
The parallelism defined by the chronological formula $T = X + 300$ that we have already been following over a span of 200 years continues well into the VI century A.D. Remember that a comparison of dates with the aid of this formula is equivalent to a rigid chronological shift forwards in time by about 1053 years. On fig. 2.27 we see a rough scheme of the new parallelism that we are about to relate herein.

1a. The Tarquinian War. King Servius Tullius (according to Livy).

1b. The Gothic War. King Theodoric the Goth.

1.1a. The Tarquinian War. Servius Tullius is the last king who died when the Regal Rome had still existed ([482]). According to Livy, “he involved himself in affairs of peace… created the canon law, and there is a rumour amongst his offspring calling Servius the founder of the system of social estates and degrees… he also founded the census, an institution that is most beneficial for the state” ([482], Book 1:42).

Also: “even his kind and modest successor found it hard to compete with his glory… which was also amplified by the fact that the reigns based on law and order had ended with him” ([482], Book 1:48).

1.1b. The Gothic War. Theodoric had been the last emperor of the Third Empire in the West. His death in the alleged year 526 marks the beginning of a period of anarchy in Italy. Theodoric’s policy in domestic affairs, as we have already mentioned in Chapter 1 of Chron2, was famous for its flexibility. He was the founder of the Ostrogothic kingdom, patronized arts and sciences, gave foreigners and Romans equal rights and instigated some great migrations ([579] and [196]). Caracalla, his double in the Second Empire, performs similar feats, qv in Chron2, Chapter 1.

1.2a. The Tarquinian War. A shift forwards by 1053 years (following the formula $T = X + 300$), the death of Servius Tullius falls on the year 518 A.D. ([482]). We shall replace all of Livy’s ab urbe condita datings with the “new era” T-datings by the formula $T = X + 300$.

1.2b. The Gothic War. Theodoric died in the alleged year 526 A.D. If we’re to compare this date with 518 A.D. for Servius Tullius, we see...
that the difference only equals 8 years. By the way, this is precisely the difference between the general time span covered by the Regal Rome and the Third Empire. What we thus see is a very good correlation of dates with the 1053-year shift accounted for.

2a. The Tarquinian War. Events following the death of Servius Tullius. The Tarquins come to power. The tale of Tullia and Lucretia according to Livy.

2b. The Gothic War. Events following the death of Theodoric the Goth. The Ostrogothic dynasty of the Amalings coming to power. The tale of Amalasuntha and Matasuntha.

2.1a. The Tarquinian War. After the death of Servius Tullius, the power is inherited by his daughter Tullia and her consort Lucius Tarquin the Proud ([482], Book 1, pages 80-81; also [269], page 9. Many Tarquins group themselves around Tullia, Lucius Tarquin the Proud being one of them – their leader, after a manner ([482], Book 1). Let us point out the similarity between the names Tullia and Julia which we are about to study as a pair.

2.1b. The Gothic War. After the death of Theodoric, the empire falls into the hands of his daughter Amalasuntha and the Amaling dynasty of the Ostrogoths. This dynasty is the double of Livy’s Tarquinian clan. A large group of the Ostrogoths forms a party of avid supporters around Amalasuntha ([695]). The Ostrogoths form a clan impenetrable for the outsiders, likewise the Tarquins. Due to the parallelism between the Second Empire and the Third, Amalasuntha’s double in the Second Empire is Julia Maesa, qv in Chron2, Chapter 1. Her name (Julia) is identical to the one used by Titus Livy – Tullia. We must also emphasize that the name Amalasuntha can be a derivative of “Amala-Santa”, or St. Alan (or Alan, if we are to consider the flexion of N and M).

2.2a. The Tarquinian War. The period of the Tarquins (between the death of Servius Tullius until the fall of Lucius Tarquin the Proud) equals 25 years. Tarquin the Ancient, the stranger who came to Regal Rome, may be an ancestor of Tarquin the Proud. According to [482], he is a foreigner. The name Tarquin is possibly a derivative from Terra Aquilonius, or “the northern land” ([237], page 88). Also, if we are to read the name Tarquin backwards – in the Hebraic or Arabic fashion – we shall get “Neukrat” (spelt phonetically); this may be a variation of “Nov-Grad”, or “Novgorod” (the New City). In this case, the name Tarquin may apply to someone from the New City. A propos, the Latin dictionary ([237]) fails to provide a translation for the name Tarquin for some reason. One also has to note that Tarquin the Proud fights a war with either a city or a state by the name of Ardea ([269], page 9). It might be a reflection of later mediæval events – the war between Italy and the Horde, Ardea being a possible version of the latter’s name.

2.2b. The Gothic War. The period the Ostrogoths remained in power, begins with the death of Theodoric and ends with them put to final rout in the alleged year 552, equalling 26 years. We see a substantial propinquity between the values 25 and 26. One also has to mention that the Ostrogoths came to the Third Empire as a foreign nation, unrelated to the Italians. This is, what the famous mediaeval author Procopius tells us, at least. His book (The War with the Goths – [237]) is a source that we shall be making numerous references to hereinafter. Now, the Goths presumably came to Italy from the North – “a northern land”. This indication concurs well with our suggestion that the name Tarquin really stood for “a stranger from the North”. What we get in this case is that the last king of the First Empire (according to Livy), L. Tarquin the Proud, is a collective personality for the entire “northern” dynasty that reigned in the alleged years 526-552 a.d. All these events are most probably reflections of what happened much later, in the Middle Ages – qv in Chron6.
2.3a. *The Tarquinian War.* The Tarquins are soon to be banished from Rome, qv below. Their name without vocalizations is transcribed as TRQN. One should bear in mind that there is a similar name Torquatus, translating as “Laurreled for Battlefield Valiance” ([237]). The name of the ruler preceding the Tarquins had been Servius. Thus, we have a pair of “key names” for this epoch – “Servius” (or Severus), and TRQN (without vocalizations).

■ 2.3b. *The Gothic War.* Shortly before the death of Theodoric, there were reports of repressive sanctions against Boetius and Symmachus. Compare to the prompt ousting of the Tarquins, qv above. The full name of Boetius turns out to contain the family names Torquatus Severus ([64], pages 45-46). Therefore, we learn of the existence of two powerful clans in the epoch of Theodoric and before him, in the alleged VI century a.d., by the names of Severus and Torquatus (or TRQN?). Also, the word Severus may be related to the Russian “Sever”, or “North” and mean “Stranger from the North”.

2.4a. *The Tarquinian War.* The clan of the Tarquins as described by Livy may be referred to by the unvocalized root TRQN (see discussion above).

■ 2.4b. *The Gothic War.* The Franks take part in the Gothic war of the alleged VI century as the allies of the Goths. Considering the flexion of F and T, the word “Frank” (FRNK, or TRNK without vocalizations) may be related to the unvocalized root of the name Tarquin, or TRQN. One should also remember a similar unvocalized version of the word Pharaoh (or “Faraon” in Russian) – TRN, which can also be found in the Bible as related to this epoch. Ergo, we can be relatively certain of the following: in both wars, Tarquinian as well as Gothic, the enemy of Rome was known by the name of TRQN or TRNK – therefore, Tarquins = Goths = Franks = People from the North (People from the New City). We shall learn that there is also a superimposition of the mediaeval Franks over the “ancient” Persians (PRS unvocalized) to be considered. *France* still reads FRNC (or TRNK) unvocalized, whereas the name of its capital is *Paris*, or PRS without vocalizations, likewise the words Persia and Prussia. Unvocalized PRS could also be used to refer to P-Russians, or White Russians (cf with modern Byelorussians).

2.5a. *The Tarquinian War.* According to Livy, *Tullia hands the state over* to Tarquin ([482]). This reign is still considered to belong with the dynastic sequence of Regal Rome, Tarquin being the last ruler of the First Empire. However, the *Tarquins shall soon be thrown over and banished* ([482]).

■ 2.5b. *The Gothic War.* Amalasuntha (and her double in the second empire – *Julia Maesa*) hands power over to her son, Amalaric the Goth. This reign also belongs to the sequence of the Third Empire, since Constantinople recognized Amalasuntha (and Amalaric) as rightful rulers in the West of the Empire ([196], Volume I). However, *the Goths were soon chased away from Italy.*

2.6a. *The Tarquinian War.* We see *Lucretia* next to *Tullia*. Both women are married into the Tarquinian clan, the former being the wife of Tarquin Collatine, and the latter espoused to Tarquin the Proud. Both women are royal by birth ([482]). They actively get involved in all proceedings concerning the throne of Rome. Livy tells us nothing about any other women from this epoch ([482]).

■ 2.6b. *The Gothic War.* We see *Amalasuntha* accompanied by her sister *Matasuntha*. We see a similar pair of “reflections” in the Second Empire – *Julia Maesa* and her daughter *Mamea*. All these pairs of women belong to royal families, and are extremely eager to take part in ruling the Empire. We know nothing about any other prominent Italian women of that epoch ([695]). Thus, “a pair of politically active women” happens to be a unique detail characterizing both wars – Gothic and Tarquinian. We shall observe a similar situation in other duplicates of the
XIII century war (Gothic = Tarquinian). We shall use the term “Legend of a Woman” for referring to this scenario in brief.

2.7a. The Tarquinian War. Lucretia commits suicide; Tullia is banished. We know nothing of her further fate ([482], Book 1:58, pages 93-94).

2.7b. The Gothic War. In the alleged year 535 Amalasuntha is assassinated, likewise her Second Empire double – Julia Maesa, whose daughter Mamea was murdered as well. Matasuntha, or Mamea’s double, is also reported killed ([196] and [695]). We see that if we’re to compare the First Empire to the Third, Lucretia and Tullia swap their respective places as related to the pair or their duplicates – Amalasuntha (or Julia Maesa), and Matasuntha (Mamea). However, the fact of murder is represented in both duplicate Empires. In fig. 2.28 we can see what is presumably an ancient portrait of the Gothic queen Amalasuntha.

2.8a. The Tarquinian war. Tarquin Sextus (Tarquin Junior from the clan of the Tarquins, or TRQN) is reported to have brought Lucretia to ruination ([269], page 9). He is supposed to have raped her, qv in [482], pages 1:58-59). Lucretia stabbed herself to death afterwards, unable to survive the dishonour (ibid). We shall encounter this story of “a woman brought to ruination” in many other duplicates, or reflections of this notorious mediaeval war.

2.8b. The Gothic War. In the alleged year 534 Amalasuntha gives Theodahad the Goth a royal title, however “kept all the actual power in her hands… Theodahad had been a sworn foe of Amalasuntha… as soon as he had had it [the crown – A. F.] in his hands, he didn’t have to wait too long with his revenge upon the princess” ([196], Volume 1, page 318). Theodahad banishes Amalasuntha to an island, where she is murdered – allegedly at his order.

2.9a. The Tarquinian War. The death of Lucretia sparked the fuse of the well-known Tarquinian war of the alleged VI century B.C., which resulted in the exile of the Tarquins from Rome ([482]).

2.9b. The Gothic War. The reason for the Gothic war of the alleged VI century A.D., a very well-known event, had been none other but that of Amalasuntha’s death. The exile of the Goths from Italy can be regarded as the main result of the war ([196] and [695]). This subject of a well-known war following the ruination and dishonour of a well-known woman shall recur in many more phantom reflections of this war as encountered in the “Scaligerian history textbook”. This is what this “legend of a woman” is based upon in the first place.

3.1a. The Tarquinian War. When the news of Lucretia’s death spreads all over Rome, animosity towards the entire clan of the Tarquins flares up instantly. Junius Brutus assembles a large crowd at a Roman forum; according to Livy, “Brutus had made the infuriated crown strip the king [L. Tarquin the Proud – A. F.] of all power and banish him together with his wife and children” ([482], Book 1:59). The Tarquinian war commences.
3.1b. *The Gothic War*. When the news of Amalasuntha’s murder reaches Emperor Justinian I, who rules in the East of the Empire, he gives orders for Roman and Byzantine troops to enter Italy in order to banish the Ostrogoths ([196], Volume 1, page 319). The land forces of Roman troops led by Mundus attack the Ostrogoths together with the fleet of the famous warlord Belisarius that moves towards Sicily (ibid); said events mark the outbreak of the Gothic war.

3.2a. *The Tarquinian War*. A short while later Tarquin Sextus, the offender of Lucretia and the main instigator of the Tarquinian war, gets killed ([482], Book 1:60, page 97). It happens in the following manner: Tarquin Sextus flees, and on his way into exile some personal enemy murders him in what is said to be an “old vendetta” ([482], Book 1).

3.2b. *The Gothic War*. After the passage of a year since the murder of Amalasuntha, Theodahad, the de-facto initiator of the Gothic war, is killed ([196], Volume 1, page 327). After the exile of the Goths, “Theodahad flees… to Ravenna. Some Ostrogoth… a personal foe of Theodahad, ambushed the latter while he was underway and strangled him” ([196], Volume 1, page 327).

3.3a. *The Tarquinian War*. A great part in the ousting of the Tarquin kings was played by the eminent Roman Lucius Junius, some of Marcus and also a Brutus ([482], Book 1:60, page 97; also [72], page 206). He had led this Roman uprising, which resulted in a coup. “His was the glory… of the one who had banished King Tarquin the Proud” ([482], Book 1, page 98). The roots of his full name without vocalizations are transcribed as N MRK BRN LC – the “consonant skeleton” of the names Junius, Marcus, Brutus and Lucius.

3.3b. *The Gothic War*. We learn of the activities of an eminent Roman that take place around the same time as the Ostrogoths fled from Rome – in the alleged years 533–538. It was none other but Pope (Pontifex) John II Mercury son of Projectus from the Hill (?) of Celius” ([196], Volume 1, pages 315, 325, and 335). This pope had been head of the Roman church in 532–535, and so he must have played an important role in the events of this epoch. However, we didn’t manage to find out about any details of his “biography”. His unvocalized name transcribes as follows: N, MRCR, PRCT, CL for John, Mercury, Projectus and Celius. If we are to look toward Livy’s text for a comparison, we shall see that what we have is most probably the same name written in two different ways. Really, *Junius = John, Marcus = Mercury, Brutus = Projectus, and Lucius = Celius*. This is a perfect example of the mediaeval chronicle duplication mechanism. Two mediaeval chroniclers – Titus Livy and Procopius in our case – were deciphering the meagre remnants of ancient documents that they had at their disposal, trying to reconstruct the past. One of the documents contained a rather lengthy old unvocalized name. Titus Livy and Procopius vocalized it in two different ways, and so the same mediaeval character became duplicated in the two well-known tracts – one by the “ancient” Livy, the other by the “mediaeval” Procopius; the names used by the two authors, albeit differently, possess an obvious similarity.

3.4a. *The Tarquinian War*. Lucius Junius Brutus, son of Marcus, is one of the most famous Romans in the entire history of the “ancient” Rome. Memories of this historical personality can be found in Roman literature up until the foundation of the Second Roman Empire, qv in the books of Plutarch, for instance ([660]).

3.4b. *The Gothic War*. John Mercury, the son of Projectus from the Hill of Celius, is one of the most famous Roman pontiffs. Some of his monuments remain in Rome to this day; one has to clarify here that only a limited number of Popes can boast having their names recorded in one way or another on the monuments that have survived until our age. However, one finds all sorts of inscrip-
3.5a. The Tarquinian War. Livy calls Lucretia, the woman whose death led to the Tarquinian war, Roman ([482], Book 1). He emphasizes her inflexible Roman will of iron. She is supposed to have addressed all those who surrounded her with a patriotic speech right before her death (ibid). What we have here is the portrait of a “true Roman woman” painted by Livy – one that subsequently became a canonical role model.

3.5b. The Gothic War. History considers Amalasuntha, the double of Lucretia, to have belonged to the Amaling dynasty of the Ostrogoths. The Amaling clan had allegedly been extremely partial to Roman culture and traditions, unlike other Gothic kings who had reigned after Amalasuntha ([196], Volume 1, page 327). Therefore, one of the chroniclers (Titus Livy, for instance) could have easily called this royal woman Roman. Vittigis becomes King of the Ostrogoths after the death of Amalasuntha, and “tramples the hereditary rights of the Amaling clan” ([196], Volume 1, page 327).

3.6a. The Tarquinian War. Junius Brutus and Publius Valerius lead an uprising aimed at overthrowing the rule of the Tarquins in Rome. The Tarquinian king is declared deposed. Livy tells us that “the liberator [Brutus – A. F.] received a warm welcome in the camp, whilst the children of the king were cast out” ([482], Book 1:60, page 97).

3.6b. The Gothic War. The Byzantine and Roman troops enter Italy. Pope John Projectus II, the double of the “ancient” Junius Brutus, happens to be in Rome at this time, whilst the approaching Roman troops are led by Belisarius, the double of the “ancient” Valerius. His troops entered Rome immediately after Vittigis, King of the Goths, had fled the city. “Romans were overjoyed to see the Greeks, and welcomed them as liberators… Belisarius entered Rome on 9 December 536” ([196], Volume 1, page 329).

3.7a. The Tarquinian War. Livy tells us that “when the tidings [of his exile – A. F.] had reached the camp [of king Tarquin – A. F.], the king headed towards Rome in order to suppress the uprising, somewhat confused by the spontaneity of it all ([482], Book 1:60, pages 96-97).

3.7b. The Gothic War. Having received the news of Belisarius invading Rome, the king of the Ostrogoths (Vittigis) led his troops towards the capital of Italy. “In early March of 537 Vittigis approached the walls of Rome with so many Goths near him that they could barely fit into one’s eyesight” ([196], Volume 1, page 339).

3.8a. The Tarquinian War. Livy tells us that “the gates were shut before Tarquin, and he was declared an exile” ([482], Book 1:60, page 97). One would think that a battle at the walls of Rome would ensue, since King Tarquin, who had arrived in order to stifle the revolt, qv above, would hardly turn back confused at the news of his being deposed. However, Livy tells us nothing of King Tarquin’s reaction to the loss of throne for some reason ([482]). He just tells us that Tarquin heads away from Rome. This is the so-called “Exile of the Kings” which marks the end of the Tarquinian rule in the “ancient” Rome. Furthermore, Scaligerian history considers this to have been the end of all royal power in Rome – until the foundation of the Second Roman Empire, at least.

3.8b. The Gothic War. The gates of Rome are shut in front of Vittigis, King of the Ostrogoths. The Goths try to storm the walls of Rome, but fail, and begin a siege ([196], Volume 1, pages 348-363). This siege of Rome is supposed to have been a breakpoint in the history of mediaeval Italy, since the Goths did not succeed, and Vittigis was forced to retreat from Rome in 538. Ferdinand Gregorovius tells us the following: “This siege of Rome that became immortal in history lasted a whole year and nine months; over this time
the Ostrogoths took part in 59 battles and were finally forced to turn away from Rome” ([196], Volume 1, page 363). Scaligerian history considers this moment to mark the end of Gothic rule in Rome ([196]).

3.9a. The Tarquinian War. According to Livy, a certain Roman by the name of Publius Valerius (Lucius Valerius Publicola – see [269], page 10) actively participates in banishing the Tarquinian kings from Rome. He is one of the most famous historical figures of the “ancient” Rome, qv in [482], book 2:1, page 101. Valerius is a prominent Roman military leader who led Roman troops when they had fought the Tarquins. There are many legends concerning his life; he is a national hero. After the death of Brutus, he became the primary figure in the epoch of the Tarquinian war ([482]).

■ 3.9b. The Gothic War. The Roman by the name of Belisarius plays a major part in chasing the Goths away from Rome. He was a famous military leader of the Middle Ages ([196], Volume 1). By the alleged year 535 “Belisarius had already succeeded in de-throning the Vandals in Africa… and was free… to conquer Italy… Justinian decided to unite the Eastern and the Western part of the empire once again… fate gave him one of the greatest warlords in history to make this plan a reality” ([196], Volume 1, page 319).

3.10a. The Tarquinian War. The full name of Valerius is as follows: Lucius Publicola Valerius, son of Valusius ([482], page 206; also [269], page 10. The unvocalized skeletons of the names Valerius and Valusius are, respectively, VLR and VLS. This could stand for Valerius + Lusius (Lucius). We see his full name to be formed by the consonants VLSR. The term “son” may have been introduced later, when various scribes vocalized the consonant bases of names they found in ancient documents.

■ 3.10b. The Gothic War. Unvocalized name of Belisarius (Velisarius) is BLSR (or VLSR, if we’re to bear in mind the flexion of “B” and “V”). It coincides with the “skeleton” of consonants for the names Valerius and Valusius from Livy’s book. It goes without saying that all such phonetic analogies mean little enough per se; however, they become more important when they appear “in all the right places” in our step-by-step comparison of the “ancient” history with the mediaeval superimposed over each other in the manner described by the rigid formula $T = X + 300$. Thus, Belisarius (Velisarius) = VLSR, likewise Valerius-Valusius = VLSR. A propos, the name of Belisarius sounds similar to the Slavic “Velikiy Tsar”, or “The Great King”.

4a. The Tarquinian War. The war between the Tarquins and Rome in the alleged VI century B.C., or the Tarquinian war, according to Livy.

■ 4b. The Gothic War. The war between the Goths and the Romans, or the Gothic war of the alleged VI century A.D., according to Procopius (see fig. 2.27).

4.1a. The Tarquinian War. Junius Brutus is one of the key characters who took part in ousting the Tarquinian kings from Rome. We have already identified him as Pope John Projectus from the alleged VI century A.D. The two military leaders – Valerius and Brutus – lead the Roman troops into battle against the Tarquins. Junius Brutus commands the Roman cavalry and is killed in a battle ([482]). His name is very similar to John.

■ 4.1b. The Gothic War. We see the famous general John beside Belisarius, a leader of the Roman (Romean) troops. He was known under the alias of “The Cruel General” ([196], Volume 1, page 358). He leads the Roman cavalry as well as Livy’s “ancient” Junius Brutus. General John was made legendary by taking Vitigis, king of the Goths, captive. Therefore, General John appears to be a chronological continuation of Pope John in a way, playing his part in the history of the Gothic war. General John was killed in one of the battles with the Goths ([695], page 273). However, Procopius mentions several Johns here and
is obviously confused about their respective identities. These “several Johns” may have transformed into a single unified image of the “ancient” Junius Brutus as described by Titus Livy.

4.2a. The Tarquinian War. All the Taquins act as a single united clan in this war, forming a dynasty of sorts: Lucius Tarquin the Proud, Tarquin Sextus (Junior), Lucius Tarquin Collatine etc.

■ 4.2b. The Gothic War. The Goths also form a union and act as a single dynasty in the war. Their kings were elected from this closely-bound group for a rather brief but intense period – Vittigis, Uriah, Ildibald, Totila and Teia ([196], Volume 1).

4.3a. The Tarquinian War. According to Livy, after the exile of the kings from Rome, the institution of consule came to existence. More specifically, Romans adopted the custom of electing consuls for the period of a year. This is a well-known institution that had existed in Rome for several centuries up until the middle of the alleged VI century A.D. (72 and 482, Book 2:11, pages 98-99).

■ 4.3b. The Gothic War. In the middle of the alleged VI century A.D. the Italian consulate ceases to exist ([196], Volume 1), see fig. 2.27. Immediately after this, the very same “consulate” appears in Livy’s “ancient” Rome, right before 544 A.D. = year 244 ab urbe condita + 300 years. The year 245 ab urbe condita is considered to be the first year of the “ancient” Roman Republic and the consulate ([72]).

Commentary. Gregorovius reports the following when he tells us about the alleged VI century A.D.: “Decius Theodore Pauline was the last consul of Rome in 534… he is famous for nothing more but being last in the long line of Roman consuls” ([196], Volume 1, pages 319-320). Thus we see that after a shift of 1053 years according to the formula T = X + 300, Livy’s “ancient” consule begins where it is supposed to have stopped existing in the Western Third Empire according to the Scaligerian chronology. At the same time, Scaligerian history of mediaeval Rome keeps showing us “traces of the consulate”, as Scaligerite historians coyly name them, starting with the exact same VI century A.D. – see [196], Volume 1. In spite of the efforts made by certain historians to “bury the mediaeval consulate” in post-VI century Rome, they have to admit every now and then that certain mediaeval consuls “did in fact exist in Rome”. However, no complete list of them has reached our day for some reason, notwithstanding the fact that the lists of “ancient” consuls of the Republican and Imperial “ancient” Rome have miraculously survived ([72]). According to our reconstruction, these documents are the “mysteriously missing” mediaeval lists of the Roman consuls from the Middle Ages, which have been arbitrarily displaced into “deep antiquity” by learned historians. As a result, mediaeval history of the XI-XIV century became a lot poorer, obscured by artificial darkness.

4.4a. The Tarquinian War. According to Livy, in the year 245 ab urbe condita (or 545 A.D. considering the 1053-year shift) the “ancient” P. Valerius, the double of the mediaeval Belisarius, was made consul. Valerius and Brutus are the first consuls in a long line of their “ancient” colleagues, whose lists have survived for the most part ([482], Book 2:1, page 101; also [72], page 206).

■ 4.4b. The Gothic War. After the first stage of fighting the Goths had been over, Belisarius was called away from Italy to fight the Persians. He returned to Italy around the end of 543 – beginning of 544 ([196], Volume 1, page 319). We see that the date given by Livy virtually coincides with the mediaeval date after a 1053-year shift. Belisarius is the first consul of mediaeval Rome after the exile of the Goths, or one of the first in the long line of mediaeval Roman consuls whose lists “didn’t survive” ([196], Volume 1).

4.5a. The Tarquinian War. According to Livy, Valerius, the “son” of Valusius, was consul for three consecutive years in 245, 246 and 247 ab urbe condita. He was then suspended from consulate ([482], Volume 2:15, page 120; also [72], page 206. A 1053-year shift of the dates forwards in time shall give us the years 545, 546 and 547 A.D.
4.5b. The Gothic War. Belisarius returns to Italy for another 3 or 4 years in the alleged years 544-548 A.D. In the alleged year 548 Belisarius leaves Italy when Emperor Justinian I calls him back (196, Volume 1, pages 401-402). When we compare this information to what Titus Livy tells us, we see that the two time intervals in question coincide in length as well as their positions on the absolute axis of time after a 1053-year shift of the “ancient” datings forwards.

4.6a. The Tarquinian War. According to Livy, Valerius the leader of troops had remained alive for some time after his suspension from the consulate in 248 ab urbe condita (or 548 A.D. after the application of the 1053-year shift). He died in 251 ab urbe condita, or 551 A.D. if we’re to shift the dates forwards (482, Book 2:16, page 122).

4.6b. The Gothic War. After his withdrawal from Italy in the alleged year 548 A.D., the eminent warlord Belisarius remained alive for some time. He died around the alleged year 561 – however, this information is rather vague (64, page 84). If we’re to compare it to Livy’s, we shall see that the date of his death, the alleged year 561, differs from the year Valerius died (551 A.D.) by a mere 10 years, which really isn’t all that much considering the size of the 1053-year chronological shift. Apart from that, we are to bear in mind that all the previous chronological landmarks of their “biographies” concur with each other perfectly after the application of the abovementioned rigid shift according to the formula T = X + 300.

4.7a. The Tarquinian War. According to Livy, despite the suspension of his consulate in 248 ab urbe condita (548 A.D. with the shift forwards equalling 1053 years) and his inability to partake in the affairs of the state, Valerius-Valusius had nevertheless served as consul for yet another year, shortly before his death in 251 (551 A.D. considering the shift), qv in [482], Book 2:16. This “restoration of rights” occurs immediately before the death of Valerius (482).

4.7b. The Gothic War. Despite his withdrawal from Italy in the alleged year 548 A.D. and accusations of treason, qv below, Belisarius manages to “restore his good name; he had soon been released, with his ranks restored and part of his estate given back to him” (64, page 84). All of this is very similar to what Livy tells us about Valerius, or Valusius. This “restoration of rights” happens a short while before the death of Belisarius. “He had received part of his estate back; however, putting it to any use was already beyond him, since his death followed shortly” (64, page 84). A rather obvious parallel with Livy’s description.

4.8a. The Tarquinian War. According to Livy, Valerius died in great glory. “P. Valerius had died; everyone deemed him the first of men in times of war and peace alike, and his glory was truly great” (482, Book 2:16, page 122).

4.8b. The Gothic War. Belisarius dies laureled with the glory of a national hero. “Having done a multitude of deeds that put him amongst the heroes of ancient times, the great warlord died” (196, Volume 1, page 402). This characteristic is unique amongst the characters of the Gothic War epoch (the alleged VI century A.D. – see 196).

4.9a. The Tarquinian War. It is amazing that Valerius (Valusius), the only truly great military leader of the epoch, should die in poverty. Livy tells us that “P. Valerius had died… his glory was great, but his means were so meagre that there was nothing left for his burial, which was financed by the treasury” (482, Book 2:16, page 122).

4.9b. The Gothic War. Virtually the same is told of Belisarius. The only famous warlord from the epoch of the Gothic war also dies in poverty – he couldn’t make any use of the estate that was returned to him, either – he dies “in such disfavour and obscurity that proverb made him symbolize the vanity and impermanence of human felicity” (196, Volume 1, page 402). All of Belisarius’ possessions were confiscated after his arrest (64, page 84).
4.10a. The Tarquinian War. Livy tells us that “Valerius, who had been in favour, didn’t just provoke envy [after the victory over the Tarquins – A. F.], but also fell under suspicion twined with a horrendous accusation… Rumour had it, he aimed for the throne… and had been building a dwelling on top of the Vellius, allegedly an impenetrable fortress… These rumours as well as the fact that the folk trusted them infuriated the very spirit of the consul [Valerius – A. F.]… Having called the citizens together, he ascended the dais” ([482], Book 2:7, page 108). Valerius proceeded to utter an inspired speech, refuting the accusation of willing to seize power. Livy quotes his following tirade: “Will no valiancy suffice… to make you respect it without ever considering making it tarnished by suspicion? Need I, a sworn enemy of kings, be in fear of being accused that I want regal power?” ([482], Book 2:7, page 109). This characteristic is unique; we have found no other consul in Livy’s work who would be accused of anything like that over all the time of the “ancient” republic’s existence up until the alleged 1 century B.C.

4.10b. The Gothic War. In the course of the Gothic War, Belisarius also becomes accused of treason. The Goths had supposedly offered him the crown of Italy so as to separate Belisarius from Justinian I and secure the support of his mighty army. Vittigis, King of the Ostrogoths, was defeated by Belisarius in the alleged year 539, which was said to have been the time when the Goths offered him the royal crown ([196], Volume 1, page 372). Towards the end of the alleged year 539, before Belisarius’ departure from Italy, Ildibald, the new king of the Goths, “sends emissaries… to tell Belisarius that he, Ildibald, would himself come and lay his royal robes at the feet of Belisarius, if the latter keeps his promise [sic! – A. F.] to get crowned as king of Italy” ([196], Volume 1, page 373). However, “Belisarius deceives the Goths and hands the crown over to the Emperor [Justinian – A. F.]” ([196], Volume 1, page 372). After that, “reluctant to rise against the emperor, he travels to Byzantium calmly with his laurels of a hero” ([196], Volume 1, page 373). However, the very circumstance that Belisarius allegedly promised the Ostrogoths to be crowned king of Italy had led to his arrest and the confiscation of his property ([64], page 84).

Let us thus highlight the key points of the events related in order to make the parallelism even more obvious.

*1a) The great warlord Valerius is accused of treason (intent to seize royal power).
*1b) The great warlord Belisarius is accused of treason (intent to become crowned King of Italy).

*2a) The charge against Valerius may have been based on some real fact.
*2b) The accusation of Belisarius was based on a real fact, namely, his acquiescence to take the crown of Italy in his negotiations with the Goths.

*3a) Valerius becomes withdrawn from his consulate; Livy’s description suggests that he fell into disfavour.
*3b) Belisarius is called away from Italy as a result of a treason charge. His arrest follows; he falls from grace with the Emperor.

*4a) Valerius tries to refute the accusation in a speech given before the Roman public.
*4b) Belisarius may have tried to refute the accusation upon his arrival to the New Rome; however, we know nothing about the process, if there was one.

*5a) During the “trial of Valerius” a bill about “withdrawing the one who attempts to seize regal power from the protection of law, and confiscating all of his property” becomes ratified ([482], Book 2:8, page 109). This may be the reason why his estate was sequestered, likewise his “death in poverty”.

(* = note added by the author for emphasis.)
**5b) The property of Belisarius was confiscated, and he had died in poverty.**

*6a) According to Livy, “the consul [Valerius – A. F.] had suggested a number of bills that didn’t just free him from accusations of having the intent to seize royal power, but also... changed the direction of the process drastically, having made him a popular favourite instantly” ([482], Book 2:8, page 109). Valerius was made consul once again.

**6b) Belisarius was pardoned, with his former ranks returned, his former glory un tarnished once again.**

*7a) All of these events take place in 245-256 ab urbe condita, or 545-546 A.D. (considering the 1053-year shift of datings forwards).

**7b) The events in question allegedly took place in the alleged years 544-548 A.D. Belisarius was called away from Italy due to a treason charge in 548; we see a perfect concurrence with the “ancient” dates after shifting them forwards by 1053 years.**

---

**4.11a. The Tarquinian War.** The Tarquinian War continues. The Tarquins are located at some distance from Rome, and keep raiding it from time to time. In the years 243-244 ab urbe condita (or 543-544 A.D., if we’re to consider the 1053 year shift) Tarquin the Proud, king of the Tarquins, sends a missive to Rome addressed to the Roman Senate ([482], Book 2:3, page 102).

**4.11b. The Gothic War.** The Gothic War rages on. The Goths are located at a distance from Rome, and raid the capital periodically. In the alleged year 543 A.D. Totila, the new king of the Goths, sends a “missive to the Roman Senate” from Naples ([196], Volume 1, page 476. We see a very good concurrence with Livy’s “ancient dates”.

---

**4.12a. The Tarquinian War.** According to Livy, the Senate was visited by the “royal envoys [of king Tarquin – A. F.] whose demands in-cluded the requisition of property – not a single word was uttered about the return of the kings. When these claims were heard by the Senate, their discussion took several days” ([482], Book 2:3, page 102). The senators obviously took their time. Livy explains that “they were afraid that the refusal to pay tribute might serve as casus belli, whereas their conceding to the terms would aid the Tarquins greatly, providing them with the means necessary for military actions” ([482], Book 2:3, page 102).

**4.12b. The Gothic War.** Totila the Goth accuses Romans of being ungrateful to the Goths in his message to the Roman senate. However, he doesn’t say a single word about their intention to return to Rome as rulers. Totila’s epistle contains no military claims. The full text of this mediaeval document is cited in [196], Volume 1, pages 376-377. In particular, Totila does not demand the exile of the Romean Greeks from Rome. The Goths delivered their letter via captive Romans ([196], Volume 1. General John forbade to reply to Totila’s missive. Then Totila addressed Romans with several more missives, which were of just as peaceful a nature ([196], Volume 1, page 377; also [695]).

---

**4.13a. The Tarquinian War.** Tarquin’s envoys addressed the young people of Rome asking them for support. Livy tells us that “they secretly plotted a coup in order to restore the royal rule... negotiating for the royal family to be admitted into the city under the cover of night” ([482], Book 2:3-4, page 102). As a result, a conspiracy emerges in Rome, one that involves many distinguished Romans. However, the conspiracy was discovered, and the conspirators arrested, tried and executed ([482], Book 2:5, pages 104-105).

**4.13b. The Gothic War.** The same is happening during the Gothic War. “The public read these proclamations, which could be encountered in virtually every part of the city, in great agitation. The Greek rulers suspected collusion between the Arian priests and
the Goths” ([196], Volume 1, page 377). It is supposed that the organization of this conspiracy could be aided by Cethegus, Head of the Senate (ibid). However, the conspiracy was discovered, and the conspirators banished from Rome (ibid).

4.14a. The Tarquinian War. Livy tells us the following: “Having received the news [of the unsuccessful conspiracy and the execution of the plotters – A. F.] Tarquin… decided to prepare to open warfare” ([482], Book 2:6, page 106). Livy refers to this leader as to “Tarquin” and not L. Tarquin the Proud almost everywhere he mentions this war, thus collecting all of the Tarquins under a single name.

4.14b. The Gothic War. The unsuccessful conspiracy and the exile of the cabal are followed by a military campaign launched against Rome by Totila the Goth in the alleged years 543-544 a.D. ([196], Volume 1, page 377). Let us emphasize that the Goths are a very close-knit group as seen in the course of the war, and their leaders are warlords rather than kings bound to a permanent place of residence ([695]). The clan of the Goths is the double of the Tarquinian clan.

4.15a. The Tarquinian War. According to Livy, “Tarquin begins to perambulate the towns and cities of Etruria” ([482], Book 2:6, page 106). He is alleged to have begged the Etruscans to help him conquer the Roman throne back. This is most probably a reference to the movement of Tarquin’s troops occupying Etruria. Livy also tells us that “these negotiations proved successful”; thus, Tarquin heads forth accompanied by his allies, who “followed Tarquin to support his claims for the throne and wage war upon the Romans” ([482], Book 2:6, pages 106-107).

4.15b. The Gothic War. In the Gothic War Totila decided to “seize several cities of Etruria, Picenum and Emilia first” ([196], Volume 1, page 378). One has to point out that Procopius may relate more details of the events in question than Livy. Totila doesn’t just “perambulate Etruria” with pleas for help – he takes over it and recruits soldiers for his troops ([196], Volume 1).

4.16a. The Tarquinian War. In the years 244-245 ab urbe condita (or 544-545 a.D. with a shift of 1053 years) the troops of Tarquin and his allies approach Rome ([482], Book 2:6). The battle of Rome begins. Livy writes that “the Tarquinians… chased away the Romans who came out against them” ([482], Book 2:6, page 107). However, the Romans, in turn, defeated the allies of the Tarquinians.

4.16b. The Gothic War. We learn that “in the summer of 545 Totila fixes his camp at the walls of Rome” ([196], Volume 1, page 378). We see ideal concurrence between the dates of Procopius and those given by Livy (see the account of 544-545 a.D. as cited above). The battle of Rome ensues. Belisarius turns back, and the Goths enter Rome “in full calm” ([196], Volume 1, page 385). This retreat of Belisarius saved the Roman troops.

4.17a. The Tarquinian War. For some reason, the Tarquins have not taken the opportunity given to them by this victory over the Romans. The Tarquins withdrew from Rome all of a sudden. Livy claims this to have been a miracle. Allegedly, a loud voice was heard in the night that claimed victory to favour Romans ([482], Book 2:7, pages 107-108). The Tarquins “scattered in terror” as soon as they learnt of this.

4.17b. The Gothic War. The Goths also fail to take advantage of their victory and leave Rome in the most bizarre fashion. According to Gregorovius, “the most peculiar thing is that Totila didn’t gather all of his resources in order to capture Porto, so as to get the war over and done with” ([196], Volume 1, page 391). The matter is that Belisarius and his troops were in Porto at the time.

4.18a. The Tarquinian War. Livy tells us that after the sudden retreat of the Tarquins “following the dawn which brought no sight of enemy,
the consul P. Valerius had gathered his armour and returned to Rome triumphant” ([482], Book 2:7, pages 107-108). This happened in 245 ab urbe condita, or 545 A.D. considering the shift of 1053 years.

**4.18b. The Gothic War.** In the course of the Gothic war, shortly after the sudden retreat of the Goths, “Belisarius… accompanied by the rest of his troops, enters the city [Rome – A. F.]. . . . As soon as the great warlord had stepped on the land that brought him glory, his genius and his fortune returned to him, their power doubled” ([196], Volume 1, page 396). Although the Goths had tried to return, they were thrown back immediately ([196], Volume 1, page 397).

“This happened in the spring of the year 547” ([196], Volume 1, page 396). The battle of Rome had lasted from 545 to 547 A.D. Yet again we see a perfect concurrence of Livy’s dating (545 A.D.) with that of Procopius (545-547 A.D.).

**4.19a. The Tarquinian War.** As we have already mentioned, Livy ascribed the victory of VALERIUS over the Tarquins to a miracle – namely, the voice of the god Sylvan from the Forest of Arsia which presumably made the enemies of Rome flee in terror ([482], Book 2:7, page 108).

**4.19b. The Gothic War.** Gregorovius draws our attention to a similar scenario in his rendition of the Gothic war according to Procopius: “Everyone was deeply amazed by the defeat of the Goths in Rome that was half open, as well as the success of Belisarius’ resistance, even the inhabitants of far-away towns and villages” ([196], Volume 1, page 398).

**4.20a. The Tarquinian War.** After the first unsuccessful battle of Rome (the first battle after the exile of the Tarquins from Rome), the Tarquins ask king Porsenna for assistance ([482], Book 2:9, page 111). The unvocalized name of Porsenna transcribes as PRSNN. One has to remember that TRQN (the Tarquins) and PRSNN (Porsenna) are allies in this war. We must point out that Porsenna might be a derivative of P-Rasena or P-Rusena. Let us remind the reader that Raseni was the name used by the Etruscans to refer to themselves, qv in our discussion of this topic as seen in Chron 5. This concurs perfectly with the references to Porsenna as “king of the Etruscans” made by the “ancient” historians of Rome ([269], page 186).

**4.20b. The Gothic War.** After the first unsuccessful battle for Rome (the first one fought after the exile of the Goths from Rome), Totila, king of the Goths, seeks the assistance of Theudebert I, a Frank ([196], Volume 1, page 398). We already mentioned the fact that the unvocalized root of “Frank”, or TRNK, is similar to TRQN as referred to by Livy. Also, the parallelisms that we have discovered often identify the Franks as the Persians, or PRS unvocalized. Remember that Paris = PRS; therefore, the Parisians could well be the Evangelical Pharisees. PRS could also have stood for “Prussians” or P-Russians (White Russians). Bear in mind that in the Gothic war the Goths (doubles of TRQN – Tarquins) and the Franks (doubles of PRSNN – Porsenna) also act as allies. We also cannot fail to mention that the unvocalized name TRNK as used to refer to the Franks (the Goths) could also have been synomonic with “Turks”, or “Tartars”. This may be a reflection of the events dating to the epoch of the Ottoman Empire.

**4.21a. The Tarquinian War.** According to Livy, the king Larth Porsenna decided to aid the Tarquins and joined them on their conquest of Rome. This is the second campaign against Rome ([482], Book 2:9, page 111). The united troops of Porsenna and the Tarquins soon approach Rome. The Roman Senate is frightened that “the Roman hoi polloi might be frightened into letting the Kings enter the City and accepting peace” (ibid). It is possible that Livy is really referring to a campaign launched against Rome by the joined forces
of TRQN-TRNK (Turks?) and PRSNN-PRSN – P-Raseni, or P-Russians (White Russians). The name of King Porsenna, which is Larth or L-Art may refer to the “Mongolian” Horde, or Arta.

4.21b. The Gothic War. In his description of the Gothic War Procopius tells us nothing of whether the Franks took part in Tótila’s second Roman campaign. Furthermore, Theudebert is supposed to have given the basket to Tótila who had tried to marry his daughter ([695]; also [196], Volume 1). However, a few years earlier the Frankish troops led by Theudebert did take part in the war fighting alongside the Goths. Theudebert I of the Franks aided the Gothic king Vittigis when the latter was waging war against the Romans and invaded Italy. However, Vittigis retreated upon hearing the threats made by Belisarius ([196], Volume 1).

4.22a. The Tarquinian War. Livy dates the second Roman expedition of the Tarquins to the year 246 ab urbe condita, or 546 A.D. considering the 1053-year shift forwards. Valerius is the leader of the Roman troops and he fights Larth Porsenna (L-Horde PRS) – see [482], Book 2:9, page 111.

4.22b. The Gothic War. The second Roman campaign of the Goths is dated to the alleged years 548-549 A.D. In 540-544 Belisarius is called away from Italy to lead Roman troops against the Persians (or PRS) – see [196], Volume 1, pages 401-402. Firstly, we observe a good concurrence between the datings offered by Livy and Procopius: 546 and 548-549 A.D. Secondly, we encounter yet another superimposition of the “ancient” L-Horde PRSN (Larth Porsenna) over the mediaeval PRS (Persians).

4.23a. The Tarquinian War. According to Livy, Larth Porsenna and the Tarquins besiege Rome, but fail to capture it ([482], Book 2:10, page 112). A certain Horace Cocles became distinguished as a heroic defender of Rome ([482], Book 2:10, page 112). His name is transcribed as CCLLS without vocalizations.

4.23b. The Gothic War. In the course of the Gothic War, Tótila captured a part of Rome, but could not seize the castle of Hadrian where the Roman garrison was located ([196], Volume 1, pages 403-404). “A gallant warlord named Paul of Cilicia” becomes distinguished for his bravery during the defence of Rome against the Goths and the battle for Adrian’s castle in particular ([196], Volume 1, page 403). Apparently, this native of Cilicia can be identified as Livy’s Cocles (compare CLC for Cilicia with CCLLS for Cocles). What we see is most probably the same name or alias transcribed in two different versions.

4.24a. The Tarquinian War. Livy informs us that Larth Porsenna “withdraws from Rome”, having failed to conquer it ([482], Book 2:13, page 118). This is the last battle for Rome in the “ancient” Tarquinian war ([482]).

4.24b. The Gothic War. In the alleged year 549 A.D. the Gothic king Tótila leaves Rome ([196], Volume 1, page 404). This marks the end of the second battle for Rome, which is also last in the course of the mediaeval Gothic war ([196], Volume 1).

5a. The Tarquinian War. The end of the Tarquinian War according to Livy.

5b. The Gothic War. The end of the Gothic War according to Procopius.

5.1a. The Tarquinian War. According to Livy, in the year 250 ab urbe condita (or 550 A.D. considering the 1053-year shift forwards), Valerius was elected consul one last time. In the next year (251 ab urbe condita, or 551 A.D. with the 1053-year shift) his involvement in the Tarquinian war finally ceases. He dies the same year ([482], page 122).

5.1b. The Gothic War. Belisarius is called back from Italy in the course of the Gothic War (allegedly towards the end of 548 – beginning of 549 A.D.). He withdraws from mili-
tary action permanently, and the Gothic war ends without his participation ([196], Volume 1, page 402). Let us point out the perfect concurrence between the dates offered by the “ancient” Livy (550) and the mediaeval Procopius (548-549), emphasizing that we are observing this almost perfect correspondence over the span of two hundred and fifty years.

5.2a. The Tarquinian War. In 253 ab urbe condita (553 a.d. with the 1053-year shift forwards) T. Larcius becomes leader of the Roman troops in Italy instead of Valerius ([482], Book 2:18, page 123). Larcius transcribes as LRC without vocalizations (or NRC, since N and L were occasionally subject to flexion).

5.2b. The Gothic War. In the alleged year 551 a.d. Justinian I appoints another commander-in-chief of the Roman army in Italy to replace Belisarius – a certain Narses. This is the second eminent Roman warlord of the epoch, albeit not quite as renowned as Belisarius – a “#2” military leader of sorts. He brings the Gothic War to its conclusion. His name without vocalisations transcribes as NRS, which is similar to LRC or NRC (Larcius) as mentioned by Titus Livy.

5.3a. The Tarquinian War. Livy singles out Larcius as the first dictator of the “ancient” Rome. The latter is described as vested with exclusive powers ([482], Book 2:18, page 123).

5.3b. The Gothic War. Narses gains powers of unprecedented scale in the course of the Gothic war. He becomes the autocratic dictator of the entire Italy ([196], Volume 1, page 121).

5.4a. The Tarquinian War. According to Livy, in the year 259 ab urbe condita (or 559 a.d. with the 1053-year shift forwards) the Tarquins faced the Roman forces for one last battle – however, this time at a certain distance from Rome. This is the last battle of the Tarquinian war (we have listed every battle in this war that Livy mentions in his work explicitly and with no omissions). The battle was an exceptionally furious one, and it ended with a complete defeat of the Tarquins ([482]).

5.4b. The Gothic War. In the alleged year 552 a.d. the Gothic troops led by king Totila faced the troops of the Roman Greeks for the last time – well away from Rome. This is the final battle in the course of the Gothic war ([196], Volume 1, pages 407-408). We have listed all the major battles of the period as related by the mediaeval sources. The battle was an arduous and bloody one. The Romans prevailed, albeit with heavy losses, and the Goths were defeated ([695]; also [196], Volume 1).

5.5a. The Tarquinian War. According to Livy, Lucius Tarquin the Proud, king of the Tarquins, “was wounded in the side and carried off to a safe place by the warriors that gathered around him” ([482], Book 2:19, page 125). He died in Cuma a short while later ([482], Book 2:21). Apart from that, L. Tarquin the Proud was accompanied by his son, the young Tarquin, in this last battle of the Tarquins with the Romans. Unfortunately, Titus Livy fails to mention the son’s name ([482], Book 2:19, page 125). It may have been the king’s young heir.

5.5b. The Gothic War. Totila, king of the Goths, was seriously wounded as he fled the battlefield, and died a short while later ([196], Volume 1, pages 407-408). In the last battle between the Goths and the Romans the young Teia or Teias becomes king of the Goths for a short period of time just after the death of Totila. However, in the alleged year 553 a.d. – that is, immediately after the defeat of Totila, young Teia gets killed ([196], Volume 1, pages 408-411). Most probably, both Livy and Procopius are referring to the same event here.

5.6a. The Tarquinian War. After this rout, the Tarquins disappear from the political arena of the “ancient” Italy as well as the history of the “ancient” Republican Rome in general. At least, Livy ceases to make references to them after
informing us of the total defeat that they suffered in this war. We know nothing of the remaining Tarquins and their subsequent location. Livy doesn’t utter a word on the subject.

5.6b. The Gothic War. After the defeat, the Goths disappear from the pages of this epoch’s historical chronicles. They are supposed to have left Italy. Gregorovius tells us that “we know nothing of… where the Goths headed after they had left the battlefield, and their exile from this beautiful land that their fathers had conquered [under Odoacer and Theodoric – A. F.] – a land that still bears numerous marks of their glorious deeds in many places, is covered in utter obscurity” ([196], Volume 1, pages 412-413).

Thus, in the overwhelming majority of cases, we have witnessed an almost complete correspondence of Livy’s “ancient” datings shifted forwards by 1053 years with the mediaeval datings of respective parallel events. The numeric coefficient $X = A/B$ (qv above) equals 74% for the part of Livy’s text that refers to the Tarquinian War. In other words, 74% of this text by Livy is covered by the parallels with mediaeval events that we have discovered, which provides most “ancient” events described by Livy with mediaeval duplicates dating to a much more recent epoch.

4. THE PARALLELISM BETWEEN THE GOTHIC WAR OF THE ALLEGED VI CENTURY AND THE NIKA REBELLION THAT TOOK PLACE IN THE SAME CENTURY. NO DATE SHIFT HERE

In Chapter 6 of CHRON1 we already witnessed the Gothic War of the alleged VI century A.D. to have been one of the brightest duplicates of the Eurasian war that we deem to have taken place in the XIII century A.D., qv in the global chronological map in CHRON1, Chapter 6, and the corresponding table. This war was reflected in the chronicles of many nations. Above we give our analysis of the texts referring to events that allegedly took place in and around Italian Rome. However, we have already told the reader that the most probable dating of the Italian Rome’s foundation belongs to the epoch of the late XIV century A.D. It wasn’t until much later that a part of the Byzantine history as well as that of the New Rome on the Bosporus became transferred to these parts (on paper, naturally). Hence one finds it hard to imagine that the Eurasian war of the XIII century A.D. wasn’t reflected in the Byzantine chronicles describing the reign of Justinian I who had been one of the key figures of the Gothic War, its “principal monarch”, in a way. Indeed, we witness this to be true.

We learn that the Eurasian war of the XIII century A.D. had indeed left a phantom trace in the “purely Byzantine” part of history known to us as the Nika rebellion which took place in the alleged year 532 A.D. ([486]). This coincides with the beginning of the Gothic war – the alleged years 534-535 A.D.

If we are to consider the documents describing Justinian’s reign in the New Rome, the ones that stand out the most are the books of Procopius of Caesarea. Some of them portray Justinian benevolently, praising him in his royal magnitude; in others, such as the Arcane History by the same author, Justinian is represented in an altogether different manner. Scaligerian history went so far as to invent the theory of a “two-tongued Procopius” who would eulogize Justinian in the daytime, and fill the pages of the Arcane History with accounts of his atrocities after dusk. However, we aren’t concerned with the authorship of the collection of texts written by “Procopius” at the moment, since it doesn’t affect anything inasmuch as our research is concerned.

A brief rendition of the events that later became known as the Nika rebellion is as follows (according to [468]). It was an uprising that shook the entire Third Roman Empire in the alleged year 532 A.D. A great revolt flared up in Rome with neither a leader striving for royal power to head it, nor any clear reason behind it. This makes the Scaligerian version of the rebellion rather odd. The revolt is supposed to have been a short one, but characterized by its dramatic scale of actions. Military conflicts involve great forces, regular imperial troops as well as mercenaries. Indeed, this seems to resemble an all-out civil war rather than a mere rebellion. The New Rome burns, arsonists being active in several locations simultaneously. The main powers behind the revolt are two political factions – the venetes and the pracines, united
against Justinian. His military commander-in-chief by
the name of Belisarius (!), the leader of the empire’s
troops, receives orders from Justinian to crush the
uprising. Belisarius employs the powerful Gothic gar-

cison led by Mundus to aid the Romean-Roman

terrified by the sheer scale of the revolt,
Justinian doesn’t take part in military actions against
the rebels himself, finding shelter in his castle instead,
unlike Belisarius. It is peculiar that the rebels didn’t
storm the castle, although, according to Procopius,
there were no special fortifications to protect it.
Eventually, Belisarius managed to use his brilliant
cunning and entrap a large mob of rebels in a hippo-
drome = circus, slaughtering a great many of their
number as a result.

a. The Gothic War of the alleged VI century A.D.
b. The Nika Rebellion of the alleged VI century A.D.

1a. The Gothic War. Procopius of Caesarea is the
most famous author to have related the events
of the Gothic war. His Gothic War is the prin-
cipal work that helped to shape the entire modern academic concept of this event (see [695]
and [696]).

1b. The Nika Rebellion. This rebellion is also de-
scribed by a famous author – the very same

2a. The Gothic War. This war broke out around the
middle of the alleged VI century – the years
535-553 A.D. It is considered to have been one
of the bloodiest wars in the whole history of Rome and Romea. It had claimed a great num-
ber of lives and resulted in the destruction of the entire Italy.

2b. The Nika Rebellion. Also happens around the
middle of the alleged VI century – in the al-
leged year 532 A.D. (468). This rebellion
serves as a classical example of a large-scale
civil war, and a very brutal one at that. All but
the entire New Rome lay in ruins as a result.

3a. The Gothic War. The primary royal figure here
is Justinian the Great, the Byzantine emperor
who is supposed to mastermind the military ac-
tions in Italy remotely. He doesn’t take part in
the Gothic war personally, controlling it from
New Rome (Constantinople, see fig. 2.29).

3b. The Nika Rebellion. The principal royalty here
is also Justinian who commands the suppres-
sion forces. As above, he doesn’t take part in

---

Fig. 2.29 Parallelism between the Gothic War and the Nika Rebellion.
any of the actual battles, and gives orders from the Palatium. He didn’t appear before his troops once; the rebels never approached the Palatium, without so much as a single attempt to storm it (see fig. 2.29).

4a. The Gothic War. Justitian’s main opponents in the Gothic war of the alleged VI century are as follows: 
   a) the Goths (aka the Trojans, qv in Chapter 6 of CHRON1 and the next section); 
   b) the Franks and the Persians = PRS (Porsenna and Paris in the Trojan war, qv in Chapter 6 of CHRON1 and below). TRQN and PRS are the two main forces gathered against Justinian.

4b. The Nika Rebellion. Justinian’s principal enemies are the venetes and the pracines. The former can be identified with the Goths and the Tarquinians, and the latter (PRSN) – over the Persians and Porsenna’s Etruscans (or P-Racines/P-Russians – PRS). The two factions are supposed to have been “circus parties” in the New Rome, whatever that means. Most probably, the two factions have been of a religious nature, and united to oppose the emperor.

5a. The Gothic War. As we shall demonstrate below, in our study of the parallelism between the Gothic War and the Trojan War, the Goths (Trojans) who fled from Troy after the city fell prey to the enemy (or, possibly, the victors who were pursuing them) had founded Venice and thus can be regarded as its first inhabitants. They may have called themselves the Venetes. The Venetes (or the Vendians) are well-known late mediaeval nations. The second power that stood against Justinian in the Gothic was referred to as “PRS” – P-Russians, or Franks (Turks) – see fig. 2.30.

5b. The Nika Rebellion. The Venetes were one of the primary forces fighting against Justinian in the Nika rebellion. They may therefore have been the duplicate of the Goths (or the Trojans), the heroes of the Gothic=Trojan war of the XIII century a.d., qv in the global chronological map in Chapter 6 of CHRON1. P-Racines = PRSN = the rebels, who apparently become superimposed over the Persians in the Gothic War (PRS). Also bear in mind the fact that, according to Titus Livy,
P-Russians (or Larth Porsenna – L-Horde P-Racens) took part in the Tarquinian war. P-Racines are the second key force in the Nika rebellion (see fig. 2.30).

6a. The Gothic War. This is a war fought by the Goths. As we shall see below, they are identified as the Trojans in the Trojan War. The Goths oppose Justinian during the Gothic war; however, prior to that they had been the Empire’s allies, qv in Chapter 1 of Chron 2. Justinian is the victor in this war, and his involvement is rather of a “behind-the-scenes” nature.

6b. The Nika Rebellion. The suppression of the rebellion is aided by the Goths, who fight on the side of Justinian as allies of Rome and Romea. However, the Goths burn and loot the temple of Sophia and murder a Roman priest in the course of their battling with the rebels, actually acting against Justinian’s clergy ([468], page 60). Justinian crushes the rebellion and also enjoys the triumph, albeit without personal participation in military action. Thus, in both versions Justinian and the Goths are seen as allies initially and enemies afterwards. Both schemes are shown in fig. 2.30. It is clearly visible that they’re virtually identical.

7a. The Gothic War. The troops of the Roman Greeks are led by the great military commander Belisarius. Beside him we see the famed warlord Mundus who actively participates in crushing the forces of the Goths – Trojans and the Franks = PRS and TRNK ([695]).

7b. The Nika Rebellion. A complete reflection of the scenario related above – the suppression of the rebellion is headed by the same military leader – Belisarius ([468], pages 60-61), who crushes the venetes and the P-Racines (PRSN) aided by the very same Mundus (ibid).

8a. The Gothic War. As we shall demonstrate in the next section, the only way Belisarius could seize Naples = The New City (or the double of the ancient Troy, qv below) was due to exceptional cunning – getting into the city via an aqueduct. Thus, the entire plan was based on the use of an aqueduct – the “Trojan horse”, the “aquatic or equine duct” ([237]). See details below.

8b. The Nika Rebellion. The situation is quite similar: the only means of suppressing the rebellion successfully was guile. Presumably, Belisarius managed to entrap the rebels in a large hippodrome (circus). There is a legend that the proclamation of Hypatius (Justinian’s nephew) as a new emperor was a trick played by none other than Justinian himself, with the aid of Belisarius. It had allegedly served to fool the crowd and lure them into the hippodrome or circus, where nearly all of the rebels were killed. “More than 30 thousand people died in this carnage” ([468], page 61). We see a hippodrome to be the centre of the entire subterfuge (ibid). Thus, the tale of the Nika Rebellion also includes an “equine duct” of sorts – compare with the Gothic war.

Commentary. One shouldn’t get the opinion that the Nika rebellion took place in the VI century a.d. As we shall see below, it is most likely to have occurred in the XV century and gained formidable extra age on the pages of the Scaligerian history. For the time being, let us merely point out the following parallel whose existence is admitted by the very same historians who inform us of the Nika rebellion: “The first insurgency flared up… under Justinian, in the year 532. The emperor had been on the verge of losing his throne; however, Belisarius, his commander-in-chief, had slaughtered 40,000 insurrectionists at the Hippodrome. The second rebellion took place under Sultan Mehmet II, who had ordered to execute 30,000 mutinous janissaries on the very same spot” ([1464], page 47). Apparently, we see two accounts of one and the same uprising in the Ottoman Empire.

Commentary. Thus, some of the mediaeval chroniclers were gazing at the abris of the past which had mayhaps not been all that distant, but rather traced out quite sparsely, and, confused by the old documents full of unvocalized words, would tell us of an aqueduct; others descanted about a hippo-
SUMMARY. It is most likely that the “Nika Rebellion” is yet another echo of the Gothic War that later chroniclers placed in the same century – allegedly IV a.d. The bellum interneceinum would thus transform into a simple mutiny, albeit an armipotent one, the scribes had crammed it into the confines of the imperial capital – the New Rome, having also subjected events to temporal compression (several weeks instead of several years). However, the backbone of key facts remained intact, and they become more or less recognizable as soon as one gets an indication of which dates should be compared.

We shall proceed to analyze a number of parallelisms generated by the 1780-1800-year chronological shift, which we shall be referring to as the Graeco-Biblical shift. It provides us with a superimposition of the “ancient” Greece over the mediaeval Greece and Italy of the XI-XVI century a.d. In particular, the great “ancient” Greek colonization of the alleged VIII-VI century b.c. becomes a mere phantom reflection of the crusade epoch of the alleged XI-XIII century a.d., as well as wars of the XIV-XV century. The “ancient” wars between the Greeks and the Persians transform into a reflection of the early XIV century wars in Greece. The “ancient” Marathon battle is most likely to have the 1316 battle of Greece as its original. The list goes on; see the chapters below for more details.

An important and representative example of how this shift manifests is the parallelism between the “ancient” Trojan war of the alleged XIII century b.c. and the Gothic war of the alleged VI century a.d. We shall then add thereto the parallelism with the European war that took place in the middle of the XIII century a.d. and likely to have been the original of all these “phantom” wars. The parallelism between the Trojan War and the Gothic War can be found at the very beginning of the 1780-1800-year shift, qv on the global chronological map in Chapter 6 of Chron1.

As we already pointed out above, Ramon Muntaner, a mediaeval historian and a contemporary of Dante, tells us the following: “One of the Trojan outposts was located on Cape Atraki in Asia Minor, near Isle Tenedos… the Romanian aristocracy would often go there… to worship the divine effigy. And so one day Helen, the wife of the Duke of Athens, made a pilgrimage there, accompanied by a hundred knights. Paris, the son of the Trojan king, had noticed her, murdered all the knights and abducted the beautiful duchess” ([195], page 188(6)).

In fig. 2.31 you can see an ancient miniature from the French “Global Chronicle” (Chronique de la Bouquechardière by Jean de Courcy published in Rouen in the alleged year 1470) – see [1485], p. 164, and ill. 202. What we see here is the arrival of Paris and Helen (on the left) in Troy. They are met by Priam, the Trojan king, at the walls of the city (qv in the right of the miniature). Unfortunately, the size of the illustration is rather small, and so one must study the colour version in order to see all the details. It is clearly obvious that the author of the miniature didn’t for a second doubt the fact that the Trojan War had been a mediaeval event. A similar mediaeval representation of the Trojan war can be seen in fig. 2.32, which is yet another ancient miniature.

According to modern historians, the ignorant Ramon Muntaner was unfamiliar with the Scaligerian chronology (which is hardly surprising, considering that it was introduced two centuries after his death). Therefore his presumed errancy had made him believe the Trojan War to have taken place in the Middle Ages. The fact that it involved dukes, duchesses, knights etc apparently didn’t baffle him at all. The authors of the illustration to the famous Russian almanac entitled Litsevoy Svod (The State Museum of History, Article #358), fig. 2.33. The illustration is called “The Trojan Army Preparing for Battle” ([851], page 33). Once again, we see warriors who are typically mediaeval in their appearance.
Fig. 2.31 Ancient miniature entitled “King Priam meets his son Paris and the abducted Helen at the gates of Troy” from the *Chronique de la Bouquechardière* by Jean de Courcy (dating to the alleged year 1470). The setting, people’s clothes and the whole city of Troy are presented as very distinctly mediaeval in nature. Taken from [1485], ill. 202.

Fig. 2.32 A miniature from *Le Roman de la guerre de Troie* by Benoit de Sainte-Maure dating to the alleged XIV century. We see a battle scene of the Trojan War with Greeks fighting the Trojans. The warriors are wearing heavy armour and helmets, some of which have closed visors. We see warriors of the Middle Ages wearing characteristically mediaeval armour. Taken from [1485], ill. 320.
Fig. 2.33 Mediaeval miniature named “The Trojan Army Riding into Battle” from the Russian Litsevoy Svod almanac (State Museum of History, Museum collection No 358). The “ancient” Trojans are portrayed as mediaeval warriors. Taken from [851], page 33.
5.1. The first accounts of the Trojan War: their presumed authorship as well as geographical and temporal origins

5.1.1. The general conception of chronological shifts

In this section we shall give an account of the phenomenal parallelism between the following events:

1) The famous Trojan War of the alleged XII century B.C.,
2) The famous Gothic War of the alleged VI century A.D.,
3) The well-known wars of the crusade epoch – the alleged XI-XIII century A.D.

In other words, the Trojan War and the Gothic War are most probably phantom reflections of real wars that took place in the crusade epoch. The Trojan War is a real event; however, it took place in the XIII century A.D. and not in deep antiquity. Homer’s epic poem of the Trojan War is therefore an intricate compound myth telling us about the crusades of the Middle Ages.

Our hypothesis is as follows: the fall of Troy is the fall of the New Rome = Constantinople = Jerusalem as a result of the crusader invasion of the XIII century A.D. The myth of the Trojan War consists of several episodes relating the events of major crusades. The crusaders were avenging the Crucifixion of Christ that took place in Czar-Grad in 1185.

The Trojan war of the XIII century A.D. had been one of the most important events in the history of Europe and Asia. It became reflected in multiple written sources, the authors of which hailed from different countries and wrote in a number of languages. When the epoch of “bringing order into history” came, the chronologists of the XVI-XVII century started to sort through the old documents that were available to them at the time, and have made many serious mistakes in their reconstruction of the ancient history. As a result, a large number of authentic documents slid into deep antiquity, having thus resulted in a phantom reflection of mediaeval reality. In other words, many of the events that took place in the XI-XVII century A.D. became doubled, tripled and quadrupled. The original would most often remain in its due place, and its duplicates were sent on a voyage which was not just temporal, but also geographical – events would drift from Rome to Greece and vice versa. Numerous misdatings led to several chronological shifts, qv in Chron1, Chapter 6. The key ones are as follows:

1) The Graeco-Roman shift of 330-360 years;
2) The Roman shift of 1053 years;

The shift values are rather approximate since they vary from document to document. The names that we offer are explained very easily:

1) The Roman-Byzantine shift had elongated the history of Rome and Byzantium and moved it into the past.
2) The Roman shift resulted in the elongation of Roman history, with artificial “extra age” added thereto.
3) The Graeco-Biblical shift made Greek and Biblical history longer and “more ancient”.

Thus, numerous copies of the real mediaeval war that took place in the XIII century A.D. came into existence. Some of them time-travelled into the past and got baptized anew. One of the phantom duplicates that wound up in the XIII century B.C. became the “Trojan War”. Another was dated to the VI century A.D. and dubbed the “Gothic War”. Et cetera, et cetera.

However, since both wars are but phantom reflections of one and the same real mediaeval war, they must resemble each other. This proves to be true. Due to the fact that these two famous wars are of paramount importance to the Scaligerian history, it shall be expedient to discuss the parallelism that we have discovered in more detail, qv below.

The reader is familiar with various accounts of the Trojan War from childhood. It was described in great detail by the blind poet Homer in his two immortal epic poems – the Iliad and the Odyssey. With great inspiration he tells us about the gods and the heroes facing each other in the Battle of Troy, the passionate love between Helen and Paris (casus belli), the legendary Trojan horse, the fall of Troy, the smoke from the fires, the escape of the Trojans and the voyage of Ulysses.

The Gothic war is somewhat less popular. Many readers don’t know anything about it whatsoever. Mediaeval history is less vogue than that of the “antiquity”, after all. At the same time, historians who study the Middle Ages are well aware of the Gothic War to have been one of the most important breakpoints in the history of the Roman Empire ([196], Volume 1). According to the Scaligerian version, the
Gothic war ends the development of Regal Rome. This is supposed to have been followed by the fall of the Roman Empire, barbaric invasions, and the transformation of the splendorous Imperial Rome into the murky mediaeval Papal Rome, which marks the beginning of the “Dark Ages” in Europe.

5.1.2. The strange fate of Homer’s epic poems

1. Who told Homer about the Trojan War that is supposed to have happened five centuries before his birth?

Let us begin with the actual legend of the Trojan War and its history. Who was the first to have told this tale? Where and how did it happen? The Scaligerian version tells us the following about the origins of the Iliad and the Odyssey. It is presumed nowadays that the fall of Troy (at the end of the Trojan War, which had lasted for several years) took place in 1225 B.C. ([72], page 243). Homer was the author whose text had allegedly been the first to reach us (see figs. 2.34 and 2.35). However, a closer acquaintance with the Scaligerian version of how Homer’s poems came into being leaves one somewhat confused.

See for yourselves: the Trojan War took place around the alleged year 1225 B.C. We know nothing of when Homer had really lived. The Concise Columbia Encyclopaedia ([1447]), for instance, gingerly informs us that the poems were “written by the poet for the aristocratic public in Asia Minor at some point preceding 700 B.C.”, qv in the article entitled “Homer” (ibid). At any case, we are told that Homer had lived in an epoch that had been separated from that of the Trojan war by several centuries – possibly as late as the alleged VIII century B.C. Thus, he must have “written his poems” a few hundred years after the war.

Actually, there’s nothing too suspicious about it so far. However, we must remind the reader that according to the Scaligerian point of view, Homer had been blind ([1447]). Therefore, he couldn’t have written anything on his own – at best, he could have dictated something. The version to prove his “authorship” of the poems is as follows.

It is admitted that Homer was blind, but he is said to have been a genius. He wrote two gigantic poems. They occupy seven hundred pages of the modern 1967 edition ([180]), no less, the font being rather small. The poet is supposed to have memorized both
of them, and started singing the poems to his audience. He must have been at it for many years, since the poems had not been recorded anywhere in his lifetime! We are surprised to learn that “both the Iliad and the Odyssey had first been written down [a few centuries after Homer’s death – A. F.] by a special commission created for this purpose by Pisistratus, the tyrant of Athens who had reigned in 560-527 b.C.” ([180], page 711).

Thus, both of these titanesque poems adding up to 700 pages of a contemporary book are supposed to have been recorded for the first time 670 years after the Trojan War. That’s more than a half of a millennium, and also several centuries after Homer’s death. All of it leads to quandary galore. How could the words sung by a blind poet with such great inspiration have reached the commission of Pisistratus through many centuries in order to get written down for the first time? We’re talking about two immense epic poems. Chanting them aloud by heart must take many hours. One should also take good care not to make any mistakes. The allegedly veracious picture of the events that we’re fed can be outlined as follows.

2. How does one memorize seven hundred pages of Homer’s poems for a lifetime?

The blind poet chanted his two poems before all kinds of audience many a time. The listeners eventually managed to memorize them. Then the poet died; however, his compatriots remained, and they had learnt the entire volume of these 700 pages by heart and verbatim. They carried on with the oral tradition, telling the poems to a new audience. They eventually perished as well, yet their “oral tradition”, as historians are so very keen to call it, continued and became inherited by their children. This is supposed to have lasted for several hundred years. Towns would fall and empires would collapse; still the descendants of Homer’s first listeners would keep on chanting two gigantic poems by heart.

Just try memorizing as little as the first hundred pages of the Iliad merely by listening to them chanted so as to keep them in memory for about two decades. Failing that, try learning them by heart reading the actual text of the book — something Homer’s descendants didn’t have. You aren’t likely to succeed. Bear in mind that there are seven times more than a hundred pages in the book. We shall be told that “the ancients had a better memory”, which is highly unlikely — the contrary is more probable, since there weren’t any libraries at the time, nor any sort of a unified educational system or anything resembling one.

Let us return to the Scaligerian version of history for the meantime. Pisistratus the tyrant finally hears the magnificent multi-day chant which was apparently crooned by the court singer, and gives orders to get the poems recorded in writing for the very first time. This must have taken several singers, since one finds it hard to imagine that “oral tradition” had only reached one singer in the epoch of Pisistratus. In this case, their versions of Homer’s poems must have differed from each other considerably. Or are we being coerced into thinking that all the singers adhered to the same version of the text?

This is what Scaligerian history tells us about the fate of Homer’s poems — all of this with a straight face. We deem it to be extremely unlikely.

3. Where are Homer’s poems supposed to have been kept for two thousand years?

Let us trace the further fate of “Homer’s poems recorded in writing”. They are presumed to have been widely known as late as the III century B.C. ([180], page 711). Still, there are no copies of either the Iliad or the Odyssey that could be dated to this period. His poems had allegedly remained lost for many centuries up until the Renaissance. And yet Homer was popular enough for his poems to have been sang aloud in many towns and villages of Greece for many centuries before they got recorded. However, no texts of Homer are seen, let alone read, anywhere in the Middle Ages. Homer’s songs have ceased to ring; the location of the unique and priceless copy of his poems remains unknown.

This is what historians tell us: “In mediaeval Europe Homer’s texts were only known by quotations and references given by Aristotle and a number of Latin authors; the poetic glory of Homer had been completely outshone by Virgil. It wasn’t until the late XIV – early XV century that… the Italian humanists made a closer acquaintance of Homer. In the XV century many of them occupied themselves with translating Homer into Latin… in 1448 the first printed Greek copy of Homer was published in Florence.
Many partial Italian translations of Homer’s texts were made in the XVI century. However, the first complete translation of the *Iliad* came out as late as 1723 and was made by the poet Antonio Maria Salvini” ([180], pages 711-712).

Where could Homer’s dusty text have been stored for nearly two thousand years? In what archive, pray? If we are to cast aside the highly implausible theories of oral/vocal/choral tradition that had allegedly kept Homer’s poems alive for many centuries, it has to be admitted that *in reality both of Homer’s poems surfaced as late as the end of the XIV century A.D.* ([881], Volume 2, pages 97-98. There are no veracious accounts of their fate dating back earlier than the XIV century. Therefore, we can put forth the hypothesis that they were written around that epoch, possibly in the XIII-XIV century of the new era. The myth about blind Homer singing them by a fire in the Copper Age Greece of the VIII or even XIII century is nothing but a fancy of Scaligerite historians that originated in the XVI-XVII century A.D.

### 5.1.3. Dares and Dictis – the “alleged participants” of the Trojan War

Scaligerian history tells us that “in the reign of the Roman emperor Claudius the sepulchre of a certain Dictis was uncovered, which contained an “account of the Trojan war” in a tin ark”. Towards the IV century A.D. we witness a *wide propagation* of the “notes” of Dictis and Dares (Dares of Phrygia), the *alleged participants* of the Trojan war, in Latin translation. The new interpretation of events and characters offered by these two authors was *deemed true in mediæval Europe*; Homer is accused of “inveracious embellishments” and being “a touch too partial wherein the Greeks were concerned” ([851], page 5).

It is perfectly clear why Dares and Dictis became immediately pigeonholed as “alleged participants”, or impostors of sorts. Indeed, according to the Scaligerian chronology, Homer’s poems had been chanted by the “ancient” Greeks for many centuries before they finally got recorded. And what do we see in this case? An instant discovery of Latin (and not Greek) original “notes written by the participants of the war”! We also learn that “the Greek texts of Dares and Dictis disappeared without a trace” ([335], page 85).

Let us enquire about the Scaligerian dating of the first surviving account of the Trojan War. After all, other authors besides Homer have written about it. The answer is that the first surviving description of the Trojan War is a Latin text from the alleged VI century A.D. We proceed to find out that “some ignorant scribbler who had probably lived in the VI century compiled the facts related to the siege in a dry and monotonous manner; he used to be very popular in the Middle Ages” ([335], pages 85-86).

We should be aware of why this “first description” of the war became dated to the alleged VI century A.D. In the present section we shall provide the facts indicating that the Trojan War can be identified as the Gothic war of the alleged VI century A.D. The chronological shift, or the difference between the respective Scaligerian datings of the Trojan and the Gothic War, shall equal about 1800 years in this case. The Trojan War is considered to have been the most important event in the history of the “ancient” Greece, whereas the Gothic War is the key event in the mediaeval Graeco-Roman history. It is little wonder, then, that the “first surviving account of the Trojan War” became dated to the VI century – erroneously so, as we are beginning to realize.

It goes without saying that historians treat the texts of Dares and Dictis sceptically or even negatively. They tell us the following, for instance: “the two freshly-manufactured accounts of ‘real eyewitnesses’ were valued higher [in the Middle Ages – A. F.] than Homer’s ‘far-fetched poem’” ([171], page 45). Also, Homer’s poem was only known in “short extracts” (ibid). Further on we find out that “Thucydides was of the opinion that the very narrative of the *Iliad* [by Homer – A. F.] wasn’t to be trusted” (ibid).

In general, the chronicles of Dares and Dictis served as a real apple of discord for the scientific community. “Many XIX century scientists denied the existence of a Greek manuscript [of Dictis – A. F.], naming Lucius Septimius as the author of *this famous forgery*… However, in 1907 an excerpt from the *diary of Dictis* was found among the Egyptian papyri” ([171], page 45).

Could Dares and Dictis really have been impostors, then? Homer himself provides us with indications that the contrary is more likely to be true. The matter is that Homer, the author of the two classical epic poems, mentions Dares directly at the very beginning
of Book V. Furthermore, Homer refers to the Cretan king Idomeneus, who was accompanied by Dictis during the Trojan campaign ([171], page 45). Finally, Dares is also mentioned in Virgil’s *Aeneid*.

The language of the Latin text by Dares the Phrygian “sets the classical philologists ablaze with indignation… the Greek original… did not survive” ([175], page 45). Had there actually been a *Greek* original? If the Trojan War wasn’t merely an event from Greek history but rather Graeco-Roman or even pan-European, why can’t the “diary of an eyewitness and a participant” be written *in Latin*, even if it had happened rather late? These “dry and monotonous” eyewitness diaries – especially the text from the alleged VI century a.d. – spawned a great many œuvres inspired by the Trojan war; their entire collection is usually referred to as “The Trojan Cycle” nowadays.

A propos, we deem it necessary to mention that in the alleged years VIII-IX a.d. the famous poet Angilbert worked at the court of Charlemagne, or simply “The Great King” in translation, and his first name had been *Homer*! ([122], Volume 5, page 391). Could *his* name be later used in the future Greek account of the “ancient” Trojan War?

I. N. Golenishchev-Kutuzov wrote that “for a whole millennium (up to the very XVII century) the glory of Dares and Dictis outshone that of Homer. Isador of Sevilla considered Dares the first historian after Moses, the precursor of Herodotus. In the XII century Dares the Phrygian became the most widely-known writer of the antiquity” ([171], page 47). In the Middle Ages “the epoch of Homer was referred to in the same terms as the age of Moses and Solomon – however, neither the devotees nor the vituperators had read any of his texts [Homer’s; bear in mind that the text in question had first surfaced in the XIV century a.d. – A. F.]; the only known part of the *Iliad* had been a short excerpt that was ascribed to Pindarus for some reason… However, the œuvres that occupied a higher hierarchical position than the passage in question were the ones whose authorship allegedly belonged to Dares of Phrygia and Dictis the Cretan” ([335], pages 85-86). As late as in the XII century Joseph of Exeter concocts a recital of the Trojan war according to Dares and Dictis, claiming to describe “real events, since Dares and Dictis were eyewitnesses”. Quote given by [171], pages 47-48.

The historians invented the “forgery” theory as late as the XVII-XIX century, after the creation of the Scaligerian chronology which, as we shall proceed to demonstrate, is very obviously at odds with the diaries of Dares and Dictis. Being forced to choose between the two versions in question, the historians decided to accuse Dares and Dictis of “ignorance” in order to preserve the integrity of the Scaliger-Petavius chronology. After that they declared Homer the Greek original while the writings of Dares and Dictis became “forgeries” (in Latin).

One would think the case was closed and all the t’s crossed. However, the new critical research of the Scaligerian chronology made the problem resurface. This is where we learn of the apparent error made by the historians. The diaries of Dares and Dictis with their dry and monotonous narrative are most probable *earlier originals*, whereas Homer’s *Iliad*, which is much more *elegant* and *grandiloquent*, happens to be a more recent work of art that couldn’t have been created before the Renaissance as the poetic epitome of the entire “Trojan Cycle” which precedes “Homer’s *Iliad*” chronologically.

In fig. 2.36 we present our graph, which provides one with an ostensive representation of how the datings of the surviving œuvres from the Trojan Cycle are distributed in time. The resulting graph proved a most edifying one, since its first peak falls on the VI century a.d. where we find the first original text that has reached our age. Then we see the visible absolute maximum of the graph to fall on the alleged XII-XIII century, which is the time when a particularly large number of Trojan legends had come to existence. This alone indicates that the actual war apparently took place in the XII-XIII century, since this is when most of its renditions had appeared.

A Trojan chronicle surfacing in the alleged VI century is most probably explained by the quirks of the Scaligerian chronology which had transferred the real chronicle of the medieaval wars (the ones that broke out in the XII-XIII century a.d.) into distant past.

In fig. 2.37 one sees an ancient miniature dating to the alleged XIV century portraying Dictis the Cretan (upper left), Dares of Phrygia (upper right), and Benoit de Saint-Maure (below) – see [1229], page 21.
5.1.4. The mediaeval troubadours and the Franks telling us about the Trojan War

According to historians, “starting from late XII – early XIII century, the eternally glorious names of Ilión, Héctor and Alexandre begin to reach wide audiences via the medium of French poetry… The troubadours of this cycle started with the Trojan war, since it had almost been a national legend for them. In the VII century Fredegarius Scholasticus calls Fransion, son of Priam [Priam the king of Troy – A. F.] the first duke of the Franks” ([335], pages 85-86). The claim made by this mediaeval author (and many others besides him) moves the Trojan War forwards in time and places it in the epoch of the “first Franks”. However, the “first Franks” belong to the Middle Ages, which is confirmed by historians themselves ([196]). In this case, the Trojan war is automatically lifted into the Middle Ages.

Here are some of the most famous late mediaeval œuvres of the Trojan cycle ([851], page 6):

“Roman de Troie” by Benoit de Saint-Maure, the alleged XII century, France;
“The Song of Troy” by Herbert von Fritzlar, the alleged XIII century, Germany;
“The Trojan War” by Conrad of Würzburg, the alleged XIII century, Germany;
“The Tale of Troy’s Destruction” by Guido de Columna (Colonna), the alleged XIII century, Sicily.

The book of Guido de Columna was translated (from Latin!) into Italian, German, English, Russian, Hungarian and a number of Southern Slavic languages in the alleged XIV-XV century ([171], pages 47-48). We shall omit the list of other authors and
their “Trojan œuvres”, and only point out the rather odd detail: there are no Greek authors listed, likewise the books of the Trojan cycle: they are written in many European languages, but not Greek for some reason. The Greek Homer shall appear much later, as a luminous and splendid crown of the entire Trojan cycle. It is bizarre that mediaeval Greeks should fail to pay any attention to this most glorious event of their “ancient” history.

We shall be using one of the most ancient and most famous sources for our analysis of the mediaeval Trojan cycle – the œuvre of Guido de Columna that dates to the alleged XIII century, in early XVI-century Russian translation (“The Tale of the Rise and the Fall of Troy”) as well as “The Book of Troy” and the book entitled “The Golden Fleece of the Magical Ram” ([851]). Let us re-emphasize that all these sources contain factual information which is all but identical to that of Homer’s epical poem – the events they relate are the same. However, these books are characterized by a much drier narrative which does indeed resemble a diary more than a poem – therefore, they must be of a more primordial nature. The works of Homer, on the other hand, are written in a lofty style and very artfully, betraying their author to have been an extraordinary poet brought up on the best literary traditions of the Renaissance, already well-developed by his time. They contain fragments of a moralistic nature, tell us about deities taking part in battles, the magnitude of love that flared up between Helen and Paris etc.

5.1.5. The ruins of a small mediaeval fortification that Heinrich Schliemann suggested to refer to as “the remnants of the ancient Troy”.

Having “lost” the “ancient Troy in the epoch of the XVI-XVII century, the XVIII century historians started to search for it anew. It happened in the following manner. According to the archaeologist Elli Kriesh, the author of The Treasure of Troy and its History, “after a certain Frenchman by the name of Choiseul-Gouffier had made several expeditions to the North-Western Anatolia at the request of the French envoy in Constantinople (1785) and published a plan of this terrain, the discussion about the exact location of Troy resumed with new vigour. The Frenchman’s opinion had been that the city of Priam would be located near Pinarbaşı, about 10 kilometres towards mainland from the hill of Hissarlik; the latter was marked as the ruin site on Choiseul-Gouffier’s map ([443], page 20). Therefore the hypothesis that the remains of the “ancient Troy” could be identified as some ruins near Hissarlik had been voiced a long time before Schliemann by the Frenchman Choiseul-Gouffier.

Apart from that, “as early as 1822 McLaren… claimed that the Hissarlik hill had once been the location of the ancient Troy… which was the reason why the Englishman Frank Culvert who had also been an American ambassador and lived near the Dardanelles together with his family tried to persuade Charles Newton, the director of the Graeco-Roman collection of the British Museum in London, into organizing an expedition for the excavation of the ruins on the Hissarlik hill in 1863” ([443], pages 21-22).

Schliemann himself wrote the following: “having inspected the entire location twice, I decided to agree with Culvert completely in what concerned the identification of the table-land on top of the Hissarlik hill as the place where the ancient Troy used to be”. Elli Kriesh proceeds to tell us that “Schliemann refers to Frank Culvert directly here, which contradicts the popular myth of Schliemann finding Troy armed with nothing but a volume of Homer’s works and basing his research on the text of the Iliad exclusively. It was Culvert and not Schliemann who had made the rather confident presumption that Troy should be searched inside the Hissarlik hill stemming from the fact that the remains of stone walls were partially visible, even if it wasn’t an actual discovery. Schliemann’s destiny was to excavate this hill and find crucial evidence to the reality of the town which had been presumed mythical before him” ([443], page 27).

Let us ask about the reason why “Homer’s Troy” would be sought in this area at all – most probably due to the fact that a vague memory of Troy being located somewhere “near the Bosporus” had still existed back then. However, the XVIII century historians could no longer refer to the New Rome on the Bosporus (or Constantinople) directly, since the fact that Constantinople and the “ancient Troy” were the same city was already completely forgotten – moreover, Scaligerian history forbade the very thought that
Istanbul might be Homer’s Troy. However, there was plenty of indirect mediaeval evidence suggesting Troy to be located somewhere “near the Bosphorus” that fortunately managed to escape destruction. This is why historians and lay enthusiasts alike began their quest for the “lost Troy” in the vicinity of Istanbul.

There are plenty of mediaeval settlement and fortification ruins all across Turkey; thus, selecting suitable remains that could be proclaimed “all that’s left from Homer’s Troy” wasn’t a problem at all. As we can see, the ruins on the Hissarlik hill were regarded as one of the potential candidates. However, both the archaeologists and the historians were aware that first one would have to unearth some kind of “proof” that the ruins in question are in fact “the Troy of Homer”. This “problem” was solved successfully by Heinrich Schliemann (fig. 2.38). He had commenced the excavations on the hill of Hissarlik.

The unearthed ruins have shown that there had really been some sort of a settlement here, covering the area of a mere 120 × 120 metres. The plan of the settlement can be seen on pages 76-77 of [443], for instance. It is natural that nothing here bore any relation to Homer at all. One comes across similar ruins virtually all over Turkey. Apparently, Schliemann had been aware that one needed something quite out of the ordinary so that these meagre remnants would attract the interest of the general public. It is most likely that the ruins in question belonged to some minor mediaeval Ottoman fortification or settlement. As we have already seen, Frank Culvert was claiming the ancient Troy to have been located here for quite a while without getting any attention, which is well understood since there are plenty of ruins in Turkey. One would need “indisputable evidence”. And so in May 1873 Schliemann “suddenly finds” a hoard of gold that he hastens to claim the “hoarding of the ancient Priam”. That is to say, “the very same Priam” as the great Homer tells us about ([1391] and [1392]).

Nowadays this set of golden artefacts travels all across the world to be presented in museums as “the treasure of the ancient Troy”.

This is what Elli Kriesh has to say about this matter: “Heinrich Schliemann… had found a remarkable treasure cache near the Scaean Gate (as he had erroneously thought) in May 1873… one that he had initially deemed to belong to none other but Homer’s king Priam. Schliemann and his work gathered wide popularity instantly. However, there were many sceptics who weren’t too inclined to trust this finding. Even nowadays there are researchers – first and foremost David A. Traill, the American specialist, – who claim the “treasure cache” story to be a myth, insisting that Schliemann had either bought most of these items, or collected them over a large period of time. The mistrust was all the stronger due to the fact that Schliemann doesn’t mention the exact date of the finding anywhere” ([443], page 113).

Indeed, for reasons unknown to us Schliemann had kept the information about the exact location, time, and circumstances of his finding the “ancient hoarding” back ([443], page 120). We find out that “detailed descriptions and reports before it. What if these rumours really reflect his negotiations about forging the “treasure of Priam” that he had conducted prior to the moment when he had “discovered the cache” on the Hissarlik hill, accompanied by no one?

Schliemann wrote some very interesting things, such as “the jeweller has to be a good connoisseur of antiquities, and he has to promise me not to put his brand on the copies. One needs to find someone who
won’t betray me, and agrees to do the job for an affordable price” . Quoting by [443], page 130. However, Baurain, Schliemann’s agent, “was reluctant to become responsible for this dubious an endeavour… he reckoned that ‘it goes without saying the copies should in no case be presented as originals’” ([443], pages 130-131). However, we learn that Baurain had “recommened Schliemann the Frohmann-Meuris jewellers from Rue St. Honoré [in Paris – A. F.]. He described this family enterprise as one that has enjoyed an outstanding reputation since the XVIII century, employing a large number of artists and fine craftsmen” ([443], page 130). A propos, in the XIX century “it became fashionable to wear antique jewellery in certain social circles. Princess Canino, the spouse of Lucien Bonaparte, would often bedazzle the beau-monde with her Etruscan necklace, which made her the indisputable centre of every festivity” ([443], page 134). Therefore, Parisian jewellers must have been well familiar with making replicas of antiques, and capable of making them well.

Elli Kriesh doesn’t dispute the authenticity of “Priam’s treasure”, yet she mentions that one finds it hard to say for certain whether Schliemann had really made any “copies”. At the same time, Kriesh gives us a kempt account of the fact that “since that day, the rumours of copies that Schliemann had allegedly ordered never subsided for a second” ([443], page 131).

Kriesh sums up as follows: “a number of abstrusities and contradictions in various accounts of this event whose true date isn’t given anywhere, have led the sceptics to question the authenticity of the finding… William M. Calder III, the Colorado University Professor of Ancient Philology, called Schliemann an egotistical and impertinent illusionist and a pathological liar” ([443], page 13).

By the way, Schliemann is supposed to have discovered another remarkable “ancient” burial ground – namely, that of Mycenae. He was amazingly lucky in what concerned finding ancient gold, wasn’t he then? In Mycenae he “discovers” a golden burial mask that he immediately declares to belong to “the ancient Agamemnon as described by Homer”. No proof is offered whatsoever. The present day historians are cautious enough to write that “Heinrich Schliemann had been of the opinion that the mask he had found in a sepulchre in Mycenae was the deathmask of king Agamemnon; however, it was later proven that it had belonged to a different ruler whose name isn’t known to us” ([863], page 14). One would wonder how archaeologists managed to “prove” that the unknown mask belonged to an anonymous ruler.

Thus, we can make the following observation in re Troy. All of the facts listed above combine into a most curious general picture.

1) Schliemann doesn’t indicate either the place, the date or the circumstances of “the discovery of Priam’s treasure” anywhere, making this issue oddly contentious. He never presented any valid evidence of having “excavated the historical location of Homer’s Troy”. Scaligerite historians weren’t too keen on demanding it from him, anyway.

2) One has reasons to suspect Schliemann of having ordered some jeweller to make “ancient golden jewellery”. One has to bear in mind that Schliemann had been a very wealthy man – for instance, “he had financed the construction of the German Institute of Archaeology in Athens” ([443], page 55). According to Kriesh, “his personal fortune made from leasing property in Indianapolis, Indiana, and Paris… served as the material base for his research, allowing him independence” ([443], page 30).

3) It is possible that Schliemann had subsequently smuggled the jewellery into Turkey having then reported it “discovered” among the ruins on the hill of Hissarlik – the very spot that enthusiasts had indicated as the probable “location of the ancient Troy”. As we can see, Schliemann didn’t even bother himself with searching for Troy. He merely presented the gold as “proof” of the theory put forward by Choiseul-Gouffier and Frank Culvert. We are of the opinion that if those two had named a different spot, Schliemann would find his “ancient treasure of king Priam” there with equal speed and ease.

4) Many XIX century sceptics didn’t believe a single word Schliemann said. However, the Scaligerites were happy for the most part, gleefully claiming Troy to have been “discovered at last”. Never mind the suspicious circumstances of the discovery – they don’t affect the general value of Schliemann’s great achievement. Now we know for certain: Priam had lived here, on the Hissarlik hill. Look, this slope of the hill is the very slope where Achilles slew Hector. And this
is where the Trojan Horse once stood. It didn’t sur-

vive, but here’s a large modern model. A very, very

precise one.

One has to admit that nowadays thousands of
gullible tourists reverently hearken to these tales.

5) The “treasure of Priam” was treated by Scal-
gerite historians in the following manner. It would
be rather careless to claim the gold to have once be-
longed to Homer’s Priam, since a statement as bold
as that would immediately provoke a demand for
proof, which naturally didn’t exist. This was appar-
ently obvious to everyone who had to deal with
“Schliemann’s Troy” in one way or the other.

A very elegant solution was offered eventually:
they admitted the treasure to have nothing to do
with Priam – yet it was proclaimed to date back to
an epoch even more distant than the one suggested
by Schliemann.

Kriesh writes that “it was the research conducted
after Schliemann’s death that gave final evidence of
the fact that the so-called “treasure of Priam” belongs
to an epoch a lot more distant that Schliemann could
have imagined – the third millennium B.C. … it be-
longs to a culture of the pre-Greek and pre-Hittite pe-
riod” ([443], page 172). That is to say, a mind-bog-
 glingly old treasure, boys and girls. Perfectly incred-
ible. No one’s even heard of either the Greeks or the
Hittites back in those days. Such statements render all
further argumentation futile since there doesn’t seem
to be anything to prove. However, it would be most
edifying to learn how the devotees of this theory man-
aged to date a number of golden articles when even
the exact location on the Hissarlik hill where they are
supposed to have been found remains unknown, qv
above. And gold itself doesn’t provide us with any
means of giving it an absolute dating so far.

6) What if Schliemann didn’t deceive us and re-
ally found some old jewellery during his excavations
on the Hissarlik? We shall counter with the following:
even if the “golden hoarding” was authentic and hadn’t been forged by Parisian jewellers, it would still be
perfectly unclear why it should prove the “ancient
Troy” to have been located on the Hissarlik hill. There
isn’t so much as a single letter anywhere on the golden
items “found” by Schliemann ([443]), let alone a
name. A mere verbal statement that someone had
found an ancient cache of gold in an unknown loca-
tion at some vague point in time doesn’t suffice to
make a valid claim about “the discovery of Troy”.

7) Let us point out a rather interesting psycho-
logical undertone of the entire affair. This entire
amazing story of “Troy finally discovered” is living
proof of the fact that neither the “discoverers”, nor
their colleagues who were involved in this activity in
some way were really interested in scientific veracity.
The Scaligerite majority of the historians and the ar-
chaeologists remained deeply convinced that “the lost
city of Troy” was located somewhere near the Bospo-
rus straits at any rate. They must have reasoned along
the lines of “well, its real location doesn’t really mat-
ter all that much, does it? Schliemann, for instance,
suggests that Troy had once proudly crowned the
summit of the Hissarlik hill. They even report him to
have found a hoarding of gold there. The rumours
that suggest there might be something wrong with the
finding notwithstanding – are the details really all
that important to us? Let’s agree with Schliemann’s
localization of Troy. He’s a well-known and well-re-
spected man, and an affluent one at that. The place
is fitting. There are indeed some ancient ruins there.
Need one begin to split hairs and demand “proof”?
Even if Troy wasn’t located at that exact site, it must
have been somewhere nearby.

8) A while later the sceptics got tired of pointing
out obvious inconsistencies in the tale of “the discov-
er of Troy”, which was when the “calm period of sci-
entific research” could finally begin. The excavations
continued, many well-respected and voluminous jour-
nals began to publish articles “about Troy” in great
abundance. It is quite natural that nothing remotely
resembling “Homer’s Troy” has ever been found on the
Hissarlik hill. The excavations of what must have been
some mediaeval Ottoman fortification carried on
without haste. Obviously, a number of assorted shards
and mutilated objects became unearthed as a result,
including remains of weapons and different utensils.
However, multiple reiterations of “this is where Troy
had once stood” eventually created the tradition that
claims that “Troy had really been here”, which proved
sufficient for everyone to convince themselves as well
as the gullible masses. The influx of the tourists began,
and those were eager to be deceived. Thus, another
problem of the Scaligerian history became “success-
fully solved”.

Kriesh writes that “it was the research conducted
after Schliemann’s death that gave final evidence of
the fact that the so-called “treasure of Priam” belongs
to an epoch a lot more distant that Schliemann could
have imagined – the third millennium B.C. … it be-
longs to a culture of the pre-Greek and pre-Hittite pe-
riod” ([443], page 172). That is to say, a mind-bog-
glingly old treasure, boys and girls. Perfectly incred-
ible. No one’s even heard of either the Greeks or the
Hittites back in those days. Such statements render all
further argumentation futile since there doesn’t seem
to be anything to prove. However, it would be most
edifying to learn how the devotees of this theory man-
aged to date a number of golden articles when even
the exact location on the Hissarlik hill where they are
supposed to have been found remains unknown, qv
above. And gold itself doesn’t provide us with any
means of giving it an absolute dating so far.

6) What if Schliemann didn’t deceive us and re-
ally found some old jewellery during his excavations
on the Hissarlik? We shall counter with the following:
even if the “golden hoarding” was authentic and hadn’t been forged by Parisian jewellers, it would still be
perfectly unclear why it should prove the “ancient
Troy” to have been located on the Hissarlik hill. There
isn’t so much as a single letter anywhere on the golden
items “found” by Schliemann ([443]), let alone a
name. A mere verbal statement that someone had
found an ancient cache of gold in an unknown loca-