead. The narration mentions luxurious buildings, temples etc. There is nary a word of caprine herds dejectedly roaming this gilded splendour.

Gregorovius, having scrupulously quoted the entirety of this mediaeval text – one cannot deny him being conscionable as a scientist – couldn’t help making another attempt at proselytizing, in his telling the reader that “in the description of the Capitol given by the Mirabilia we see it as if it were lit with the last light of a dying dawn; we have no other information about this epoch” ([196], Volume 4, page 394). And also: “even for these legendary books, everything remains an enigma and a matter of days long gone” ([196], Volume 4, page 428, comment 16).

It is most expedient to turn to original sources more often and to read them open-mindedly, without prejudice and a priori judgements. We find out lots of interesting things, the ones that the Scaligerite historians prefer to hush up.

In reference to the mediaeval Rome of the alleged X-XI century, Gregorovius points out (for the ump-
teenth time) that “Rome appears to have returned to times long gone: it had a Senate again, and was at war with the Latin and the Tuscan cities, which had united against Rome once again” ([196], Volume 4, page 412).

In the alleged XII century a “Classical revival” is observed yet again. Gregorovius tells us that “Arnold [of Brescia – A. F.] had been excessively vehement about adhering to the ancient traditions” ([196], Volume 4, page 415). Apparently, he had “revived” the estate of cavaliers considered “ancient” nowadays ([196], Volume 4, page 415). Later on, in the alleged XII century, Pope Alexander III “revives the pagan triumph of the ancient emperors” ([196], Volume 4, page 503).

F. Gregorovius informs us of the fact that “the legendary name of Hannibal reappeared as a mediaeval family name that had been borne by senators, warlords and cardinals for several centuries” ([196], Volume 5, page 122). Hannibal is nevertheless considered an “extremely ancient” character nowadays.

Another “revival of antiquity” is presumed to have occurred in the alleged XIII century:

“The Roman populace have developed a new spirit over this time; it marched forth to conquer Tuscany and Latium as it had done in ancient times, in the age of Camillus and Coriolanus [allegedly “distant antiquity” nowadays – A. F.] The Roman banners bearing the ancient S.P.Q.R. initials appeared on battlefields yet again”. ([196], Volume 5, pages 126-127).

A detailed list of the allegedly “revived” and “resurrected” traditions, names, and rites deemed “ancient” can be continued on many dozens of pages, since practically all of the key institutions of “ancient” Rome appear to have been “revived” in the Middle Ages. We limit ourselves to a number of individual examples here. The interpretation of this amazing phenomenon as a “revival,” and not naissance, roots itself exclusively in the errors of the Scaligerian chronology.

Nowadays the only original sources on the archaeology and the monuments of mediaeval Italian Rome add up to just two books compiled in the XII-XIII century at the earliest ([196], Volume 4, pages 544-545). We suddenly learn that according to the Scaligerian chronology, the names of Roman monuments given in these mediaeval books are often considered erroneous and chaotic. We are now beginning to understand that what this really means is that they contradict the Scaligerian history. Could it be that the old books are in fact correct, unlike the Scaligerian version?

For instance, these texts refer to Constantine’s Basilica as “the Temple of Romulus” (sic!). This sounds preposterous for a modern historian; however, this mediaeval indication concurs perfectly with the identification of Emperor Constantine with King Romulus that we have discovered as a result of a dynastic parallel (see fig. 6.52 in Chron1, Chapter 6). Apart from such “bizarre” identifications, the mediaeval chronicles contradict the consensual chronology of Scaliger and Petavius every now and then.

1.4. The real date when the famous “ancient” statue of Marcus Aurelius was manufactured

Ricobaldus, for one, claims that the famous “ancient” equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius had been cast and erected by the order of Pope Clemens III. However, in this case the event occurred in the XI century, and not in the “Classical Age” ([196], Volume 4, page 568, comment 74). Let us remind the reader that the historians date this statue to the alleged years 166-180 A.D. ([930], page 91). By the way, according to the parallelism that we have discovered (see fig. 6.45 in Chron1, Chapter 6), the “ancient” Marcus Aurelius of the alleged years 161-180 is but a “phantom duplicate” of the mediaeval Otto IV of the alleged years 1198-1218 A.D.

The claim that Ricobaldus makes about the statue of Marcus Aurelius (that it was only erected as late as the papacy of Clemens III) makes Gregorovius utter the following rather embarrassed remark: “this is an erroneous statement that Ricobaldus makes…” ([196], Volume 4, page 568, comment 74). What is the argumentation that Gregorovius offers? It is rather droll indeed: “how could such a bronze work have been made considering the low development level of fine arts that Rome had managed to attain by that age?” ([196], Volume 4, page 573). In other words, mediaeval Romans “could not manufacture anything of value.” The “ancient” Romans that preceded them by several centuries have, on the other hand, been fine craftsmen, and could confidently cast such masterpieces in bronze (see fig. 7.1).

The chronological oddities engulfing this famous statue are so blatantly obvious that they even make
their way into the mainstream press on occasion. This is what our contemporaries write:

“The history of the equestrian statue is truly unusual. It contains many riddles, and has grown over with legends. For instance, its author and previous location in ancient Rome remain unknown... It was discovered by accident in the Middle Ages in one of the Roman squares... The statue had erroneously been mistaken for a representation of Constantine [? – A. F.].” (See the issue of the Izvestiya newspaper dated 16 February 1980).

According to Gregorovius, this explanation was proposed by the historian Theo, who “points out that the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius had been confused with the statue of Constantine, and thus managed to survive the Middle Ages. Such errancy is possible in Barbarian times” – as Gregorovius proceeds to expostulate – “but could it have been possible that the figure of Constantine could not be told from that of Marcus Aurelius in the times when the Noticia had been written?” ([196], Volume 1, page 49, comment 32)

The Scaligerian history has even got an “explanation” of sorts for the fact that “ancient masterpieces” have survived the twilight of the Middle Ages despite the militant church presumably having destroyed the pagan legacy. We are told that in the daytime the ignorant mediaeval monks destroyed pagan statues and “ancient” books, in order to secretly reconstruct them at night, copying the “legacy of the ancients” meticulously in order to carry it through the mediaeval tenebrosity to the luminous peaks of the Renaissance.

In the alleged XIII century we see a period of efflorescence in the arts which presumably represents ruthless pillaging of the “ancient” constructions and their transformation into mediaeval ones. For instance, we are now told that the mediaeval Romans used “ancient sarcophagi” for their own entombments. Apparently, they had none of their own, since they did not know how to build them; the knowledge had been lost, and there were money shortages. According to the Gregorovian interpretation, new and original mausoleums – ones, that is, that didn’t resemble the “ancient” ones (the way Gregorovius imagined them) – only began to appear towards the end of the XIII century, and these were dubbed “mediaeval” with great relief. However, Gregorovius proceeded to voice his surprise at the fact that “not a single monument of any Roman celebrity from the first part of the XIII century remained in Rome” ([196], Volume 5, page 510). This should not surprise us. According to our reconstruction, the foundation of the Italian Rome as a capital city took place in the XIV century A.D. at the earliest (see Chron 5).

Incidentally, the mediaeval cardinal Guglielmo Fieschi, who allegedly died in 1256, “lays in an ancient [sic! – A. F.] marble sarcophagus, whose carvings in relief picture a Roman wedding – a peculiar symbol for a cardinal!” ([196], Volume 5, page 510). The amazement of Gregorovius is perfectly justified. Could the mediaeval cardinals really have been so poor as to be forced to use “ancient” sarcophagi,
offhandedly shaking out the remains of their ancestors? It is considered sacrilege, after all. Common sense tells us that the matter here lies in the contradiction between the planted Scaligerian chronological concepts and true specimens of mediaeval art that were later declared “ancient” (as in “very old indeed”).

The senatorial mausoleum in Arceli is a most curious artefact. This “monument appears to identify antiquity with mediaeval forms; a marble urn with Bacchic relief carvings... serves as a foundation for a sarcophagus embellished with inlays and a Gothic superstructure” ([196], Volume 5, page 511). The amazement of Gregorovius is truly ceaseless.

Let us formulate a question: where did the powerful clans of the Guelph and Gibelline aristocracy reside in mediaeval Rome? It is hard to fathom. Apparently, we are told that they lived among the ruins of the ancient steam baths. This is precisely what the historians of today are forced to assume in their attempts to unravel the oddities of the Scaligerian chronology.

This is what F. Gregorovius tells us:

“Powerful clans owned the slopes of Quirinal, and they built their fortifications near the forum of Imperial times... among those have been... the Capocci, who have found lodgings in the thermae [in the steam baths – A. F.] of Trajan, as well as the Conti, whereas the nearby thermae of Constantine [steam baths again! – A. F.] housed the fourth castle of Colonnus... The enormous ruins of the forums built by Augustus, Nerva and Caesar have been easily transformed [? – A. F.] into a fortress which was erected by the Conti as a citadel reigning over the entire city”. ([196], Volume 5, pages 526-527)

Gregorovius, albeit obliged to follow the Scaligerian chronology, cannot squirm out of having to admit that there is no genuine evidence of the existence of this gigantic and allegedly “ancient” fortress before the mediaeval Conti – it simply had not existed! He writes that “there is no proof that it had stood for centuries and only been enlarged by the Conti” ([196], Volume 5, page 527). Doesn’t this directly imply that Conti had most probably built this castle as his fortress in the Middle Ages, and its “extreme antiquity” was declared a lot later? This was done by the historians and archaeologists of the XVII-XVIII century when the Scaligerian chronology began to shift authentic mediaeval constructions into the distant past.

1.5. Could the “ancient” Emperor Vitellius have posed for the mediaeval artist Tintoretto?

Let us formulate the following concept that may strike one as somewhat unexpected at first. It is possible that the XVI century painter Tintoretto (1518-1594) could have drawn the “ancient” Roman emperor Vitellius from nature.

The catalogue titled The Five Centuries of European Drawing contains a drawing by the well-known mediaeval painter Jacopo Tintoretto ([714], page 52). He lived in 1518-1594 ([1472], pages 23-24). The drawing is dated to approximately 1540 A.D. The name that it is catalogued under draws one’s attention instantly: “Etude of the head of the so-called Vitellius” ([714], page 52). See fig. 7.2. Let us remind the reader that Vitellius is considered to have been an “ancient” emperor of Rome who had reigned in the alleged year 69 of the new era ([72], page 236). Thus, according to the Scaligerian chronology, Tintoretto and Vitellius are separated by an interval roughly equalling 1470-1500 years. The modern commentary to this rather famous drawing is very noteworthy:

“Tintoretto had either a mask or a marble replica of an ancient bust in his studio, that had been considered a portrait of the Roman emperor Vitellius in the XVI century. The original had been given to the Venetian Republic by the cardinal Domenico Grimani as a present in 1523, and is currently part of the exposition of the Archaeological Museum of Venice (inventory number 20). Modern archaeology that dates this artefact as belonging to the epoch of Adrian (roughly 178 A.D.), excludes the possibility of identifying the portrait as that of Vitellius, who had reigned in the years 67-68. However, Tintoretto had kept this sculpture under this very name, and the testament of the artist’s son Domenicus proves this explicitly mentioning the “head of Vitellius.”… More than twenty etudes of this head are known that were done by Tintoretto himself and his apprentices”. ([714], page 187).

The XVI century opinion had been that the bust really portrayed the Roman emperor Vitellius. As we have seen, the real history of the bust only began in 1523, when it entered the possession of the Venetian republic. It may have been drawn in the XVI century either from the death-mask of the emperor, or from nature – namely, the body of the recently deceased
Vitellius. Tintoretto’s drawing clearly depicts someone who had just died, or is asleep. It is only natural that the Scaligerian history deems it perfectly impossible to place the “ancient” Vitellius in the XVI century. It would therefore be interesting to try dating this bust to the XVI century within the paradigm of the New Chronology for comparison, especially considering the dynastic parallels that we have discovered. The historians consider Vitellius to have been an emperor of the Second Roman Empire ([72], page 236). As we already know, this is a phantom duplicate of the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII centuries (fig. 6.23 and 6.24 in CHRON 1, Chapter 6), which, in turn, is a carbon copy of the Habsburg (New Town, or Nov-Gorod?) empire of the XIII-XVII centuries a.d. for the most part (see figs. 6.21 and 6.22 in CHRON 1, Chapter 6).

The “ancient” Vitellius is considered to have been a short-term governor, and the immediate precursor of the “ancient” Vespasian. He is supposed to have reigned in 69 a.d. ([72], page 236). Therefore, he travels forward in time as a result of said dynastic superpositions, and turns out to have been a mediaeval ruler of the first half of the XVI century; as can be seen from fig. 6.22 in CHRON 1, Chapter 6, the end of his reign and his death fall roughly on the year 1519. It is significant that, as mediaeval historians tell us, the bust that must have portrayed the recently deceased Vitellius only appeared on the historical scene around 1523, when it had been given to the Venetian republic as a present ([714], page 187). Thus, the two dates correlate perfectly well: the “ancient” Vitellius dies around 1519, and a bust is made which the cardinal gives to the Venetians in 1523, four years later.

Everything falls into place. Apparently, the bust of Vitellius portrays a real mediaeval ruler of the first half of the XVI century. Tintoretto the painter and his apprentices paint Vitellius as a recently deceased famous contemporary of theirs. The latter saponaceous addition – “so-called” – added by the historians of the Scaligerian tradition, needs to be crossed out of the name of Tintoretto’s drawing, leaving it with the shorter and more correct “Etude of the head of Vitellius.”

If we’re to consider the possibility of minor veers and fluctuations in the mediaeval chronology, it might turn out that Vitellius had died a few years later than 1519, so Tintoretto could have drawn him from nature, while one of his colleagues was making an intravital “ancient” bust of Vitellius. The apprentices of Tintoretto naturally trained for their task by first drawing a bust being inspired by the drawing done by their mentor – who, we feel worth repeating, may have been present to witness the famous emperor’s death.

Another peculiar detail has to be mentioned. The lower part of Tintoretto’s drawing bears the legend “1263” (see fig. 7.2) – that is, dated as 1263. But Tintoretto lived in the XVI century. Modern historians mention this circumstance as well, albeit without commenting on it: “At the bottom in the centre one sees the number 1263 drawn with a pencil” ([714], page 187). We are confronted with an important fact here. The artist Tintoretto, having done the drawing around 1540, dated it to 1263. However, usually all painters date their works to the time of their creation. Tintoretto thus transcribes the year 1540 as 1263. This
shows us, which is exactly what we claim, that there have been various mediaeval chronological traditions that differ from the current one. For instance, the number 1263 could have been used to refer to the year 1540. If we interpret it according to the modern tradition, we shall get a much earlier date, which would make the drawing about 277 years older. This is probably what Scaligerian historians usually did in such situations; however, this time they had to “let the drawing stay” in 1540, since Tintoretto is linked to the XVI century by various independent evidence.

1.6. The amount of time required for the manufacture of one sheet of parchment

We shall conclude with another useful observation. Many of the classical “ancient” texts are written on parchment or papyrus – however, they’re written in a perfect acrolect. On the other hand, many really old mediaeval texts are written in a clumsy and brief manner, which is quite natural. Primitive language requires time in order to become literary language. Furthermore, really ancient texts contain words written in nothing but consonants comprising semantic skeletons of words, with vowels either altogether missing, or replaced by small diacritical signs. This is the reason for the existence of the vocalization problem for many ancient texts, namely, the Biblical ones – it translates as the necessity to find just the right vowels in order to restore the original. Apparently, due to the scarcity and high cost of writing materials in antiquity, the scribes were frugal with them, and condensed the text, leaving nothing but consonants. One naturally comes to think that a polished literary style implies a long evolution of culture, and also the availability of writing materials, since style takes practice to evolve. Paper, for instance, is rather cheap (although this has not always been the case). However, there was no paper in “antiquity.” As we are being told nowadays, the “ancient” classics used parchment exclusively. Just how available had parchment been?

The manufacture of one sheet of parchment requires the following (see [544], for instance):

1) skinning a young calf no older than 6 weeks, or a young lamb;
2) macerating the skin in running water up to 6 days;
3) scrubbing the membrane off with a special scrubber;
4) loosening the wool via souring the skin in a damp pit and subjecting it to ash and lime for 12-20 days;
5) scraping off the loosened wool;
6) fermenting the clear skin in oat or wheat bran in order to remove excessive lime;
7) tanning the skin with special extracts to make it soft after drying;
8) eliminating the roughness by pumicing the chalked skin.

This is the procedure required for the manufacture of every leaf of parchment. This made both parchment and papyrus luxuries, which had been the case until the very discovery of rag-paper before the Renaissance.

Let us open the work of the “ancient” Titus Livy. He begins his narration ornately and grandiloquently:

“Shall my writing of the history of the Roman people ever since the foundation of the capital be worth the effort? I do not know it well, and even if I did, I would have been too timid to utter it aloud. This endeavour, as I can see perfectly well, is far from original, and has been attempted by many; also, the new writers that keep on appearing think they may either add something new factually, or excel the austere antiquity by the art of enunciation…” ([482])

We are being assured that such a free-flowing and elaborate style had been used in the alleged I century b.c. for the writing of 142 (or 144, according to different sources) books by Titus Livy. Developing a style as confident as his must have required writing lots of drafts. How much parchment (and how many calves and lambs) would it require? Our take is that the explanation is simple – the creation of all these “ancient” books took place in the Middle Ages, when paper was already widely known.

1.7. The “ancient” Roman Emperor Augustus had been Christian, since he wore a mediaeval crown with a Christian cross

In fig. 7.3 we can see the well-known mediaeval Hereford map, dated to the end of the alleged XIII century ([1177], pages 309-312). Its physical size is rather large – 1.65 metres by 1.35 metres. It is as-
Fig. 7.3. The famous mediaeval Hereford map allegedly created towards the end of the XIII century. Its diameter is about 1.3 metres. In the bottom left-hand corner one sees the “ancient” Roman emperor Augustus sitting on a throne. On his head there is a crown with a Christian cross. See a close-in on the next illustration. Taken from [1177], page 311.
Fig. 7.4. The bottom left-hand corner of the Hereford map showing the “ancient” Roman emperor Augustus sitting on his throne. We can clearly see a crown with a *Christian cross* on the emperor’s head.

Fig. 7.5. A fragment of the Hereford map. We can see a mediaeval crown with a Christian cross on the head of the “ancient” Octavian Augustus. Taken from [1177], page 206.

Fig. 7.6. A Christian crown with a cross on the head of the “ancient” Roman emperor Octavian Augustus. Taken from [1177], page 206.
sumed that this map is based on the History by Paul Orosius, who is supposed to have lived in the IV century a.d. ([1177], page 311). As we understand, this map must have really been created in the XVI century at the latest.

In the bottom left corner of this map we can see the famous “ancient” Roman emperor Augustus. He is handing out his edict demanding the creation of a description of the World to three geographers (see [1177], page 206, and fig. 7.4). Modern historians make the following comment: “on the left of the map we read that the measurements of the world have been commenced by Julius Caesar. In the bottom left corner we see a picture of the emperor Augustus holding his edict in his hands” ([1177], page 309).

The fact that what we see on the head of the “ancient” Roman emperor Augustus is a mediaeval crown with a Christian cross (it looks very much like a Papal tiara as well, see figs 7.5 and 7.6) is perfectly astonishing within the reality tunnel of the Scaligerian history. Generally, the entire appearance of the famous Roman emperor doesn’t resemble his likeness in the “ancient history teaching aids” for the Scaligerian history whose mass production era in Western Europe peaked in the XVI-XVIII century, the least bit. In fig. 7.7 we can see an example of such a “propaganda” statue of Augustus which is kept in the Museum of the Vatican nowadays ([304], Volume 1, page 489). Octavian Augustus is represented in an austere and heroic manner here, doubtlessly an example to inspire the youths. This “ancient” statue must have been manufactured in the XVII century at the latest. On the Hereford map the very same Roman emperor Augustus is represented in a completely different manner, in a crown with a Christian cross, a beard, and wearing typically mediaeval clothing. As we now understand, there is nothing strange about it. The map is correct, and this ruler couldn’t have lived earlier than the XIII century a.d.

2. THE “ANCIENT” HISTORIAN TACITUS AND THE WELL-KNOWN RENAISSANCE WRITER POGGIO BRACCIOLINI

Today it is considered that the famous “ancient” Roman historian Tacitus lived in the I century a.d. ([833], Volume 2, pages 203, 211). His most famous work is the History. In the Scaligerian chronology, the books of Tacitus disappeared from sight for a long time, fell into oblivion, and only resurfaced in the XIV-XV century a.d. This is what the Scaligerian history tells us:

“Mediaeval authors of the XI-XIII centuries usually demonstrate no immediate knowledge of Tacitus, he is only known by proxy of Orosius… In the XIV century Tacitus becomes known better. The Montecassino manuscript had been used by Paulinus of Venetia (in 1331-1334)… and later on Bocaccio… Then it… came to the well-known Florentine humanist Niccolo Niccoli, and is also kept in Florence currently, in the Medicean Library… Our tradition of the last books of the Annals and History ascends to
Fig. 7.8. A portrait of Poggio Bracciolini allegedly dating from the XV century taken from his book titled *De varietate fortunae*. The modern commentator has the following to say about it: “This fantastic miniature depicts Poggio, one of the most famous adventurers of the entire XV century who had researched the Classical past. Poggio Bracciolini is walking down a street surveying the ruins of Rome” ([1374], page 92).

Fig. 7.9. A close-in of Bracciolini’s portrait allegedly dating from the XV century. Taken from [1374], page 92.
this manuscript for the most part. Only the Italian manuscript of 1475 that is currently kept in Leiden must have had some other source. In the 1420’s, the Italian humanists begin to look for Tacitus’ manuscripts in Germany. The history of this search remains unclear in many ways due to the fact that the owners of the freshly-found texts often withheld their acquisitions, especially if they were made illegally. In 1425 the eminent humanist and Papal secretary Poggio Bracciolini received an inventory of a number of manuscripts that contained several minor works of Tacitus from a monk from the Hersfeld Abbey... Whether the manuscript had really been from Hersfeld or from Fulda, or whether Poggio had really received it, as well as the possible date of this event – all of this remains a mystery. In 1455 the manuscript or its copy was already in Rome, and provided the basis for the manuscripts that have reached our day”. ([833], Volume 2, page 241).

We have thus been told the following:

1) According to the Scaligerian chronology, Tacitus lived in the alleged I century A.D., presumably around the years 58-117 A.D. ([797], page 1304).

2) However, his History had not been known in the Middle Ages.

3) The biography of the History of Tacitus that we have at our disposal can only be traced as far back from our time as the XIV-XV century A.D.

4) Nothing is known of the fate of the History of Tacitus before the XIV century. Therefore, a hypothesis is born that the books of Tacitus may have been mediaeval in their origin and referring to real mediaeval events of the X-XIV century A.D. However, they may have been edited in the XVI-XVII century.

This summary would have been sufficient. However, let us pay attention to an interesting fact. The academic account of the fate of Tacitus’ books that we have quoted from [833] is written neutrally and demurely, and contains nothing that could surprise us. Except for the odd gap of a millennium and a half between the moment the book was written and its surfacing in the XV century A.D.

This arid text really conceals some rather peculiar circumstances blearing the entire history of the discovery of the books written by the “ancient” Tacitus. Modern historians aren’t too keen on recollecting these facts, since the latter lead to a number of confused questions and serious doubts about the correctness of the datings of the events described in the books of Tacitus.

Let us give an account of what really happened in the XV century. We shall study the history of how the famous History by Cornelius Tacitus was discovered, according to the following works: [1195], [1379], and [21]. Towards the end of the XIX century the French expert Hochart and the English expert Ross have independently proclaimed the History of Cornelius Tacitus to have actually been written in the XV century by the eminent Renaissance humanist Poggio Bracciolini. In other words, they accused Bracciolini of premeditated forgery.

The publication of the works by Hochart and Ross initially caused a great scandal in the historian community. However, their opponents were forced to give over with the discussion, since they had nothing of substance to counter the evidence of Hochart and Ross; they resorted to the stance of complete obmutescence instead. This is a common method for such adversaries. The modern commentary to [833] is a perfect example, since it doesn’t mention the research of Hochart and Ross with a single word.

The analysis performed by Hochart and Ross was an important one. Let us state straight away that nowadays when we possess information that had been unknown to Hochart and Ross, we should say that we cannot agree with their conclusion about the History of Tacitus being a forgery. The facts that we have discovered and the new concept of the short chronology suggest that it was based on a lost original – which was, however, describing real mediaeval events and not some distant antediluvian epoch. However, this text reached us in a more recent edition, possibly done in the XVI-XVII century.

Hochart and Ross discovered distinct relics proving the History of Tacitus to be mediaeval in its origins. Hochart and Ross had only been wrong concerning one thing – namely, the interpretation of their own results. Remaining perfectly unaware of the inveracity of the Scaliger-Petavius chronology, they considered the facts they discovered to prove the History a sham; however, from our point of view the very same facts may indicate that the History of Tacitus was a genuine historical text describing real events of the XIV-XV century A.D. However, it could have under-
gone a transformation in the hands of the partisan “caring editors” of the XVI-XVII century.

Let us consider the Renaissance atmosphere that the “ancient” manuscripts were “surfacing” in.

Poggio Bracciolini is considered to have been one of the most spectacular writers of the XV century Renaissance. An old portrait of his can be seen in figs. 7.8 and 7.9. He is the author of top-bracket historical and moralistic tractates. “In what concerns theological issues… he can speak with a language that would have been considered belonging to one of the Holy Fathers by anyone if it hadn’t been for Bracciolini’s signature” ([21], pages 358-363). He is the author of the historical study guide of Roman monuments and the famous History of Florence, which is a work that resembles the chronicle of Tacitus.

“This brilliant imitator had fully been a universal mastermind of his century. The critics equated him with the greatest Renaissance authors… Many found it possible to define the first half of the Italian XV century as the “Age of Poggio”… Florence built an intravital statue in his honour that belonged to the chisel of Donatello…

A rather splendid way of living had cost Poggio Bracciolini dearly… and put him in constant need of money. The search, preparation, and copy-editing of ancient authors were an additional source of income for him. In the XV century… this had been a very lucrative activity. With the aid of the Florentine scientist and publisher Niccolo Niccoli (1363-1437)… Poggio Bracciolini had founded a studio of sorts that occupied itself with redacting ancient texts, having engaged a large number of partners and counteragents, very educated ones, but most of them had been marked by obloquy… The first findings were made by Poggio Bracciolini and Bartholomeo di Montepulciano in the epoch of the Constantian council… in a forlorn and humid tower of the St. Gallen monastery… “in a forlorn and humid tower where a prisoner would not be able to survive three days” they managed to find a pile of ancient manuscripts – the works of Quintilian, Valerius Flaccus, Asconius Pedianus, Nonius Marcellus, Probus, and others. The discovery created more than a sensation – it initiated an entire literary epoch” ([21], pages 358-366).

Some time later Bracciolini “discovered” fragments “from Petronius” and the Bucolic by Calpurnius. The circumstances of these findings remain nebulous.

Apart from the originals, Bracciolini also traded in copies, which he sold for great sums of money. For instance, having sold a copy of a manuscript by Titus Livy to Alphonse of Aragon, Poggio made enough money to buy a villa in Florence.

“He charged Duke D’Este a hundred ducats (1200 francs) for the letters of St. Jerome, and that with great irritation… Poggio’s clients were the Medici, the Sforza, the D’Este, the aristocratic families of England, the Duchy of Burgundy, cardinals Orsini and Colonna, rich people like Bartolomeo di Bardi, universities, which… either began to set up libraries, or have been busy extending their old book storages”. ([21], pages 363-366).

Let us now regard the history of the discovery of Tacitus’ books.

The main copies of the works by Tacitus – the so-called First and Second Medicean Copies – are kept in Florence, in a book storage which had Poggio amongst its founders. According to the Scaligerian chronology, these copies are the prototypes of all the other ancient copies of Tacitus.

The first printed edition of Tacitus is supposed to have appeared in the alleged year 1470 from the Second Medicean copy, or a copy thereof that is supposed to have been kept in the St. Marcus library in Venice. “However, it had disappeared from there, or maybe hadn’t been kept in the library in the first place” ([21], pages 366-368).

“The two Medicean copies… contain the entirety of the historical works of Tacitus that have reached our days” ([21], pages 366-368).

The Scaligerian chronology is of the opinion that Tacitus was born between 55 and 57 A.D. “The year Tacitus died remains unknown” ([833], Volume 2, pages 203, 211). Thus, it is presumed that Tacitus lived in the 1 century A.D.

After that, his name disappears for many centuries, until the Renaissance epoch ([833]). Hochart and Ross have collected all of the references to Tacitus made before Poggio’s discovery in the XV century. It turns out there are very few such references, and they are all general and vague enough that they could refer to people who have nothing in common with the author of the History. Thus, even in the Scaligerian chronology there
is no real information about Tacitus – the author of the
*History* – that would predate the XV century.

How did the “discovery of Tacitus” really occur? “In
November 1425 Poggio notified Niccoli in Florence
from Rome that “some monk” was offering him a
batch of old manuscripts… including ‘several works
of Tacitus unknown to us’” ([21], page 382). Niccoli
agrees upon the deal immediately. However, the ac-
tual purchase takes several months for some reason.

“Poggio procrastinates, giving different excuses…
He gives a rather meandrous answer to Niccoli’s in-
quiry that only makes clear the fact that he had not
been in the possession of the Tacitus’ book yet… In
what concerns the monk, Poggio blatantly lies and
appears confused: the monk is allegedly a friend of
his, but for some reason failed to have visited Poggio
while in Rome… the books were in Hersfeld, but had
to be collected in Nuremberg, etc.”([21], page 382).

Niccoli demanded the book catalogue “discov-
ered” by Poggio, being rather irritated. It turned out
that “there were no works of Tacitus in the catalogue”!

“Such strange rigmarole of miscomprehensions that
look clearly artificial marks the years 1427 and 1428”
([21]). Finally, Poggio notifies Niccoli in 1428 that the
mysterious monk had arrived in Rome again – but
without any book!

“The almost quinquennial procrastination led to
the fact that Poggio’s discovery had been made pub-
lic prior to having been actually made, and many
strange rumours surrounded it. The latter made
Niccoli worry greatly, to which Poggio replied: “I know
all the songs that are sung in this respect… so this is
what I’ll do: once Cornelius Tacitus arrives, I shall
hide him well from strangers.” One would think – as
Hochart justly remarks – that the most natural pro-
tection of the manuscript from vicious rumours
would be making it public for the scientists, explain-
ing all the ways, means, and secrets of its appearance.
Poggio, on the contrary, promises to palter yet
again…” ([21], pages 374-382).

Hochart and Ross have found that “in a much later
edition of his letters to Niccoli, Poggio, having lost
track of the dates of his Tacitus-related correspon-
dence of the years 1425-1429, had for some reason
*forged the dates* of 28 December 1427 and 5 June 1428
in two of the letters that were made public” ([21],
pages 374-382).

In these letters Poggio asks Niccoli to send him (?!)
another copy of Tacitus that had allegedly already
been in Niccoli’s possession. Comparing the dates of
the correspondence and the texts of the letters,
Hochart claims the mysterious “second copy” to have
been nothing else but the First Medicean copy that
had allegedly been discovered many years after!

Hochart is of the opinion that “*the letter dates are
faked*, they have been composed post factum after
Niccoli had made Tacitus public in order to validate
the reputation of the first… copy [the so-called
Second Medicean one – A. F.] that had entered the
collections of several palatine libraries, and prepare
the way for the second copy” ([21], pages 374-382).

Today’s historians are of the opinion that these two
copies had been discovered in a reverse order.

Amphitheatrov, whom we often quote here, wrote the
following:

“Studying the history of the origins of the First
Medicean Copy [the second to have been discovered
– A. F.]… one cannot fail to notice the recurrence of
the legend that had engulfed the copy of Niccolo
Niccoli 80 years ago… a northern monastery figures
here again, as well as some mysterious, unnamed
monks. Some German coenobite brings the first five
chapters of the *Annals* to Pope Leo X. The Pope is de-
lighted, and presumably designates the monk as the
editor of the work. The coenobite refuses, pleading
semi-literacy. One clearly sees the resurrection of the
legend about the provisioner of the Second Medicean
Copy [the first to have been discovered – A. F.] and
the Hersfeld monk… the legend calls Arcimboldi the
intermediator in this deal… however, Arcimboldi
doesn’t mention this with a single word, despite the
fact that he is supposed to have received 500 sequins
from Leo X in order to pay for it – that amounts to
6000 francs, an entire fortune considering the cost of
money [this makes chronology irrelevant! – A. F.]. All
of these mysterious monks with no name, origin, and
place of residence are the continuers of the falsifica-
tion system started by Poggio Bracciolini in the eyes
of Hochart. No one ever sees them or knows any-
thing about them, whilst today one of them brings a
lost decade of *Titus Livy* from Sweden or Denmark,
tomorrow another one comes from Corbea or Fulda
with a work of Tacitus, etc. – they always come from
the North that is far away and hard to reach, and they
Fig. 7.10. The first page of the *Historiarum ab Urbe condita* by Titus Livy published in the alleged XV century. The picture probably portrays the author himself. The entire ambience is clearly mediaeval. Taken from [1485], ill. 349.

Fig. 7.11. A close-in of a fragment portraying a mediaeval writer, most probably, Titus Livy himself. Taken from [1485], ill. 349.
always bring exactly the goods that are sought after and that the book market of the century is starved for” ([21], pages 374-382).

The study of Poggio’s correspondence leads to stronger suspicions. The authors of the letters either fail to mention the findings, or give mutually exclusive versions.

“Bayle tells us [already in the XVIII century – A. F.] that Pope Leo X wanted to find the missing chapters of Tacitus so much that he promised an indulgence of sins for them as well as money and power. Is it surprising that they were found with haste? [Chronology is of little relevance here – A. F.] Therefore, both parts of the Tacitus’ codex are of equally mysterious origins. Hochart assumes that the relation of legends and mystery that surrounds them indicate a common origin and family, namely, that they have been forged in the Roman studio of the Florentine Poggio Bracciolini”. ([21], pages 374-382).

Hochart and Ross provide information that speaks unequivocally about Poggio’s penchant for transformation. For Poggio Latin is a mother tongue. “He doesn’t write in any language but Latin, and how he does it! His imitational flexibility makes him the Prosper Mérimée of the XV century… when the reader wants it, Poggio becomes Seneca, Petronius and Titus Livy; he can write like anyone, being a true chameleon of word and spirit” ([21], page 385).

The analysis of the books by Tacitus shows serious discrepancies between their content (in what concerns the history and the geography of “ancient” Rome) and the consensual Scaligerian version of “ancient” Roman history.

“A great list of contradictions is cited by Gaston Boissier… Having listed a great number of mistakes [have they really been mistakes? – A. F.] that couldn’t have been made by a I century Roman [according to Scaligerite historians – A. F.], Hochart points out the ones that give the author away as someone adhering to the XV century traditions and Weltanschauung”. ([21], pages 387-390).

This is an important moment. For Hochart, Ross, Gaston Boissier and other critics of Tacitus all of this signifies the History to be a forgery. Being raised on the Scaligerian history and certain of the fact that “the real Tacitus” must have lived in the I century a.d., they cannot interpret the XV-century relics found in the text of the History by Tacitus in any different way. For us, there is no contradiction here. It suffices to suppose the following: the “History” of Tacitus refers to real events of the XIII-XV century a.d. Tacitus, being a XV century author, naturally “adheres to the XV century traditions and Weltanschauung”; thus, the “misses” found by the historians become evidence of the fact that Tacitus’ History is genuine, albeit with the condition that we transfer the time period that it covers into the Middle Ages.

At the same time, Hochart and Ross have found some extremely peculiar circumstances of the unearthing of Tacitus’ History. They consider these to be indications of forgery; our take is that they indicate a tendentious editing of the real text of the History by Poggio Bracciolini. However, it is possible that Tacitus had been a nom de plume used by Poggio Bracciolini. He could really have described the “ancient” Roman events that occurred in the XIII-XV century a.d. based on some genuine documents that he managed to lay his hands on. See for yourselves:

“His [Poggio’s – A. F.] sojourn in London was marked by greatly frustrated hopes for Beaufort’s generosity… In 1422… Piero Lamberteschi offers him a project of some historical work that is supposed to have been based on Greek sources and done in the utmost secrecy over the period of three years, for which Poggio shall receive a fee of 500 golden ducats. “Let him pay me six hundred, and I’m game” – writes Poggio, leaving Niccoli to take care of the matter. “The task that he offers pleases me greatly, and I hope to produce something worthy of reading.” A month later he writes: “if I see… that Piero backs up his promises with deeds, it shall not just be the Sarmatians that I shall study, but the Scythians as well… Keep the projects that I’m telling you about secret. If I shall indeed go to Hungary, it should remain unknown to everyone except for a few friends”.

In June: “Rest assured that if I’m given enough time… I shall write something that shall please you… When I compare myself with the ancients, I believe in myself. If I really get to it, I shan’t lose my face before anyone…” His subsequent location remains a mystery. According to Corniani, he had really lived in Hungary for some reason. Tonnelli tells us that he went straight to Florence. Whether his mysterious deal with Lamberteschi reached any results at all re-
mains an enigma as well. Lamberteschi’s name disappears from Poggio’s correspondence, which Hochart explains by the fact that Poggio himself was the editor of his collected letters.

Even if the deal had fallen through and come to nothing, what possible residue could have been left by this episode? The following: “Lamberteschi was offering Poggio the creation of some secret historical work. The secrecy was planned to be great enough to make Poggio work in Hungary while everyone would think him to have still been in England. For this work he would have to study the Greek authors… and compete with the ancient historians, which he both feared and yearned for. And, finally, all the demands for secrecy that he had been ready to comply with demonstrate that the deal, albeit literary and scientific, had been a murky one”. ([21], pages 393 ff).

Lamberteschi had a moral right to confront Poggio with such a suggestion, since the latter had already been caught red-handed at the manufacture of a forgery. Several years before, Poggio had published the Commentaries of Q. Asconius Pedianus via Niccoli.

“The original for these Commentaries hasn’t been seen by anyone, and all the copies have been made by Niccoli from another copy that Poggio had sent him from Constance. It was a great success, despite the fact that… the world of science soon sensed that something was wrong… The success of the sham Asconius Pedianus had ensued in an entire series of forgeries bearing the name of the same fictitious author, but they were all too rough, and immediately got exposed as fakes. Poggio… just happened to have been more artful than the others…

Prior to his involvement in the Tacitus business, he tries to sell some amazing copy of Titus Livy to Cosmas Medici and Leonello D’Este — again in an atmosphere of mystery, with a faraway monastery on some North Sea island, Swedish monks and the like somewhere in the background. It is improbable that we’re speaking of an actual oeuvre being forged, but a forgery of a copy may well have taken place. It is known that Poggio had been a master of Lombardian handwriting, which the manuscript that he tried to entice the princes with had been written in… however, something went wrong there, and the precious copy had disappeared without a trace… It is significant that over this period the usually prolific Poggio fails to write anything of his own… However, he spends lots of time educating himself—systematically and unidirectionally, apparently training himself for some serious task of great responsibility concerning the Imperial period in Roman history. Niccoli barely manages to send him the works required: Ammianus Marcellinus, Plutarch, Ptolemy’s Geography, etc”. ([21], pages 394 and ff).

Hochart is of the opinion that Poggio had been alone when he began the forgery, but was probably soon forced to engage Niccoli as well. They must have planted the so-called Second Medicean Copy first, holding the First one back hoping to “skin the same steer twice.” However, the market had soon beenaddled by a great number of exposed forgeries. Poggio refrained from risking it the second time. The First Copy must have entered circulation by proxy of his son Giovanni Francesco after he had made away with the fortune of his father.

Apart from the works mentioned, the Poggio-Niccoli syndicate had put the following “Classical” texts into circulation:

The complete Quintillian, some tractates by Cicero, seven of his speeches, Lucretius, Petronius, Plautus, Tertullian, some texts of Marcellinus, Calpurnius Seculus, etc.

The market became agitated after the finding of Tacitus. In 1455 “Enoch D’Ascoli had found Tacitus’ Dialogue of Orators, Agricola’s Biography, and Germany, (a monastery in the north yet again) whose language and character differ from the History and the Annals significantly… The Facetiae ascribed to Tacitus appeared on the market, and the sham took a long time to expose” ([21], pages 350-351).

Let us reiterate – Hochart and Ross insisted that the History of Tacitus was a sham exclusively because of their unswerving trust in the Scaligerian chronology. Rejecting it and transferring “ancient” Roman events into the XIII-XV century a.d. cardinally changes our attitude even to such events as Poggio’s mysterious involvement in the discovery of Tacitus’ books.

Finally, let us cite an ancient miniature from the Historiarum ab Urbe condita by Titus Livy that was published in Italy in the alleged XV century ([1485], page 264). The miniature is on the very first page of the book (see fig. 7.10). The inscription below says “Titi Livii…” What we see on the miniature is a typically mediaeval interior of the house of a writer who
is working on a book (see fig. 7.11). The artist must have tried to draw the author of the oeuvre, namely, Titus Livy. However, the historians prefer to assure us that it isn’t the “ancient” Titus Livy, but, rather, an anonymous humanist writing some book. Modern historians archly comment that “On top of the first page of the text we see a writer who finishes his work… The picture shows a humanist scientist in his study” ([1485], page 264). However, most probably, the picture represents the author of the book, or the mediaeval writer Titus Livy. He may have been a contemporary of Poggio, or Poggio Bracciolini himself, who had been a humanist scientist after all.

What one has to note in this respect is that on the pages of the books by the “ancient” Titus Livy and other “Classical authors” one keeps coming across mediaeval symbolism, Christian crosses and coats of arms, for instance (see fig. 7.12). The modern commentators archly comment that “On top of the first page of the text we see a writer who finishes his work… The picture shows a humanist scientist in his study” ([1485], page 264). However, most probably, the picture represents the author of the book, or the mediaeval writer Titus Livy. He may have been a contemporary of Poggio, or Poggio Bracciolini himself, who had been a humanist scientist after all.

What one has to note in this respect is that on the pages of the books by the “ancient” Titus Livy and other “Classical authors” one keeps coming across mediaeval symbolism, Christian crosses and coats of arms, for instance (see fig. 7.12). The modern commentators naturally noticed this phenomenon a long time ago. For instance, the current edition of the book by Titus Livy is commented upon in the following matter: “The beginning of Book 21… one sees a coat of arms with a cross and some angels” ([1485], page 265). However, today the commentators prefer to assure us that all these visible late mediaeval relics have been introduced into the “ancient” books by the artists just in order to please the mediaeval book-owners. The real explanation is most probably a different and more natural one – namely, that the mediaeval Christian artists used the mediaeval Christian symbols in order to illustrate a mediaeval book of a late mediaeval author who was describing contemporary mediaeval events.

3.

THE MEDIAEVAL WESTERN EUROPEAN CHRISTIAN CULT AND THE “ANCIENT” PAGAN BACCHIC CELEBRATIONS

According to our reconstruction, the “ancient” Dionysian (Bacchic) pagan cult prevailed in Western Europe in the Middle Ages, that is, in the XIII-XVI century, and not in “distant antiquity.” This may have been one of the forms of mediaeval Western European Christianity. Can we find support for this theory in the original sources that have reached our time? We can, and rather substantial support at that.

N. A. Morozov in his analysis of ecclesial history has paid attention to the known, albeit oftentimes withheld, fact of the openly Bacchic practise of Christian officiations in mediaeval Italy and France, where liturgies often transformed into orgies, convents would frequently serve as houses of ill repute, etc.

What does the Scaligerian history tell us about mediaeval Western European monasticism? Let us turn to the book by Alexander Paradisis titled The Life and Activity of Balthazar Cossa (Pope John XXIII) ([645]).

“Nothing remained of the reclusion and the piety of the first centuries of Christianity, the decadency in the church and its morals attained grandiose proportions… The nuns’ clothing didn’t help austerity, either, since it served to emphasize their natural beauty and gracefulfullness… Nearly all Italian monasteries [according to Rodocanachi] allowed male visitors… As for Venetian monasteries – Casanova is not the only source of information in what regards those; St. Didier writes that “nothing attracted as much interest in Venice as the monasteries.” Noblemen have been frequent visitors there, too. Since all of the nuns were beautiful and clean-limbed, none of them went without a lover. The care of the dominae about the morals manifested as aiding the nuns in finding more elaborate ways of meeting their lovers and providing necessary alibis. During the Venetian carnival (which would last almost half a year over there), convents would turn into dance halls and become filled with masked men… The dresses have
been narrow, fitting tight around the waist, with large scoop necklines which demonstrated the white and voluptuous bodies of the nuns.” (see Rodocanachi (E.), La femme Italienne, avant, pendant et après la Renaissance, Paris, 1922.)

Charles Louis Pölnitz writes that the Venetian nuns curled their hair, wore short dresses that failed to cover their svelte legs, and that their bosoms were only covered when they sang in church choir. The garments worn by the Roman nuns also weren’t exactly characterized by demureness; as for the Florentine nuns, the prior of a friary who had visited Florence writes that they resembled mythical nymphs rather than “brides of Christ” (see Pizzichi, Viaggio per l’alta Italia, Firenze, 1820). There were theatres at many monasteries where it was allowed to give performances, however, only the nuns could take part in those. The nuns of Genoa weren’t exactly known for continence, either. One of the Papal edicts aggrievedly stated that “the sisters from the convents of St. Philip and St. Jacob roam the streets of Genoa, committing whatever ribaldries their hotspurred imaginations dictate” ([645], pages 160-162).

Finally, the church began to persecute this Bacchic form of the Christian cult in the West.

“The dissoluteness of the nuns in the Bolognese convent of John the Baptist had been so great that the authorities were forced to disperse the nuns and close down the convent. The nuns from the convent of St. Leonard were given into custody of the St. Laurence convent which had gained prominence due to its austere and harsh regulations, being called “the tormentor of the nuns”… The amount of nuns persecuted by the justice had grown by the day. Every Bolognese convent had a nickname: “the convent of the dolls’” “the convent of the gossipers,” “the convent of the repenting Magdalenes,” “the convent of the wenches,” “the monastery of the Messalinas,” etc. (see Frati (Lodov.), La vita private di Bologna nel Medio Evo, Florence, 1898)…

The eminent humanist Giovanni Pontano tells us that in Valencia the Spaniards had free access to the convents, and that it was hard to differentiate between these holy tabernacles and houses of ill repute. Settenbrie, who studied the last collection of Masuccio’s works, writes that the book The Conjugality of
Monks and Nuns had been withdrawn from circulation, and entered the list of the books forbidden by the Catholic Church, while its author was anathematized” ([645], pages 162-164).

Let us stop for a moment and think. A natural question arises, namely, that of the essence of the Christian cult in Western Europe prior to the introduction of the rigid sanctions of the XVI-XVII century. Did it resemble modern Christianity? Nowadays we are often told that the mediaeval clergy frequently spent time in bacchanals. We have all heard of the alleged lechery of many mediaeval monks who are supposed to have corrupted the original ideals, which were intrinsically intemperate. See figs. 7.13 and 7.14, for instance.

An unprejudiced study of mediaeval documents shows this mediaeval Christian cult to have been practically identical with the one we consider the ancient Bacchic, Dionysian cult. N. A. Morozov cites plenty of data showing that, for instance, official prostitution was an integral part of the mediaeval Western European Christian liturgy. Another example is the love-cult prevalent in a number of mediaeval temples located on the territory of modern India. Accordingly, there exists the possibility of point of view differing from the official modern standpoint, one which would interpret the distinct relics of the Bacchic in Christian rituals of the Middle Ages as the corruption of archetypal Christianity. These “ancient relics” persisting in the Middle Ages strike us as odd nowadays since they contradict the Scaligerian chronology. A change of the latter and the dislodgement of “antiquity” into the Middle Ages instantly eliminates the seeming contradiction.

The Scaligerian history contains many relics of the mediaeval Bacchic-Christian liturgies. According to the experts in the history of religions, the Western European Christians of the Middle Ages had (see, for instance, the review given in [544]) religious rituals including nocturnal congregations called “agapes,” or “nights of love.” Despite the efforts of the late mediaeval and modern commentators to convince us that these Christian “love suppers” involved nothing but “comradely libations” and “platonic cordialities,” the initial meaning of the word “agape” reveals something completely different. As N. A. Morozov duly re-
marks, the correct Greek word for fraternal love is “philia,” whereas “agape” is solely used for erotic love.

Therefore the “agapes” have most probably merely been the way Christians referred to the mediaeval Western European bacchals of the Dionysian cult with all of their orgiastic attributes – the attributes deemed “extremely ancient” nowadays. What the Scaligerian chronology presents as an exception must have been the rule for the Western European Christian church of the Middle Ages. For instance, the numerous references to “Papal and Episcopalian lewdness” simply indicate just how widespread the Christian bacchanal cult was in the Middle Ages. This may have been a result of a distortion of the strict Christian rites of the XI century. Let us recollect that the pagan bacchanals were described by the “ancient” Titus Livy in his famous History of the City. And the dynastical parallels that we have discovered identify the “ancient Rome” of Titus Livy with the epoch of the XI-XIII century, and also partially over the Habsburg (New Town, or Nov-Gorod?) epoch of the XIV-XVI century (see figs. 6.19, 6.20, 6.21, 6.22, 6.23, 6.24, 6.52 and 6.52 in Chron1, Chapter 6).

Apparently, the necessity of curbing the Bacchic cult eventually presented itself. N. A. Morozov puts forth a hypothesis that this Christian-Bacchic practice of religious Dionysian orgies in the Western church may possibly have caused a wide propagation of venereal diseases in Western European countries ([544], Volume 5). We shan’t discuss the likelihood of this hypothesis, since it’s well beyond the scope of our work. It is however possible that the Western European church of the XV-XVI centuries eventually had to return to the original, ascetic and somewhat austere style of XI century Christianity in order to mitigate the effect of negative social aftermath of the Bacchic rites. This may have been one of the primary reasons for religious reform, as well as for the rigid celibacy edicts. This reform was later arbitrarily placed in the XI century A.D. and ascribed to “Pope Gregory VII,” or “Pope Hildebrand” (“Ablaze as Gold”), who, according to our reconstruction, is a mere reflection of the XI century Jesus Christ. One takes it that many events of what we know nowadays as “Hildebrand’s biography” actually belong to the more recent periods of the XIV-XVI century.

Naturally, doing away with the “ancient” Bacchic or Dionysian cult was far from an easy task due to its great appeal, accumulated social consequences (venereal diseases, etc.) notwithstanding. Nowadays “Pope Hildebrand” is the very person who is said to have given great attention to this problem during the religious reform of the alleged XI century, which is the time period to which we nowadays ascribe the rigid edicts about the expulsion of those holy fathers who continued their married lives. This decision caused an uproar, since almost all of the Roman clergy was married. As N. A. Morozov pointed out:

“The natural facet of human existence had suffered defeat in this tragic matrimony conflict, and rigid monastic asceticism became victor due to the influence of the Gospel according to Matthew – the actual celibacy edict must have been caused by a wide propagation of venereal diseases among the clergy as well as the laics, since it is hard to explain and justify such an innovation.” ([544], Volume 5)

The opposition was crushed, although it took years of struggle.

The necessity of crushing the orgiastic Christian cult entailed the establishment of the Inquisition for the initiation of hard-line reforms in both clerical and secular life of Western Europe. We should point out that the Eastern Orthodox Church and Russia in particular have never seen such open and wide dispersion of Bacchic practices. This is why there was no Inquisition in the Orthodox Church. The transition to the stricter modern form of the cult in the Western church may have been caused by the negative social after-effects of the Bacchic liturgies.

However, N. A. Morozov had been persistent in regarding the Orthodox church as the heir of the Western Latin church, by and large. We consider this to be another grave mistake of his. The reason for this error is clear to us now: N. A. Morozov erroneously considered the Western church to have been much older than the Orthodox church in general, and the Russian church in particular, since, according to the Scaligerian outlook, the formation of the Orthodox Church in Russia occurred as late as the X-XI century, whereas in Morozov’s opinion the Western church had been formed in the IV-V century A.D.

However, nowadays we are beginning to understand that both the Western and the Orthodox Church, and the Russian church in particular, ap-
Fig. 7.15. The title picture from a book on witchcraft by Pretorius dating from 1668. A propagandist representation of a “sabbat of the witches”. Taken from [492], Volume 1, page 95.
Chapter 7 “Dark Ages” in Mediaeval History

Peared simultaneously – in the XI-XII century, q.v. in the new statistical chronology in Chron1, Chapter 6. Apparently, the Orthodox and the Latin church were of the same origin, and have subsequently been developing in cardinally different ways. The very name of the Orthodox (as in conservative, or ancient) Church indicates the possibility of the Orthodox practice being closer to the proto-cult of the XI century than the Latin-Catholic liturgy.

The mediaeval descriptions of the infamous “diabolic sabbats” in Western Europe must have been based on the same archetypal “agape” Bacchanals as mentioned above, but these have already been declared “a creation of the devil” (see fig. 7.15). Let us remind the reader that dissolve orgiastic excesses had been a notable feature of the agapes or sabbats (according to the Scaligerian history). Quite naturally, the new “reformed” Western European church conveniently delegated the responsibility for the agapes (or sabbats, or Bacchanals) to “the devil” in order to smother all recollections of the recent Bacchic Christian past in the congregation. The people’s own history was thus ruthlessly severed and attributed to a “different religion”, or even to “the devil”. After that, it was further removed into an antediluvian age labelled “antiquity.” In fig. 7.16 one can see one of the numerous and rather eloquent pictures of a mediaeval “ancient” Bacchanal – the famous oeuvre by Dosso Dossi bearing that very title. Further, in fig. 7.17, one sees a relief from an “ancient” Attic sarcophagus made in the Middle Ages that makes effigy of a Bacchanal feast in the honour of Dionysius. The famed “Bacchanal” by Rubens, painted around 1615, can be seen in fig. 7.18.

Fig. 7.16. “Bacchanal” by Dosso Dossi. Kept in the Castel Sant’Angelo National Museum in Rome. Taken from [138], page 80.
Fig. 7.17. A Dionysian feast. A relief from an “ancient” Attic sarcophagus. Taken from [304], Volume 1, page 103.

Fig. 7.18. “Bacchanal” by Rubens. Dating from around 1615. Taken from [188], sheet 44.
Fig. 7.19. The illustrations on top represent fragments from the capital of the Strasbourg cathedral. A bear is carrying an aspersorium, a wolf follows him with a cross, followed in turn by a hare bearing a torch etc. Further we see: a) a miniature from a mediaeval moralistic Bible (No 166 from the Imperial Library); b) mediaeval “Christian-Bacchic” subjects still adorning some Western European cathedrals. Taken from [1064].
The history of the Bacchic Christian cult in Western Europe must have been a long one. We shall give a few quotes from the rather rare œuvre of Champfleury titled *Historie de la Caricature au Moyen Age* (*The History of Caricature in the Middle Ages*) ([1064]). Caricature usually serves to reflect reality by hyperbolizing some of its facets in order to draw attention to them.

Champfleury writes: “The mediaeval cathedrals and monasteries have housed strange kinds of entertainment [as seen from the stance of the consensual concept of the Middle Ages that was inflicted upon us – A. F.] during big church feasts in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance epoch. It isn’t just the common clergy that takes part in the dancing and the singing, especially during Christmas and Easter, but even the top ranking ecclesial dignitaries. The monks from the friaries danced with the nuns from nearby convents, and the bishops joined the merrymaking.” ([1064], page 53. Quoted in [544], Volume 5)

Champfleury proceeds to cite the most modest example, presenting it as a caricature [], which is a picture of a supper taken by monks together with “their ladyloves” from a XIV century *Bible* (which is a fact we feel worthy of emphasizing), see fig. 7.19 taken from [1064], The National Library, Paris, No. 166. But how could this “caricature,” if it really is one, wind up in the Bible, a holy book? The Holy Writ is hardly the place for jests and witticisms, especially considering the fact that the other miniatures from this edition of the Bible do not give the illustrator away as a farceur. The miniature depicts a typically Bacchic scenario: a monk and a nun are entwined in a passionate embrace in the foreground, and the same actions are performed by a larger group in the background. Other similar mediaeval artwork can be seen in fig. 7.19, the phallic symbolic of the Indian god Shiva-Rudra in fig. 7.20, and other examples in figs. 7.21 and 7.22.

A Dutch “caricature” of the mediaeval Christian cult can be seen in the *History of the Papacy* by S. G. Lozinsky, for instance (fig. 7.23). A crowd of parishioners bursts into a church following a priest, while a crowd is being rampantly joyous on the square in front of the church.

The number of such “caricatures” in mediaeval manuscripts that have reached our age is great enough. Incidentally, Pope Pius II, for one, was the author of

---

Fig. 7.20. A stone effigy of Shiva Lingamurti. A phallic image of the Indian god Shiva-Rudra. Taken from [533], Vol. 1, page 222.
A bas-relief from the dome of the portal of the Notre Dame of Paris (XII c.)

The capital of the Magdeburg Cathedral

The capital of the nave from the Saint-Hilaire de Melle church in Poitou

A wooden sculpture from Malestroit (Brittany)

A bas-relief from the church in Poitiers

A sculpture from the Saint-Gille church in Malestroit (Brittany)

Fig. 7.21. Mediaeval “Christian-Bacchic” subjects that can still be observed in some Western European temples. For instance, the obscene (in modern understanding) pictures from the dome of the portal of the Notre Dame in Paris, France, and the ones from the capital of the Magdeburg Cathedral. A named woman is riding a goat, and a monkey is playing the guitar. Otte, *Manuel de l’Archéologie de l’art religieux au moyen age*, 1884. Taken from [1064].
numerous erotic poems and an extremely obscene [by current standards – A. F.] comedy titled \textit{Chrysis} ([492], Volume 1, page 156). It would also be appo-
site to remind the reader of the “Song of Songs,” part of the Biblical canon with explicit erotic references and descriptions galore. Of course, the theologians of our age cagily interpret those as an “allegory” of sorts.

Champfleury in his attempt to make the monas-
tic life of Western Europe in the XIII-XVI century fit modern morals and inculcated concepts of religious life and “monastic ideals” of the epoch, tries to con-
vince us that all such phenomena in mediaeval art aren’t to be regarded as illustrations of contemporary reality, but rather as an admonishment against such actions ([1064]). However, it is most odd, since the “admonishment” is pictured in a most enticing man-
ner indeed. Is it possible to conceive of someone who would try to restrain the public from debauchery with the aid of pornographic editions? This would most probably have the opposite effect. Furthermore, if these were “admonishments,” one would expect to see depictions of unpleasant after-effects of such ac-
tions. However, none such are present!

Such illustrations in religious literature only make sense if they are a rendition of quotidian phenomena from the life of the mediaeval clergy — events con-
sidered normal by everyone, in other words. Had the painter wanted to express his reprehension of the subject matter, he would have shown this carousal in some unappealing light, with demons dragging sin-
ers into inferno, the revolting aftermath of diseases, etc. Instead of this, several mediaeval Bibles contain illustrations of Bacchanal dances, and ones looking perfectly “ancient,” at that. The capital headings are
Fig. 7.23. Mediaeval Dutch “caricature” of the Roman church. Taken from [492], Volume 1, page 17.
enwreathed in grapevines, with little angels climbing them – spitting images of allegedly “extremely ancient” cupids. And so on, and so forth. We are referring to our personal acquaintance with certain ancient Bibles that are kept in the Moscow Planetarium Library, for instance, or those from the Rare Book Museum of the National State Library in Moscow.

According to Champfleury, it was as early as the VII century A.D., 700 years after the naissance of Christianity, that the Council of Chalon-sur-Saône forbids women to sing obscene songs in churches ([1064]). The date is given as VII century in the Scaligerian chronology; according to our results, all of this occurs in the XV-XVI century, which coincides with the time of the formation of the Inquisition in the West. Gregory of Tours protests against the monastic masquerades in Poitiers that occurred during the historically ecclesial “feasts of the mad,” “feasts of the innocent” and “feasts of the ass.”

Champfleury writes that: “it was as late as [the alleged date of – A. F.] 1212, that the Paris Council prohibited the nuns to partake in the “frantic celebrations” in the following form: “The frantic celebrations where the phallus is worshipped are to be condemned everywhere, and we forbid partaking to monks and nuns specifically”” ([1064], page 57, quoted in [544], Volume 5, page 658). The ban didn’t seem to help much, since much later, in the alleged year 1245, the reformist bishop Odon reported, after having visited the monasteries of Rouen, that the nuns there take part in forbidden pleasures en masse ([1064], page 57. Quoted in [544], Volume 5, page 658).

The “feasts of the innocent” greatly resembled the Church “feasts of the mad,” or festi follorum (possibly renamed from festi phallorum). Apparently, the label “innocent” referred to people unaware of the difference between the allowed and the forbidden. Both feasts may have been the same old Christian agapes and bacchanals named differently. According to Champfleury, they existed in Besançon as late as the years 1284-1559 (in the Scaligerian chronology), until the reformed church outlawed them in that area as well. King Charles VII forbids these religious “feasts of the mad” again in 1430, in the Troyes Cathedral ([1064], page 58, quoted in [544], Volume 5). One sees how much labour it took the Western European church to weed out the deeply rooted Bacchic-Christian cult of the XIII-XV century.

Champfleury writes the following: “Many a time, studying the ancient cathedrals, and trying to unravel the secret reason for their ribald ornamentation, all of my own explanation seemed to me as comments to a book written in a language that is alien to me… What could one possibly make of the bizarre sculpture that one sees in the shade of a column in an underground hall of the mediaeval cathedral in Bourges?” ([1064], quoted in [544], Volume 5, page 661, see fig. 7.19)

The sculpture in question is an effigy of human buttocks protruding from the column in a very erotic manner, done meticulously and with great expression. How could the monks and the parishioners of the times before the era when this sculpture became a tourist attraction from the days of yore, have abided it in the temple that they attended every day?

Another example is the stone sculpture allegedly dated 1100 that is now a showpiece in the museum of the Santiago de Compostela Cathedral in Spain.
We see a naked woman in a very explicit position. The museum plaque tells us that the sculpture had been inside this very cathedral prior to being made an exhibit. Then, during its reconstruction, it was taken off its original mounting and placed in the museum.

Attempts to explain away all of these mediaeval sculptures and images (of which there are quite a few left) as “caricatures” of the clergy carved in stone on the walls of holy temples, very simply don’t hold water. Champfleury proceeds to ask us:

“Can one think of an imagination paradoxical enough to determine the correlation of such an improbable jape with the holy place that houses the carving? What authority did it take to let the sculptor carve such details with impunity?… On the walls of several ancient Christian temples we find, with great surprise, images of human genitalia compli-antly displayed amidst the objects used for holy liturgy. The lapicides demonstrate great innocence in carving such pornographic sculptures, that resemble an echo of the Classical symbolism… These… phallic relics of the past that one finds in darkened halls [where the Bacchanals took place – A. F.] are especially numerous in Gironde. Léo Drouyn, an archaeologist from Bordeaux, showed me some highly peculiar specimens of brazen sculptures put on display in the ancient churches of his province that he conceals in the depths of his files and folders.” ([1064], quoted in [544], Volume 5, page 661)

N. A. Morozov was quite correct in pointing out that excess shame deprives us of valuable scientific information. Scaligerian historians, in remaining taciturn about the Christian genital symbolism present in a number of mediaeval temples, have slowed the potential for comparison of artefacts of the “Classical Age” with mediaeval ones. Serious, thoroughly illustrated books on the phallic cult would pour some bright light on the matter and expose the Weltanschauung of the Christian-Bacchic cult devotees of the Middle Ages.

Most probably, all of these drawings and sculptures are the furthest thing from anti-ecclesial mockery, and serve the same invitatory purpose as foamy beer steins painted on the doors of German pubs. Naturally, all of this made sense only prior to the large-scale repressions of the new evangelical church and the Inquisition of the XV-XVI century against the old Western European Bacchic Christian cult.

“Classical” pornographic effigies (those from the excavations of “ancient” Pompeii, for instance) are directly related to their Christian counterparts. Once again, the misconceived “shamefulness” keeps the scientific public from learning of those extremely interesting source materials. V. Klassovsky tells us that:

“The pictures that depict explicitly erotic and ithyphallic scenes that the ancients liked so much are kept under lock and key… In the house of the dissolute women… someone had scraped off the obscene frescoes with a knife at night… As of late, all of the Pompeian paintings and sculptures that contradict the modern concept of decency are kept in the secret department of the Bourbon museum where no visitors are allowed except for those possessing the special permission of the high officials that they have to demonstrate at the door. Obtaining such a permission by legal means is far from easy.” ([389], pages 75-76)

However, in 1836 a catalogue was published that contained engravings of some of the exhibits from this secret department ([1278]); this catalogue is an antiquarian rarity nowadays. Let us also mention that, according to Humphrey Davy, “the Pompeian painters and the Italian painters of the Renaissance epoch used identical paints” (quoted in [389], page 70).

Houses have been found in Pompeii – one of which is considered a hotel nowadays – that have stone phal-luses in front of the entrance. The connexion between the phallus and the Christian cult is not only present in the Western European temples of the Middle Ages. “In Hieropolis there were gigantic phalluses carved out of granite, of 180 feet and higher; they used to be placed at the temple gates” ([389], page 122). V. Klassovsky was of the naïve opinion that these gigantic stone phal-luses served “for the edification of the parish” [?] ([389], page 122). Most probably, the carving had been a sign, or a facia of sorts. Compare with a similar stone effigy of the Indian Shiva Lingamurti; what one sees here is the phallic symbol of Shiva-Rudra.

If the obscene mediaeval artwork is nothing but signs whose primary purpose is to inveigle the public to partake in the Christian entertainment as was practised in Western European temples up until the XVI century – and occasionally later yet – what could the images of witches, demons, etc. that they incor-
porate possibly signify? The more recent ones, with demons dragging sinners to hell, are, of course, meant to intimidate. But what would be the meaning of those where the devil is playing the guitar, and naked women riding goats and asses are carried away by the momentum of sensuality? What could be the import of the stone apes dancing lewd roundels? Such are the stone sculptures on the chapiters of the Magdeburg Cathedral. Or, for instance, the bas-relief from the portal dome of Notre Dame de Paris allegedly dating from the XII century, that contains obscene imagery of naked women copulating with asses, goats, and each other – a tangle of human bodies and demons entertaining male and female members of the parish alike with their sexual callisthenics.

We should also remind the reader of the extremely well-developed erotic cult in India. Some of the Indian temples are covered with intricate erotic sculptures from top to bottom. Also, what could the sculpture from the portal of the Ploërmel church possibly mean, the one plainly visible to the public and depicting a young wife tweaking the nose of her husband who is wearing a nightcap? See figs. 7.19, 7.21 and 7.22. A Dutch “caricature” of the mediaeval Roman church can also be seen in fig. 7.23.

Champfleury, who cites all of these pictures and sculptures, and a great deal of others to boot, does not provide a clear answer to all these questions. However, the meaning of the last sculpture, for instance, is crystal clear. “Such a picture is far from being an inappropriate caricature; one would rather think it a sign quite appropriate for the entrance to a legal disorderly house for married women [located in a temple – A. F.]” ([544], Volume 5, page 666).

In [544], Volume 5, one encounters argumentation in favour of the theory that the Western European Christian temples of the XII-XVI century combined certain distinctives consistent with the liturgy presented to us in late Christian literature, with those of brothels from which it would have been hard to distinguish them in the Middle Ages. Thus, the initially austere Christianity of the XI century gave birth to the orgiastic and Bacchic Christian cult. After the separation of the churches from the brothels (which didn’t happen in some areas of India until the XIX century), the latter became semi-legal institutions resembling their modern counterparts. All of the above mentioned imagery on the walls and over the entrances to the XII-XV century temples could only have seemed appropriate for as long as the temples served as places of erotically-flavoured entertainment honouring the vivacious “ancient” gods, and where the Eucharist chalice also served an orgiastic purpose. Far from the abodes of pious meditation that we deem them to be nowadays.

One finds it appropriate to make the following remark in this respect: according to the Scaligerian chronology, nearly all the mediaeval Roman Christian churches have allegedly been built “on the sites of ancient Pagan temples.” These “ancient predecessors” have for some reason shared the same purpose, and even the same name as the “more recent” Christian temples ([196]). The mediaeval church of St. Dionysius, for instance, was allegedly built on the site of the “ancient pagan temple of Dionysius,” etc. From our point of view, the picture is perfectly clear. What we see here is the same old effect of the Scaligerian chronology. Having declared its own recent Bacchic past “erroneous” for one or another objective reason, the Western Christian Church in its new reformed phase of the XV-XVI century had simply renamed all of its recent Christian-Bacchic gods new Evangelical saints, occasionally even keeping their names intact, since the parishioners had been accustomed to them.

One might ask the obvious question about whether we indeed are right, and the Bacchanals are merely a form of the mediaeval Christian cult of the XII-XVI century, the strict edicts outlawing this cult introduced by the Inquisition in the XV-XVI century finding their reflection in the “ancient” bans of the Bacchanals. Is it really so? Are there any “ancient” documents that forbid the “ancient” bacchanals? There are indeed, and they occasionally match their mediaeval relatives of the XV-XVI century word for word.

This is what the historians tell us about the “Classical Age”: “The Graeco-Roman decadence that began to infiltrate the lives of all the Roman estates… in 186 [the alleged year 186 A.D. – A. F.] manifested in one alarming symptom – secret Bacchus cults… these cults have spread across all of Rome and Italy” ([304], Volume 1, page 362). Considering the Roman chronological shift upwards by roughly 1053 years, we get the Scaligerian date of 186 A.D. actually standing for a date approximating 1239 A.D., since 186 + 1053
= 1239. It turns out that the wide propagation of the Bacchic cult really falls on the XIII century A.D., which concurs well with the information concerning the pervasion of the mediaeval orgiastic cult of the XII-XVI century. If this happens to really be a manifestation of the two chronological shifts of 1383 years (a sum of 1053 and 330), the “ancient” events as mentioned above roughly fall on the middle of the XVI century, which fits our reconstruction even better.

What did really happen later in “antiquity?”

The authorities have commenced an energetic investigation, and it turned out that the members of this cult exceeded 7,000 people in their numbers. Many have been seized and done away with quick and severe executions. A large number of the women that took part in the criminal cult have been handed over to their relations for the execution, and if none of their kin could bring themselves to execute the death sentence, they would be claimed by the henchman.

A most valuable relic of the time is given to us by an important governmental edict of the Senate in its original edition. The Roman Senate forbade all manner of manifestation of the Bacchic cult on the territory of the United Roman State under pain of death... The Senate’s edict forbidding Bacchanals explicitly had been carved on a copper plaque and had been sent to all of the districts in such a fashion in order to be put up in public places for everybody’s information. One of such plates was unearthed in a rather secluded place, the ancient Bruttian country. ([304], Vol. 1, pp. 362-363)

We cite this “ancient” document in fig. 7.26. According to our reconstruction, this “ancient” decree is one of the imperial Inquisitional prohibitions of mediaeval Bacchanals issued in the XV-XVI century, which had been found in 1640, right about the time the Scaligerian chronology was nascent. It had immediately been declared “ancient” and attributed to the distant past.