3a. Henry III the Black – 28 years (1028-1056 A.D.)
■ 3b. Tiberius + Caligula – 27 years (14-41 A.D.)

4a. Henry V – 53 years between 1053 and 1106. The parallelism is broken here since there is no similar reign in the Second Empire.
■ 4b. The parallelism is instantly restored if we are to study the full names of the Second Empire rulers. We find out that the four emperors Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius and Nero can be united into a sequence resembling a long reign of a single emperor. The matter is that all four of them had the formula Tiberius Claudius Nero as part of their name, which is their unique characteristic in the entire Second Empire ([72], page 236-237). Apparently, the scribes have collated them together, which resulted in a 54-year reign of a single “ruler” – Tiberius Claudius Nero. Thus, Tiberius + Caligula + Claudius + Nero – 54 years between 14 and 68 A.D.

5a. Henry V the Black ([64], page 227); German reign duration – 27 years between 1098 and 1125 A.D.; Roman reign duration – 14 years between 1111 and 1125 A.D.
■ 5b. Claudius + Nero – 41-68 A.D., or 14 years for Nero alone (54-68 A.D.)

6a. Lothair – 12 years: 1125-1137 A.D.
■ 6b. Two kings sharing the name of Titus Vespasian – 12 years between 69 and 81 A.D.

7a. Conrad III Hohenstaufen – 14 years (1138-1152 A.D.) There is a possible link between Conrad and “Khan of the Horde”.
■ 7b. Domitian – 15 years (81-96 A.D.)

8a. Frederick I Barbarossa (a barbarian from Russia?) – 38 years between 1152 and 1190 A.D.
■ 8b. Trajan + Adrian – 40 years: 98-138 A.D. The unification of these two rulers may result from their sharing the name Trajan as part of their full names, qv in [72], pages 236-237.

9a. Henry VI – 28 years (1169-1197 A.D.)
9b. Antoninus Pius – 23 years (138-161 A.D.)

10a. Philip of Swabia – 10 years (1198-1208 A.D.)
■ 10b. Lucius Verus – 9 years (161-169 A.D.)

11a. Otho IV of Brunswick – 20 years (1198-1218 A.D.)
■ 11b. Marcus Aurelius – 19 years (161-180 A.D.)

12a. Frederick II – 39 years (1211-1250 A.D.) 1211 here is the date of the second inauguration in Germany – the final crowning.
■ 12b. Commodus + Caracalla – 37 years (180-217 A.D.). The reign of Commodus is calculated from the end of the reign of Marcus Aurelius; this is therefore the second version (see CHRON2, Chapter 1, the Second Empire list). We must point out that the merging of these two rulers into one and the same person is most probably explained by the fact that the full names of both Commodus and Caracalla contain the formula Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, which happens to comprise half of each full name in question.

■ 13b. Septimius Severus – 18 years (193-211 A.D.)

14a. Interregnum – 17 years (1256-1273 A.D.)
■ 14b. Interregnum (Julia Maesa and her minions, qv in CHRON2, Chapter 1) – 18 years (217-235 A.D.)

Since our proximity coefficient is defined by the formula $1.3 \times 10^{-12}$, both dynasties superimpose over each other quite well, considering the same universal rigid shift of 1053 years. We shall now give a brief outline of the biographical parallelism manifest here (the form-code parallelism).

1a. The Second Empire. The total lifetime of the Second Roman Empire equals about 299 years – the total period between the alleged years 82 B.C. and 217 A.D., qv in CHRON2, Chapter 1. This empire is considered “purely Roman”, and its parent state is allegedly Italy.
■ 1b. Empire of the X-XIII century. The entire period of the Holy Roman Empire’s existence covers the span of roughly 292 years starting with ei-
This state is supposed to have consisted of Italian and German lands, the parent state being Italy. The lengths of the temporal spans covered by both empires are all but coincident.

2a. The Second Empire. A shift of 1053 years forwards shall date the formation of the Second Roman Empire to 971 A.D. (the year 671 ab urbe condita + 300 years = 971 A.D.) Sulla, the first emperor of the Second Empire, was titled “Restorer of the City/State/Peace”. See Chron2, Chapter 1.

■ 2b. Empire of the X-XIII century. This empire came into existence in either 962 A.D., the year Otho was crowned in Rome, or 965 A.D., the year he conquered Italy ([64], page 205). Otho I, the first emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, is said to have “resurrected the Roman Empire” ([64]). Mark the parallelism with Sulla. This deed of Otho’s is important enough to make the headings of historical reviews. For instance, Paragraph 14 of [64] is entitled “The Revival of the Western Empire for the Benefit of Otho I (962)” ([64], page 206). Thus, we see the rulers standing at the roots of the two empires under comparison to bear the same title of “Restorer” or “Reviver” of the City (or the State). Let us point out the fact that the dates 962 and 965 all but coincide with the parallel date – 971 (see above).

3a. The Second Roman Empire. After a 1053-year shift forwards in time, the dissolution of the Second Empire falls on the year 1270 A.D. This is where the end of Caracalla’s reign gets relocated (the alleged year 217 A.D.) Caracalla is the last emperor of the Second Empire; what we see after his reign is an 18-year period of wars (the alleged years 217-325 A.D. – the so-called Gothic War of the III century A.D. This is the epoch of Julia Maesa and her minions (see Chron2, Chapter 1).

■ 3b. Empire of the X-XIII century. The decline of the Holy Roman Empire is somewhat “marred” by the war and covers the period between either 1252 or 1254 and 1256 ([64]). 1254 is considered the year when the Empire of the X-XIII century ceased to exist officially, according to the Scaligerian chronology ([64], table on page 250). It is significant that the year 1254 is very close to the “parallel date” – 1270 A.D., qv above. Therefore we witness the datings of the rise and the fall of both empires under comparison to concur very well with each other if one is to consider a 1053-year shift. This period (ending in 1256) is followed by 17 years of anarchy and interregnum in Italy and Germany (1256-1273, qv in [76], Table 25. The durations of both “parallel wars” identifying as one and the same war are almost identical – 18 and 17. The parallelism is thus manifest in a very obvious manner.

4a. Second Empire. A large amount of “ancient” Roman golden coinage from the epoch of the Second Empire has reached our day (see [1070], [1163] and [1164]). See Chron1, Chapter 1 for more details. For the most part, these coins are of very fine mintage and resemble the golden coins of mediaeval Europe in quality as well as subjects – for instance, the ones minted in the XIV-XV century Italy. It may well be that these coins were made in the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century A.D., but became misdated by chronologists and “time-travelled” into a “distant age”.

■ 4b. Empire of the X-XIII century. It is most peculiar that there are hardly any golden coins from the Holy Roman Empire left in existence ([1070], [1163] and [1164]). See Chron1, Chapter 1. This bizarre fact was noticed by numismatists a long time ago, spawning a great many explanatory theories in numismatic literature. These coins are most probably known to us under a different name and erroneously dated to the epoch of the Second Empire, the chronological shift equalling 1053 years.

5a. Second Empire. The decline of this empire is roughly dated to the alleged year 217 A.D. It is interesting that in the Third Roman Empire of the alleged III-VI century A.D. the amount of golden coinage is drastically lower than in the
Second Empire that is supposed to have preceded it. Our explanation of this effect is a very simple one: most of these coins remained in their “rightful place”, that is, the XIV-XVII century A.D.

5b. Empire of the X-XIII century. In 1252 Italy “begins” to mint full-weight golden coins – quite unexpectedly for Scaligerian history ([1070], pages 20-21). Bear in mind that the end of the Second Roman Empire falls on the alleged years 1263-1270 A.D. after a 1053-year shift forwards. This dating is very close to 1252 A.D. Thus, the numismatic data for both of the parallel empires concur well with each other if we are to consider the 1053-year shift.

6a. Second Empire. This state is of a distinct republican/imperial character, and combines elements of a republic with those of an empire. 6b. Empire of the X-XIII century. The Holy Roman Empire also has manifest characteristics of a republic and an empire; said institutions managed to coexist. The famous mediaeval Roman republic blossoms in the period of 1143-1155.

7a. Second Empire. Some of the emperors here share the formula of Germanicus Caesar Augustus between themselves as a common part of their respective full names – the emperors Germanicus, Caligula, Claudius, Nero and Vitellius, for instance ([72]; see also CHRON2, Chapter 1). 7b. Empire of the X-XIII century. The rulers of the Holy Roman Empire have simultaneously been Roman emperors and German Kaisers Augusti ([64], page 250). Thus, their full names would include the same formula of “Germanicus Caesar Augustus”, Kaiser being a version of Caesar.

8a. Second Empire. A famous eruption of the Vesuvius took place in the alleged year 79; this resulted in the destruction of Pompeii, the “ancient” town ([389]). This eruption is the only one observed over the first two centuries of the new era according to the Scaligerian chronology, qv in fig. 2.86. Let us quote the entire list of Vesuvius’ eruptions that became reflected in the chronicles of the last two alleged millennia (taken from page 28 of [389]). We have the Scaligerian Anno Domini datings before us: 79 A.D., 203, 472, 512, 685, 993, 1036, 1049, 1138, 1139, 1306, 1500, 1631, 1660, 1682, 1694, 1698, 1701, 1704, 1712, 1717, 1730, 1737, 1751, 1754, 1756, 1760, 1766, 1767, 1770, 1771, 1773, 1774, 1775, 1776, 1777, 1778, 1779, 1786, 1790, 1794, 1804, 1805, 1806, 1810, 1811, 1813, 1817, 1822, 1831, 1833, 1834, 1835, 1839, 1841, 1845, 1847, 1847. The following report of V. Klassovsky is of a great interest to us: “some scientists (N. Ignarra, Laporte-du-Theil. v. magasin encycloped. 1803. t. IV. P. 145 Sqq.) tried to prove that it had not been the 79 A.D. eruption of the Vesuvius that brought Pompeii to the condition it was discovered in at the end of the XIX century. Indeed, Suetonius and Cassius Dio testify that Emperor Titus gave orders to represtinate it forthright, and so Pompeii continued to exist as a town under Hadrian and the Antoninii; it can even be seen on the Peutinger Map (Tabula Peutingeriana) which is dated to the IV century. However, since there are no subsequent references to Pompeii anywhere, it is presumed that it was destroyed by the eruption of 471 the earliest” ([389], pages 28-29). Thus, we find out that Pompeii may have been destroyed a great deal later than 79 A.D. – in the alleged years 471 or 472 A.D., or four centuries later. Now let us try and estimate whether these two “ancient” eruptions of the Vesuvius can be phantom reflections of their mediaeval originals misplaced by the 1053-year shift.

8b. Empire of the X-XIII century. In fig. 2.86 one sees perfectly well that all three Vesuvius eruptions of the first alleged centuries of the new era (the ones dated to 79, 203 and 472 A.D.) are most likely to be phantom reflections of mediaeval eruptions of 1138-1139, 1306 and 1500 A.D. Thus, the “ancient” town of Pompeii had most probably been wiped out by the eruption of 1500 A.D. – in the beginning of the XVI century, that is. Its first partial destruction could have taken place in 1138-1139 A.D. Then both these eruptions “time-travelled” into the past as a result of the 1053-year shift and trans-
formed into the eruptions of the alleged years 79 and 472 A.D. Let us point out that the 1138 eruption of Vesuvius had been an extremely powerful one ([544], Volume 2, page 106; also [389], page 28). It is reported that “Mount Vesuvius was disgorging fire for 40 days” (quoting after [544], Volume 2, page 107). The chronicle of Falcone Beneventano dates this eruption to 1139. Let us point out that after a 1053-year shift forwards, 79 A.D. becomes 1132 A.D., which is a mere six years away from 1138 A.D. This discrepancy is infinitesimal considering the millenarian value of the chronological shift. Fig. 2.87 depicts the 1822 eruption of Vesuvius (an old engraving taken from [544], Volume 2, page 124, ill. 60).

**Commentary.** In Chapter 1 of CHRON1 we already discussed the fact that the archaeological findings from the “ancient” Pompeii are amazingly similar to their mediaeval counterparts in style and nature. Everything fits perfectly. If the eruption of 1500 (or even that of 1671) is to blame for the fate of Pompeii, it makes perfect sense that the destroyed city was mediaeval. The fossilized dust was removed during excavations, unveiling the quotidian realities of an Italian town the way it had been in the end of the XV century A.D. One should hardly wonder that V. Klassovsky cannot refrain from making the following perplexed com-
ment to the engravings included in his book entitled *A Systematic Description of Pompeii and the Artefacts Discovered There*: “The picture of a bronze saucepan from Herculaneum can be seen in engraving XIII, number eight; if we’re to compare it to the kind used nowadays, we shall discover them to be completely identical, which is most curious in itself” ([389], page 238). Nothing curious here; the “ancient” inhabitants of Pompeii were using saucepans resembling modern ones towards the end of the XV century. We begin to realise why Rafael’s frescoes are so much like the ones found in Pompeii (see Chron1, Chapter 1). Rafael and the “ancient” Pompeian artists have lived in the same epoch and the same country (Italy); thus, they all painted in a similar manner.

**Commentary.** The famous astronomer Claudius Ptolemy is presumed to have lived in the II century A.D., or the epoch of the Second Roman Empire. In fig. 2.88 we can see a portrait of the “ancient” Ptolemy from a star chart by Albrecht Dürer dated to the alleged year 1515 ([515], page 185; also [90], page 9). Ptolemy’s “ancient” attire is most peculiar indeed! For instance, he is wearing a silk hat, which wasn’t worn at any epoch preceding the XVII-XVIII century. Historians have naturally discovered this fact a long time ago, but tend to comment it with the utmost caution, rounding off rough chronological corners – for instance, they say that “one can see Ptolemy dressed in quite as strange a manner in the top right corner [of the map – A.F.]” ([515], page 187). A propos, modern historians are also irritated by how the “ancient” astronomer Aratus is represented in the top left corner of the map ([515], page 187) since it contradicts the consensual concept of “ancient clothing”.

Another question that arises in this respect is when Dürer’s star chart could really have been created. It appears that early XVI century is too early – no silk hats existed at that time. Dürer’s famous work isn’t likely to predate the XVII century.

Let us now return to the time when the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century was just being founded. We find out that yet another duplicate of the Trojan = Tarquinian = Gothic War wound up right here, in the X century. We shall linger on it for a short while.

### 8.3. Empire of the X-XIII century.
#### The parallelism between the X century war and the “ancient” Trojan = Tarquinian = Gothic War

9) *Empire of the X-XIII century. Senatrix Marozia = the “ancient” characters Tullia/Lucretia, Julia Maesa and Amalasuntha.* The epoch in question is the X century, the very dawn of the Holy Roman Empire. Scaligerian chronologers have placed another duplicate of the XIII century war here (the original of the “ancient” Trojan War, that is). We shall point out all the main parallels between the events in the X century Rome (presumably in Italy) and those of the Trojan = Tarquinian = Gothic War.

The duration of the period between 931 and 954 A.D. equals 23 years, which is rather close to the 26 years of the Gothic war that took place in the alleged VI century A.D.: 536-552. The “legend of a woman” plays an important part in the history of the Tarquinian = Gothic War; the woman in question is either Amalasuntha (the alleged VI century A.D.), Tullia/Lucretia from the same century, or Julia Maesa from the alleged III century A.D.
The X century duplicate of this scenario is the story of Marozia, the Roman Senatrix. Let us remind the leader that Titus Livy mentions a strong will for power among Tullia’s primary qualities ([482]); the Tarquinian coup in Rome was her idea. Chronicles dated to the X century A.D. nowadays characterize Marozia in the same way, telling us that “two minor popes followed John X; there aren’t any doubts that both of them were creatures of Marozia, who had become omnipotent by that point” ([196], Volume 3, page 240).

This story is most likely to duplicate the one of the “ancient” Amalasuntha = Julia Maesa. Bear in mind that Amalasuntha had made her sons Amalaric and Athalaric Gothic kings of Rome; in the X century Marozia handed power over to her son John XI and then to two more of her creatures. Just like back in the “ancient” days of Amalasuntha = Julia Maesa, “she [Marozia – A. F.] had been the de facto secular ruler of the city [Rome – A. F.], with power to appoint popes… thus came the time when the Church and all of Rome were tyrannized by a woman” ([196], Volume 3, page 240).

10) Empire of the X-XIII century. Hugo, the X century King of Italy vs the “ancient” Tarquin the Proud. We have already witnessed the “ancient” husband of the ambitious Tullia, Tarquin the Proud, become superimposed over the Goths of the alleged VI century A.D., as well as the Hohenstaufens of the XIII century A.D. Apparently, Hugo, the husband of Marozia, King of Italy, also happens to be a phantom reflection of the Hohenstaufen (Staufen) clan shifted backwards in time by roughly 333 years. Don’t forget the negative attitude of the “ancient” Titus Livy to Tarquin the Proud and his wife Tullia; we witness the chronicles dated to the X century A.D. to refer to Hugo with similar animosity. We learn the following of King Hugo: “a perfidious, gripping and libidinous schemer, bold and lost to shame, ready to use any means to further the borders of his Italian kingdom in the most unscrupulous manner imaginable” ([196], Volume 3, page 241). As for Senatrix Marozia, we learn the following: “ambition made her send envoys to Hugo with the offer of her hand and power over Rome… her limitless greed for fame fed on the thought of changing the titles of senatrix and patricia for that of a queen” ([196], Volume 3, page 243).

11) Empire of X-XIII century. The legend of “a woman wronged”. Let us remind the reader that this legend plays a crucial role in the inchoation of the Trojan = Tarquinian = Gothic War (the rape of Helen in the Trojan War and Lucretia in the Tarquinian; the Gothic version of the alleged VI century tells us about the humiliation and incarceration of Amalasuntha. According to Titus Livy, this “harm inflicted upon a woman” led to a coup d’état, the exile of the kings from Rome and the subsequent formation of the Roman Republic. The same scheme is present in the chronicles dated to the X century nowadays.

The motif we encounter here is just the same – some woman was insulted during a marital rite. We learn of the following: “the scribes remain taciturn about the festivities that accompanied this amazing wedding [of Marozia and King Hugo – A. F.]. . . however, an unanticipated political upheaval in Rome makes it impossible for Hugo to become crowned Emperor… certain of his imminent and utter triumph, Hugo [the double of the “ancient” Tarquin the Proud – A. F.] had donned the manners of an arrogant suzerain, treating Roman aristocracy most scornfully” ([196], Volume 3, page 245). The X century king Hugo is an outsider in Rome, as well as the “ancient” Tarquin.

Then King Hugo “had put a mortal affront upon his young stepson Alberic who was opposing his mother’s wedding, since it had stood in his own way” ([196], Volume 3, page 245). Thus, Alberic is a double of the “ancient” Valerius, the hero of the Tarquinian War. Even their names possess a slight similarity if we’re to consider the flexion of B and V. Thus, Hugo insults Alberic mortally “by proxy of a woman”, likewise the “ancient” clan of the Tarquins, one of which had raped Lucretia and thus humiliated Valerius, the double of Alberic. Both duplicate versions emphasize the sexual undertones in this struggle for power.

The story dated to the X century nowadays informs us of the following details: “Insidious Hugo was already plotting to do away… with Alberic at the first opportunity… serving his stepfather as a page at the insistence of his mother, the youth had one day started to pour water over the king’s hands with resolved indexterity… and the latter had struck him in the face” ([196], Volume 3, page 245).
12). *The Empire of the X-XIII century. The uprising in the X century Rome = the exile of the kings in the “ancient” Tarquinian War.* Going back to the history of the Tarquinian War, let us remind the reader that, according to Livy, the “affront to a woman” leads to a civil uprising in Rome. The X century scenario is just the same: “burning with desire for revenge, Alberic… had called upon the Romans and inspired them with a speech wherein he had made it clear for everyone what utter humiliation it was to obey a woman and allow… coarse barbarians to be their rulers” ([196], Volume 3, page 245).

As we already know, the “ancient” Livy describes a similar situation, emphasizing the fact that the Tarquins were of a foreign origin, which made their rule a disgrace for Rome. The following happened in the X century: “the Romans rose in indignation… the people grabbed whatever arms they had and… rushed to besiege the castle of St. Angelus, the residence of Hugo and Marozia. The king decided to flee, since he did not aspire to face out the siege” ([196], Volume 3, page 245). This is most probably a reflection of the event described by the “ancient” Titus Livy as the exile of the Tarquinian rulers from Rome. Both duplicate versions (Livy’s as well as the X century version) tell us of the king fleeing Rome and surviving the upheaval.

We learn some curious details concerning these events: “like a runaway galley-slave, he [King Hugo – A. F.] climbed across the wall using a rope… and hurried to the camp of his troops” ([196], Volume 3, page 245). The “ancient” Titus Livy tells us the exact same thing, reporting that the troops of the banished king Tarquin were camped outside Rome. In the X century a.d. king Hugo “was forced to make his retreat with them, covered in dishonour… for he had lost his wife as well as the imperial crown” ([196], Volume 3, page 245).

Both duplicate versions that we have under study tell us that this event marks the end of the royal period in Rome; Titus Livy also tells us the “ancient” Valerius became a de facto ruler of Rome aided by Brutus. We see the same motif in the X century: “the Romans managed to liberate themselves from the king, the emperor and the temporal power of the pope with just one blow, having claimed the city’s independence” ([196], Volume 3, page 245). According to the “ancient” Titus Livy, this is how the Roman Republic came into being. The parallelism that we observe here is a very explicit one.

Alberic was “pronounced ruler of Rome… his first action had been the incarceration of his mother [Marozia – A. F.” ([196], Volume 3, page 245). One should bear in mind the similarities in the Gothic War, namely, queen Amalasuntha thrown into prison, qv above. F. Gregorovius is perfectly correct to point out that “the roots of this uprising were aristocratic, and thus Rome transformed into a republic for the patriciate” ([196], Volume 3, page 245). This is exactly how Livy describes the proclamation of the “ancient” republic.

Further we learn that “the revolution of 932 made away with the illegitimate power of a woman who abused the power of her gens… and her husbands, who had not been Roman [sic! – A. F.” ([196], Volume 3, page 245). The “ancient” Titus Livy was telling us the same story: the Romans overthrew the power of Tarquin, a foreigner, and his hyper-ambitious wife Tanaquil. We see this parallelism with the Tarquinian war continue into the X century: “the exile of Hugo [or the Exile of the Kings in Livy’s rendition – A. F.] was a means used by the Romans to make a loud and clear statement that they shall never accept foreign rule, neither royal nor imperial, and that the ruling power should be of a national origin… Rome transforms into a free secular state” ([196], Volume 3, page 246).

As is the case with “Livy’s ancient Rome”, the Republican senate “makes a sudden comeback” in the X century. We are surprised to discover the fact that “the historians of the IX and X century make numerous references to the Senate, likewise the documents of the epoch. Since the revival of the Roman Empire, when the titles of Emperor and Augustus were restored and even the post-consulate of the emperors made a comeback [just like the “ancient” Rome – A. F.], memories of the old days became animated again… the word “Senate” was used often enough for us to encounter it among the decrees of some ecclesial council” ([196], Volume 3, page 247).

Therefore, the historians who deny “the effective functioning of the Senate” in mediaeval Rome have reasons to think twice. We see all of the so-called “ancient institutions” present in mediaeval Rome – not
as “vague recollections” of any sort, as we are told nowadays, but real and valid structures of Roman power. The only question that remains is one of the identity of Rome in question; as we have mentioned many a time, it is most likely that the city in question is the New Rome on the Bosporus, or some other Rome – however, it could not have been the Italian Rome, which simply did not exist until the XIV century (in its capacity as a capital, at least).

13) The Empire of the X-XIII century. The X century Alberic = the “ancient” Valerius. According to Titus Livy, Publius Valerius, the leader of the Romans, becomes consul at the very dawn of the “ancient” Roman republic. We observe the same in the X century: the Romans vest all power in Alberic: “having made him [Alberic – A. F.] a lifelong consul, the Romans have marked his exclusive powers in the new Roman Republic [sic! – A. F.] by the title of the Senator of All Romans” ([196], Volume 3, page 250). All of the abovementioned events follow the version of the “ancient” Titus Livy almost word for word.

14) The Empire of the X-XIII Century. The demise of Alberic in the X century and the inauguration of his son Octavian. “Ancient” history describes it as the death of Julius Caesar and the inauguration of his stepson Octavian Augustus. The motif of the Greek woman Helen, who had played an important role in that epoch, is prominent in the course of the Trojan War. The X century chronicles also emphasise the Greek connections of Alberic. It is said that “Alberic’s aspirations to the hand of a Greek princess were frustrated… this marriage did not take place. The successes of the Greeks brought them closer to Rome day by day” ([196], Volume 3, page 255). The following events of “Alberic’s biography” – the wars with the banished king Hugo, the siege of Rome etc – are virtually identical to the respective events from the history of the Tarquinian War in the version of the “ancient” Titus Livy. We shall skip this material since a list of all parallels would prove rather bulky, and the general idea of this particular parallelism is becoming quite clear.

Alberic’s epoch in the X century is followed by that of his son Octavian. Bear in mind that the double of Alberic in the Second Roman Empire is none other but Julius Caesar. The following is told of the X century: “the temporal power vested in Alberic was inherited by his young son after the death of the father… we must… find the most honourable place amongst all mediaeval Romans for this “senator” [Alberic – A. F.]. The glory of Italy was all tied to his name in that epoch… he was worthy of being a Roman, and had deserved the title of Magnus [sic! – A. F.] well enough… the line of Alberic did not die with him and his son Octavian” [196], Volume 3, page 270. As we shall see below, this X century Octavian becomes identified as the famous Octavian Augustus from the Second Empire.

8.4. The “ancient” Second Roman Empire from the X-XII century A.D. and the XIII-XVII century A.D.

Apart from the parallelism mentioned above, the respective historical currents of both the Second Empire and the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century have three famous and powerful rulers at their very beginning. Lucius Sulla, Pompey Magnus and Julius Caesar constitute such a triad in the Second Empire; in the Holy Empire of the X-XIII century we see a similar trinity consisting of Otho I (The Great), Otho II (The Fierce), and Otho III (the Red, or Chlorus – compare to the Third Empire). Let us now study their “biographies”.

15a. Second Empire. The famous emperor Octavian Augustus from the alleged I century b.c. – the beginning of the I century a.d. Let us remind the reader that Octavian Augustus was the adopted son of Julius Caesar, qv in CHRON2, Chapter 1. It has to be pointed out that a large number of “ancient” golden coinage minted under Octavian Augustus had reached our day. The numismatic catalogue [1142] dedicates several pages to the description of these coins ([1142], pages 44-46). As we shall witness, this “ancient Octavian” is also rather obviously manifest in the Scaligerian history of the alleged X century a.d.

15b. Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval Octavian from the X century a.d. The imme-
diate predecessor of Otho I is Octavian, the son of Alberic. Bear in mind that the mediaeval Alberic is a double of the “ancient” Valerius, or Julius Caesar, qv above. The name Alberic (or Alveric) is somewhat similar to that of Valerius. F. Gregorovius tells us that “upon the demise of Alberic, his young son… Octavian became recognized as the legitimate ruler and senator of all Romans with no objections from any part… he inherited full temporal power… no coins from Octavian’s epoch have survived until the present day, but it is certain that he had minted coins with his name and title as well” ([196], Volume 3, page 278). Let us point out that “ancient” coins of the “ancient” Octavian Augustus had no problems with surviving until our age, qv above. Therefore, these golden coins were probably minted by the mediaeval Octavian in the alleged X century and subsequently thrown backwards in time, winding up in the phantom Second Empire and having thus effectively disappeared from the Middle Ages. And so, what we see in the numismatic catalogue that we are referring to is but a variety of mediaeval Octavian’s coins – the ones ascribed to the “ancient Octavian”.

16a. Second Empire. The “ancient” Octavian Augustus, stepson of Julius Caesar, had been 19 when he was crowned emperor in Rome. See Chron2, Chapter 1.

■ 16b. Empire of the X-XIII century. Virtually the same is reported of the mediaeval Octavian: “Octavian [son of Alberic, Julius Caesar’s double – A. F.] had hardly been 16 when he became the ruler of Rome” ([196], Volume 3, page 278). The identification of the “ancient Octavian” as his mediaeval namesake that was made with the use of our empirico-statistical methods had been manifest in certain episodes before; an expert in the history of the “ancient” and mediaeval Rome of such magnitude as Gregorovius couldn’t fail to notice the parallelism in question. This is how he comments upon it: “pride and ambition made Alberic call his son Octavian, possibly harbouring the bold hope that his line would become imperial at some point” ([196], Volume 3, page 278).

17a. Second Empire. The “ancient” Octavian Augustus received the title “Augustus” (The Holy). He had been both the temporal and the ecclesial leader of the Second Empire ([327]). This concurs well with the fact that his mediaeval double and namesake had occupied the Holy papal See, as we shall witness below ([196], Volume 3, page 278).

■ 17b. Empire of the X-XIII century. “In autumn 955… the young ruler of the Romans becomes a pope. No one, excepting the Soracentine scribe, mentions Octavian receiving any kind of theological education… Octavian changed his emperor’s name to that of John XII” ([196], Volume 3, page 278). Also remember that the “ancient” Octavian remained the temporal ruler of Rome after having received the title of Augustus (the Holy); the same is true for his mediaeval namesake who remains the temporal ruler of Rome despite his holy papal title. “However, John’s [XII – A. F.] propensity for being a secular ruler was a lot greater than his willingness to take on ecclesial duties, and so his two natures – Octavian’s and John’s – were locked together in unequal struggle… Pope John XII… gave praises to the ancient gods” ([196], Volume 3, page 279).

What we observe here is easily understandable. We see Gregorovius the historian run into multiple indications suggesting mediaeval Rome to be full of “anachronisms”, which makes him theorize about mediaeval Romans being extremely fond of “recollecting the antiquity” and “reviving ancient customs”.

18a. Second Empire. The “ancient” Octavian Augustus spreads the Roman influence over vast territories ([327]).

■ 18b. Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval Octavian does the same. “We know little about the state of affairs in Rome in the first years of John’s pontificate… the young man…
being both the sovereign and the pope, decided to launch several daring projects and extend his power far into the South” ([196], Volume 3, page 279).

19a. Second Empire. The “ancient” Octavian Augustus had reigned for 37 years: 23 B.C. to 14 A.D., qv in CHRON2, Chapter 1. He was succeeded by Tiberius, who had ruled for 23 years between the alleged years 14 and 37 A.D.

19b. Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval Octavian soon hands power over to Otho I the Great, who succeeds Octavian in a peaceful manner and continues to make Rome a stronger state. Octavian crowns Otho I in the alleged year 962: “Imperial power was thus... given to a foreign house of Saxon kings. One of Charles’ greatest successors was crowned by a Roman, whose name had been Octavian – what a bizarre twist of fate!” – as we see, Gregorovius remains perplexed ([196], Volume 3, pages 280-281).

If this transfer of power also gave a new name to Otho I (that of Octavian, which is what some of the chroniclers believe), we get a very important reign length correspondence – Otho I had reigned for 37 years (936-973 A.D.) as a German king; the reign duration of his “ancient” double Octavian also equals 37 years, qv above. Furthermore, his successor, Otho II, had ruled for 23 years (960-983 A.D.), which equals the reign duration of his double, Emperor Tiberius, qv above.

20a. Second Empire. This empire fights large-scale wars in the East ([327]).

20b. Empire of the X-XIII century. This is the epoch of the famous crusades. Once again, F. Gregorovius, being well aware of both the “ancient” and the mediaeval history of Rome, points out an obvious parallel: “these bicentenary military developments in Europe [the crusades – A. F.] were a very strong influence, much like the Eastern Wars fought by the ancient Rome” ([196], Volume 3, page 410).

21a. Second Empire. Lucius Sulla rules in Rome between the alleged years 82 and 78 B.C.; he had presumably been titled Restitutor Urbs, or “Restorer of the City (State)”. Lucius Aurelian, the first emperor of the Third Empire, is supposed to have possessed a similar title (see the parallelism described in Chron2, Chapter 1). Therefore, we come across the title of “Restorer” in the early history of the Second Empire, likewise the Third, likewise the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century (Otho I was titled similarly, qv above).

21b. The Habsburg (Nov-Gorod?) Empire. A summary shift of 1386 years (1053 years + 333 years) identifies the Habsburg (Nov-Gorod?) Empire of the XIII-XVII century as the Second Roman Empire, qv in Chron1, Chapter 6. This places the beginning of the “ancient Sulla’s reign” somewhere around 1304 A.D. The ruler that we see at the very beginning of the Habsburg Empire is Rudolf Habsburg (1273-1291). He is also known for his title of the “Restorer of the Empire” ([196], Volume 5, page 368). Scaligerian history therefore reports yet another “revival” of this sonorous title – however, such “revivals” are more likely to be of a mythical nature. Considering the shifts that we have discovered, one sees several rulers with the same title of “Restorer” superimpose over each other and transform into the same king (from Nov-Gorod, or “New City”) who had founded the Empire at the end of the XIII – beginning of the XIV century A.D.

Commentary. The wrath of the XIII century Pope = the wrath of the “ancient” emperor Sulla. The parallelism between the Second Empire and the Habsburg Empire is so obvious that the historian F. Gregorovius could not fail to mention it in the following rather grandiloquent piece of commentary: “Palestrina [Pale-Strana, or Belaya Strana – the Slavic for “White Land”? – A. F.] surrendered to the pleas [of Pope Boniface – A. F.] Both cardinals... came dressed in funereal garments [in 1298 – A. F.]... and fell to the Pope’s feet... Palestrina and all of the fortifications... were surrendered instantly. Pope’s hatred for the mutineers... knew no limits. The punishment that he
hastened to inflict upon Palestrina revealed his intentions. A strange fate poured the same cup of wrath over this city of fortune twice, with a long interval [one of 1386 years – A. F.]. After the capitulation of Praeneste, Sulla had levelled the town; 1400 years later [Gregorovius rounds 1386 off to 1400 – A. F.] the same town of Praeneste surrendered to the Pope, who had also stamped it out of existence with ancient Roman wrath” ([196], Volume 5, page 431).

In full accordance with the “ancient” events that were supposed to have taken place 1400 years earlier, “all of it ceased to exist in a mere couple of days… the ruins were ploughed over and salted. Boniface VIII apparently liked to emulate ancient Romans in his actions [theorizes Gregorovius – A. F.]” ([196], Volume 5, pages 432-433). The “emulated ancient Roman” in question is Sulla.

Therefore, according to the opinion of the eminent Scaligerite historian, the mediaeval Pope was exceptionally well-read and fond of ancient history, trying to emulate the “role models from the days of yore” in every which way. What we’re being told is that the pope artfully copied his own life from the “ancient books” – rising early in the morning just to open the “classics” on the right page and learn about the course of his actions for the day. All this bizarre and far-fetched explanatory activity becomes useless once one realizes that what we see is but a manifestation of the chronological shift that duplicated real mediaeval events and sent their copy into a distant epoch in the past (see fig. 2.89).

F. Gregorovius describes the end of the parallelism as follows: “he [Boniface – A. F.] had really destroyed one of Italy’s oldest cities, who had once died in her ancient past… Boniface followed the example of Sulla, who had made a military colony settle on the site of the destroyed city, when he had ordered the wretched townsfolk… to build their new homes
nearby. They built their huts upon a lowland” ([196], Volume 5, pages 432-433).

22a. The Second Empire. Ptolemy’s famous Almagest is supposed to have been written in the reign of Antoninus Pius, the Roman emperor who had reigned in the alleged years 138-161 A.D., qv in Chron1, Chapter 1.

■ 22b. The Habsburg (Nov-Gorod?) Empire. The famous emperor Maximilian I reigns in 1493-1519 A.D. A shift of about 1386 years identifies his reign as that of the ancient Antoninus Pius (see fig. 2.89). Indeed, a summary shift of 1053 + 33 = 1386 years places the “ancient” Antoninus Pius into the XVI century A.D., superimposed over the period of 1524-1547 A.D., which is close to the epoch of Maximilian I. Let us also remind the reader that it was in the reign of Maximilian I (1493-1519) and Maximilian II (1564-1576) that the publications of Ptolemy’s Almagest began – presumably “re-discovered at last” after many centuries of oblivion. The first Latin edition comes out in 1537, the Greek one – in 1538, the “translation” of the Trebizond edition is published in 1528 etc. Let us also recollect the fact that Maximilian’s name contains the formula Maximilian Kaiser Pius Augustus, qv in Chron1, Chapter 6 (Dürer’s engravings). It turns out that the Almagest could really have been created in the XVI century A.D. “in the reign of Emperor Pius”, or Maximilian Pius, hence the reference to a “Pius” in the Almagest. Therefore, the XVI century author of the Almagest didn’t deceive anyone by the inclusion of the ruler regnant at the time of the observations. As we are beginning to realise, most of them took place under Maximilian I; however, some of the data – the star catalogue, for instance – could have been obtained from earlier works on astronomy – those dating to the XI-XV century A.D. See Chron3, and also fig. 2.89.

23a. The Second Empire. The second half of the alleged I century A.D. is marked by the activity of the famous Vitruvius, “a Roman architect and engineer... the author of the tractate entitled Ten Books on Architecture containing a study of many issues pertinent to urbanism, engineering, technology and art, and encapsulating the entire body of Greek and Roman architectonic science” ([797], page 227). Modern scientists have made numerous references to the far-reaching parallels between the works of “ancient Vitruvius” and the mediaeval architect Alberti ([18] and [544]).

■ 23b. The Habsburg (Nov-Gorod?) Empire. The famous Italian architect Leon Battista Alberti (1414-1471) lives and works in the XV century ([18], page 3). In Chapter 1 of Chron1 we point out obvious parallels between his work and that of the “ancient” Vitruvius ([18] and [544]). In particular, Alberti writes a famous tractate in the XV century that happens to bear the very same name – Ten Books on Architecture ([18], page 50). It turns out that a shift of approximately 1386 years makes the epochs of Vitruvius and Alberti coincide for the most part, qv in fig. 2.89. Apparently, the “ancient Roman architect Vitruvius” is merely a phantom reflection of the mediaeval Italian architect Alberti. Even the name “Vitruvius” contains what can be seen as traces of “Alberti” (or “Alverti”). Scaligerian history created an ink-and-paper duplicate of Alberti and sent it 1400 years backwards in time where it had transformed into “the great ancient scientist Vitruvius”, whilst the original remained in its due place. We did not compare their “biographies” in detail, which would be an interesting undertaking.

24a. The Second Empire. The famous Roman historian Tacitus is said to have been active in Rome around the alleged years 58-117 A.D. ([797], page 1304). Some of his books contain descriptions of “the ancient Rome”.

■ 24b. The Habsburg (Nov-Gorod?) Empire. In Chapter 7 of Chron1 we were telling the readers about Poggio Bracciolini, a famous Renaissance writer who had lived in the first half of the XV century ([21], [1195] and [1379]). Scientific literature contains many rather ex-
plicit indications of the fact that Poggio himself had in fact been the author of the “ancient oeuvres of Tacitus” that he had “discovered” ([1195] and [1379]). As we are capable of seeing now, the 1386-year shift does indeed superimpose the epoch of the “ancient Tacitus” over that of the mediaeval Poggio Bracciolini (see fig. 2.89). Ergo, what we observe here is most probably yet another case of what had happened to Vitruvius and Alberti – “Tacitus” is but an alias of the XV century writer Poggio Bracciolini, who had spawned a doppelgänger on the pages of the Scaligerian history – one that wound up in the alleged 1 century A.D. under the name of Tacitus, while the original remained in the XV century.

25a. The Second Empire. The famous “ancient” Greek writer and historian Plutarch is active in the alleged years 45-127 A.D. ([797], page 1012).

25b. The Habsburg (Nov-Gorod?) Empire. The famous writer and poet Petrarch is active in Rome in the XIV century (1303-1374; see [797], page 993. In Chapter 7 of CHRON1 we entertained the idea that the “ancient Plutarch” might be a phantom reflection of the mediaeval Petrarch. In addition to those considerations, we discover that a shift of approximately 1386 years brings the two epochs close together, qv in fig. 2.89. By the way, this scheme demonstrates that Petrarch “pre-dates” Plutarch on the time axis. Another theory that we propose in the same chapter is that the dating of Petrarch’s lifetime needs to be brought somewhat closer to our epoch, which would give a perfect mutual superimposition of these two characters.

26a. The Second Empire. We can call this empire “Holy” in the sense that all of its rulers, beginning with Octavian, bear the title “Augustus” – “Holy”.

26b. The Empire of the X-XIII century. Its official name is “The Holy Roman Empire”, and it has been known as such ever since the XII century. Historians are of the opinion that this empire was a “holy institution” ([459], Vol. 1, p. 153).

27a. The Second Empire. The “ancient” emperor Marcus Aurelius had reigned in the alleged years 161-180 A.D.

27b. The Empire of the X-XIII century. A shift of approximately 1053 lifts Marcus Aurelius into late XII century at the very least, and becomes identified with the emperor Otho IV the Guelph (1198-1218). In Chapter 7 of CHRON1 we report that, according to certain mediaeval sources, the famous equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius was made in the XII century and presumably erected in Rome ([196], Volume 4, page 568), comment 74. All of that notwithstanding, this statue is also considered “extremely ancient” – an artefact of the Second Empire, no less. It is one of the most famous “ancient” Roman relics. The explanation of this fact already presented itself to us: the “ancient Marcus Aurelius” is merely a reflection of Otho IV; therefore, his statue could not have been erected before the XII century, and its “journey backwards in time” is merely a consequence of the erroneous Scaligerian chronology.

8.5. Identifying the Third Roman Empire as the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century as well as the Habsburg Empire of the XIV-XVII century. A 720-year shift and a 1053-year shift

In fig. 2.90 we see the already familiar parallelism between the Third Roman Empire of the alleged III-VI century A.D. and the Holy Roman Empire of the alleged X-XIII century A.D. The proximity coefficient here equals $2.3 \times 10^{-10}$, qv in CHRON1, Chapter 6. The superimposition is observed with a 720-year shift; the primary common points are as follows:

1) Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval Frederick II = the “ancient” Theodoric.

The end of Friedrich’s reign in the mediaeval Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century (namely, the alleged year 1250) coincides with the last reign year of Theodoric the Goth – 526 A.D. (after a 724-year shift).
Chapter 2 The Famous Reform of the Occidental Church in the XI Century…

Average reign end shift equals 723 years, which is close to 720.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman Empire of the X-XIII century A.D.</th>
<th>The Third Roman Empire of the IV-VI century A.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Otto III the Red (Chlorus!) (983-1002)</td>
<td>Constance I Chlorus (293-306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry II (1002-1024)</td>
<td>Diocletian (284-305)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad II Salian (1024-1039)</td>
<td>Licinius (308-324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry III (1028-1056)</td>
<td>Constantine I (306-337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry IV (1053-1106)</td>
<td>Basil the Great (333-378)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry V (1098-1125)</td>
<td>Honorius (395-423)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lothair (1125-1137)</td>
<td>Theodosius I (379-395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad III (1138-1152)</td>
<td>Arcadius (395-408)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich I Barbarossa (1152-1190)</td>
<td>Theodosius II (408-450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry VI (1169-1197)</td>
<td>Valentinian III (423-455)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anarchy and Philip Ghibelline (1198-1208)</td>
<td>Anarchy, Recimer (456-472)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otto IV (1201-1217)</td>
<td>Anarchy, Odoacer (476-493)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedrich II (1220-1250)</td>
<td>Theodoric. 2 versions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final coronation in 1220 after the death of Otto IV.</td>
<td>either (497-526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or, Friedrich II (1196-1250) (co-ruler: Otto IV until 1218)</td>
<td>or Theodoric + Odoacer (526-526)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conrad IV (1237-1254)</td>
<td>Totila (541-552)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manfred (1254-1266)</td>
<td>Teia, or Teias (552-553)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conradine (1266-1268)</td>
<td>The end of the Third Empire in Italy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The end of the X-XIII century empire.
The defeat and decline of the Hohenstaufen dynasty

The end of the Roman Empire of the alleged X-XIII century A.D. and the Holy Roman Empire of the alleged X-XIII century A.D.

Fig. 2.90 The parallelism between the “ancient” Third Roman Empire of the alleged III-VI century A.D. and the Holy Roman Empire of the alleged X-XIII century A.D.
2) Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval Henry = the “ancient” Valens.

The mediaeval pair of Emperor Henry IV and “Hildebrand the Roman Pontifex” becomes identified as the “ancient” couple of Emperor Henry IV and St. Basil the Great, his famous contemporary. Bear in mind that the death of “Hildebrand” in 1085 coincides with that of St. Basil in the alleged year 378 after a 707-year shift, which is very close to 720 years, the average value of the shift.

3) Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval Otho III “the Red” = the “ancient” Constance Chlorus.

Furthermore, the mediaeval emperor Otho III (“the Red”), who died in the alleged year 1002, can be identified as the “ancient” emperor Constance I Chlorus, the latter being the word for “ginger”. We thus get a correspondence of names; both these emperors, in turn, merge into the single figure of the “ancient” Julius Caesar from the Second Empire, qv in Chapter 1 of Chron 2. It would be interesting to find out whether or not Julius Caesar had ginger hair.

4) Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval Conrad IV = the “ancient” Gothic kings.

The mediaeval emperor Conrad IV (Horde Khan?) from the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century becomes superimposed over the “ancient” dynasty of male Gothic rulers from the Third Empire after the shift – he had ruled after the death of Theodoric the Goth in the alleged year 526 A.D. and until the death of the Gothic king Totila in the alleged year 541 A.D.

5) Empire of the X-XIII Century. The mediaeval Manfred = the “ancient” Totila.

The mediaeval Manfred is identified as the “ancient” Totila, whilst the mediaeval Conradin’s double is the “ancient” Teia. The average date shift here equals 723 years – very close to 720. Let us relate the parallelism between the respective declines of both empires (the Third and the Holy).

6) Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval embroilment = the “ancient” strife.

History of the Third Empire tells us that Rome was in turmoil and anarchy after the alleged year 455 A.D., which is the epoch of Recimer and his minions (see Chron2, Chapter 1). A shift of 720 years reveals that Recimer also has a double in the Holy Empire of the X-XIII century: the reign of Philip the Ghibelline also ends in turmoil and anarchy. According to F. Gregorovius, “in 1198 the last visible remains of imperial power in Rome were finally wiped out” ([196], Volume 5, page 13).

A war breaks out here as well as in the Third Empire ([196], Volume 5, page 21). “The war raged anew at the end of the same year of 1199, when the strong man Pandulf from Subur was senator” ([196], Volume 5, page 23). It is possible that this mediaeval Subur (a native of Subur – possibly Siberia, or Sever – “the North”) became reflected in the “distant past” as Emperor Libius Severus (the alleged years 461-465 A.D.)


The following rulers are considered to have been principal figures in the epoch of the Third Empire’s decline (455-476 A.D.): Petronius Maximus, Avitus, Majorian, Recimer, Libius Severus, Anthemius (Procopius), Olybrius, Julius Nepos and Romulus Augustulus ([72]). 720 years later we observe a similar situation in the mediaeval Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century: “Rome was divided by the two opposing factions – the papists and the democrats… this violent urban conflict had been of a political nature” ([196], Volume 5, page 27).

Apart from the good concurrence of dates after a 720-year shift, we also see very conspicuous parallels between names: the “ancient” Severus = the mediaeval Subur; the “ancient” Petronius = the mediaeval Petrus; the “ancient” Recimer = the mediaeval Rainerius ([196], Volume 5, page 27).

8) Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval Otho IV = the “ancient” Odoacer.

We proceed to discover the superimposition of the mediaeval Otho IV over the “ancient” Odoacer. Their reign durations concur with each other very well indeed, qv in fig. 2.90. Otto IV is considered to have been a German, whereas Odoacer was the leader of the Germanic Heruli. The name Odoacer (Odo + CR) may have meant “Otho the Kaiser” or “Otho the Czar”. The “ancient” Odoacer ruled in Rome; the me-
mediaeval Otho IV had been “declared king upon the Capitol Hill” ([196], Volume 5, page 52).

9) Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval reign of Otho IV = the “ancient” reign of Odoacer.

The mediaeval Otho IV had reigned for 21 years as a German king: 1197-1218. His double, the “ancient” Odoacer, remained on the throne for 17 years (476-493 a.d.) The following fact is most curious: according to Volume 5 of [196], the mediaeval Otho IV was crowned King of Rome in 1201, which makes his “Roman reign” exactly 17 years long, 1201-1218, which coincides with the reign duration of the “ancient” Odoacer completely.

10) Empire of the X-XIII century. Parallels in the respective reign ends of the mediaeval Otho IV and the ancient Odoacer.

The end of the “ancient” Odoacer’s career was in close relation to the activity of Theodoric the Goth who had succeeded Odoacer on the Roman throne. Theodoric must have been a great deal younger than Odoacer. The career of Otho IV in the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century is also closely linked to the early activities of Frederick II, who had also been a great deal younger than Otho IV.


In the Third Empire Odoacer is at feud with Theodoric. As one should rightly expect, in the Holy Empire of the X-XIII century Otho IV also has a feud with Frederick II: “Otho… had a mortal foe in the heir to the Hohenstaufen estate… Frederick’s youthful figure lurking in the distance would never fail to make a strong impression” ([196], Volume 5, page 57).

12) Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval Frederick = the “ancient” Theodoric.

The “ancient” king Theodoric had been a Goth by birth, but his life was committed to the Third Roman Empire. The end of his reign marks the outbreak of the Gothic War of the alleged VI century. Similar events take place 720 years later, in the Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century: “Frederick became alien to the German nation from his early childhood… he had once again bound the destinies of Italy and Germany together, having immersed both nations… into a ceaseless struggle that would take over a century to die out” ([196], Volume 5, page 57). The epoch in question is the XIII century.

13) Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval Friedrich Gattin = the “ancient” Theodoric the Goth.

One cannot fail to notice the obvious similarity of the names Theodoric and Frederick (Friedrich). The “ancient” Theodoric was the king of the Goths; the title of his double, the mediaeval Friedrich (or Frederick – however, the I and not the II) also contains the word Goth in the form Gattin, qv on his coins in [1435], No 26 (the table). Furthermore, the word “Gattin” is very similar to the word “Hittite” – and we have already discovered the superimposition of the mediaeval Goths over the “ancient” biblical Hittites. Therefore, Friedrich must have been known as a Goth or a Hittite in the Middle Ages. It would also be appropriate to remember the German city of Göttingen – its name is probably derived from “Hettin” and “Genus”, or “the Hittite Genus”.

14) Empire of the X-XIII century. The two mediaeval Fredericks = the two “ancient” Tarquins. Events of the XII-XIV century a.d. on the pages of the Bible.

We have seen two Tarquins in the First Roman Empire described by the “ancient” Titus Livy: the kings Tarquin the Ancient and Tarquin the Proud. A similar pair can be observed in the Holy Empire of the X-XIII century – the emperors Frederick I and Frederick II.

We have already pointed out the parallelism between the “ancient” Judean and Israelite kingdoms, and the Third Roman Empire. However, since the Third Empire is but a reflection of the Holy Roman Empire (X-XIII century) and the Habsburg Empire (XIII-XVII century), the Biblical kingdoms must also be reflections of the same empires. This was discovered independently with the use of the dynastic parallelism method, qv related in Chron. Chapter 6; also see Chron.6 for more details. We shall just examine one of such parallel scenarios herein.

Above we have already given an account of our discovery that Frederick II can be identified as Theodoric the Goth. One also has to bear in mind that a number of mediaeval documents dating to the XVI cen-
we can see a mediaeval picture dating to the alleged year 1188 A.D. that portrays Frederick Barbarossa ([304], Volume 2, pages 294-295).

14b. The Third Roman Empire. Theodoric the Goth. He happens to be the ruler of both Rome and the Gothic Kingdom. Theodoric wages war on the New Rome; his troops are led by Vitalian. The main opponent of Theodoric is the Eastern Roman regent Anastasius, ruler of the New Rome. Vitalian leads Theodoric’s army against New Rome, but sustains a defeat.

14c. The Bible. II Kings. King Sennacherib. Sennacherib is the king of Assyria. As we have demonstrated above, Assyrians merge with the Goths, P-Russians, Germans or Russians. Sennacherib attacks Jerusalem, which once again becomes identified as the New Rome, or Constantinople. Sennacherib’s enemy is Hezekiah king of Judah, whom we have already identified as Emperor Anastasius, qv in CHRON1, Chapter 6. Sennacherib launches an unsuccessful assault against Rome (II Kings 19:35).

14a. Empire of the X-XIII century. This defeat of Emperor Frederick I Barbarossa (Ross the Barbarian?) is well-known event in the history of the Middle Ages, described in mediaeval chronicles in the following manner (according to modern historians, the chronicle in question refers to the Bible, which presumably already exists at that time, drawing parallels with Biblical events): “And the Lord sent an angel, which cut off all mighty men of valour, and the leaders and captains in the camp of the king of Assyria. So he returned with shame of face to his own land.” (II Chronicles 32:31). Gregorovius insists that “such is the imagery that Thomas of Canterbury weaves when he congratulates Alexander III [presumably the Pope – A. F.] with the retreat of Sennacherib, whose army was destroyed by the Lord... nearly all of the chroniclers [in their rendition of Frederick’s rout – A. F.] speak of divine retribution” ([196], Volume 4, page 496, comment 89).
This is how the famous legend of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, and his defeat, is told by the Bible: “And it came to pass that night [when Sennacherib the Assyrian besieged Jerusalem – A. F.], that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred fourscore and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses. So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned, and dwelt at Nineveh” (II Kings 19:35-36).

**Commentary.** Nowadays historians try to convince us that the mediaeval chroniclers deliberately employed the “ancient” Biblical imagery due to the Bible’s long-term existence as a source of great authority that it was customary to refer to, which is presumably the very reason why mediaeval scribes would often use archaic Biblical language to describe the events of their own epoch, disguising the contemporaneity in “ancient Biblical attire”. Our results demonstrate that the reverse is more likely to have been the reality. Only parts of the Bible had existed back then, qv in CHRON 1, Chapter 6; its entire bulk was created around that very epoch, the XI-XVI century. Therefore, what we see is not a case of chroniclers referring to the Bible, but rather that of assorted mediaeval chronicle fragments comprising the final canon of the Bible which was created relatively recently – in the epoch of the XV-XVI century.

We shall conclude with some details of the above-mentioned famous event (allegedly dating to the XII century A.D. – the defeat of Friedrich Barbarossa, or possibly Ross the Barbarian, which would then become reflected in the second book of the Kings as the defeat of Sennacherib king of Assyria (Russia?). F. Gregorovius relates the contents of mediaeval chronicles in the following manner: “Rome became the second Jerusalem, with emperor Frederick playing the part of the loathsome Sennacherib. On 2 August [of the alleged year 1167 – A.D.] dark clouds erupted over the city in a thunderstorm; the malaria, which is so perilous here in August, assumed the semblance of plague. The elite of the invincible army died a honourless death; equestrians, infantry and sword-bearers alike would fall ill and perish, often unex-pectedly, riding or walking along a street… Frederick lost his finest heroes in just seven days… death claimed a great multitude of hoi polloi and aristoi alike. Rome suffered from the plague just as much… the city hadn’t faced afflictions this horrendous for centuries… the Germans were gripped by panic; they were saying that the Lord poured his anger over them for attacking a holy city… the emperor was forced to break camp in despair already on 6 August; his army of ghostlike warriors set forth on their way back… more than 2000 of his people had died en route” ([196], Volume 4, page 484).

15) Empire of the X-XIII century. The parallelism between the Roman campaigns of the mediaeval Otho IV and the “ancient” Odoacer.

Likewise the “ancient” Odoacer, the mediaeval Otho IV the Guelph was “crowned king [of Germany – A. F.]… it had been declared that Otho would set forth against Rome” ([196], Volume 5, page 58). In full accordance with the scenario, the “ancient” Odoacer launches a campaign against Rome and conquers the city. We see history repeat itself in 720 years, when Otto IV gathers a great army in 1209 and conquers Rome after a successful campaign, becoming crowned king of Rome as a result. However, “the Senate and the armed citizens held the Capitol hill… the decisive battle took place in Leonine city; both sides sustained heavy casualties; finally, Otho managed to smite the opposition and become King and Emperor of Rome, conquering the entire Italy subsequently” ([196], Volume 5, page 66). Thus, the conquest of Italy by Otho in the Middle Ages became reflected as the Italian conquest of the “ancient” Odoacer after a shift of roughly 720 years backwards.

16) Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval Otho IV = the mediaeval Otho IV.

Actually, the 333-year shift is also manifest here. Indeed, 1209, the year Otho IV conquers Italy, becomes the year 976 after a shift of 333 years backwards. It is significant that the conquest of Italy by Otho I falls over this very year – more precisely, the period between 962 and 965. Otho I also conquers all of Italy; thus, certain biographical fragments pertinent to Otho I may reflect passages from a more recent “biography” of Otho IV.

The Pope summons young Frederick II to Italy so that he would assist him with getting rid from Otho IV ([196], Volume 5, page 66).

The “ancient reflection” of this event is a similar appeal of the Byzantine emperor Zeno to Theodoric the Goth – lead the Gothic troops to Italy and rule there instead of Odoacer. We re-emphasize the superimposition of the mediaeval Hohenstaufen dynasty over the “ancient” Goths. In Chron5 we also point out the parallel between the Goths and the nations of Gog and Magog – the Tartars and Mongols, in other words.

8.6. War of the XIII century as the original reflected in the “ancient” Trojan = Tarquinian = Gothic War

18) Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval war of the XIII century = the “ancient” Trojan = Tarquinian = Gothic War.

Bear in mind that the Gothic War began when the hostile Greek troops disembarked in Sicily. The Trojan version reflected this as the invasion of the “ancient” Greeks onto Isle Tenedos. We observe the same in the XIII century: Frederick II, the young king of Sicily in the Middle Ages, initiates an all-out war ([196], Volume 5, page 74).

His main ally was Anselm von Justingen ([196], Volume 5, page 71). We instantly recognize the “ancient” Justinian in this hero, the contemporary of the “ancient” Theodoric the Goth and the double of Frederick II. The Trojan = Gothic War is a crucial event in the “ancient” history; its original is the war of the XIII century a.d., of which we learn that “the moment that he [Pope Innocent – A. F.] had offered the King of Sicily [Frederick II – A. F.] to capture the Roman Crown had been one of the most fatal ones in the entire history of papacy. It had led to the struggle that proved destructive for both the church and the empire, and eventually the domination of the House of Anjou as well... as well as the “Avignon captivity” ([196], Volume 5, page 75). Below we shall see that the mediaeval “Avignon captivity” is the double of the “ancient” Babylonian captivity of the Judeans described in the Bible.

19) Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval couple of Otho IV and Frederick = the “ancient” couple of Odoacer and Theodoric.

In 1212 Frederick II enters Rome as king, and becomes the de facto co-ruler of Otho IV, who hadn’t been stripped of his rank yet. We see a carbon copy of this very situation in the “ancient” Third Empire where Theodoric and Odoacer ruled jointly for a while (see Chron2, Chapter 1). Then Theodoric the Goth defeated Odoacer the German in the Third Empire; we see the same happen in the Holy Empire of the X-XIII century: “after his triumph over the wretched enemy [Otho IV – A. F.], whose glory was tarnished on 27 July 1214 after the Battle of Bouvines, Frederick II became crowned... in Aachen” ([196], Volume 5, page 78).

20) Empire of the X-XIII century. The XIII century succession = the “ancient” succession.

Theodoric proceeds to concentrate all power in his hands in the alleged year 493, after the death of Odoacer in the Third Empire. A similar scenario develops in the Holy Empire of the X-XIII century: Frederick II inherits absolute power in 1218, after the death of Otho IV, the double of the “ancient” Odoacer. The dates (1218 and 493) are 725 years apart, which is close to the 720-year value of the shift.

21) Empire of the X-XIII century. The XIII century reforms = the “ancient” reforms.

In 1220 Frederick II gives Rome a constitution and instigates serious reforms ([196], Volume 5, page 97). This activity resembles the legislation reforms of the “ancient” Theodoric a great deal (see Chron2, Chapter 1). Just like the “ancient” kingdom of the Ostrogoths, the mediaeval Italian state of Friedrich II is also called a kingdom ([196], Volume 5, page 104).

22) Empire of the X-XIII century. Parallels between the Middle Ages and the antiquity that F. Gregorovius could not fail to notice.

The parallelism between the “ancient” Third Empire and the mediaeval Holy Roman Empire of the X-XIII century is conspicuous enough to have been commented upon by several historians in a variety of contexts. F. Gregorovius, for instance, writes that “in the
Middle Ages, Viterbo had played the same role for the Romans as Veas in the antiquity… the Roman populace [in the middle of the XIII century – A. F.] was riding a new wave of inspiration – like in the distant days of Camillus and Coriolanus [the epoch of the “ancient” Tarquinian War, according to Livy – A. F.], they set forth to conquer Tuscia and Latium… the battlefields would once again see the Roman banners bearing the ancient initials S. P. Q. R. against a golden-red field, as well as the national army consisting of Roman citizens and their allies from vassal cities led by senators” ([196], Volume 5, pages 126-127). Gregorovius is also perplexed by the fact that “it is amazing how… the Romans recollected the Roman customs, having put up border stones with the initials S. P. Q. R. to mark the boundaries of Roman jurisdiction” ([196], Volume 5, pages 129-130).

Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval Roman colours = the “ancient” Roman colours.

The official colours of the “ancient” Rome are considered to have been red and gold, qv above. However, we find out that the official colours of the mediaeval papal Rome had been the same: “red and gold remain the colours of the city of Rome until this day. It has been so since times immemorial, and the colours of the church had been the same… only in early XIX century the popes adopted white and gold as the ecclesial colours” ([196], Vol. 5, p. 141, comment 34).

Empire of the X-XIII century. The XIII century titles = the “ancient” titles.

We proceed to find out that “right about this time [in 1236 – A. F.], the Roman aristocracy added another title to the ones already in use, one of ancient origins – Romans of noble birth have started calling themselves proconsuls of the Romans upon the occupation of a high rank in the city council, without so much as a shade of self-irony”, as Gregorovius is amazed to tell us. “The ancient title of Consul Romanorum… had still been in use by that time” ([196], Volume 5, page 148).

We hear the voice of the “antiquity” ring loud and clear from the pages of mediaeval documents. To continue with quoting, “the loot taken at Milan was put up for demonstration on the Capitol hill, upon the hastily erected ancient columns” ([196], Vol. 5, p. 151).

25) Empire of the X-XIII century. The mediaeval Peter de Vineis = the “ancient” Boetius.

Let us reiterate that F. Gregorovius with his extensive knowledge of the Roman history keeps pointing out the parallels between the “antiquity” and the Middle Ages which can be explained well by the chronological shifts that we have discovered. For instance, he writes that “the death of Peter de Vineis, the famous capuchin citizen, cast a black shadow over the life of the great emperor [Frederick – A. F.], just like the death of Boetius had been the harbinger of Theodoric’s demise [sic! – A. F.]. Both of these German kings [the mediaeval Frederick II and the “ancient” Theodoric – A. F.] resemble each other in what concerns the end of their lives as well as the fast and tragic decline of their gentes” ([196], Volume 5, pages 202-203).

Both the mediaeval Vineis and the “ancient” Boetius fell prey to the emperor’s suspiciousness ([196], Volume 5, page 202). Kohlraush also compares Theodoric the Goth to Frederick II in [415], praising their wisdom and religious tolerance, among other things.

26) Empire of the X-XIII century. The XIII century Frederick II = the “ancient” Theodoric the Goth.

Kohlraush points out the following in his story of Frederick II: “he hadn’t been of great utility to Germany because of his partiality to Italy… a great many Germans would follow the Hohenstaufens to Italy” ([415], Volume 1, page 309). We observe a similar process in the “ancient” Third Empire – namely, the “hoards of Goths” that fill Italy. Titus Livy reports the same telling us about the advent of the “ancient” Tarquins to Italy.

The “ancient” Theodoric dies a natural death, just like the mediaeval Frederick II. Both of them are the last rulers of Italy before the outbreak of a disastrous war. One of the reign duration versions for Theodoric the Goth is 29 years (the alleged years 497-526 – see version #2 in CHRON2, Chapter 1). The Roman reign of Frederick II lasted 30 years. He was crowned in 1220 and died in 1250 ([5]). Reign durations are similar.

27) Empire of the X-XIII century. Frederick II as the “Pharaoh” in the XIII century.

F. Gregorovius refers to a number of ancient documents telling us that “Innocent IV had seen his great opponent [Frederick II – A. F.] as nothing but
the antichrist, or the Pharaoh” ([25], Volume 5, page 205). The term “Pharaoh” that appears here corresponds perfectly to the superimposition of the mediaeval epoch that we have under consideration presently over the Biblical description of the Trojan = Tarquinian = Gothic War, qv in Chron 2, Chapter 1.

When certain ancient documents use the word “Pharaoh” for referring to Frederick II, they confirm the parallelism between the mediaeval Roman history and the Biblical history of Israel and Judea. Frederick II had really been a pharaoh. However, we must also note that all these documents – papal epistles and the like – were edited in the XVII-XVIII century, when historians had already been of the opinion that the XIII century war and the Biblical war with the pharaoh were two unrelated events. Therefore, the entire Biblical terminology was declared to be “referring to deep antiquity” in mediaeval documents, notwithstanding the fact that it had really referred to mediaeval contemporaneity. Another detail that drew our attention was that the name Innocent may have originally sounded as “John the Khan”.

28) The X-XIII century Empire. Beginning of the XIII century war as the original of the Trojan = Tarquinian = Gothic War.

The primary parallelisms with the “antiquity” are as follows. The mediaeval Conrad IV can be identified as the “ancient” group of Gothic kings from the alleged VI century: Amalaric + Athalaric + Theodahad + Vittigis + Uriah + Hildebald, their summary reigns adding up to the period between the alleged years 526 and 541 a.D.

Further on, we discover that the mediaeval Manfred = the “ancient” Totila, the mediaeval Conradin = the “ancient” Teias (Teia), the mediaeval Charles of Anjou = the “ancient” Narses, and the mediaeval Innocent = the “ancient” Justinian.

Thus, the reign of Conrad IV (1237-1254) becomes superimposed over the dynasty of the Gothic kings (excluding queen Amalasuntha) that had reigned in the alleged years 526-541 a.D. A comparison of durations gives us 17 and 15 years, respectively – almost equal values. In 1252 Conrad IV invades Italy, starting one of the greatest wars in European history which would immerse the entire continent into the vortex of chaos for many a decade” ([196], Volume 5, page 213).

“The barons swore fealty to him... all cities up to Naples acknowledged his power” ([196], Volume 5, page 213). In the Gothic War of the alleged VI century, the ascension of the Goths to the Roman throne in 526-541 coincides with Justinian, Belisarius and Narses turning their attention to Italy and beginning an invasion. We see the same happen in the XIII century: “the achievements of Frederick’s sons [or, as we now understand, Theodoric’s “ancient Goths” – A. F.] made Innocent [John the Khan? – A. F.] set about the plan that was conceived a while back in Lyon... he decided to hand this kingdom over... to a foreign prince; this démarche proved fatal for Italy [a war began – A. F.]... he offered the crown of Sicily to Charles of Anjou, the brother of the French king” ([196], Volume 5, page 214).

29) Empire of the X-XIII century. Identifying certain mediaeval characters as their “ancient” doubles.

The mediaeval Charles of Anjou can therefore be identified as the “ancient” Belisarius/Narses. Bear in mind that Narses the commander-in-chief acts as a successor of Belisarius in the Gothic War of the alleged VI century. Innocent [John the Khan?] becomes identified as emperor Justinian – “the just”.

If we’re to reverse the unvocalized root of Conrad’s name (CNRD), we shall get DRNC – or the already well-familiar TRNK – Trojans/Franks/Turks/Tartars. The name Conrad can also be a reference to “Horde-Khan”, or the Khan of the Horde. Also, the title of the mediaeval Manfred von Tarent (see [196], Volume 5) transcribes as TRNT unvocalized. It is likely to be yet another modification of the name TRQN which is already known quite well to us. Thus, the names of the two key leaders of the Hohenstaufen dynasty (the Gog dynasty?) that appeared on the historical arena after the death of Frederick II are distinctly similar to the name TRQN. A propos, the successor of Manfred and the one to end the war is Conradin, whose unvocalized name also gives a version of TRNK reversed. The name Conradin might also stand for “Khan-Horde”, “KHAN ORDYNskiy” (“Khan of the Horde”) or “Khan Ratniy” (“The Warlord Khan”).

30) Empire of the X-XIII century. The XIII century Manfred = the “ancient” Totila.

Conrad IV dies in 1254 “lamenting his fate and the
misery of the empire whose decline he had foreseen" ([196], Volume 5, page 216). He is succeeded by the famous hero Manfred – the double of the “ancient” Gothic king Totila. Bear in mind that Totila had reigned for 11 years in the alleged years 541-552. Manfred had ruled for 12 years, 1254 (the year Conrad IV died) to 1266, the year of his death on the battlefield. The same fate befalls his “ancient” double Totila (see Chron2, Chapter 1). Thus, we see that the durations of the parallel reigns (11 and 12 years, respectively) concur well with each other.


Before the very death of Conrad IV, temporal power in Rome is inherited by Senator Brancaleone (BRNC + Leo?). This mediaeval Roman ruler had been an ally of Frederick II: “he had taken part in the Lombardian War fighting on the side of Frederick” ([196], Volume 5, page 226). Brancaleone is a foreigner – not of Roman birth, like the “ancient” Goths. “When the foreign senator arrived in the city that had called him, he was given a honourable welcome [just like the “ancient” Goths that had ruled in Rome after Theodoric – A. F.]. This had been the first time [after the alleged VI century – A. F.] when the cream of the urban magistracy consisted of foreigners exclusively” ([196], Volume 5, page 233). It is reported that “the spirit of the ancients was reborn in this great citizen of Bologna [Brancaleone – A. F.]” ([196], Volume 5, page 252).

It is most peculiar that there are no traces of Brancaleone’s activities left anywhere in the Italian Rome – there are neither inscriptions nor monuments of any sort ([196], Volume 5). One is only right to wonder whether it is in fact true that the events in question took place in the city of Rome in Italy. Could it be that the chronicles were referring to an altogether different city – the New Rome on the Bosporus, for instance?


The enemies of Conrad and Manfred (the doubles of the “ancient” TRQN clan and Totila) in the XIII century war are the Pope and his ally, Charles of Anjou. The Pope is the “master of Rome”, and thus can be regarded as the “primary ancient king” of the Trojan = Gothic War. The Pope attempts to drive Manfred out of Italy ([196], Volume 5). The “ancient” Justinian was doing the very same thing in the alleged VI century, chasing the Goths away from Italy. Troy suddenly surfaces in many ancient chronicles in the context of this mediaeval war – particularly the references to Naples, or the New City. We learn that “the legate fled Troy; his army was scattered, and he hurried to Naples” ([196], Volume 5, page 238). Brancaleone in Rome and Manfred in Sicily enter into a pact, and face the “Pope/King united, just like the “ancient” Goths.

33) Empire of the X-XIII century. Galeana/Helen in the XIII century = the “ancient” Helen.

The wife of the mediaeval Brancaleone was called Galeana; her name is evidently similar to that of the Trojan Helen. Indeed, Helen (Helena) may well have been transcribed as Gelena or Galeana. Apart from that, there was a “real Helen” in the XIII century war – the wife of Manfred, a key historical figure of the epoch ([196], Volume 5, page 274). Moreover, this mediaeval Helen turns out to have been “a daughter of the despot of Epirus” ([196], Volume 5, page 174), which makes her Greek – likewise the “ancient” Trojan Helen.

34) Empire of the X-XIII century. The destructive war of the XIII century = the destructive Trojan War.

In the XIII century Italy was cast into utter devastation. For example, it is reported that in 1257 more than 140 fortified towers were destroyed in Rome ([196], Volume 5, page 250); the city in question is most likely to have been the New Rome on the Bosporus. The war had dire consequences for Germany as well: “exhausted by Italian wars [of mid-XIII century – A. F.], Germany drifted into a state of inner corruption and impuissance which the old empire never truly emerged from again” ([196], Volume 5, page 267).


In the Gothic war of the alleged VI century, the warlord Belisarius/Narses invades Italy from a foreign territory; the scenario “recurs” in about 720 years, when the Pope “made Italy open for a foreign ruler
yet again, who had come filled with greed and whose victory eradicated the national mentality” in the XIII century ([196], Volume 5, page 276).

Charles of Anjou was rather unexpectedly elected senator in Rome; he is supposed to have come from France as the leader of the French army. We see yet another superimposition of the French (PRS) over the “ancient Persians” (PRS once again).

Let us remind the reader that in the “ancient” Gothic War the Byzantine army of the Roman Greeks invaded Sicily first, qv above. The mediaeval invasion of the XIII century began similarly – Charles of Anjou launched a campaign against Sicily, which had been the domain of Manfred, the double of the “ancient” Goth Totila. We learn the following: “the Sicilian campaign of Charles of Anjou ranks amongst the boldest and most victorious undertakings of the crusaders in that epoch” ([196], Volume 5, page 286).

In 1266 Charles of Anjou becomes crowned King of Sicily. Once again, F. Gregorovius confirms the existence of a chronological shift without even being aware, pointing out the parallel that corresponds to the results of our research ideally. The text of Gregorovius deserves to be cited in its fullness:

“The sinister figure of Charles of Anjou enters the ancient arena that had seen many a battle between the Romanic and the Germanic nations just like Narses, whilst Manfred became the tragic representation of Totila. History made a cycle [sic! – A. F.], since although the balance of powers had been different, the actual scenario was virtually the same – the Pope summoning foreign invaders to Italy in order to liberate it from the German rule. The Swabian dynasty [of Frederick and the Conradines – A. F.] fell just like its Gothic predecessor. The amazing decline of both kingdoms and their heroes marks history by a double tragedy on the same classical arena, the second tragedy being a twin of the first” ([196], Volume 5, page 287).

It has to be mentioned yet again that all the parallels pointed out by F. Gregorovius are explained perfectly by the system of chronological shifts discovered by the authors inside the “Scaligerian textbook”.

The discovered superimposition of the mediaeval Charles of Anjou over the “ancient” Narses is unexpectedly confirmed by a comparative study of how these names were written.

The name Charles used to mean “king”, which is plainly visible on Charlemagne’s coins, for instance. On the XIII century coins we also see the name Charles transcribed as Karolus or Carolus ([196], Volume 5, page 296, comment 42) - “The King”, in other words. Therefore, the name Charles of Anjou may have simply meant “King of Anjou”, or Caesar (Cesar) D’Anjou; a shortened version would transcribe as Cesar-An; it obviously transforms into Narasec when read back to front, after the Hebraic or Arabic manner – virtually the same as “Narses”.

Therefore, some of the chroniclers may well have turned Charles of Anjou into Narses having reversed his name or vice versa. It goes without saying that the consideration in question is of a hypothetical nature and neither confirms nor disproves anything per se; however, in the row of consecutive parallelisms that we observe over a rather lengthy time period, it becomes worth something.

Let us conclude with the observation concerning Charles of Anjou being characterized as “a cold and taciturn tyrant” ([196], Volume 5, page 314) – in exactly the same terms as his “ancient” double Narses.

37) The “exile of the kings” in the XIII century = the “ancient” exile of the kings.

Bear in mind that in the Gothic War of the alleged VI century Belisarius captures Rome and banishes the Gothic kings that reign there ([695]). This event is identical to the exile of the kings described by Titus Livy ([482]). We see the same happen in the XIII century. Charles of Anjou, the double of the “ancient” Belisarius/Narses, captures the city of Rome: “his escapade of mad daring was accompanied by blind luck” ([196], Volume 5, page 287).

Charles of Anjou encounters no opposition in his invasion of Rome; his troops arrive from both the sea and dry land – the same happens in the VI century, qv in [196], Volume 5, pages 286-287. This “exile of the kings” from the XIII century Rome takes place in a relatively peaceful manner, without excessive bloodshed. The same is reported by Livy in his rendition of the Tarquinian War, ([482]) as well as the

36) The reasons why “King of Anjou” may have been read as “Narses”.

The reasons why “King of Anjou” may have been read as “Narses”.

The reasons why “King of Anjou” may have been read as “Narses”.
history of the Gothic War by Procopius ([695]). For instance, according to Procopius, Belisarius entered Rome peacefully, already after the departure of the Gothic troops, qv above. The troops of Charles of Anjou were met with similar exultation in the XIII century Rome.

38) Empire of the X-XIII century. The “poverty” of Charles of Anjou in the XIII century = the poverty of the “ancient” Belisarius/Valerius.

History of the alleged VI century characterizes Belisarius/Narses as a fortunate military leader. The same is told about the XIII century Charles of Anjou ([196], Volume 5, page 288). The motif of the “poverty” that befell Belisarius/Valerius is emphasized in the history of the Gothic War dating to the alleged VI century A.D. and the Tarquinian War of the alleged VI century B.C.

A similar scenario is constantly discussed in the chronicles referring to Charles of Anjou. Mark that the actual motif of a great hero being poverty-stricken is unique in itself, and its resurgence after many centuries cannot fail to draw our attention. We learn of the following: “the Count of Anjou arrives in Rome empty-handed” ([196], Volume 5, page 288). As the XIII century war progressed, there were more references to the poverty of Charles, such as “Manfred… was well aware of just how great a need for money was experienced by Charles in Rome…” it was seldom that an enterprise as great would be undertaken with such sparse funds… the poverty of Charles had been great, and his debts were numerous…” ([196], Volume 5, page 300). The lamentable financial condition of Charles of Anjou is described on several pages of [196], Volume 5 – 300 to 304.

39) The XIII century quarrel with the Pope = the “ancient” quarrel with the “King of Kings”.

The quarrel between Belisarius/Valerius/Achilles and the “main royalty” is paid a lot of attention in chronicles relating the events of the Gothic War (the alleged VI century A.D.), the Tarquinian War (the alleged VI century B.C.) and the Trojan War (the alleged XIII century B.C.), qv above. A similar event takes place in the XIII century.

What we see here is a somewhat odd quarrel between the Pope and Charles of Anjou, which is supposed to have happened “because of a house [sic!]” ([196], Volume 5, page 289). And it was precisely that, “a dwelling-place”, which served as reason for Valerius being accused of treason (see above). The XIII century events unfurled as follows: Charles of Anjou, upon his arrival in Rome, “had occupied quarters in Lateran without giving it a second thought” ([196], Volume 5, page 289). This had infuriated the pope, which led to a quarrel. Despite the fact that Charles had found a different residence eventually, animosity prevailed in his interactions with the pontiff, since both suspected each other of harbouring ambitions to seize absolute power. This opposition becomes particularly manifest towards the end of the XIII century war ([196], Volume 5, page 303). We have witnessed the same happen in the “ancient” biographies of Narses, Valerius and Achilles.

40) Empire of the X-XIII century. The XIII century letter to the Romans = the “ancient” letter to the Romans.

Narses was appointed vice-regent of Italy in the Gothic War of the alleged VI century, whereas his double, Charles of Anjou, received the right of “temporary rule with terms defined in the agreement” ([196], Volume 5, page 290). The situations are similar.

Furthermore, the chronicles of both the Gothic War and the Tarquinian War tell us that the king who had been banished from Rome addressed an admonitory epistle to the Romans, qv above. This missive is discussed in detail by the chroniclers of both duplicate wars, and deemed extremely important - Titus Livy and Procopius even quote its content. The same thing happens in the XIII century. Manfred, the double of the Goths and the Tarquins, sends a letter to the Romans. The second chapter of the 10th book from Volume 5 of [196] begins with a special paragraph entitled “Manfred’s epistle to the Romans” ([196], Volume 5, 298). Manfred’s missive is similar to its “ancient” duplicates from the Gothic and the Tarquinian versions.

41) Empire of the X-XIII century. The XIII century Battle of Troy = the “ancient” Battle of Troy.

The final phase of the Gothic War in the alleged VI century is marked by the brilliant victories of Belisarius and Narses; the XIII century war ends similarly.
We learn that “the conquest of Charles was but… endless scenes of disruption, misery and instant death. This campaign is distinguished by the rampancy and the ferocity of the French [PRS = Persians or P-Russians – A. F.]… the French started with assaulting the Cyclopean castle of Arce that stood on a steep slope and was considered an impregnable fortress [successfully – A. F.]… the entire vicinage was shaken by so unanticipated an event: 32 fortresses capitulated to Charles” ([196], Volume 5, page 305).

The fall of the New City = Naples = Troy signifies the culmination of the Trojan = Gothic War. We see the same events recur in the XIII century: the fierce battle of Beneventes and the New City (Naples, which is located in the vicinity of Beneventes) taken. The famous Italian city of Troy is located nearby (it exists to this day); we find out that “the Greeks built a fortified town not far from Beneventes [the epoch in question is mediaeval – A. F.] and named it after the immortal city of Troy” ([196], Volume 4, page 20). Apparently, this name appeared in Italy as recently as the XIII century, when the entire country was occupied by the troops of the king known to modern historians as Charles of Anjou. Then the events of the XIII century Trojan War were copied into the Italian chronicles; their epicentre had originally been in the New City = the New Rome on the Bosporus. We can thus compile the following parallelism table:

a. The Trojan version of the alleged XIII century b.c.: 1) The battle of Troy. 2) The fall of Troy.

42. Fierce battles of the XIII century war = the “ancient” Battle of Troy.

Let us provide a brief rendition of the final phase of the XIII century war, since it most probably served as the original for all the “ancient” wars – the Gothic, the Trojan and the Tarquinian. However, let us re-emphasize that the Scaligerian encapsulation of this war known to us today is very likely to contain severe distortions, the first of them being the transfer of the key events from the New Rome on the Bosporus to Italy, which had not possessed any sort of capital in Rome at that epoch.

Manfred, the double of Totila the Goth, “hastened to move his troops to Beneventes in order to block the passage to Naples [New City – A. F.] for Charles and engage in battle with the latter” ([196], Volume 5, page 307). The fall of the New City (Naples = Troy) is considered a great and tragic event in the “ancient” history of the Gothic War and the Trojan War, as well as the final battle at the walls of the city. We are told the same about the XIII century war: “each of the parties had 25,000 people maximum. It took several hours to bring the long and terrible war between the church and the empire, as well as the Romanic and Germanic peoples, to its final conclusion on a two-by-twice battlefield” ([196], Volume 5, page 309).

The looting and the destruction of the “ancient” Troy = New City after its fall is emphasized in both the Gothic and the Trojan version; the destruction of Beneventes is described in similar terms ([196], Volume 5, page 313). After that, Charles of Anjou, the double of Belisarius = Valerius = Achilles “entered Naples triumphant… this was the advent of the French [PRS, or P-Russian – A. F.] tyranny” ([196], Volume 5, page 315).

43) Empire of the X-XIII century. The death of young Manfred in the XIII century = the demise of young Totila in the alleged VI century.

The double of Manfred – Totila, King of the Goths, dies in the last battle of the Gothic War, the battle of Naples, or the New City. The Goths are defeated.

The very same situation repeats in the XIII century: “the valiant Germans, [the army of Manfred – A. F.] the last representatives of the German nation that ceased to exist with Frederick II, had fought and fallen as doomed heroes, just like the ancient Goths” – Gregorovius doesn’t hesitate to point out the parallel in [196], Vol. 5, p. 310. Manfred is killed in this battle, and becomes a legendary hero of the XIII century (ibid).

Bear in mind that Totila, King of the Goths also dies a young man (see [196], Volume 1, and above)
– likewise Manfred, his double: “Manfred died at 34; he had been as gallant as Totila in life and death alike. Just like this Gothic hero, whose brief life was full of glory, had restored the empire of Theodoric, Manfred made the Italian empire of Friedrich rise from the ruins and… fell prey to the luck of a foreign invader armed by the Pope” ([196], Volume 5, page 312).

Gregorovius is perfectly correct to point out the parallels between the “ancient” Totila and the XIII century Manfred as well as the “ancient” Theodoric, the XIII century Frederick II, and their respective empires.

We thus see that certain experienced historians would constantly refer to the most obvious parallels between the “antiquity” and the Middle Ages in a variety of contexts. However, they were forced to interpret them as either chance occurrences, or strange cyclic phenomena, trusting in the Scaligerian history and possessing no objective dating methods; either that, or they ignored the multitude of such facts altogether. This stance is easy to understand: they had no comprehension of the general picture of chronological shifts that spawn all such parallels.

44) Empire of the X-XIII century. The tragic fate of the XIII century Helen = the tragic fate of the “ancient” Helen.

A brief rendition of Helen’s biography in the history of the Trojan War is as follows: beauty – bride – war – death (see above and in [851]).

The very same scheme can be applied to the life of one of her originals, namely, Helen, the wife of Manfred in the XIII century. “The victor [Charles of Anjou – A. F.] had been a cold and taciturn tyrant. Helen, the young and beautiful wife of Manfred… fled… abandoned by the barons in her misery, she arrived in Trani, where she was welcomed with splendid festivities as a princess in 1259” ([196], Volume 5, page 314).

Thus, we see the mediaeval town of Trani – or Troy, in other words, and so one can say that true history does in fact reach us through the documents of the Middle Ages, their thorough editing and processing by the Scaligerites in the XVII-XVIII century notwithstanding. Let us remind the reader that Helen received a grandiose welcome in Troy, where she came with Paris (P-Russ?) as a Greek princess.

The fate of the “ancient” Helen was tragic: death, qv above and in [851]. The very same thing happens in the XIII century: “Helen had died after five years of imprisonment [she was handed over to the mercenary cavalry of Charles of Anjou – A. F.]… her daughter Beatrice remained incarcerated for eighteen years in a fortress… in Naples” ([196], Volume 5, page 314). We already know the legend of the incarceration and death of a queen from the history of the Gothic War (Queen Amalasuntha, “the instigator of the war”). Let us point out that the old documents concerning Helen and Manfred are kept in Naples ([196], Volume 5, page 326, comment 37). It would be most interesting to study them now, from an altogether new viewpoint, since they are bound to contain a large amount of valuable data.


Let us remind the reader that the history of the Gothic War of the alleged VI century A.D. contains a very remarkable final episode – the story of the brief reign of Teias (Teia), the young king of the Goths who had succeeded Totila. Teia had reigned for two years maximum – in 552-553; he died on the battlefield, and his death decided the final outcome of the entire Gothic War.

The XIII century prototype of the “ancient” Teia is most probably the famous young hero Conradin (Horde Khan?), the last representative of the dying dynasty (presumably German). His brief career is practically identical to that of the “ancient” Teia. Conradin had been only 14 years of age when Manfred, the original of Totila, died. Gregorovius tells us the following: “political history knows very few such… cases as the destiny of this youth” ([196], Volume 5, p. 322). The “ancient” Teia had ruled for a year or two, allegedly in 552-553; the mediaeval Conradin’s reign length also equals 2 years (1266-1268, A.D., qv in [196], Volume 5, page 340). Their reign durations coincide.

46) Empire of the X-XIII century. The beheading of Conradin in the XIII century = the decapitation of the “ancient” Teia.

In 1268 Conradin (Horde Khan?) led his troops forth in an attempt to reclaim the crown of Manfred,
the double of the “ancient” Totila. However, he was defeated by the army of Charles of Anjou ([196], Volume 5, pages 341-342). The “ancient” reflection of this event is the rout of Teia’s army (Conradin’s double) in the battle with Narses (the double of Charles of Anjou) in the alleged VI century.

An important detail of the “ancient” Gothic War is the decapitation of Teia the Goth. This episode is the only one of this kind in the entire history of this war, and a lot of symbolic meaning was attached thereto. We see the same happen in the XIII century: Conradin was beheaded in Naples (the New City which figures as the double of Troy yet again) in 1268 ([196], Volume 5, page 348). This episode finalizes the history of the Gothic dynasty in Italy, whereas its double marks the end of the Swabian dynasty, which had “reached its final demise claiming Conradin as the last victim” ([196], Volume 5, page 349-350).

We shall conclude with the following detail of the parallelism that pertains to a different shift, the 333-year one. It identifies the Habsburg Empire as the Empire of the X-XIII century: “it is known that Conradin was executed in Naples… the marble statue of the last Hohenstaufen is kept in the church… it was erected by Maximilian II the Bavarian, and the remains of the wretched Swabian prince are buried under its pedestal” ([196], Volume 5, page 360, comment 66). Pay attention to the fact that a 333-year shift backwards transposes Maximilian II (1564-1576) into the period of 1231-1243, which is very close to Conradin’s epoch (the alleged years 1266-1268). The discrepancy is minute considering the summary length of the empires compared – a mere 25 years. It would be interesting to study the history of this statue, especially bearing in mind that Conradin had been from Bavaria, just like Maximilian II ([196], Volume 5, page 322).


The further biography of Charles is largely parallel to the final period of the military leader Belisarius/Narses in the alleged VI century. The quarrel between the Pope and Charles of Anjou develops despite their alliance in the struggle against the Conrads (Horde Khans?) in the XIII century. Charles of Anjou falls into disfavour, just like Belisarius, his “ancient” double. After that, Charles becomes “stripped of senatorial power” ([196], Volume 5, page 316).

The “ancient” reflection of this event (which took place in 1266) must be the legend of Valerius = Belisarius = Achilles falling from grace and losing power. It has to be emphasized that the “disfavour of Charles” preceded the final defeat of the Swabian dynasty in the XIII century. In exactly the same manner, the “ancient” disgrace of Belisarius (the Great King?) began before the final defeat of the Goths in the alleged VI century. The parallel continues; one is to remember that Belisarius = Valerius was exculpated. Similarly, in the XIII century the Pope restores the influence of Charles after the disfavour. “He had even appointed the king [Charles – A. F] paciarius” ([196], Volume 5, 330). As a matter of fact, the senatorial palace in Rome still contains a statue of Charles of Anjou – or, as we understand now, the symbolic representation of Belisarius/Narses = Valerius = Achilles.


The famous tale of the Trojan horse, or aqueduct, is know to us from the history of the Trojan – Gothic War, qv above. We could not find its complete reflection in the XIII century; however, we learn of an odd occurrence that deserves to be mentioned here. We have already discovered the siege of the New City (Naples) to be the duplicate of the siege of Troy. And so, it turns out that “there was a curse on Conrad [in the XIII century – the Horde Khan? - A. F.]… which didn’t stop him from conquering Naples; however, the Neapolitans had hated him ever since his order to put a rein on the old equestrian statue that stood on the city square and was revered as a political halidom” ([415], Volume 1, page 309).

Let us emphasize that the statue in question was that of a horse and not of a mounted person; therefore, the New City had a statue of a horse, most probably without a rider, standing on the city square – moreover, the statue was considered a political halidom of the city! This very circumstance is far from typical, and therefore draws our attention instantly. Indeed, does one see a statue of a horse without a rider on many city squares? It is most likely that what we see is yet another distorted version of the leg-
end of the Trojan Horse – the one that the besieged Trojans are supposed to have brought into the city and mounted in the middle of a square.

One needn’t get the impression that Kohlrausch, the author of the book that we are quoting from, mentions equestrian statues on every page – far from it. The entire first volume of his book, the one that deals with the history of the “ancient” and mediaeval Germany and Italy, only contains two references to a “horse statue” – the first one being to the Italian equestrian statue of the alleged VI century A.D., no less; the second – to the “political halidom” of the XIII century Naples (New City) that we were discussing above ([415], Volume 1, pages 166 and 309). It is significant that the first such reference should be made to the VI century A.D. – the epoch that the Gothic War is dated to nowadays.


A 1053-year shift backwards identifies Dionysius Petavius, the famous chronologist, as his phantom colleague and namesake Dionysius Exiguus who had lived in the alleged VI century A.D. and presumably died in 540 or 556 (see fig. 2.89). We already discussed the parallelism between these two characters in Chapter 6 of CHRON1, providing a table to illustrate it. Bear in mind that “petavius” is the French version of the name “little” (petit).

As we are beginning to understand, the falsification of ancient history and the introduction of the erroneous chronology are the fault of the school of J. Scaliger and D. Petavius; therefore, it shouldn’t surprise us that the parallelism in the “Scaligerian history textbook” should end with none other but Dionysius Petavius.

Furthermore, his phantom duplicate, “Dionysius Exiguus” from the alleged VI century A.D. had calculated the date of Christ’s birth as preceding his own time by 560 years and declared it to be the beginning of the “new era”. If we are to count 560 years backwards from the epoch of Dionysius Petavius, we shall come up with roughly the year 1050 A.D. Now, Petavius had lived in 1583-1652; therefore, the epoch that we come up with falls on the middle of the XI century, which is the time when Jesus Christ had lived, according to the mediaeval tradition that we managed to reconstruct (which contains a centenarian error). He had really lived in the XII century, qv in our book entitled King of the Slavs.

Therefore, Scaligerian history is more or less correct (in a way) when it tells us that Christ had been born some 500 years before Dionysius Exiguus. It just has to be elaborated that under said character we have to understand the real chronologist Dionysius Petavius who had died in 1652. If we are to subtract roughly 500 years from this date, we shall come up with the middle of the XII century as the epoch when Christ had lived.


In 1534 Ignatius Loyola founded the famous monastic order of the Jesuits – “The Society of Jesus” (Societas Jesu), qv in [797], page 476. The order was officially established in 1540. This organization is considered to have been “a tool in the hands of the Counter-Reformation” ([797], page 476). A shift of 333 years backwards superimposes the foundation of the Jesuit order over that of the Dominican order around 1220, approximately 1215 ([797], page 406), as well as the foundation of the Franciscan order around the same time, in 1223 (the alleged years 1207 – 1220 -1223). Ignatius Loyola dies in 1556, which becomes 1223 after a 333-year shift.

It is therefore possible that the Franciscan and the Dominican orders were but other names of the Jesuit order founded in the XVI century A.D. – its reflections, as it were.

As we are told nowadays, the struggle against the Reformation was defined as one of the Jesuit order’s primary objectives. It is also presumed that the Dominicans took charge of the Inquisition as early as the alleged year 1232 ([797], page 406). Nowadays, “Dominicans” are translated as “God’s Hounds” – however, the name may also be a derivative of the Slavic “Dom Khana” – “The Khan’s House”, or maybe “Domini Khan” – “The Divine Khan”. The actual word “order” may also be derived from the word “Horde”, which is considered to be of a “Tartar-Mongol” origin nowadays.