In the second illustration we see the explanation of the parentage of the pharaoh: his virgin mother and the chief solar god Amon hold each other in a lovers’ embrace.

The third illustration elaborates on the meaning of the previous one and provides details of the immaculate conception from the divine seed. This idea is conveyed through the cross that is held near the nose of Met-em-ve [the author makes a reference to the poly-


Commenting on this amazing, but far from unique, series of the *Christian and Evangelical* bas-reliefs of “ancient” Egypt, J. Robertson, the prominent expert in the history of religions, wrote that “the most exact analogy of the Egyptian myth of the divine royalty birth is that with the Christian Annunciation” (quoted in [743], page 130).

We have just covered three bas-reliefs of the five. What about the remaining two?

“Three out of these five subjects depicting various moments of his [Amenope’s] birth show us the Annunciation, the coition of the lovers… and its result – immaculate conception… .

In the fourth illustration we see the actual birth of the divine royalty, and the fifth shows us the *adoration* of the child by the Magi [exactly the way the Gospel has it, q.v. in fig. 7.72 – A. F.]. The three genuflected human figures [or the evangelical magi accompanied by a king who is also on his knees, see *Chron6* – A. F.]
say benedictions and present him [the infant Christ? – A. F.] with gifts, and there are gods near them doing likewise… We consider further commentary to these five effigies unnecessary.” ([743], page 149)

Historians point out that “they [the evangelical subjects of the Annunciation and the immaculate conception – A. F.] bear the greatest resemblance to similar subjects pertinent to the biographies of other famous mythical saviours of the past – the Jewish… Samson, the Babylonian and Phoenician Tammuz, or Adonis, and the Indian… Buddha” ([743], page 132).

Also “the Egyptian chrismation, or the baptism of the pharaoh by kings Horus and Thoth… they pour holy water on the king, which is represented as a stream of crosses here… with the king himself holding another cross in his hand” ([743], page 198). A similar “ancient” Egyptian picture can be seen in fig. 7.73.

In fig. 7.74 we see mediaeval Coptic representations of the Christian crosses ([544], Volume 6). Let us remind the reader that the Copts were the mediaeval Egyptian Christians. It is clearly visible that the mediaeval Coptic ankhs are virtually identical to the “ancient” Egyptian ones.

In fig. 7.75 one sees an “ancient” Egyptian obelisk that stands in Italian Rome nowadays, in Minerva Square ([1242], page 43). We see a Christian cross on its top. Nowadays historians assure us that this cross is a later addition. We are extremely sceptical about that. Most probably the obelisks, including the “ancient” Egyptian ones, were created as tall pedestals for the specific purpose of bearing crosses or other Christian symbols. Ergo, they were manufactured in the XVI-XVI century.

A similar Egyptian obelisk with a Christian cross on top was erected on St. Peter’s square in Rome ([1242], page 43. See fig. 7.76). In fig. 7.77 we see an ancient engraving depicting the same obelisk in the Vatican. Here we also see a Christian cross on the spire, see fig. 7.78.
However, another ancient engraving dated as 1585 (fig. 7.79) allegedly shows the very same Vatican obelisk, but looking completely different, as is its setting, although it is supposed to be depicted as standing close to St. Peter’s cathedral in this picture as well ([1374], page 121). The spire of this Egyptian obelisk in the Vatican is crowned by a large sphere, possibly solar imagery (see fig. 7.79). This symbolism is Christian, since Jesus Christ was referred to as “the Sun.”

It is possible that the Christian crosses or solar spheres were taken off the “ancient” Egyptian obelisks in the XVII-XVIII century, in the tumultuous epoch of the Reformation, so as to facilitate dating them to some hypothetical “ancient” period long before Jesus Christ.

Furthermore, there’s a XVIII century obelisk in front of the façade of the “ancient” Roman Pantheon which dates from the alleged II century a.d. (fig. 7.80). However, its style isn’t any different from that of the other “ancient” Egyptian obelisks that one sees in other Roman squares and in Egypt. All of them most probably belong to the same epoch and tradition of the XV-XVIII century.

In fig. 7.81 we see a picture allegedly dating from
Fig. 7.75. “Ancient” Egyptian obelisk on the Minerva Square in Rome. There’s a Christian cross on its spire. Taken from [1242], page 43.

Fig. 7.76. “Ancient” Egyptian obelisk on St. Peter’s square in Rome. Taken from [1242], page 42.
Fig. 7.77. Ancient engraving depicting the “Egyptian” obelisk in Vatican with a Christian cross on its spire. It is presumed that this engraving pictures a “new consecration” of the obelisk. Taken from [1374], page 21.
1650 which shows an “ancient” Egyptian obelisk covered in hieroglyphs from top to bottom. The obelisk of Pamphilius can be seen in the centre with either an alectryon or a dove on its top (fig. 7.82). Both are well-known Christian symbols. The same “ancient” Egyptian alectryon symbolism can be seen topping many Western European Christian temples. In Chron6 we demonstrate that the alectryon used to symbolize the Ottoman=Ataman crescent. Also, modern commentators assure us that Kircher, the author of the XVII century book this picture is taken from, interpreted the hieroglyphs in a “fanciful manner” ([1374], page 123). It would be interesting to find out what exactly it is that the present day historians dislike in Kircher’s translation. We haven’t had the opportunity of studying this issue yet.

In fig. 7.83 we see an engraving allegedly dating from 1499 that shows an “ancient” Egyptian obelisk mounted upon an elephant ([1374], page 119). Once again, we observe a spherical solar symbol on the top of the obelisk that symbolizes Jesus Christ. This engraving is taken from a book by Francesco Colonna which never fails to irritate the present day commentators. For instance, they have the following to say about this “ancient” Egyptian obelisk: “This romantic pseudo-
Fig. 7.81. An “ancient” engraving dating from 1650 depicting “ancient” Egyptian obelisks covered in hieroglyphs. The obelisk of Pamphilus is in the centre; we can clearly see an alectryon or a dove on its spire – a Christian symbol, in other words. One can still see such ornithic images on tops of many mediaeval cathedrals. As we shall demonstrate in Chron6, it used to symbolize the Ottoman crescent. Taken from [1374], page 123.
Egyptian image was very popular in the XVI century. The book that [the drawing] was taken from originally is called the Hypnerotomachia, and really is a romantic fantasy text written in a strange mixture of languages – Italian, Latin, babelized Hebrew, and imaginary hieroglyphs. However, the illustrations are very artful; the ascetic style was considered authentically Classical by many readers” ([1374], page 119).

In other words, we are told that despite the fact that this old book is written in a rather austere manner, modern historians know the exact nature of “real Egyptian antiquities” better than the mediaeval author. Their consensual decision treats Francesco Colonna in a patronizing manner, deftly withdrawing his book from scientific circulation.

6.4. Researchers of the ancient religions commenting on the strange similarities between the cults of “antiquity” and those of the Middle Ages

The “ancient” Greek legends would have it that the “ancient” god Dionysius (fig. 7.84) performed the miracle of transforming water into wine ([743], page 198). Experts in the history of religions have noted that this is a perfect analogue of the famous evangelical miracle of Christ’s transformation of water into wine in Cana in Galilee. Could Galilee refer to “Gaul,” or France, and the well-known city of Cannes? Saintyves wrote that “after this, no one could possibly fail to see the origins of the matrimonial miracle in Galilean Cana… ever since the Dionysian cult and during the age of the Christian cult, water never ceased to turn to wine on the 9th of January” (quoted in [743], page 259).

A great body of scientific literature is dedicated to finding parallels between the legends of the “ancient” Indian Buddha and Jesus Christ. Buddha’s “biography” doesn’t only include the principal evangelical myths, such as the immaculate conception, the birth miracles, Candlemas etc, but finer details as well – the baptism, the temptation in the desert, etc. Lists of such parallels can be seen in the works of Drews, Frazer, Saintyves, Rumyantsev, etc.

N. V. Rumyantsev wrote the following as a summary of his research:

“An entire caravan of suffering, dying and resurrecting ancient gods had passed in front of our eyes, we have seen their mythology, studied their feasts, rites etc. However, despite the fact that they have different names, individual mythological characteristics, countries of origin, or specialization, one feels a clear presence of something that unites them all. The ancients themselves have marked this fact…

Indeed, if we regard the last centuries before Christ and the first centuries Anno Domini, we shall see a most peculiar tableau. All of the deities that we have listed with all their attributes appear to have blended into each other, often to the extent of becoming indistinguishable. Osiris, Tammuz, Attis, Dionysius, etc., appear to have formed some common gestalt, transforming into some syncretic deity that reigned supreme over the entire territory of the Roman state… the deities have transformed into a single eclectic, but de facto unified saviour figure. This intense merging occurred during the age of the Roman Empire, and affected Rome itself in particular.” ([743], pages 44-45)

Let us conclude with a discussion of another issue
that is of great interest to us. N. A. Morozov paid special attention to the evangelical fragments where “our translations speak of the crucifixion of Jesus. I emphasize ‘our translations’ in particular, since the original Greek text of the Gospels uses the word *stavros* instead of ‘cross,’ and the verb *stavroo* instead of ‘cru- cifixion.’ However, *stavros* is used to refer to a stake or a pale, and not cross” ([544], Volume 1, page 84). N. A. Morozov suggests making the translation “execution at the stake” instead of crucifixion – as in being tied to a stake. The semantic transformation of the Greek word for “stake” (*stavros*) occurred in the Latin translation of the Bible where, according to Morozov:

“The word *crux*, or cross, was used instead of the Greek *stavros*, and the feedback from this transformation affected the interpretation of the original Greek word *stavros*. The Slavic translation is actually somewhat more precise, since it tells us Jesus was “pinioned to a tree”… Contemplating a possible solution for my quandary, I decided to go by the Church Slavonic text and translate the Greek word *stavros* as “stake,” and the verb “stavroo” as “execute at a stake,” since it tells us nothing of the details of the execution described.” ([544], Volume 1, page 85)

In fig. 7.85 one sees an ancient miniature taken from *The Great French Chronicle* titled “Kings Hildebert and Lothar Laying Siege to Saragossa and the Death by Stoning Inflicted by the Franks upon the Roman Prince Belisar [Velisarius – A. F]” ([1485], page 156). We see the execution of Velisarius (the great Czar?). He was tied to a stake and stoned to death (see fig. 7.86).

Let us now turn to the allegedly pagan “ancient” Greek myths. Heracles is one of the protagonists of “ancient” Greek mythology. Drews points out that “Heracles carrying pillars used to be a symbol greatly favoured in antiquity… Furthermore, the mystical meaning ascribed to those columns is the same as that of Christ’s cross. We can see God stoop under… the weight of the pillars and recognize him as the Saviour in the New Testament” ([259], page 49). Thus, the pictures of the “ancient” Hercules bent over under the weight of the cruciform pillars are probably mediaeval pictures of Christ carrying a cross and suffering from its great weight. See the mediaeval paintings by Tintoretto in fig 7.87, for instance [1472], or those by Marko Palmezano allegedly dating from the XVI century, seen in fig. 7.88 ([713], ill. 129).

A. Drews continues, telling us that:

“The cross made of two bars in Christianity is as much of a symbol of the new life and all things divine… as both of the pillars in the Tyrean or Libyan cults of Heracles, Shamash, or Simon…. One of the drawings portrays Christ bearing both pillars in such a way that they form a slanting cross.” ([259], page 49)

The “ancient” Heracles bearing a cross is present in the Scaligerian history as yet another phantom reflection of Jesus Christ. We are referring to the “mediaeval Emperor Heraclius” who, as we learn, is also often portrayed bearing a cross, the scene of the action being Jerusalem, no less. The names Heracles and Heraclius are virtually identical. Allow us a short reminder in this respect – Jesus was often called Horus, which was where the “ancient” Egyptian name Horus originates from (see Chron6, Ch. 3). In fig. 7.89 we
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Fig. 7.85. An ancient miniature from a book allegedly dating from the mid-XV century and titled Les Grandes Chroniques de France. It depicts the execution of Prince Velisarius [the name bears some semblance to Velikiy Czar, which stands for “the Great Czar” in Russian]. He was tied to a stake and stoned to death. Taken from [1485], ill. 186.

Fig. 7.86. A close-in of the miniature depicting the stoning of Prince Velisarius (the Great Czar?). Taken from [1485], ill. 186.
Fig. 7.87. Jesus Christ bearing his cross to Golgotha. A painting by Tintoretto (XVI century). Taken from [1472], No. 27.
see a painting by Michael Wohlgemut allegedly created in 1485-1490. Modern commentary is as follows: “The king Heraclius in Jerusalem… we have a simultaneous representation of the king approaching the city gate on a horse… and then carrying a cross barefoot” ([1425], page 8). See a close-up detail in fig. 7.90. King Heraclius is also shown barefoot and bearing a cross in an ancient picture that can be seen in fig. 7.91.

The crucifix that one sees in the Cologne Cathedral is called “The Gero Crucifix” see CHRON6, chapter 3. Let us also point out that the “Grave of Jesus” located on Mount Beykos near Istanbul is also called the “Grave” or “Resting Place of Heracles” ([240], pages 76-77). More about this in CHRON6.

Most probably, the “ancient” Heracles, as well as the mediaeval king Heraclius, are phantom duplicates of the XI century Christ = Horus. Both ancient pictures of king Heraclius show him bearing a T-shaped cross, which must be the original shape of the Christian cross.

In fig. 7.93 we see an ancient sculpture from Palmyra, the so-called “Palmyra God Triad” allegedly dating from 150 B.C. ([1237]). The characters that we observe, however, are clearly Christian saints. Two of
them have Christian halos over their heads. Furthermore, the saint on the left has got an Ottoman crescent behind his head. One should mark the fact that the right arm of every statue is broken off, but the rest of the sculpture is in a good condition. Could their right hands have been raised in Christian benediction? It is possible that some devout Scaligerite broke their fingers that were raised in the familiar Christian gesture in order to eliminate such blatantly mediaeval relics from “antiquity.”

This array of facts proves that Christianity and “ancient” symbolism share the same mediaeval origins that can be traced back to the XI-XIII century a.d.

In fig. 7.93 we see an archaeological finding from Iran allegedly dating from the XIII-XII century b.c. ([1237]). It is kept in the Louvre nowadays and considered to be an “ancient” figure of some “fantasy monster.” However, the unprejudiced observer will instantly recognize a bicephalous eagle here, which was a well-known imperial symbol in the Middle Ages.

6.5. Moses, Aaron and their sister
Virgin Mary on the pages of the Koran

As one sees from folding the “Scaligerian History Textbook” into a sum of four shorter chronicles, we get several options for dating the beginning of the Muslim Hijra era, that is dated at 622 a.d. nowadays. All of them supersede the Scaligerian version. N. A. Morozov cites a great number of data showing considerable oddities pertinent to Muslim as well as Christian history. Let us give an example.

The chronology of the Koran is often radically different from the Scaligerian chronology of the Bible. The Koran insists on Aaron (Arius?) being the uncle of the evangelical Jesus, no less. Mary, the mother of Jesus, is declared to be the sister of Moses and Aaron. Thus, according to the Koran, these Old Testament characters belong to the generation that immediately preceded Jesus Christ. Naturally, this is in drastic contradiction of the Scaligerian chronology, the discrepancy comprising several centuries. However, it concurs well with our abbreviated chronology. Let us turn to the 19th Sura from the Koran ([427], page 239). The Koran commentator I. B. Krachkovsky writes that it is “the oldest Sura that mentions such evangelical characters as… Mary and Jesus” ([427], page 560).
The 19th Sura refers to the birth of Jesus, the son of Mary, in the following manner: “O Mariam, thou hast performed a feat unheard of! O sister of Harun [Aaron – A. F.]…” ([427], the 19th Sura, 28(7); 29(28), pages 240-241). The commentary to this fragment is as follows: “the sister of Moses and Aaron is the mother of Jesus” ([427], page 561, No. 17).

6.6. The XI century as the apparent epoch of St. Mark’s lifetime.
The history of St. Mark’s Cathedral in Venice

The gigantic Venetian cathedral of St. Mark is a true architectural gem adorning the city. It is also one of the most popular mediaeval buildings in Italy. Its history proves to be most interesting indeed in light of the new abbreviated chronology. Let us begin with reminding the reader of the official history of St. Mark’s cathedral as it is related in the books titled Basilica of San Marco ([1265]) and Venice ([1467]).

This is what we learn from [1265]:

“The Basilica of San Marco is an object of adoration of the Venetians that also symbolizes their historical unity. This is doubtlessly the main symbol of Venice that attracts visitors from afar by the uniqueness of its beauty and its oriental splendour.

The Basilica of San Marco used to be a ducal chapel until the end of the XVIII century and has thus absorbed the secular and the ecclesiastical history of the Venetian republic. Ever since 1807, when the church transformed into the city cathedral having substituted the church of San Pietro de Castello in this role, it became a Mecca not only for the Venetians, but also visitors from across the world. Its bishop bears the ancient title of the Patriarch.

The initial construction of the Church of St. Mark occurred… after 828 a.d., when the body of St. Mark was saved from desecration and delivered from Alexandria on a ship by some Venetians” ([1265], page 7).

The story unfolds as follows: nowadays St. Mark is supposed to have been the first of the four canonical evangelists ([765]). His Gospel – The Gospel According to Mark – is presumed to be the oldest, written around 50 a.d. at the insistence of either St. Peter or the Christian community. Sometime later Mark returned to Alexandria in Egypt where he had died on the 25th April of the alleged year 68 a.d. ([1265], p. 26).

Scaligerian chronology contains an informational gap of many centuries in what concerns St. Mark, whose name allegedly resurfaces from oblivion in the IX century a.d. – a millennium later, in other words. His body is supposed to have been secretly delivered to the Italian Venice from the Egyptian Alexandria. The canonical legend runs as follows ([1265]): two Venetian traders paid a chance visit to a Christian church in Alexandria that was consecrated to St. Mark and housed his ossuary. Some monk, as well as the prior, complained to them about the constant desecrations inflicted upon the church by the Muslims seeking to convert all Christian churches to mosques. The Venetian traders then uncoffined the body of St. Mark and have smuggled it out of Alexandria in a basket full of vegetables and pork. After a sea journey full of deadly perils, the salvaged holy relic was delivered to Venice, where the construction of a new temple instantly began, one that was designed as a shrine for St. Mark. All the episodes of this abduction are illustrated by inlays covering the walls of the Venetian cathedral.

The first church of St. Mark was thus constructed after the alleged year 828 a.d. as a shrine for his body.
that was “miraculously salvaged” from Alexandria. However, alack and alas, there are no traces of the first Venetian church of St. Mark anywhere. The historians say: “There is a large number of different hypotheses concerning the shape of this original church, all of them based on a very small number of archaeological findings” ([1265], page 7).

The first Basilica of San Marco is supposed to have burnt down in the alleged year 976. According to [1265], page 7, “it had immediately been reconstructed.” As a result, the second San Marco Basilica was built in Venice, allegedly towards the end of the X century. It was destroyed as well ([1265]).

Then, allegedly around 1063, the doge Domenico Contarini began the construction of a new and much larger church of St. Mark on the site of the second basilica. It is assumed that this third basilica was built after the fashion of the Basilica of the Twelve Apostles in Constantinople.

This is where oddities begin, well shrouded in mystery. See for yourselves, we are quoting verbatim: “The rediscovery [sic! – A. F.] of St. Mark’s body is the last episode of the Venetian legend. During the construction of the third basilica, the ossuary was hidden so well [?! – A. F.] that several years later, after the death of the doge, no one had a clue about their possible location. It was only in 1094, after several days of ardent prayers of the doge Vitali Falier, the Patriarch, and the entire populace, that the holy relic [the body of St. Mark – A. F.] had manifested itself miraculously from inside a column [sic! – A. F.]” ([1265], page 67).

This miraculous event is also represented on one of the inlays inside the Cathedral of St. Mark. Below one can see the famous painting on this subject by the XVI century artist Tintoretto.

Now then, we are being assured in a poised, no-nonsense manner that the XI century Venetians erected the gigantic cathedral of St. Mark without having the slightest notion of the location of the holy relic that served as the very reason for the cathedral’s construction. And all the while, the body of St. Mark the evangelist was right there, on the building site!

Apparently, the cathedral was erected first; after that, the loss of the holy relic was suddenly noticed, and the search for it was long and fruitless. It took the fervent prayers of the doge, the Patriarch, and all of the population of Venice to make the body of the evangelist manifest itself inside a stone column (?). It was taken out with the utmost care (does that mean the stone pillar had to be shattered?) and solemnly buried by the altar.

This is where the body of St. Mark lies until the present day, being the central object of adoration in the
cathedral. The Scaligerian chronology of the events that we have related is shown in fig. 7.94. It is noteworthy that the eminent XVI century artist Tintoretto had an altogether different concept of the history of St. Mark’s burial in this cathedral. His famous painting with this exact subject can be seen in fig. 7.95 ([1472]).

Mark the fact that St. Mark does not resemble a desiccated mummy the least bit, looking like a man who has just died and is going to be buried, q.v. in the left corner of the painting. The prevalent opinion in the XVI century was that St. Mark the evangelist was buried in the cathedral built specifically for this purpose in the alleged XI century as befitting a person who had just died and earned great honours. As we can see, there wasn’t any “millenarian vagrancy of St. Mark’s body” in Tintoretto’s perception.

Fig. 7.95. A XVI century painting by Tintoretto titled “The Discovery of the Body of St. Mark”. It may have had a different title at some point, something along the lines of “The Burial of St. Mark”. Taken from [1472], ill. 17.
Apparently, the bizarre legend of the “pilgrimage of Mark’s body” was a product of efforts by later historians to delve deeper into the real events of the XI century and make them concur with the erroneous Scaligerian chronology. This is what we think really happened:

St. Mark, the first evangelist, lived in the XI century A.D. and died in the second half of that century. He was buried for the first and the last time in the Cathedral of St. Mark, erected in his honour. This opulent inhumation, which took place in 1094 with the doge, the patriarch, and the entire city present, was later misinterpreted as the rediscovery of his body, since the Scaligerian chronology had already shifted the lifetime of St. Mark into the I century A.D.

There were no mysterious disappearances and miraculous rediscoveries. These legends come from a much later age, when the historians attempted to make the Scaligerian chronology concur with the documents that explicitly pointed to the XI century as the age of St. Mark’s life and activity.

The cathedral of St. Mark obviously assumed its current shape a great deal later than the XI century. When we look at this cathedral nowadays we see a building whose construction was finished by the XVI century. On its walls we see inlays illustrating the rather airy legend of the fate of St. Mark’s body. Even within the Scaligerian chronological paradigm, the cathedral’s construction continued well into the XIII century, when it was adorned with an equine sculptural group that was allegedly smuggled from the hippodrome of Constantinople in Byzantium ([1467], page 39).

It is difficult to pinpoint the exact place of St. Mark’s residence. It may have been Asia Minor or Constantinople, as the Scaligerian history insists, and not Italy. But at any rate his lifetime falls within the XI century A.D. and not the first.

The idea that St. Mark could have lived in Venice for some time is indirectly substantiated by the fact that “for many centuries the town was associated with the symbol of the winged lion that the Christian tradition ascribes to St. Mark the evangelist. Venetian banners, churches, palaces and ships, as well as the lands that the Venetians conquered all bore the sigil of the winged lion” ([1265], page 27).

It is however possible that Italy obtained the “possession rights” to St. Mark merely as a result of a chronological and geographical transfer of the Byzantine events from Constantinople (on paper, naturally).

This conclusion fits with our hypothesis that Jesus Christ lived in the XI century A.D. Mark, the first evangelist, lived in the same century and died near its end.

This implies that the other three evangelists – Luke, Matthew, and John – also couldn’t have lived earlier than the XI century, since they wrote their Gospels after Mark, according to the Scaligerian history. It would be very interesting indeed to find the real burial spots of these three evangelists as well.

7. THE “ANCIENT” EGYPT AND THE MIDDLE AGES

7.1. The odd graph of demotic text datings

We give a detailed account of Egyptian history in Chron5. Here we will limit ourselves to several brief introductory notes.

As we have already mentioned in Chron1, chapter 1, the Scaligerian chronology of Egypt contains gigantic gaps and actually consists of a number of assorted fragments, either linked in an arbitrary manner or altogether independent. [1069] contains a complete list of all the dated demotic texts for 1966. It goes without saying that certain Egyptian texts can be given no exact dating; we shall not be considering them here, turning to the ones described in [1069] instead. It is most edifying to observe their distribu-

---

Fig. 7.96. Quantity distribution graph for the dated demotic Egyptian documents compiled from the data collected in [1069]. One’s attention is instantly drawn to the strange gaps in the beginning and at the end of the Second Roman Empire, as well as a suspicious lack of such documents pertinent to the Third Roman Empire epoch.
tion on the time axis of the Scaligerian history. The result can be seen in fig. 7.96. The resulting graph is extremely noteworthy.

Primo, one sees that the majority of dated demotic Egyptian texts falls on the epoch of the Second Roman Empire allegedly covering the period of the I-III century a.D. It is significant that the gaps in the graph correspond fully to the chronological framework of the Second Roman Empire. Some of them are dated as belonging to earlier epochs, but those are separated from the Second Roman Empire by a strange gap in the middle of the alleged I century a.D.

Secundo, the graph in fig. 7.96 shows a complete absence of dated demotic documents in the epoch of the Third Roman Empire.

The Scaligerian chronology of demotic texts ipso facto reveals itself as several groups of documents whose relation to each other is rather far-fetched and fanciful. These groups are separated by gaps whose boundaries most peculiarly coincide with the break points between dynastic duplicates that we have determined by completely different methods – those of statistical analysis, q.v. in Chron1, chapter 5. Ergo, the folding of the European chronological scheme results in a corresponding abbreviation of the “ancient” Egyptian chronology.

7.2. The enigmatic “revival periods” in the history of “ancient” Egypt

In Chron1, chapter 1, we have already discussed the fact that the chronology of Egypt counts amongst the youngest of historical disciplines. Its formation was based on the existing Scaligerian chronology of Rome and Greece, and has therefore been dependent on it from the very start. The Egyptologists who initiated the compilation of the Egyptian chronology did not possess the objective criteria necessary for the verification of their hypotheses. This led to major discrepancies between the “different chronologies” of Egypt, amounting to 2-3 millennia, q.v. in Chron1, chapter 1.

The few dynastic lists that have survived until our day occasionally give reign durations for certain pharaohs, but the pharaohs are often referred to by different names; moreover, these numbers change drastically from list to list.

For instance, Eusebius gives 26 years as the reign duration for Amenmesse (second version), as it is pointed out in [544], whereas Africanus gives 5 years. The durations differ from each other by a factor of five.

Eusebius gives 40 years for Amenope (both versions), Africanus gives 20, and Ophis only 8. And so on, and so forth.

Nevertheless, all of this data can still provide the basis for some speculation at least, obvious and numerous distortions notwithstanding, and there is little wonder that the XIX century Egyptologists attempted to use these numbers to establish chronologies. However, they would get deviations of several millennia, as we have seen above, not to mention the inveracity of the very concept of the Scaligerian “elongated history.”

However, for most Egyptian dynasties, reign durations of the pharaohs remain a complete mystery ([99], pages 725-730). The entire sixth dynasty, for instance, can be cited as an example (according to Brugsch). There is no chronological data for most of its pharaohs, which makes it all the more peculiar to observe Brugsch ascribing reign durations of 33.3 years to every pharaoh of this dynasty with some determined and glum exhilaration, counting 3 pharaohs per century. His datings of the sixth dynasty are as follows:

Userkaf – reigned from 3300 b.c. onwards,
Teti – from 3266 b.c.,
Pepy I (Meryre) – from 3233 b.c.,
Merenre – from 3200 b.c.,
Neferkaf – from 3166 b.c.,
Merenre Zafemzaf – from 3133 b.c. (see [99], p. 725).

Furthermore, Brugsh used the very same principle – numbers ending in 00, 33, and 66 – for “dating” all of the dynasties starting with the first and ending with the twenty-fourth inclusive. It was only the pharaohs of the last seven dynasties (of thirty!) that enjoyed some sort of heterogeneity in the way their reigns were dated ([99], pages 725-730).

This “dating method” is so ludicrous one feels embarrassed even to discuss it nowadays. Nevertheless, it is this very method, with a number of minor later modifications, that provided for the foundation of the consensual version of the Egyptian chronology. Brugsh’s datings haven’t ever been revised in any cardinal way. See [1447], page 254, for instance.

The dynastic history of Egypt is anything but con-
tinuous. Some of the gaps that it contains swallow entire dynasties ([99], [544], Volume 6). At the same time, the researchers of “ancient” Egyptian history have noted that it has an uncannily cyclic nature. The Scaligerian history of Egypt demonstrates a strange “renaissance effect,” much like that of its European cousin. This effect is well known to us already – what we encounter are phantom duplicates of one and the same mediaeval reality that were cast far back into the past.

Chantepie de la Saussaye, for one, wrote:

“If we are to turn to later ages in Egyptian history, we shall be surprised to discover that the culture of the Sais epoch is a spitting image of the culture of the pyramid epoch. The texts that were used almost 3000 years ago [sic – A. F.] enter circulation once again, and the ancient fashion of decorating graves makes a comeback”. ([966], page 99)

H. Brugsch pointed out that:

“As Mariett-Bey justly noted, the names typical for the twelfth and especially the eleventh dynasty come back on the monuments of the eighteenth dynasty in the same shape and form as they had once possessed, and similar sepulchres with identical ornamentation were used in both these periods. What we have in front of us is a historical enigma that we sadly lack the means to solve so far”. ([99], page 99)

Egyptologists find inscriptions referring to pharaohs and kings set apart by millennia in the Scaligerian chronology, coexisting side by side on the walls of Egyptian temples. In order to provide some kind of explanation, the Egyptologists have thought up the following hypothesis:

“The temples, newly-built by the Ptolemaic rulers and adorned by the Romans, had all been built on the sites of ancient shrines; all of the ancient inscriptions found on temple walls were meticulously and devoutly copied onto the walls of the new temple,” suggests Brugsch in [99], page 145.

The practice of copying old and unintelligible inscriptions from the walls of ancient temples hasn’t been noted in any veracious historical period. One has to think no such nonsense occurred in “ancient” Egypt, either.

All of these recurrences and renaissances have received the legitimate and earnest title of “restorations.” We are told, for instance, that the nineteenth dynasty was followed by a restoration when “Egypt… had re-
turned to the ancient epoch of pyramid construction, which becomes regarded as an age worthy of imitating. The ancient religious texts are resurrected, although their understanding is supposed to be partial. The funereal rites of the fourth dynasty are adhered to once more. Their pyramids are restored; the ancient titles of the kings that have remained in complete obscurity for over two millennia are celebrated in quotidian use yet again. Art comes back into the solid realistic manner of the Old Kingdom” ([966], page 166).

It is obvious that the Scaligerite historians should want to find some sort of explanation for these bizarre “mass recurrences” of ancient rites, failing to recognize them for the products of an erroneous chronological system that they are. The “explanation” offered by historians is the alleged extreme conservatism of the Egyptians. It is written that “the Sais restoration can be counted amongst the most significant periods in the history of the Egyptian culture, and provides for the best possible illustration of just how conservative the Egyptian national spirit was” ([966], page 166).

This is what B. A. Turayev has to say about the “restorations”:

“Attempts were made to edit all of the official texts using an archaic language that is hardly understood by many… the forgotten ranks and offices are revived, the inscriptions made during the epoch, even the private ones, can be taken for those made during the epoch of the Old Kingdom [sic! – A. F.].… The most typical phenomenon here is the appearance of the pictures of agricultural works, pastoral scenes, etc., on the sepulchral wall that are familiar to us from the Old Kingdom epoch.” ([853], Volume 2, pages 102-103)

All of this after two thousand years?

Try imagining having to write a message to your friends using the language of 1 b.c. This seems hardly possible, even if one were to express such a volition.

The new chronology eliminates the necessity of inventing such absurd explanations. Apparently, there have been no “global renaissances” on such a scale.

N. A. Morozov gives a consecutive analysis of all thirty dynasties of the Egyptian pharaohs. He comes to the conclusion that nearly all of the dynasties preceding the IV century a.d. are phantom duplicates of several mediaeval dynasties.

We shall refrain from quoting his speculations here. It isn’t Morozov’s conclusions that our research
is ultimately based upon, but, rather, our mathematical and statistical research, q.v. in the bibliography of our publications. Our research has shown, among other things, that N. A. Morozov was really very far from concluding his research. He stopped at too early an epoch — the beginning of the IV century A.D. — being of the erroneous opinion that subsequent Egyptian history doesn’t need to be revised.

He turns out to have been wrong. Apparently, the entire “Scaligerian Textbook of Egyptian History” preceding the X-XII century A.D. is compiled from phantom duplicates of the mediaeval history of Egypt of the XIII-XVII century A.D., as well as the XIV-XVII century history of the Great=Mongolian empire, q.v. in Chron5. Furthermore, the Biblical “Land of Egypt” apparently has got nothing to do with the territory of modern Egypt, since the Biblical Egyptian events apparently took place in an altogether different location. See Chron6 for more details.

7.3 The ancient Hittites and the mediaeval Goths

It is commonly known that the “ancient Hittites” were “discovered” as late as 1880, when Professor Archibald Sayce read his lecture proclaiming the existence of “the ancient nation of the Hittites,” basing his research on analysis of the Bible, q.v. in [291], page 21. Sayce was granted the title of the Inventor of the Hittites ([291]). The Biblical studies of Archibald Sayce and William Wright led them to the conclusion that the “Hittites” used to live to the north of the Biblical Promised Land. Being raised on the Scaligerian history and adhering to the erroneous opinion that the Promised Land is located on the territory of modern Palestine, Sayce and Wright confined the “ancient Hittites” to Asia Minor, which was the place of the erroneous XVII century Scaligerian localization of Biblical events, and not in Europe, where one wouldn’t have to search for them since these “Hittites” were already perfectly well known under the name of Goths. The “Hittite studies” were conducted in the same manner as previous Biblical research, with archaeologists going to Asia Minor in search of ruins and finding plenty to ascribe to “Hittites.” This is how another error of the Scaligerian chronology received “archaeological proof.”

8. PROBLEMS INHERENT IN THE SCALIGERIAN CHRONOLOGY OF INDIA

The Scaligerian history of the East is closely related to the history of Europe and Egypt as presented by Scaliger and Petavius. Thus, all possible alterations of the European chronology automatically affect the chronology of “ancient” India. Let us give a brief summary of the Scaligerian chronology of India. The historian N. Gousseva writes that “historical science runs into such problems in India as the researchers of the ancient history of other countries and peoples cannot even conceive of [this confession was made in 1968 – A. F.]. The primary difficulty here is the absolute lack of dated monuments” ([433], page 5). Apparently, all of the main “chronological landmarks” in Indian history are a product of a rather recent age, and they are directly dependent on the previously compiled Scaligerian chronology of Rome, Greece, and Egypt. Hence the obvious necessity for the revision of the Scaligerian history of India.

The historian D. Kosambi reports:

“There is virtually nothing of what we know as historical literature in India… all we have is a vague oral tradition and an extremely limited number of documented data, which is of a much greater value to us than that obtained from legends and myths. This tradition gives us no opportunity of reconstructing the names of all the rulers. The meagre remnants that we do possess are so nebulous that no date preceding the Muslim period [before the VIII century A.D. – A. F.] can be regarded as precise… the works of the court chroniclers didn’t reach our time; only Cashmere and Camba can be regarded as an excep-
tion of sorts… all of this leads some rather earnest and eminent scientists claim that India has no history of its own”. ([433], pages 19-20).

For instance, this is what the historians tell us about the “ancient” culture of the Indus valley:

“Written memorials of the Indus culture defy decipherment to this day… not a single finding can be associated with an actual person or historical episode. We don’t even know the language that was spoken by the inhabitants of the Indus valley”. ([433], pages 65-66).

We are told that the Scaligerian chronology of “ancient” India contains gaps larger than 600 years ([433], pages 65-66). As does the Scaligerian “ancient” Europe, India “suddenly” rolls back to barbarism around the beginning of the new era, and then “resumes” its ascension to the mediaeval “position of eminence”; which is suspiciously similar to the fate of the culture of “ancient” Europe, allegedly forgotten by everyone and only achieved once again in the Middle Ages.

The VII century a.d. is the time when the alleged “renaissance” of the Indian culture allegedly began – rather gradually, based on the Aryan culture (possibly the Christian-Arian ideology). The famous “ancient” Indian “Aryans” can apparently be identified as the Arian Christians of the XI-XIII century, according to our reconstruction. The mysterious Aryans began to haunt an antediluvian age courtesy of Scaligerian chronology.

Furthermore, it turns out ([433]) that the texts concerning the cult of Krishna in India are of a relatively recent origin. Specialists in the history of religions have long since confirmed the existence of a vast number of parallels between Krishna and Christ ([544], Volume 4). This is why certain statements made by latter day historians reek of ambiguity, such as “the complete biography of Krishna was completed as late as the XII century a.d.” ([433], page 122). It is possible that the Indian Krishna cult is nothing but the cult of Jesus, brought to India by the Christian missionaries of the XI-XII century.

It is assumed that the god Krishna is mentioned in the Bible ([519], Volume 4, page 17). According to some Indian sources, the god “Krishna” can virtually be identified with Christ ([519], Volume 4).

Mediaeval authors occasionally placed India in Africa or Italy (!). See more details in CHRON5. We should point out another very odd fact of Scaligerian history in this respect. It is presumed that the “ancient” Alexander the Great reached India and defeated the Indian king Porus, having conquered many lands in India ([433]). One would think an event of this calibre would leave some trace in Indian history at the very least. However, this doesn’t seem to be the case. “This invasion… appears to have remained unnoticed by the Indian tradition, although some foreign historians consider it to be the only large-scale event in the ancient history of India” ([433], page 143).

One feels like asking the obvious question of whether the “India” of the mediaeval manuscripts really is the same country as the modern India? Could it have been an altogether different country that Alexander had conquered?

We are told further on that many vital issues concerning the “ancient” history of India are based on the manuscripts found as late as the XX century. It turns out, for instance, that “the main source of knowledge in what concerns the governmental system of India and the policy of the state in the epoch of Maghadhi’s ascension is the Arthashastra – the book… that had only been found in 1905, after many a century of utter oblivion” ([433], page 146). It turns out that this book is basically an Indian version of the famous mediaeval oeuvre of Machiavelli. However, in this case the “ancient Indian Arthashastra” couldn’t have been written before the Renaissance. This could have happened in the XVII-XVIII century, or even the XIX.

The Scaligerian history of India resembles its European cousin in that it rolled back to barbarism in the beginning of the new era, and had to “resume” its “long ascension to the heights of civilization” ([433]). We are also told that the “first significant Sanskrit inscription was found in Ghirnar and dates from roughly 150 a.d.” ([433], page 172). However, we instantly discover that the heyday of Sanskrit literature in India began around the XI century a.d. This is most probably a result of the chronological shift of a thousand years that we so familiar with by now. A propos, could “Sanskrit” stand for “Saint Script,” or the Holy Writ?

The Scaligerian history of mediaeval India also contains a great number of centenarian chronological gaps, and is confusing and chaotic.

“The apathy of the Brahmans to everything real in the past and the present… had erased the history of
India from human memory…. The reconstruction of the history and the realities… of the ancient India… we have to rely on the reports of the Greek geographers and Arab travellers… there isn’t a single Indian source that would equal the reports of the foreigners in value” ([433], page 180).

Thus, the Scaligerian history of India is wholly dependent on the consensual chronology of Rome and Greece and will have to be reconstructed in turn.

Historians characterize the dynastic history of India thusly: “The names of individual kings are obscured by the quaint haze of legends. We possess nothing that would remotely resemble palace chronicles” ([433], page 192). We fail to see the quaintness of historical haze. Could it reside in the freedom it gives to one’s fantasy?

The famous Mahabharata, a collection of the “ancient” Indian epos, is relegated to a distant b.c. epoch by the Scaligerian historians. On the other hand, the work is supposed to have been based on the “ancient” Greek epos. A large number of parallels between the Mahabharata and the poems of Homer were discovered quite a while ago ([519]). Historians claim that the Indians were “rephrasing Homer” ([520], page 13). If this be the case, the dating of the Mahabharata becomes completely dependent on the datings of the poems written by the “ancient” Homer. We have already demonstrated that events that occurred in “ancient” Greece were most probably really mediaeval, that is, dating to the XIII-XVI century a.d.

An in-depth analysis of the Mahabharata, the great body of epic text, as seen from the stance of the new chronology, is performed in our new book titled The Chronology of India. Ptolemy’s ‘Geography’. The ‘Atlas’ of Ortelius, 2003.

9. WAS THE ARTIFICIAL ELONGATION OF ANCIENT HISTORY DELIBERATE?

According to the results obtained by the new methods of dating, virtually all of the old documents that have reached our age are copies from ancient originals, presumed lost. These originals were written in order to reflect the current events of the XI-XVI century a.d., and not for the purpose of confusing future historians. It seems that earlier documents simply failed to have survived until the present day. However, the overwhelming majority of XI-XVI century originals either got destroyed, or were subjected to tendentious editing in the XVI-XVII century, during the creation of the Scaligerian chronology. Whatever meagre genuine evidence of antiquity escaped such editing (or re-writing in the light of the veracious Scaligerian Chronology) are declared to be forgeries or creations of ignorant authors.

In Chron5 and Chron6 we give examples of how our revised chronology acquits several old documents from accusations of forgery, such as the famous Gift of Constantine, the Gift of Alexander the Great, and so on. In other words, many of the documents declared fake nowadays turn out to be original, concurring perfectly well with the new chronology. Such is the case with the “Privileges” given to the mediaeval Ducal House of Austria by Caesar and Nero (see Chron1, chapter 1). In our opinion, nearly all of the events described in the ancient chronicles really did take place. The question is one of their exact location and timing. This is precisely where chronological and geographical confusion began, aided by the deliberate distortions of the Scaligerite chronologers, which led to the “elongation of history.” However, the key role was most probably played by the tendentious “editing of history” in the XVI-XVII century.

Summary.

1) Most of the documents that have reached our age – the ones referring to pre-XVI century events – are based on old originals. However, nearly all of the latter went through the hands of the tendentious editors of the XVI-XVII centuries. Their reading and interpretation are ambiguous, and an altered chronology leads to a new understanding.

2) Some chronological errors were accidental. A millenarian shift of the years of Christ’s life from the XI century a.d. to the I might be an example of such an error.

3) Some of the distortions of mediaeval history preceding the XVI century a.d. were deliberate and verged on blatant falsification. We shall provide more details in Chron5, Chron6 and Chron7.