Part I.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF RUSSIAN HISTORY
In the present book we are operating within the framework of the New Chronology that was conceived and introduced with the use of mathematical methods and empirico-statistical results of our research as related in CHRON1-CHRON3, and also in CHRON6, Chapter 19. Apart from that, one can find related materials in the mathematical and statistical Annex to CHRON7. The primary chronological shifts as discovered in “ancient” and mediaeval history were presented as the Global Chronological Map (GCM) compiled by A. T. Fomenko in 1975-1979.

The present book is written in a manner that stipulates no special knowledge from the part of the reader. All it requires is a genuine interest in history as well as the wish to unravel its numerous conundrums. However, it has to be emphasised that everything we relate below was discovered as a result of long and arduous scientific research, which began with the denial of the consensual version of history by certain critically-minded scientists of the XVII-XIX century. We find Sir Isaac Newton among their ranks, whose primary works on chronology have been subject to the policy of obmutescence up until relatively recently. However, it appears that these very works were the first attempt to rectify the errors of history with the use of natural scientific methods. Yet Sir Isaac himself proved incapable of solving this problem in full; he simply voiced a number of valuable observations in this respect. The problem of chronological rectification was addressed by N. A. Morozov, the Russian scientist and encyclopaedist (1854-1946) more successfully and in greater depth than by any of his predecessors; however, he never managed to construct a correct and final chronological scale – his reconstruction was rather sketchy and still erroneous, although less so than the consensual version.

Over the last 27 years, starting with 1973, the problem of reconstructing the correct chronology of the antiquity and the Middle Ages has been dealt with by a group of mathematicians, from the Moscow State University for the most part. Although this particular line of work isn’t our primary specialization (our main interests lay in the field of pure and applied mathematics), it has required a great deal of time and effort from our part.

Let us give a general overview of what we are referring to presently. Readers interested in the scientific aspect of the problem can study the history of the issue as well as the modern mathematical methods used for dating the ancient events if they turn to CHRON1, CHRON2 and CHRON3.

The aim of the scientific project we call “the New Chronology” can be formulated as the discovery of independent methods used for the dating of ancient and mediaeval events. It is a complex scientific problem whose solution required the application of the most intricate methods offered by the modern mathematical science, as well as extensive computer calculations. Publications on this topic have been appearing in scientific journals ever since the 1970-s, and books have been coming out ever since 1990. There are eight monographs on the subject published in
Russia to date (in several versions), and two more abroad. Thus, the works on the new chronology have been coming out published by academic publishing houses for over twenty years now, although they may remain unknown to the general audience so far.

The “New Chronology” project is far from completion. However, the results that we came up with give us a right to claim that the version of ancient and mediaeval history that we’re taught in school contains substantial and numerous errors that stem from a false chronology. The New Chronology that we constructed with the aid of mathematical methods is often at great odds with the chronology of J. Scaliger and D. Petavius that is still being used by historians. The latter owes its existence to the scholastics of the XVI-XVII century, and contains very serious errors, as we discover nowadays. These errors, in turn, lead to a great distortion of the ancient and mediaeval history viewed as a whole.

One might wonder why professional mathematicians would develop an interest in chronology, which is considered a historical discipline nowadays. The answer is as follows: chronology belongs to the domain of applied mathematics, since it has the estimation of certain dates, or numbers, as its goal. Furthermore, chronology was considered a mathematical discipline at dawn of its creation, in the XV-XVI century. The problem is that the mathematical science of that epoch was incapable of solving chronological problems – very complex ones, as it turns out. They can only be solved by means of modern mathematics, with the aid of well-developed methods and powerful computational means, none of which had existed in the XVI century. This might be why the scholastics ended up dealing with chronological problems. Historians were the next ones to take charge of the discipline, which was declared auxiliary and therefore of minor importance. It was then “shelved” and presumed complete. We are attempting to revive an old tradition and marry chronology with applied mathematics yet again.

Dozens and dozens of people have helped us with this complex task. We are most grateful to them all for assistance and support.

A. T. Fomenko, G. V. Nosovskiy.
1. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1) We must warn the reader that the ancient and mediaeval history known to us today (including that of Russia) is the furthest thing from obvious and self-implied – it is extremely vague and convoluted. In general, history of the epochs that predate the XV-XVI century and the invention of the printing press is anything but accounts of real events based on, and implied by, authentic ancient documents. On the contrary, historical events that predate the XVI-XVII century in their consensual version came into existence courtesy of historians and chronologists – several generations of those, in fact. They all attempted to reconstruct the events of the past. However, the resulting picture is hardly indubitable. And yet most of us are certain that reconstruction of past events is rather easy in principle, believing that it suffices to take a chronicle and translate it into the modern language. The only complications that may arise presumably concern details of minor importance and little else. This is what the school course of history makes us assume. Sadly, this is not the case.

2) History known to us nowadays is written history – based on written documents, in other words. All of them have been edited, revised, recompiled etc for a very long time. Some of the things are written in stone – however, these morsels of information only begin to make sense after the entire edifice of chronology is already constructed – and chronicles are the main construction material of history.

When we say that Brutus killed Caesar with a sword, the only thing it means is that some written source that managed to reach our time says so, and nothing but! The issue of just how faithfully documented history reflects real events is very complex and requires a special study. It is really a problem posed by the philosophy of history rather than documented history per se.

Readers are prone to thinking that nowadays we have chronicles written by the contemporaries of Genghis-Khan and eyewitnesses of the events that took place in his epoch. This isn’t so. Nowadays we’re most likely to have a rather late version at our disposal, one that postdates the actual events by several centuries.

It goes without saying that written documents reflect some sort of reality. However, one and the same real event could be reflected in a multitude of written documents – and very differently so; at times the difference is so great that the first impression one gets precludes one from believing the two to be different reflections of the same event. Therefore, phrases like “such-and-such historical figure is a duplicate of another character” that the reader shall encounter in the present book by no means imply the existence of two real characters, one of which is the doppelganger of another. This would make no sense whatsoever, obviously enough.

We are referring to an altogether different phenomenon – namely, the fact that our “history textbook” may contain several reflections of the same
real character – Genghis-Khan, for instance. These reflections will have different names and be ascribed to different epochs. However, the person in question only became “duplicated” on paper and not in reality; as for the issue of just when and where a given person had lived, it is anything but easy. Another extremely contentious issue is that of a person’s real name. The ancients would often have a multitude of names and nicknames; furthermore, they would receive new ones once they made their way into chronicles – names that their contemporaries had never used. Many factors may have come into play here – errors, confusion and distortions in translation. In the present work we do not envisage it as our goal to find out the exact names used by the contemporaries of historical figures for referring to the latter.

3) In one’s study of written history, one must always bear in mind that words in general and names of people or places in particular may have attained different meanings with time. The name “Mongolia” is an excellent example; we shall relate this in more detail below. Furthermore, many geographical names would migrate to new longitudes and latitudes with time. Geographical maps and the names inscribed thereupon have only become more or less uniform with the invention of the printing press, which made it feasible to produce many identical copies of the same map for the practical purposes of seafaring, learning etc. Before that epoch, each map had been unique, and usually at odds with other maps to some extent.

Characters that we’re accustomed to consider “ancient” nowadays are frequently manifest in mediaeval maps as mediaeval heroes. Even historians recognize this rather noteworthy tendency, writing that “ancient characters are drawn on maps as mediaeval townsfolk and knights” ([953], page 21).

Ancient texts would often transcribe names without vocalizations – no vowels at all, just the consonant root. Back in those days vocalizations would be added by the reader from memory. This would be especially manifest in Arabic languages, where virtually all the vowel sounds are memorized, and subject to a certain degree of randomness. And seeing how Arabic letters were used for some other languages besides Arabic in the Middle Ages, vowels would frequently become dropped in those languages as well, even if they had originally been more or less constant. Obviously enough, names were the first to be affected by this process.

Quite naturally, with the course of time the vowels would become confused for one another, forgotten or replaced with other vowels. Consonants set down in writing demonstrate higher stability. For instance, we may recollect that many ancient texts frequently allude to the “Greek Faith”. However, it is possible that the word Greece is but a derivative of the name Horus, or Christos (Christ). In this case, the “Greek Faith” is nothing other than the Christian faith.

Russian history is naturally in close relation to global history. All kinds of chronological and geographical shifts one might find in Russian history invariably lead to the discovery of similar problems in history of other countries. The reader must let go of the opinion that ancient history rests upon an immutable foundation – it appears that chronological problems do exist in history of Rome, Byzantium, Italy and Egypt. They are of an even graver nature than the problems of Russian history. See Chron1, Chron2 and Chron3 for further reference.

4) The authors are naturally interested in the history of the ancient Russia, the Russian Empire and its closest neighbours the most. The knowledge of Russian history as a whole is extremely important and affects the very foundation of world civilization, and therefore its most crucial moments are to be studied with the utmost care and attention. Nowadays we are well familiar with numerous examples of how often certain historical facts become distorted to suit passing political trends. In Chron1, Chron2 and Chron3 we have exposed a great many cases when such distortions became rigidified as indisputable truths that migrated from textbook to textbook. One must invest a gigantic amount of labour into “chiselling off later glazing” in order to pour light onto the true nature of the ancient events.

Historical distortions are unacceptable in any state’s history – as for the authors’ very own native history, the investigation needs to be conducted with the utmost clarity, and we have to opt for a completely unbiased approach. No authority can be recognized as such in these matters.

Why do we have to mention all of the above? The reason is that the consensual chronology of Russian
history is full of grave contradictions. They were initially pointed out by Nikolai Morozov ([547]). However, our analysis demonstrates that he wasn’t even aware of the actual scale of the problem.

Russian history is considered to be relatively “young” by many historians nowadays, who compare it to the “old cultures” – Rome, Greece etc. However, in Chron1, Chron2 and Chron3 we demonstrated that all of these “ancient chronologies” need to be made significantly shorter. It is most likely that the “old cultures” need to be shifted forwards, into the interval between the XI and the XVII century A.D. The consensual history of the X-XIII century is a product of collation and “summarization” of the real events dating from the epoch in question (which was described rather sparsely in the surviving documents) and the duplicates of events from the more eventful epoch of the XIII-XVII century. We are naturally referring to the amount of surviving accounts of events rather than eventfulness per se. The immutable period in history begins with the XVII century A.D.

It is presumed that documented Russian history begins with the IX-X century A.D. This means that about 300 years of its chronology fall over the “duplicate danger zone”. Our accumulated experience in this field leads us to the expectation of a chronological shift here, which will move some of the events forwards, into the epoch of the XIV-XVII century A.D. This expectation is fulfilled by the authors’ discovery of a 400-year shift, which had first become manifest in the statistical volume analysis of the ancient texts (see Chron1, Chapter 5:2), and was later discovered independently in our study of dynastic parallelisms, qv below.

5) We occasionally point out certain linguistic parallels and unexpected phonetic similarities between the ancient names encountered in various chronicles. Let us emphasise that such parallels are by no means presumed to prove anything at all; we merely allude to them in order to demonstrate that unvocalized ancient texts could be read in a great variety of ways. Nevertheless, such parallels are usually explained by our reconstruction quite well.

In the present introduction we shall give a brief outline of the main problems inherent in the Russian chronology and suggest our new conception thereof, which is radically different from both the Scaligerian-Romanovian version and N. A. Morozov’s reconstruction ([547]). In the chapters to follow we shall be providing an account of our systematic analysis of Russian history.

2. OUR CONCEPTION IN BRIEF

We shall encapsulate our hypothetic conception immediately, without preparing the readers for it in any special way. Such narration style might seem to be insufficiently convincing; nevertheless, we suggest that the readers should carry on reading instead of jumping to any conclusions. Factual data to validate our theory shall be presented in the following chapters.

Let us pay attention to the following facts, which we find very odd. However, this oddness is only based on consensual chronology and the version of ancient Russian history that we learnt in school. It turns out that a change in chronology eliminates a great many oddities and puts things into a more logical perspective.

One of the key moments in the history of the ancient Russia is the so-called “Mongol and Tartar yoke”. The Horde is presumed to have originated from the Far East, China or Mongolia, conquered a great many countries, enslaved all of Russia, and moved further westwards, reaching Egypt and establishing the Mameluke dynasty there. However, this version contains many inconsistencies even within the framework of Scaligerian history, and they are more or less well known.

We shall begin with the following observation. Had Russia been conquered from either the East or the West, there should be surviving accounts of conflicts between the invaders and the Cossacks who had lived near the western borders of Russia, as well as the lower Volga and Don regions. One must note that school history textbooks say that the Cossack troops only appeared in the XVII century – presumably formed from yeomen who had escaped and settled on the banks of the Don. However, historians themselves are well aware of the fact that the Cossack State of Don had existed as early as in the XVI century, with independent legislation and a history of its very own. Furthermore, it turns out that the origins of the Cossack history date to the XII-XIII century. See
[183], for instance, as well as Sukhorukov’s publication by the name of “The History of the Don Troops”, Don magazine, 1989.

Thus, the Horde, wherever it came from, would inevitably move upwards along the Volga and attack the Cossack states – and yet there are no records of this anywhere. Why would this be? The natural hypothesis can be formulated as follows: the Horde didn’t fight the Cossacks because the Cossacks were a part of the Horde. This hypothesis is backed by some substantial argumentation in the book of A. A. Gordeyev ([183]). In his attempt to fit the hypothesis into the consensual Millerian version of Russian history, Gordeyev was forced to assume that the Tartar and Mongol Horde had taken to Russian ways very rapidly, and the Cossacks, or the warriors of the Horde, gradually turned Russian ethnically as well.

Our primary hypothesis (or, rather, one of our primary hypotheses) is as follows: the Cossack troops weren’t merely a part of the Horde, but also the regular army of the Russian state. In other words, the Horde was Russian from the very start. “Horde” (“Orda”) is the old Russian word for regular army. Later terms “voysko” and “voin” (“army” and “warrior”, respectively) are Church Slavonic in origin, and not Old Russian. They were only introduced in the XVII century. The old names were “orda” (horde or army), “kazak” (Cossack) and “khan”.

The terminology would alter eventually. As recently as in the XIX century, the words “czar” and “khan” were interchangeable in Russian folk sayings; this becomes obvious from the numerous examples that one finds in Dahl’s dictionary (such as “wherever the khan (czar) may go, the horde (or “the folk”) will follow” etc). See [223] for further reference (the “orda” entry).

By the way, the famous town of Semikarakorsk still exists in the Don region, and there’s also a village called Khanskaya in the Kuban. Let us remind the reader that the birthplace of Genghis-Khan is supposed to have been called Karakorum ([325], page 409). Another known fact is that there isn’t a single trace of Karakorum anywhere near the place where the historians of the Scaligerian-Romanovian school are still stubbornly looking for this town ([1078], Volume 1, pages 227-228).

According to the rather desperately-sounding hypothesis that our brave scholars have put forth, “the Erdinidusu monastery, founded in 1585 [several centuries later than Genghis-Khan had lived – Auth.] was erected upon the ruins of Karakorum” ([1078], Volume 1, page 228). This monastery, which had survived until the XIX century, was surrounded by a mile-long rampart. Historians are of the opinion that the entire “Mongolian” capital of Karakorum, a city of great renown, had occupied the tiny piece of land where the monastery was built subsequently ([1078], Volume 1, page 228).

The name Karakorum can however be encountered in the Don region. For instance, in the map entitled “The Southern Part of the Great Russia” dating from 1720, the entire Cossack region of Don is called “The Lesser Tartaria”; we also see a river by the name of Semi Karak here, one of Don’s tributaries on the left-hand side. The full name of the map reads as follows: “Tabula Geographica qua Russiae Magnae Pontus Euxinus. Johan Baptist Homann. Nürnberg, ca 1720. The name Karak is therefore found in the area of the Cossack = Tartar Don. The name Karakorum may simply have meant “the Karak area”.

Furthermore, in the map of Russia dating from 1670 (Tabula Russia vulgo Moscovia, Frederik de Wit, Amsterdam, ca 1670) we find a town called Semikorkor in this very region, near the Don. On yet another map, one that dates from 1736 (Theatre de la Guerre sur les Frontieres de Russie de Turquie, Reiner & Joshua Ottens, Amsterdam, 1736) one of Don’s tributaries bears the name of Semi Korokor. The authors have seen all of these maps personally, at the exhibition of old maps of Russia that took place in February 1999 in a private collection museum affiliated with the A. S. Pushkin Museum in Moscow.

Thus, we see several versions of the name Korokor in the Don region – in the name of a town and in that of a river. A Romanised version of the name could have had the suffix “um” at the end, which would transform the Cossack name of Korokor into Korokorum – the famous birthplace of the Conqueror of the World. In this case, the great conqueror Genghis-Khan was born in the Cossack town of Korokor near Semi Korokor, the tributary of Don.

Let us return to the issue of the Horde. According to our hypothesis, the Horde had borne no relation to any foreign conquering armies, but rather was the
regular army of the Eastern Russia, an integral part of the ancient Russian state. Furthermore, the period of the “Tartar and Mongol yoke” is nothing but the time of military rule in Russia, when the commander-in-chief, or the Khan, effectively functioned as the king (czar); cities were governed by princes, who weren’t part of the army but collected taxes in order to support it. The ancient Russian state can therefore be regarded as a united Empire, where professional soldiers were a separate stratum of society and called themselves the Horde; other strata had no military formations of their own. We are of the opinion that the so-called “raids of the Tartars” were nothing but repressive actions against the areas of Russia that would refuse to pay taxes for one reason or another. The mutineers were punished by the regular Russian army. Typically, the prince would leave the town before such a raid.

3. THE TRUE IDENTITY OF MONGOLIA AND THE TARTAR AND MONGOL INVASION. THE COSSACKS AND THE GOLDEN HORDE

Let us contemplate the etymology of the word Mongolia. It may have derived from the Russian word *mnogo* (a lot, a mass – of people etc), or the words *mosch, mog* (a possible precursor of the word “Magog”) and *mogoushchestvo*, translating as “might (noun)”, “could, was able to” and “power”, respectively. N. A. Morozov voiced the theory that the word “Mongolia” stemmed from the Greek word “Megalion”, or The Great One. However, the Greek word may just as well be a derivative of the Slavic “mog” and “mnogo”. In fig. 0.1 one sees a photograph of the ancient inlay from the Chora church in Istanbul. We see the word “Mongolia” spelt as “Mugulion” – virtually the same as Megalion, see fig. 0.2. Eastern Russia is still known as the Greater Russia, or Velikorossiya. According to our hypothesis, the “Mongolian” Empire is but another name for the Great Empire, or the mediaeval Russia.

Is there any evidence that could back this hypothesis? There is, and a substantial amount of evidence at that. Let us see what the Western sources tell us about the so-called “Mongol and Tartar invasion”.

“The notes of the Hungarian king and a letter to the Pope that mentions Russian troops as part of Batu-Khan’s army serve as evidence of the latter’s structure and composition” ([183], Volume 1, page 31).

“Batu-Khan founded a number of military settlements on the right bank of the Dnepr for the purposes of observation and protection of the frontiers; they were populated by the inhabitants of Russian principalities… there were lots of Russians among the borderland settlers on the Terek line as well… the governing system created by the Golden Horde was implemented and maintained by the Russians predominantly” ([183], Volume 1, page 40-42).

Furthermore, it appears that “Russia was made a province of the Mongolian empire and became known as the Tartaro-Mongolia” ([183], Volume 1, page 35). Could it be that Tartaro-Mongolia was simply another name of Russia, or the Great Empire (Mongolia) whose population partially consisted of
Muslims, or Tartars – just as we witness to be the case nowadays.

The more mediaeval sources are brought to our attention, the more we learn and understand once we break free from the confines of consensual historical paradigm as reflected in textbooks, complete with vivid imagery of the “Mongolian conquest”. For instance, it turns out that “at the very dawn of the Horde’s existence, [the very first days, mind you! – Auth.] an Orthodox church was built in the Khan’s headquarters. As military settlements were founded, Orthodox churches were built everywhere, all across the territory governed by the Horde, with the clergy called thereto and Metropolitan Cyril relocated to Kiev from Novgorod, thus completing the restoration of the pan-Russian ecclesiastical hierarchy” ([183], Volume 1, page 36).

Let us stop and reflect for a moment. All of the above is very odd indeed from the consensual point of view. Indeed, a Mongolian conqueror (who most probably didn’t even speak Russian, let alone share the Russian faith) builds Orthodox temples, which must be thoroughly alien to him, all across the newly conquered empire, and the Russian Metropolitan moves to Kiev as soon as the city is taken by Batu-Khan the “Mongolian”!

Our explanation is as follows. A foreign invasion is nothing but a fantasy. What we see is the Russian military government (a. k. a. “The Horde”) taking care of typical domestic affairs, such as the construction of imperial institutions. All of these events are perfectly typical for a developing state.

To quote from L. N. Gumilev:

“Let us take the veil of confusion away from our eyes and consider the situation in Russia during the epoch of the yoke. Firstly, every principality retained its boundaries and territorial integrity. Secondly, all institutes of administrative government consisted of Russians throughout the entire territory of the empire. Thirdly, every principality had an army of its own. Finally – and this may be the most important fact, the Horde destroyed no churches and demonstrated great religious tolerance, which is characteristic for such states. It is a fact that the Orthodox religion was supported in every which way. The church and the clergy were completely freed from all taxes and contributions. Apart from that, one of the Khan’s decrees declared that whoever dared to slander the Orthodox faith was to be executed with no right of appeal” ([214], pages 265-266).

We also learn that the Russian system of communication that had existed until the end of the XIX century – the coachmen service, was created by the Mongols. Coachmen were known as yamshchiki, and the very word is of a Mongolian origin: “there were stables with up to 400 horses along all the lines separated by 25-verst intervals [1 verst = 3.500 feet or 1.06 km]… there were ferries and boats on every river; these were also run by the Russians… Russian chroniclers stopped keeping chronicles when the Mongols had come, which is why all information concerning the internal structure of the Golden Horde comes from foreigners travelling through its lands” ([183], Volume 1, page 42).

In fig 0.3 we see a païze, or a token used by the representatives of the Horde’s governing structures in Russia. The word is apparently related to the Slavic poýti (“to go”), and possibly a precursor of the Russian word pogon (meaning “shoulder-strap”, among other things.) Even in Romanovian Russia, one needed a document called “pogonnaya gramota” in order to travel along the state-owned communication lines on state-owned horses”. In figs 0.4 and 0.5 we see two other “Mongolian” païze found in Siberia and the Dnepr region.

We see that foreigners describe the Golden Horde
as a Russian state. Russians don’t describe it at all, for some reason, relating the most mundane things instead – built churches, weddings etc, as if they were “completely unaware” of their country being conquered and their lands made part of a gigantic foreign empire, with new and exotic systems of communications, ferries etc introduced all over the country. It is presumed that foreigners didn’t mention Russia during the time of the “Mongolian” conquest, since the country “had changed its name to Tartaro-Mongolia” ([183], Volume 1, page 35).

We are of the following opinion: “Tartaro-Mongolia” is a foreign term that was in use before the XVI century. From the XVI-XVII century and on, foreigners started to call Russia “Moscovia”, having simultaneously stopped making references to “Mongolia”. However, the territory of the Russian empire and even a somewhat larger area had remained known as “the Great Tartaria (Grande Tartarie)” among the Western cartographers up until the XVIII century. There are a great many such maps in existence. One of them, which we find very representative, can be seen in fig. 0.6. It is a French map from the Atlas of the Prince of Orange, dated to the XVIII century ([1018]).

We may encounter references to the invasion of the Tartars and the Mongols being reflected in Russian chronicles as counter-argumentation. The actual age of those chronicles shall be discussed below; the analysis of the latter demonstrates that the surviving chronicles were written or edited in the Romanovian epoch. Actually, historians have still got enough problems with chronicles as they are. For instance, G. M. Prokhorov, the famous researcher, writes the following: “the analysis of the Lavrentyevskaya chronicle (dating from 1337) demonstrated that the authors of the chronicle replaced pages 153-164 with new pages, some of them repeatedly. This interval includes all the data concerning the conquest of Russia by the Tartars and the Mongols” ([699], page 77).

According to what A. A. Gordeyev tells us, “historians remain silent about the historical evidence of the Cossacks amongst the ranks of the Golden Horde’s army, as well as the Muscovite armies of the princely predecessors of Ivan the Terrible” ([183], Volume 1, page 8).

Further also: “the very name ‘Cossacks’ referred to the light cavalry that comprised a part of the Golden Horde’s army” ([183], Volume 1, page 17). Apart from that, we learn that “in the second half of the XII century there were independent tribes inhabiting parts of Eastern and Central Asia known as ‘Cossack hordes’” ([183], Volume 1, page 16).

The Russian word for Cossack (kazak) may be de-
Prince Yaroslav went to represent Batu-Khan at the Great Khan's elections for some bizarre reason. Could it be that the hypothesis about Batu-Khan sending Yaroslav in his stead was invented by modern historians with the sole purpose of making Carpini’s evidence concur with the obvious necessity of Batu-Khan’s presence at the elections of the Great Khan?

What we see here is merely documental evidence testifying to the fact that Batu-Khan is none other than the Russian prince Yaroslav. This is also confirmed by the fact that Alexander Nevsky, the son of Yaroslav, had also been the “adopted” son of Batu-Khan, according to historians! Once again we witness the two figures to be identical (Yaroslav = Batu-Khan). In general, it has to be said that “Batu” (“Baty” in Russian) may be a form of the word “batya”, or “father”. A Cossack military commander is still called a “batka” (“father”, “dad” etc.). Thus, Batu-Khan = the Cossack batka = Russian prince. Similar names are found in the bylini, or the Russian heroic epos – two of them are called “Vassily Kazimirovich Takes the Tribute Money to Batey Bateyevich” and “Vassily Ignatievich and Batyga” ([112]).

We are also told that “having conquered the northern Russian principalities, Batu-Khan placed his troops everywhere, together with his representatives (called the baskaks) whose function was to bring 1/10 part of property and the populace to the Khan” ([183], Volume 1, page 29). Our commentary is as follows.

It is a known fact that “the Tartar tribute is a tenth of the whole”. However, foreign invasion has got nothing to do with this. The Orthodox Church had always claimed the tribute called desyatina – literally, “tenth part”. As we have seen, a tenth part of Russian population was drafted in order to maintain the ranks of the Russian army, or the Horde. This is perfectly natural, given that the Horde was the name of the regular Russian army that never got disbanded and took care of border patrol, warfare etc; they would obviously have neither time nor opportunity for planting and harvesting crops, or indeed supporting themselves independently in general. Furthermore, agriculture had remained strictly forbidden for the Cossacks up until the XVII century. This is a well-
fact, and also a very natural one for a regular army. This is mentioned by Pougachyov in his Notes on Russian History and Gordeyev in [183], Volume 1, page 36. Therefore, the Horde had to draft every tenth member of the population as regular Russian army, and demand the ten per cent contribution in supplies and provision.

Furthermore, a regular army is constantly on the move, and requires depots for the storage of provision, weapons and ammunition. Therefore, a system of depots must have existed on the territory of Russia. One of the most commonly-used Russian words for “depot” (or “storage facility”) is 

saray. Military leaders, or khans, needed headquarters, which would normally be located right next to these depots. What do we see? The word “saray” surfaces very frequently in history of the “Golden Horde of the Tartars and the Mongols” – the word is often encountered in Russian toponymy. Many towns and cities have the root SAR as part of their name, especially in the Volga region. Indeed, we see Saratov, Saransk, Cheboksary, Tsaritsyn (Sar + Tsyn) here, as well as the episcopal town of Zaraisk in the Ryazan region of Russia and Zaransk in the West of Russia. All of them are large towns and cities, some of them also capitals of autonomous regions.

One may also recollect Sarayevo, the famous Balkan city. We often encounter the word Saray in old Russian and mediaeval Turkish toponymy.

We proceed to find out that “Sultan Selim wrote the following to the Khan of the Crimea [presumably in the early XVI century – Auth.]: ‘I heard about your intentions to wage war against the land of the Muscovites – beware; do not dare to attack the Muscovites, since they are great allies of ours … if you do, we shall raid your lands’. Sultan Seliman who ascended to the Turkish throne in 1521 confirmed these intentions and forbade campaigns against the Muscovites… Russia and Turkey exchanged embassies and ambassadors [in the XVI century – Auth.]” ([183], Volume 1, pages 161-163).

The relations between Russia and Turkey were severed already in the XVIII century.

One might wonder about the dislocation of the Russian troops when they fought the Tartars and the Mongols who had “raided Russia”? Right where the Russian “army of resistance” would congregate, as it turns out – for instance, in 1252 Andrei, Prince of Vladimir and Suzdal set forth from Vladimir to fight the Tartars and met them at river Klyazma, right outside the city gates of Vladimir! All the battles against the Tartars that were fought in the XVI century took place near Moscow, or near river Oka the furthest. One might find it odd that Russian troops always have a mile or two to go, whilst the Tartars have to cover hundreds of miles. However, our reconstruction explains all of the above – as the regular Russian army, the Horde was used for punitive expeditions against disobedient subject. It would naturally approach the rebellious town that tried to oppose the military government.

4.

Batu-Khan was known as the Great Prince

We are accustomed to believe that the Tartar governors used to call themselves Khans, whereas the Russians were Great Princes. This stereotype is a very common one. However, we must quote rather noteworthy evidence from the part of Tatischev, who tells us that the Tartar ambassadors called their ruler Batu-Khan Great Prince: “We were sent by the Great Prince Batu” ([832], Part 2, page 231). Tatischev is rather embarrassed by the above, and tries to explain this title by telling us that Batu-Khan had not yet been a Khan back in those days. However, this is of minor importance to us. The thing that does matter is the fact that a Tartar governor was called Great Prince.

5.

The Romanovs, the Zakharins and the Yuryins. Their role in Russian chronography

Let us conclude the present introduction with an important question which needs to be answered before one can understand why the Russian history that we got used to from our schooldays had “suddenly” turned out incorrect. Who would distort the true history of Russia, and when did this happen?

In 1605, the Great Turmoil began in Russia. 1613 marks a watershed in Russian history – the throne was taken by the pro-Western dynasty of the Romanovs,
the Zakharyins and the Yuryins. They are responsible for the “draft version” of the contemporary Russian history; this happened under Czar Mikhail and Patriarch Philaret, possibly later. We shall present our reconstruction of the Great Turmoil in the chapters to follow.

The Cossack Horde was banished from Moscovia under the Romanovs, the Zakharyins and the Yuryins. Its banishment symbolizes the end of the old Russian dynasty. The remnants of the old Empire’s resisting army, or the Horde, were chased away from the centre of the Muscovite kingdom. As a result, nowadays we see Cossack regions at the periphery of Russia and not the centre. All these regions are legacy of the Russian “Mongolian” Horde. Kazakhstan, for instance, can be interpreted as Kazak-Stan, which translates as “Cossack Camp” or “Cossack Region”; alternatively, the name may have derived from Kazaks Tana or Cossacks from the Don.

One may well wonder how the professional regular army of the Horde could have lost the civil war. This issue is indeed of great importance. One may theorize at length about this; we hope that the present book will help the future researchers of the Russian history to find the answer.

The defeat of Razin and later Pugachyov is the final defeat of the Horde. After this military success, the Romanovs edited official documents and declared the Horde “foreign”, “evil” and “an invader on the Russian land”. In the minds of their descendants the Horde was transformed into a hostile foreign invasion force and moved to the far and mysterious Orient to boot; this is how Mongolia (Megalion, or The Great, or the Russian Empire) transformed into an Eastern country. A propos, something similar happened to Siberia, which had moved there from the banks of Volga.

When the Romanovs came to power, they tried to erase as much of the old Russian history as they could. The historians of the Romanovian epoch received explicit or implicit orders to refrain from digging too deep. This was a mortal danger – they must have remembered the fate of Viskovatiy, qv below.

Our own impression of the works published by the XVIII-XIX century historians confirms this idea. They circumnavigate all rough corners and instinctively shun the very obvious parallels, questions and oddities. This point of view makes the books of Solovyov, Kluchevskiy and other historians of this epoch seem to be the most evasive of all – for instance, their laborious attempts to read the name “Kulichkovo field” as “Kuchkovo field” followed by lengthy hypothesising about the existence of mythical boyars by the name of Kuchki that the field had allegedly got its name from ([284]; see also CHRON4, Chapter 6).

It is a known fact that the genealogical chronicles were burnt in the reign of Fyodor Alekseyevich, the older brother of Peter the Great and his precursor – this happened in Moscow in 1682, qv in [396] and [193], page 26. Apparently, this was done to erase the information concerning the origins of the boyar families. All genealogy was thus effectively erased. Nowadays this is presumed to have been a “progressive” act aimed against the order of precedence – in other words, to keep the boyars from arguing about seniority by erasing all documental proof of their origins ([193], page 26). Our point of view is as follows: the Romanovs were destroying the real ancient genealogy in order to make place for their new dynasty. The “ranks from Ryurik” that have survived until the present and cited in M. V. Lomonosov’s Complete Works must have appeared later than that.

Let us point out a curious fact. During their entire history the Romanovs took brides from the same geographical region – Holstein-Gottorp near the city of Lübeck. It is known that the inhabitants of this part of Northern Germany are of Russian descent, qv in Herberstein’s book ([161], page 58). We learn of the following: “Lübeck and the Duchy of Holstein had once bordered with the land of the Vandals with its famous city of Vagria – the Baltic sea is presumed to have been called after this very Vagria – “the Varangian Sea”… the Vandals were mighty, and had the same language, customs and religion as the Russians” ([161], page 60).

It is obvious that the ascension of the Romanovs must have been declared to serve the country’s greater good during their reign. Although the duchy of Holstein had once been populated by Russians, they had lost a great part of their Russian populace starting with the XVII century. In general, the Romanovian policy was purely Teutonic for the most part, and their governing methods pro-Western. For instance, the oprichnina period between 1563 and 1572, when
the Zakharyins and the Romanovs became the de facto rulers, is the time that the first mentions of religious persecution date back to. The Muslims and the Judeans who refused to convert to Christianity were destroyed. We know of no such occurrences in any earlier epoch of Russian history. Russia had adhered to the old “Mongolian” and Turkish principle of religious tolerance.

The reign of the first Romanovs – Mikhail, Aleksei and Fyodor Alekseyevich is characterized by mass burnings of books, destruction of archives, ecclesiastical schism and campaigns against the Cossacks, or the Horde. More or less well-documented Russian history begins with the reign of Peter I Romanov. His epoch was preceded by a time of strife, turmoil and civil war, with the Cossacks (the Horde) being the main enemy; they had settled in the Don area by that time. This is also the epoch that the beginning of agricultural activity in the Cossack regions dates to; it had been forbidden for them before that. We must also point out that the Romanovs had made lots of efforts to prove to the Westerners that the point of view about Stepan Razin being of royal blood, rather popular in the West, was “perfectly untrue”. Western sources call him Rex, or King. However, it is known that a certain “prince Aleksei” was part of Razin’s entourage, qv in Chron4, Chapter 9:4. Apparently, the epoch of Razin, the entire XVII and even the XVIII century is the epoch when the Romanovs had fought against the old dynasty, which was backed by the Horde and its Cossacks.

After the fall of the Romanovs in 1917, the spell of taciturnity ended. Indeed, many excellent works on ancient Russian history began to appear, written by Russian emigrants, exposing numerous oddities, which had remained hidden for a long time. For instance, the book by A. A. Gordeyev that we occasionally quote had first been published in the West; its Russian publication took place fairly recently. Of course, nowadays it is considered mauvais ton to mention the Romanovs in a critical context. However, scientific research cannot be limited by political considerations. The plaster is coming off, revealing parts of the original ancient artwork.