

Our reconstruction of the Russian history before the battle of Kulikovo

1. THE ORIGINS OF THE RUSSIAN HISTORY

According to our hypothesis, the more or less documented period in Russian history (that is to say, Russian history that relies upon written sources that have survived until the present day) only begins with the XIV century A.D. Unfortunately, we can only give a very general outline of the pre-XIV century Russian history; apparently, there are no surviving documents in existence that could assist one here.

Let us turn to the *Povest Vremennyh Let*, which follows Russian historical events up until 1204 – the fall of Constantinople after the fourth crusade. Morozov reports his study of this chronicle’s various copies in [547] and shares his opinion that the *Povest Vremennyh Let* is most likely to relate Byzantine events and have little in common with the Russian history. For instance, Morozov mentions frequent references to earthquakes, which never happen on the territory of historical Russia. Morozov had also studied all the references made to solar and lunar eclipses in the Russian chronicle, and made the following corollary:

Not a single eclipse predating the end of the XI century and mentioned in the *Povest Vremennyh Let* can be verified by astronomical calculations; the first solar eclipse that was confirmed by calculations, one that took place on 8 April 1065, could not have been observed from Kiev, unlike Egypt and Northern Africa.

All the astronomical data contained in Russian chronicles can only be confirmed starting with the XIV century and on.

Our hypothesis is as follows: the *Povest Vremennyh Let* has absorbed events from Byzantine chronicles, coated by a layer of later Russian events, primarily dating from the XVI century. We shall cite plenty of examples below.

Thus, we find no traces of documented Russian history that predate the XIII century; it is possible that no historians had existed outside Byzantium back then.

The power of Byzantium, even if regarded as a purely formal or a wholly religious institution, covered enormous territories, which were often at a great distance from the capital. The dominant role of Byzantium in the epoch of the XI-XIII century is explained by the fact that, according to our reconstruction, the historical character known as Jesus Christ had lived (and been crucified) in the XI century Czar-Grad = Jerusalem – Troy. Conquered regions, or *themae*, as they were called in Byzantium, comprised the entire world that was known to Byzantine chroniclers, beyond which lay bizarre regions that they failed to comprehend and called “deserts”, populating them with fictional characters – giants, people with canine heads etc.

After the dissolution of the Byzantine Empire in 1204, its parts became independent, complete with

nascent statehood and new historians. This didn't happen at once, and so the old Byzantine chronicles were used as the ground layer for the Russian history. This is also natural, since the countries that were formed from shards of the Byzantine Empire had all been governed by former governor-generals, or members of Byzantine aristocracy. They eventually became independent rulers, keeping the old Byzantine chronicles in their possession all the while. Their offspring had deemed these chronicles to be the "beginning of the local history", and would start with them.

This situation is typical for virtually every country – for instance, the same happened to the old English history, qv in Part 2; once again, old Byzantine chronicles of the XI-XIII century were subsequently included into the ancient English history by the historians from the British Isles. The same process took place in Russia and in Italian Rome, whose old "chronicles" reflect the real XI-XIII century history of Byzantium transferred to Italy and woven into the Italian chronology.

Therefore, the XIII century marks a break point in Russian history; we know next to nothing about the epochs that had preceded it. The dawn of Russian history as we know it falls on the period when there's a large number of principalities or Hordes scattered all across the territory of Russia; they must have been built upon the ruins of the former Byzantine Empire of the Roman Greeks.

Let us briefly list the most important horders: The Greater Horde, the Lesser Horde, the White Horde and the Blue Horde. Novgorod the Great = Yaroslavl, as well as Suzdal, Ryazan, Smolensk, Kiev (or Chernigov), Tver, Azov, Astrakhan and a number of others had still been independent capitals, whereas Moscow simply didn't exist. These Hordes had not yet unified into a single state and kept fighting against each other.

These independent states were governed by distant offspring of the Byzantine governor-generals from aristocratic clans, all of which used to trace their ancestry back to Augustus and were perfectly correct in doing so, no matter how much sarcasm and vitriol this notion might provoke from the part of a learned historian.

The ties with the Byzantine court had remained

functional and active for many years; Kartashev reports that some of the "Mongolian" = "Great" Khans (or the Slavic rulers of Russia, as we are beginning to realise) occasionally married the daughters of the Byzantine emperors.

For instance, Abaka-Khan was married to the daughter of the Byzantine emperor Michael Palaiologos ([372], page 281); Nogai-Khan, a famous character in Russian history, was married to Euphrosinia, the daughter of a Byzantine emperor ([372], page 282). Tokhta-Khan, the predecessor of Uzbek-Khan, was married to the daughter of Andronicus the Elder, also a Byzantine emperor; Uzbek-Khan himself was married to the daughter of Emperor Andronicus the Younger; however, it is assumed that Uzbek had already been converted into Islam.

Below we shall be discussing the fact that when one reads mediaeval Western sources, one finds it very hard to understand whether the authors refer to the Muslims or to the Orthodox Christians, since they often proved reluctant to distinguish between the two, using the term "infidels" for referring to both – therefore, the "infidels" one might encounter in such texts may well have adhered to the Orthodox faith, depending on the persuasion of the author.

2.

THE INVASION OF THE TARTARS AND THE MONGOLS AS THE UNIFICATION OF RUSSIA under the rule of the Novgorod = Yaroslavl dynasty of Georgiy = Genghis-Khan and then his brother Yaroslav = Batu-Khan = Ivan Kalita

Above we have already referred to the "invasion of the Tartars and the Mongols" as to the unification of Russia (see our analysis of the report written by a Hungarian missionary and a contemporary of the events in question). This epoch (the first half of the XIV century) is the furthest we can trace documented history of Russia to (bear in mind that the epoch of the Great = "Mongolian" conquest falls over the XIV century after the compensation of the centenarian chronological shift inherent in Russian history and discovered by the authors.

The situation in Russia had largely resembled the chaos of independent principalities that had reigned over the entire Western Europe, with larger stately

structures emerging therefrom. This process began in Russia; the first centre to unite all the other Russian principalities around it had been Rostov the Great. Let us relate our reconstruction in more detail.

2.1. Genghis-Khan = Georgiy = Rurik

2.1.1. *His original in the XIV century is Youri = Georgiy Danilovich of Moscow*

In 1318 the Great Prince Georgiy Danilovich = Genghis-Khan ascended to the Rostov throne in the territory that would later become the Vladimir and Suzdal Russia. His phantom duplicates are Prince Georgiy Vsevolodovich from the alleged XIII century, Youri Dolgoroukiy of Rostov in the alleged XII century, Mstislav Oudaloi (“The Daring”), brother and co-ruler of Yaroslav the Wise in the alleged XI century.

Georgiy (Youri) Danilovich = Genghis-Khan initiates the unification of Russia. He captures the Volga region first, and proceeds to move to the West step by step. The details of this conquest aren’t known to us all that well, but their significance isn’t all that great. Romanovian historians have stretched this period of conquest over several decades; it had been a great deal shorter in reality. The abovementioned evidence from the part of the Hungarian observer is a lot more realistic chronologically, and makes more sense in general ([25]). The unification process in question is known to us nowadays as the “invasion of the Mongols and the Tartars from the East” – however, it must have looked like that to the chroniclers from Western Russia. Apparently, the Russian chronicles that had served as originals for the ones that have reached our age were of Polish or Ukrainian origin (after all, the Radzivilovskaya Chronicle was found in Königsberg). It is a known fact in general that many Russian chronicles demonstrate distinct signs of the South-Western Russian dialect.

One must pay attention to the fact that the old Russian coat of arms used to depict St. George the Conqueror – hardly surprising, considering how George (Georgiy), aka Genghis-Khan, had indeed been the founder of the Great = “Mongolian” Russian Empire.

Indications that the first Russian capital had been in Rostov survive in many sources – let us quote Ka-

ramzin’s “History”, which contains the following passage about Rostov:

“The towns competed in antiquity, just like old aristocratic clans would. The inhabitants of Rostov were proud of just how ancient their city had been, calling Vladimir a suburb and its inhabitants, masons, builders and servants. The former implied that the latter weren’t even worthy of having a Prince of their own and suggested to send them a governor-general” ([363], Volume 3, Chapter 2, page 375). Historians date this dispute between Rostov and Vladimir to the end of the XII century, when Vladimir had already been capital of the Russian state according to the Romanovian-Millerian chronology. Rostov had tried to regain its status of a capital.

2.1.2. *The identity of Rurik, the founder of the royal dynasty of the Russian princes, the dating of his lifetime and the localization of his endeavours.*

1) *What does the chronicle tell us?*

The name of the legendary Rurik, who was summoned to Russia in order to “help restore order”, is known to every Russian from a very early age. Many scientific works have been written about this legend, and disputes about its real meaning take place to date. Some claim this legend to be proof of the “slavish nature of all Russians”, who had been perfectly helpless and unable to organise a state of their own, and forced to summon Rurik the “Varangian” to rule over them. Nowadays the Varangians are identified as the Normans, and certain scientists claim Rurik and the very sources of the Russian statehood to be of a foreign (Norman) origin. The opponents of this theory (the Slavophiles of the XVIII-XX century in particular) have argued against it back then, and keep at it to date. It is perfectly obvious that we shall inevitably be confronted with this rather contentious issue; however, we don’t intend to avoid it, since we are interested in the topic and have got some related considerations that we would like to share.

Let us look into the *Povest Vremennyh Let*. We shall quote Karamzin’s rendition of the respective passage first: “the Novgorod Slavs and the tribes of Krivichi, Ves and Choud sent envoys to cross the sea and tell the Russo-Varangians: ‘Our land is great and abundant, but lacks order: we invite you to govern over us’ ... Rurik came to Novgorod, Sineus to Bye-

loozero ... and Truvor to Izborsk, the city of the Krivichi" ([362], Volume 1, Chapter 4, page 69).

This is what the original chronicle tells us:

"In the year 6370 [the alleged year 862 A.D. – Auth.] ... there was no peace between them, with one clan rising against another, and ceaseless strife everywhere, and so they decided to look for a Prince to govern them. And they fared across the sea to the Varangian tribe of the Russians ... all the other Russian tribes – the Choud, the Krivichi, all the Slavs, and the rest of them, and they said unto the Varangians: 'Our land is great and abundant, yet we can find no peace between ourselves. Come now, and reign over us'. And three brothers set forth to govern over the entire Russia, together with their families; the first came to the Slavs from the Ladoga; the eldest brother was Rurik, and he became Prince of Ladoga; the second came to rule over us here in Byeloozero, and the third, Truvor, had gone to Izborsk. And those Varangians baptised Russia the land of Novgorod, since their ancestors had come thence; in the second year, both Sineus and Truvor died, and Rurik became the sole ruler. And it came to pass that he had founded a town upon River Volkhov, and called it Novgorod, making it his capital. He had divided the entire land between his people as fiefs – Poltesk, Rostov and Byeloozero. All those towns were inhabited by the Varangians; the dwellers of Novgorod were Slavs, the Krivichi lived in Polotsk, the Meryane in Rostov, the Ves in Byeloozero and the Muroma in Murom. Rurik had been their liege ... and two of his men set forth ... and went along the Dnepr [having conquered Kiev on their way – Auth.] ... and became rulers of the Polish land, while Rurik had remained their sole ruler regnant in Novgorod" (The Radzivilovskaya Chronicle, [716], page 16).

According to our reconstruction, this passage describes the unification of Russia by Georgiy the Great in the beginning of the XIV century (this historical character is also known as Genghis-Khan). In particular, we learn about the foundation of Novgorod upon Volkhov (Volga) = Yaroslavl.

2) *Rurik = Yuri = Gyurgiy = Georgiy (George).*

The name Georgiy = Gyurgiy (Yuri) is derived from the famous name of Rurik as found in the chronicles, the latter being the archaic version of the former. A propos, the name Rurik does not exist in

Russia as such, and it is also absent from the ecclesiastical canon. One shouldn't think that this name was forgotten – it is used in its two modern forms, Youri and Georgiy. The two have only become independent names recently; one discovers them to be the same name when one looks into the ancient chronicles.

3) *Rurik = Youri = Georgiy Danilovich in the XIV century.*

The original of Rurik is the Great Prince Youri = Georgiy Danilovich of Moscow, who had lived in the early XIV century.

4) *The "summoning of the Princes" as the unification of Russia by Youri = Genghis-Khan.*

As we have witnessed, the chronicle begins the legend of Rurik with the description of a great embroilment, or a war between the various parts of the Slavic lands, which is a mirror reflection of the XIV century strife that had ended with the unification of Russia by the dynasty of Ivan Kalita and Genghis Khan = Youri = Rurik after the plea to "come and govern". The chronicle is perfectly correct to point out that a new and larger state was founded as a result.

5) *On the origins of the Varangians.*

The chronicle explicitly identifies the Varangians as Russians: "And those Varangians baptised Russia the land of Novgorod" ([716], page 16). Some historians try to convince us that Russia had once been the name of an "ancient" Scandinavian tribe, that had heeded to the desperate call of their neighbours from Novgorod and come to the rescue, having abandoned their ancient homeland and settled on the territory of the modern Russia, baptising it by the name of their old birthplace. This "Scandinavian tribe of Russians" had left no mark in the old Scandinavian history whatsoever – no Scandinavian source that dates from the epoch in question mentions the conquest of Russia from the territory of the modern Scandinavia.

According to our reconstruction, Rurik = Youri Danilovich had been a Russian prince. His troops did invade Scandinavia on their way from Russia (the Horde) to the West and the North-West. Rurik had originally governed over Rostov, Yaroslavl and the rest of the town agglomeration known as Novgorod the Great. Bear in mind that the chronicle uses the

word for referring to the entire Russian land and not just one city ([716], page 16). This is in perfect concurrence with our hypothesis that Novgorod the Great had once been the name for the entire region of Yaroslavl, and all the towns and cities it comprised.

Furthermore – historians themselves tell us that ancient Byzantine documents often used the term “Russo-Varangians”, or simply the Varangian Russians ([804], page 246). Historians hasten to explicate that the name in question is a result of “assimilation” and nothing but:

“The term ‘Russo-Varangians’ (rôssobaraggoi) as used in the Byzantine political terminology of the XI century is a direct consequence of the assimilation of the Normans among the Slavs. The term was used for referring to the Russian troops ... It is noteworthy that an Icelandic poet did not distinguish between the Slavs and the Greeks back in the day” ([804], page 246, comment 25).

6) *Did the name of the Varangians survive on any maps?*

Assuming that the Varangians were of Slavic origin, where did they live in Russia? Let us study the map of the world in order to locate places whose toponymy is related to the word “Varangian” in one way or another. We find only one such name in the entire geographical atlas, a rather extensive one ([159]), as one can plainly see from its name index. It is the town of Vargovo (or simply “Varyagovo”, the Russian word for “Varangian” being “Varyag”). It is located at the distance of a mere 30-40 kilometres from Yaroslavl.

This name is the only one whose origins can be traced to the word “Varangian”. The atlas ([159]) contains no similarly-named locations anywhere, be it Scandinavia, America or Australia.

According to N. M. Karamzin, there is a “Varangian Church” in Novgorod, and also a “Varangian Street”. Karamzin is of the opinion that the Baltic Sea identifies as the Varangian Sea ([362], Volume 4, P. Stroyev’s index). There is nothing surprising about it – the Russians (or the Varangians) used to trade with the West, using the ports in the Baltic sea for this purpose in particular, hence the name: Varangian = Russian. Let us reiterate that, according to the chronicle ([716], page 16), the Varangians and the Russians

were two names of the same nation. However, the hypothesis of Karamzin about the Varangian Sea being solely the Baltic Sea is rather flimsy, as we shall demonstrate below.

7) *The Varangians as another word for “enemy”.*

Let us once again ponder the true identity of the Varangians. Our hypothesis about the origins of the name is as follows: the Varangians translate as “enemies” (“vorogi” or “vragi” in Russian, cf. “Varyagi”). In other words, the name doesn’t mean any particular nationality, but rather refers to the hostile nature of the nation referred to in this manner – namely, the hostile forces that came to power in the unified Russia. Bear in mind that we’re discussing the epoch of the early XIV century, which is the time when the gigantic Empire of Genghis-Khan = Georgiy was founded. From the viewpoint of a scribe from the Western Slavic territories (the author of the first chapters in the *Povest Vremennyyh Let*), the successful merging and military empowerment of the Eastern lands (Yaroslavl et al) under Genghis-Khan and Batu-Khan = Ivan Kalita had been an invasion of the enemy, or a “Varangian invasion”. This would serve as a pretext for declaring “the Mongols and the Tartars” enemies of Russia in some of the documents.

Our summary is as follows: the beginning of the *Povest Vremennyyh Let* reflects the position of the Western Russian (or Western Slavic) principalities and their dwellers, who said: “our foe Rurik (the Varangian) came to power in Russia”.

These sentiments could only be expressed by the defeated Western party, whose political merging with the Empire must have come as a result of an annexation. This might be the very reason why the Eastern Russian dynasty of George = Genghis-Khan (the Horde) was declared foreign and maligned in general by some of the scribes – the defeated Westerners were naturally very vocal in the expression of displeasure, and their irate voice was heeded by their successors. It is easy to understand the defeated party – the unification of the Empire must have been accompanied by massacres of opposition. Even today we often witness how the voice of a defeated party rings louder than that of the victor; a defeated party finds consolation and sympathy easily, and has good chances to be treated benevolently by future scribes.

8) *The opposition between the Western Slavs with the Russians, or the foes from the East.*

The above concept can easily be proved by historical documents; indeed, the Radzivilovskaya chronicle is telling us about the Varangian Russians, or the Russian foes, qv in [716], page 16. Furthermore, the chronicle claims that “those Varangians [or enemies – Auth.] had given the Russian land its name” ([716], page 16). Everything is perfectly clear – the word “Russian” refers to an ethnic group, but in a rather general sense of the word, insofar as it is applicable to ancient nations of the XIII-XIV century at all. The word “Varangian” is nothing but an emotional characteristic of the nation by the Westerners. Quite naturally, the Western Slavs initially try to oppose the Eastern foes (the Russians). Indeed, Russian chronicles tell us so directly:

a) The people of Novgorod have to pay tribute to the Varangians (or the enemies): “paying tribute to the Varangians from across the sea” ([716], page 56).

b) We learn of the violence wrought upon the Slavic tribes (the Krivichi and the rest) by the Varangian foes: “the Varangians that live there wreak violence upon the Slavs – the Krivichi, the Meryane and the Choud” ([36], page 56). A hostile and violent nation would naturally be classified as a foe; hence “Varangians”.

c) Some of the cities had initially united and tried to banish the Varangian foes and rule autonomously: “And so the Slavs did rise, the Krivichi, and the Meryane, likewise the Choud, against the Varangians, and banished them, and made them flee over the sea; and so they had founded towns and cities, and started to rule over their own lands” ([36], page 56).

d) All these efforts were in vain – what ensued was a period of civil wars and anarchy: “and town rose against town, and there was violence and bloodshed galore” ([36], page 56). The warring nations finally invited the Varangian Russians to govern them: “And they fared across the sea to the Varangians ... all the other Russian tribes – the Choud, the Krivichi, all the Slavs, and the rest of them, and they said unto the Varangians: ‘Our land is great and abundant, yet we can find no peace between ourselves. Come now, and reign over us’” ([36], page 56).

Russia was united by Genghis-Khan – Georgiy, or Youri, and then Batu-Khan = Ivan Kalita. Chronicles

tell us that Russia received its name from those rulers ([36], page 56).

9) *Apart from the Varangian foes, chronicles also mention allies.*

However, if the Varangians were the foes of the scribe’s nation, he must also mention allies. We do indeed find them reflected in the chronicle, which tells us about the allies right after it finishes with its foes, the Russians. The allies of the scribe’s nation are the Goths and two other nations called Ouremyane and Inglyane (see [716], page 16).

Bear in mind that the Russian words for “other” and “friend” are very similar – “drougoi” and “droug”, respectively. The word “drouzie” used in the original is most likely to be the latter and not the former – it would be an obvious thing to do for the chronicler to mention friendly nations alongside enemy nations. We consider this interpretation of the text to make perfect sense. Thus, the chronicle in question tells us about the friends and the foes of the Western Slavic scribe’s nation.

10) *“Fryagi” and “Fryazi” as two other forms of the word “vragi” (“enemies”). The identity of the “Fryagi” who stormed Constantinople in 1204.*

Nowadays it is presumed that the Varangians (the foes) are also mentioned in the ancient chronicles under the alias Fryagi, or Fryazi. Some historians (M. N. Tikhomirov, for instance; see [841]) are of the opinion that the nation known as Fryagi, Fryazi and Fryaziny can be identified as the Italians – not even all Italians, but the Genoese in particular. One cannot help mentioning that a great many texts speak of the Fryagi and no other nation, be it Italians or Western Europeans in general; this leaves one with the opinion that the entire Western world had been populated by the Genoese in the eyes of the Russian scribes, who wrote of no other nation but the Fryagi.

This is possible; however, one must by all means note that the Russian word for enemy (“vrag”) has the dialect form “vrazhina” – same as “frazhina” or “fryazina”, bearing in mind the flexion of the sounds Zh and Z.

Our hypothesis is as follows. Italians, among others, could indeed be referred to as Fryazi or Fryagi – however, this name has got nothing in common with

any mythical nations that had disappeared without a trace. Therefore, some part of Russians may have perceived them as enemies at some point in time, and called them respectively. This is hardly surprising – there have been many Roman Catholics among the Italians starting with the XVI-XVII century, and Orthodox Christians may have treated them as a hostile power during certain historical epochs.

There used to be villages of Fryazino and Fryazevo to the North of Moscow; they still exist as satellite towns. These villages were presumably populated by Italian immigrants. Could those have been regarded as foes? See [841], pages 116-117 for further reference. The fact that the Fryagi (or the Fryazi) aren't an actual nationality, but rather a form of the word *vrag* (enemy) becomes obvious from the ancient Russian account that tells about the conquest of Constantinople by the crusaders in 1204 (see the Almanac entitled "Old Russian Tales", Moscow, 1986). It is common knowledge that the crusaders were of the utmost ethnical diversity; however, the chronicle uses the word "fryagi" for referring to the invaders, without using the term "crusader" once. If we are to follow the Scaligerian-Millerian point of view, we shall have to think that the author had considered all of the crusaders to have come from Genoa. We are of the opinion that everything was a great deal simpler in reality – the scribe calls the invaders "enemies", and that is hardly a term that anyone could apply to a single nationality. Therefore, our interpretation of these references makes everything fall into place – the capital was taken by some hostile power referred to as "fryagi" or "the foes".

11) *The city of Novgorod founded by Rurik and its true identity.*

Rurik, or Youri, had founded the city of Novgorod upon River Volkhov. Everything is quite correct – apparently, the city in question is Yaroslavl on River Volga, Volkhov being an early version of the latter's name. It wasn't until the migration of Novgorod to its current location due to some historical sleight of hand that the original name of Volga had moved to the northwest and became identified with the river that runs through the modern Novgorod, known as Volkhov to date.

Geographical names were subject to migration and

multiplication, as we have demonstrated many a time. However, it is also possible that the modern Novgorod had once been founded by the natives of the original Novgorod, or Yaroslavl, who had baptised the local river with the familiar name of Volkhov, or Volga - a possible derivative of "*vlaga*" (water, moisture etc), whereas the town became known as Novgorod (cf. Moscow, St. Petersburg and Odessa in the USA).

12) *The meaning of the word Ilmer.*

Rurik (Youri) founds Novgorod next to Ilmer. What could this word possibly mean? The chronicle mentions the nation of Mer, whose capital had once been in Rostov – right next to Yaroslavl.

13) *The real location of Rurik's capital.*

We have thus found virtually all of the geographical names mentioned in the tale about "the summoning of Rurik". All of them pertain to the region of Yaroslavl; this is also confirmed by the fact that all the towns and cities mentioned in the chronicle are located in the same area – Polotsk, Belozersk, Rostov and Murom. The geographical location of Rurik's capital is therefore indicated perfectly unequivocally – it could have been Rostov or Yaroslavl, but certainly not the modern town of Novgorod upon the modern River Volkhov.

14) *The foundation of Kiev.*

The "Archangelsk Cronograph" dates the very dawn of Russian history to the alleged year 852 A.D., telling us that "there were three brothers – Kiy, Shchek and Khoriv. Kiy had founded the city of Kiev" ([36], page 56).

We are of the opinion that the passage in question refers to the Western Slavs – the name Shcheck sounds similar to "Czech", whereas "Khoriv" could be a reference to Croatia or the Croatioans. We have already cited Morozov's opinion about the first chapters of the *Povest Vremennyh Let* containing a significant layer of Byzantine events, with Byzantium given priority over Russia. One must also remember that the mediaeval English sources had used the word Chyo for Kiev, as well as the names Cleva and Riona ([517], page 262). However, Chyo is most likely to be another name of Isle Chyos (Khios) in the Aegean Sea right next to Greece. Could the "*Povest Vremennyh*

Let” be telling us about the foundation of the Czech and Croatian kingdoms, likewise the kingdom of Chyo (Chyos). This is perfectly natural for a Byzantine-influenced source.

2.1.3. The fastest and most comfortable way from Greece to Rome, and the location of the famous “Graeco-Varangian Route”

Since both Greece and Italy are Mediterranean countries, common sense suggests sailing westward across the Mediterranean – it would take one about two days to get to Rome from Greece. However, we are being told that ancient seafarers were accustomed to taking an altogether different route. They would set sail from Greece, their ships loaded with weapons, livestock, grain, textiles and building materials, and head towards the Bosphorus in order to get to Rome – opposite direction, no less. Having passed through the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus, they would reach the Black Sea, sail towards its northern coast, and enter the Dnepr estuary. Upon reaching the source of Dnepr, the seafarers would unload the ships and drag their ships and their wares across the strip of dry land between Dnepr and the river Lovat. They would have to cross the Western Dvina on their way – a large navigable river flowing towards the Baltic Sea, right where they had to get; it is much wider than the Lovat to boot. However, instead of using the Western Dvina for sailing towards the Baltic Sea, they would cross the river, unload their ships once again and carry on towards the Lovat. A few dozen kilometres further on they would reach Lovat and sail on to Lake Ilmen then towards the modern Volkhov, Lake Ladoga, and, finally, the Baltic sea with its storms and the perils of Kattegat and Skagerrak. Having crossed it, the seafarers would reach the North Sea, the foggy coast of Britain, pass the English channel, the coastline of Portugal, France and Spain, and then the Gibraltar, returning to the Mediterranean that they had left many months ago for some unfathomable reason.

We are told that the traders circumnavigated the entire continent of Europe, and this isn’t a fancy of ours! This is the very route insisted upon by the modern historians who identify the Varangian Sea as the Baltic Sea. The *Povest Vremennyh Let* tells us the following:

“From the Varangians to the Greeks, then further

north along the Dnepr, dragging the ships towards the Lovot, and then to the Great Lake of Ilmer; from that lake they went to the Great Lake of Nevo via Volkhov and then to the Varangian Sea, making their way toward Rome, and then to Czar-Grad through the very same sea” ([716], page 12).

We have been quoting the Academic Moscow Copy of the Radzivilovskaya Chronicle; however, since the chronicle claims that the last part of the itinerary lay through one and the same Varangian sea, up until Constantinople, which makes it the same sea for Rome, Constantinople and the modern St. Petersburg. The Varangian Sea can therefore just as easily be identified as the Mediterranean, and indeed the whole Atlantic.

The clumsiness of this interpretation (which is nonetheless considered “traditional”) becomes instantly obvious. This is why Academician B. A. Rybakov, for instance, declares this entire fragment with the description of the itinerary to be of an apocryphal nature, written by some scribe who needed to find “a route that would lead from the Black Sea to Rome through the Russian lands” ([753], page 127). Therefore, the hypothetical identification of the Varangian Sea as the Baltic rests upon the extremely convoluted and a priori distorted description of the Graeco-Varangian trading route.

Had the itinerary in question coincided with the reconstruction suggested by the modern historians, one should expect an abundance of trade-related findings in this region, even despite the fact that a large part of the “route” had presumably led through marshland wilderness. However, specialists in numismatic history tell us the following in this respect:

“The intensity of the economical and political relations between Russia and Byzantium notwithstanding, the coins of the latter are all but absent from the Eastern European hoardings of the IX-X century. This is all the more bizarre considering the activity of the traders on the Graeco-Varangian trading route starting with the middle of the IX century and on – one should expect to find the production of the Constantinople mints all across this region” ([756], page 59). It is perfectly obvious that the real route had been elsewhere.

Our hypothesis is as follows: the name “Varangian” could be applied to different seas – the Baltic, the

White and the Mediterranean; possibly, others as well. If the Russo-Varangians can be identified as the Russians who had traded with many foreign countries, some of the main seafaring routes could have been dubbed Varangian, or Russian (bear in mind that the Black Sea had once been known as the Russian Sea, for instance).

The correctness of this theory is confirmed by the comments from N. M. Karamzin's *History* (see the "Baltic Sea" entry in the alphabetical index of geographical names in [362], Book 4). Indeed, N. M. Karamzin is forced to identify the numerous seas mentioned in the chronicles as the Baltic Sea, following the Scaligerian-Millerian historical geography (the White Sea, the Venetian Sea, the Varangian Sea, the Eastern Sea and the Great Sea). The White Sea is known quite well, and it is definitely not the Baltic Sea. The Venetian Sea is clearly the Mediterranean. We see numerous traces of the extensive "Varangian geography".

Let us reiterate – the only geographical name related to the word "Varangian" found on the modern atlas ([159]) belongs to the town of Varegovo in the Yaroslavl region.

2.1.4. The three brothers: Ryurik, Sineus and Truvor. The division of the Russo-Mongolian Horde into the Golden Horde, the White Horde and the Blue Horde in the XIV century

The legend about "the summoning of the princes" also reflects the division of the "Mongolian" (Great) Russia into three parts – the Golden Horde, the Blue Horde and the White Horde. The legend in question relates this event as the division of the state between the three brothers – Ryurik (the elder), Sineus and Truvor. A propos, could the name Sineus be a reflection of the Blue Horde, seeing as how the Russian word for "blue" is "*sinii*"?

2.1.5. The hypothesis about the origins of the Muslim era of Hegira

The beginning of the Hegira era in Scaligerian history falls over 622 A.D. Morozov voiced a number of considerations in [547] that speak in favour of the following bold hypothesis: the Hegira era really began in 1318 A.D. and not 622.

Let us add that in this case the beginning of the

Hegira era coincides with the beginning of Georgiy's (Genghis-Khan's) reign. If we linger upon this, we shall notice the similarity between the word Hegira and the name Georgiy (as well as its variants – Gourgiy, Gourgouta etc). The word Hegira can also be a compound derivative of the two words, Gog and Era – the Era of Gog, the Era of the Goths or the Era of Mongols.

2.2. Batu-Khan identified as Yaroslav, his XIV century original being Ivan Danilovich Kalita = Caliph

2.2.1. A brief biography

Georgiy = Genghis-Khan was killed in a battle at River Sitt, which was nonetheless won by his "Tartar" troops. His brother, Batu-Khan, or Ivan Kalita = Caliph, carried on with Georgiy's cause. The name Batu must be a derivative of the word "*batka*" – "father". The word "*batka*" is used by the Cossacks for their atamans; also consider the usual way of addressing the Czar in Russia: "*Tsar-Batyushka*", which translates as "Our Father the Czar". The name Kalita is most likely to be a distorted version of the word Caliph.

Phantom duplicates of Ivan Kalita = Batu-Khan include Yaroslav the Wise in the alleged XI century, Andrei Bogolyubskiy in the alleged XII century and Yaroslav Vsevolodovich, the legendary founder of Yaroslavl, or Novgorod the Great, in the alleged XIII century (see [994], pages 8-9). The latter character is also credited with the conquest of Kiev around 1330; this dating can hardly be estimated with any degree of precision worth speaking of. Batu-Khan = Ivan Kalita continued with waging wars against his neighbours in the West. It is presumed that he had reached Italy. The unification of Russia and the formation of the cyclopean Empire reached completion during his reign. He had divided Russia between his children shortly before his death. The chronicle mentions this when it tells us about Yaroslav the Wise: "Yaroslav's children divided the state between themselves, following the will of their father" ([363], Volume 2, Chapter 4, page 45). This is the famous division of Russia between the sons of Yaroslav the Wise. According to our reconstruction, this very division had led to the existence of three states on the territory of Russia; it took place in the middle of the XIV century.

Russia became separated into the Greater Russia, the Lesser Russia and the White Russia (also known as the three Hordes – Golden, Blue (the modern Ukraine and Poland) and White. Ivan Kalita is said to have died in 1340.

It is rather noteworthy that the mediaeval authors consider modern Hungary an area conquered by the natives of the Greater Hungary, or the Volga Region ([25]). Herberstein, for instance, reports the same as he describes the region of Yugra in Russia, calling it “the very Yugra that the Hungarians hail from; they settled in Pannonia, and conquered many European countries led by Attila. The Muscovites are very proud of this name [Attila – Auth.], since their alleged subjects had once laid most of Europe waste” ([161], page 163). We hope that the readers paid attention to the most noteworthy mention of the famous Attila in the context of Russian history. We shall refrain from delving deeper into the subject for the time being, and simply remind the reader that, according to the Scalligerian chronology, Attila had died in “times immemorial” – namely, the alleged V century A.D. Thus, Sigismund Herberstein tells us that Attila used to be a Russian military leader.

Also bear in mind that the Hungarians are one of the few linguistically isolated European nations – other Ugro-Finnic European languages include Finnish and related languages in Scandinavia, and the Udmurtian language spoken to the East of Volga, closer to the Ural. Bear in mind that Batu-Khan had sent three armies to Europe; could the ancestors of the present day Hungarians have been one of them?

2.2.2. An attempt of transferring the capital to Kiev

Apparently, Yaroslav the Wise = Batu-Khan = Ivan Kalita had attempted to transfer the capital of the state to Kiev. According to the chronicle, he had “founded a great city [in Kiev – Auth.] ... likewise the Church of St. Sophia, having thus transferred the Metropolitan’s diocese here” ([716], year 6545 (1037)). The same event became reflected in the “Tartar” version as the invitation sent by Batu-Khan to Metropolitan Cyril, who travelled from Novgorod to Kiev, as we already mentioned. A propos, the “tomb of Yaroslav” still exists in Kiev. Apparently, Yaroslav the Wise = Batu-Khan had intended to carry on with his military expansion westward and move the capital

further west, closer to the front line. Indeed, it is known that he moved towards Hungary next.

2.2.3. The battle between Batu-Khan and the Hungarian king with his allies

“Having captured Kiev, Batu-Khan had moved three armies towards Europe – the first to Poland, the second towards Silesia, and the third to Hungary. The Mongols [= The Great Ones – Auth.] destroyed Vladimir-Volynskiy, Cholm, Sandomir and Krakow on their way, crushed the Teutonic knights as well as the German and Polish troops, and invaded Moravia. They encountered resistance from the part of the Bohemian king’s army, and even stronger resistance in the lands of the Czechs, where they were met and defeated by the united army of the Austrian and Caringian dukes ... the Horde turned back and proceeded to join the main forces in Hungary. By that time the country had already been invaded by Batu-Khan, who had crushed the troops of Bela, King of Hungary. The latter brought a large army to Pest that consisted of Hungarian, Croatian and Austrian troops, as well as French knights and numerous armed parties of various princes. The Mongols [= The Great Ones – Auth.] had approached Pest and stood there for two months. Then they started to retreat, and the allied forces marched onwards in hot pursuit. For six days they have been on the march, meeting no one but solitary riders here and there. On the seventh day the allies decided to camp in a valley surrounded by hills covered in vineyards, and in the morning they found themselves surrounded by the Mongolian army. The allies tried to attack the Mongols, but were met by a swarm of arrows and stones from catapults. Allies began their retreat towards the Danube in face of heavy casualties. Most of the allied troops were destroyed in the six days that followed, and the Mongols [= The Great Ones – Auth.] captured Pest.

King Bela’s army fled towards Dalmatia pursued by the Mongols [= The Great Ones – Auth.], who kept destroying European cities; they turned back after having marched through Slavonia, Croatia and Serbia ... Then Batu-Khan had turned the troops backwards to Lower Volga and Don, having thus concluded his conquest of the Western lands” ([183], Volume 1, pages 30-31).

We have cited a quotation this large with a pur-

pose. The above information is of paramount importance, since the description of this battle between Batu-Khan's Russian troops and the Hungarian king accompanied by his allies is very similar to the account of the famous Battle of Kalka between the Tartars and the Polovtsy (or the Russians and the Poles, according to our reconstruction).

Let us make a small observation before we carry on with our account of the Battle of Kalka. The capital of Hungary is called Budapest; however, according to the chronicle that we have just quoted, it used to be known as Pest back in the day. Could the prefix "Buda" have appeared after Batu-Khan's conquest? After all, "Buda" and "Batu" are similar enough to each other.

2.2.4. The Battle of Kalka fought between the "Mongols", or the Russians, and the "Russians", or the Poles

The Battle of Kalka was fought in the alleged year 1223 by the following two parties: the "Mongols" (or the Russian troops that came from the Vladimir-Suzdal Russia) and the united army of "the Russians and the Polovtsy" ([634], page 149). The Western Russian troops came to aid the Polovtsy (the Poles), although the "Mongols" (Great Ones) recommended them to withhold from taking part in the battle: "We have heard that you are about to come against us at the insistence of the Polovtsy; pray refrain, for we do not mean to take your land, nor your cities, nor the villages, and you are no foes to us" ([643], page 155). However, the Western Russian princes decided to fight on the side of the Polovtsy, or the Poles. The battle ended with a complete rout of the allies.

The Battle of Kalka was preceded by an 8-day retreat of the "Mongols" from the Dnepr (presumably). After a long march, they brought the pursuers to a place called Kalki, or Kalka (a river, according to some reports). The allied forces were ambushed here, and suffered a bitter and crushing defeat. The "Tartars" had chased them all the way back to the Dnepr. The scenario is the same as we remember from the battle between Batu-Khan and the Hungarian king. It would be expedient to carry on with the comparison in a more meticulous manner.

The only difference between the descriptions of the two respective battles is that in the first case the al-

leged "retreat" of the Mongols began from the Dnepr, and in the second the river in question had been the Danube. In case of the Battle of Kalka, it is presumed that the "Mongols" had retreated until they reached a certain River Kalka that is supposed to flow into the Azov sea ([634], page 552). However, one must instantly note that there is no such river anywhere in the vicinity, nor are there any records of its existence anywhere in the world (see the alphabetical index of the Global Geographical Atlas, Moscow, 1968). Another river where the "Tartars" defeated the Russian princes from the North-East (River Sit) still exists under the very same name as a tributary of River Mologa. Other rivers mentioned in the chronicles retained their former names as well, and exist until the present day.

Our opinion is that "Kalka" or "Kalki" is a corrupted version of the name Kulikovo (field). In CHRON4, Chapter 6, we shall demonstrate that the Kulikovo Field is most likely to identify as Kulishki, a well-known part of Moscow. According to our reconstruction, Moscow had neither been a capital nor indeed a city at all in the epoch under study, qv in CHRON4, Chapter 6. This place had indeed once been surrounded by hills with orchards (the mention of vineyards in the Hungarian sources, qv above, does not necessarily imply grapes – this would naturally be an impossibility in these latitudes). However, the Slavic word for "grape" ("*vinograd*") had originally meant "orchard" or "a cultivated piece of land" ([782]-[790]). There were many orchards in this part of Moscow, and the toponymy of the local streets and churches, many of which have the root "SAD" ("orchard") in their names, testifies to that. Not that we insist that the Battle of Kulikovo took place here; we are merely trying to point out the fact that the name Kalka (Kalki) is very characteristic for Moscow and the area around Moscow (cf. the town of Kaluga etc).

A propos, the word "*vinograd*" may have meant "*voin-grad*" at some point – "warrior town", in other words, or "military settlement" – it would be more natural to expect the description of a battle to refer to a military settlement and not a vineyard, after all.

Our opinion is that we have two accounts of the same battle before us – they only separated in chronicles, on paper, being reflections of one and the same event.

As for the exact geographical localization of the false retreat of the “Mongols” (Dnepr or Danube), all we can say is that this issue requires additional research. The distance between the Azov and Dnepr roughly equals that between Dnepr and Moscow or Kaluga; it would hardly make any difference to the “Mongols” whether to retreat towards Azov or Moscow (or Kaluga). The Azov region is the localization insisted upon by the modern historians, although there are no signs of any Kalka anywhere near Azov, unlike Moscow. In this case, our reconstruction suggests that the “Mongols” have lured their enemies into following them to the borders of their own Greater Russian principality of Rostov, Vladimir and Suzdal, also known as Novgorod. Moscow had then been located on the borderlands, qv in Chapter 6.

One must also mention that the chronicle hardly mentions any “Tartar” chieftains anywhere; all that we learn is that the Tartars were accompanied by “the Brodniki and their leader Ploskinya” ([634], page 159). The only “Tartar” warlord mentioned in the chronicle had therefore been an ethnical Slav – could he have been Russian?

2.3. The “Mongol and Tartar invasion” according to the Russian chronicles: Russians fighting Russians

The very description of the Mongol and Tartar conquest found in the Russian chronicles suggests that the Tartars can be identified as Russian troops led by Russian commanders. Let us open the Lavrentyevskaya Chronicle, for instance, which is the primary Russian source concerned with the epoch of Genghis-Khan and Batu-Khan. This text is presumed to be “a compilation from Vladimir and Rostov chronicles” ([634], page 547). The text contains a great number of literary passages, which are presumed to have been introduced during a later epoch ([634], page 548).

Let us remove obvious stylistic embellishments and consider the remaining skeleton of the chronicle. It appears that the Lavrentyevskaya Chronicle describes the unification of the Russian principalities that took place in the alleged years 1223–1238, the centre being in Rostov, and the main instigator, Georgiy Vsevolodovich, Prince of Rostov. If we compensate for the centenarian shift that we’re already aware

of, we shall come up with the beginning of the XIV century. The chronicle relates Russian events, telling us about Russian princes, Russian troops and so on. “Tartars” are mentioned quite often, but we don’t learn of a single “Tartar” leader’s name. All the Tartar victories appear to benefit none other but the Russian princes of Rostov – namely, Georgiy Vsevolodovich, and his brother Yaroslav Vsevolodovich after his death. If we are to replace “Tartar” with “Rostovian”, we shall get a very plausible account of Russian princes unifying Russia.

Indeed – the first victory of the “Tartars” over the Russian princes near Kiev is described as follows. Immediately after this event, when “there was weeping all across the Russian land”, Vassilko, a Russian prince sent to those parts by Georgiy Vsevolodovich (in order to “aid the Russians”, as we’re being told nowadays) turns back from Chernigov and “returns to Rostov, praising the Lord and Our Lady” ([634], page 135). Why would a Russian prince be so overjoyed with a Tartar victory? His praises to the Lord testify to the fact that the victory he expresses gratitude for had been his own; he returned to Rostov triumphant. This identifies the “Tartars” as Russians, making this conflict a mere internecine dissention.

After a brief account of the Rostov events, the chronicle carries on with a grandiloquent description of the wars with the Tartars, who take Kolomna, Moscow, besiege Vladimir (referred to as “Novgorod”, for some reason), and head towards River Syt, which exists to this day (it is a tributary of the Mologa). This is where the battle takes place; Great Prince Youri (Georgiy = Gyurgiy) is killed. Having told us about his death, the scribe appears to forget about the “wicked Tartars” and proceeds to tell us at length about how the body of Prince Georgiy had been brought to Rostov with plenty of ceremony. After the description of Georgiy’s luxurious funeral and a brief panegyric to Prince Vassilko, the scribe tells us how “in the year 1238 Yaroslav, son of Vsevolod the Great, was enthroned in Vladimir, and there was much rejoicing among the Christians, who were protected from the Tartar infidels by the hand of Lord Almighty himself” ([634], page 145).

The result of the Tartar victories is therefore as follows. The Tartars have defeated the Russians in a series of battles and seized several key cities of Russia.

Then the Russian troops are put to rout in the decisive Battle of Syt. The Russian forces were bled dry by this defeat. Historians are trying to convince us that this defeat had marked the beginning of the horrendous “Mongolian” yoke, with fields covered in bodies of warriors and cruel foreigners ruling over the land. The independent existence of Russia ceases, and the country is immersed into darkness.

The readers may well expect an account of how the surviving Russian princes, unable to provide any kind of military resistance, were forced to go and negotiate with the Khan. Actually, where was the Khan located? Since the Russian troops of Georgiy are supposed to have been crushed, one should expect his capital to be taken by a truculent Tartar invader – the new ruler of the country.

What does the chronicle tell us? It instantly forgets about the Tartars, telling us about the Russian court in Rostov and the ceremonial burial of the Great Prince who had perished in battle. His body is taken to the capital – however, we find no Tartar Khan there, but rather the Russian brother and heir of the deceased Georgiy – Yaroslav Vsevolodovich. Where did the evil Tartar khan go, then, and why should the Christians in Rostov rejoice in so strange and inappropriate a manner? It turns out that there has never been any Tartar khan – Yaroslav is the next Great Prince who takes the power in his hands, while the Tartars disappear without a trace. All is peaceful; the scribe tells us about the birth of Yaroslav’s daughter and makes a passing reference to the Tartars taking Kiev and moving onward towards Hungary ([634], page 148).

Our opinion is that what we see described here is the unification of the Vladimir and Suzdal Russia by the Great Princes of Rostov, who had won the decisive Battle of Syt. However, Great Prince Georgiy (aka Genghis-Khan) dies in battle; his brother Yaroslav is the next Great Prince, also known as Ivan Kalita = Caliph. Yaroslav (or Ivan) transfers the capital from Rostov to Vladimir or to the city of Yaroslavl that he had founded, also known as Novgorod the Great ([634], page 145).

The above chronicle already uses the name Novgorod for referring to Vladimir, which demonstrates that there had already been some confusion between the two in that epoch ([634], page 138). Let us

remind the reader of our hypothesis that Lord Novgorod the Great had been the name of the entire domain of the Great Prince comprising Vladimir, Yaroslavl, Rostov etc, and not a single city. Therefore, the conquest of Novgorod as mentioned in the Lavrentyevskaya chronicle may mean the initial conquest of this region by the Prince of Rostov.

By the way, we are also beginning to realise why Novgorod was called Novgorod, or the “New City” – apparently, Rostov was known as the “Old Town” ([839], page 36). Thus, the capital was transferred from the old capital (Rostov) to the New City, or Novgorod (Vladimir or Yaroslavl).

The Lavrentyevskaya chronicle tells us further about the “Tartars” taking Kiev and crushing the Hungarians in the reign of the Great Prince Yaroslav ([634], page 148).

3.

THE TARTAR AND MONGOL YOKE IN RUSSIA AS THE PERIOD OF MILITARY RULE IN THE UNITED RUSSIAN EMPIRE

3.1. The difference between our version and the Millerian-Romanovian

The Millerian and Romanovian history considers the epoch of the XIII-XV century to have been a dark age when Russia had been ruled by foreign invaders. On the one hand, we are told that the crushed and defeated Russia languishes in the miserable state of an imperial province, with the centre of the empire located in the faraway, mysterious and mythical Orient. On the other hand, both Russian chronicles and foreign reports describe the Mongolian Empire as a country populated by the Russians for the most part, governed by the Great Princes and the Mongol Khans. It is likely that the word “Mongol” means “The Great” and is a shorter form of the full title of the Great Prince. Russian chronicles simply call the Khan Czar. Below we shall relate our concept of this period in Russian history, which differs from the traditional version in the interpretation of known facts primarily – we aren’t presenting any new historical facts, yet we suggest an altogether different approach to the history of Russia. Apart from that, the dynastic parallelism between different epoch of Russian history

and the resulting compression of the latter has been discovered by the authors and can definitely be regarded as a new scientific fact.

3.2. Alexander Nevskiy = Berke-Khan. His original: Simeon the Proud or Chanibek-Khan (the XIV century)

After the death of Ivan Kalita = Batu-Khan = Yaroslav in the XIV century, Russia (or the Horde) became divided between his children – the Khans. N. M. Karamzin tells us the following:

“The Children of Yaroslav [the Wise – the double of Ivan Kalita – Auth.] divided the State between themselves, following the will of their father. Izyaslav’s region included Novgorod, Poland and Lithuania, spanning the huge area between Kiev and the Carpathians in the South-West. Prince of Chernigov also took the faraway Tmutarakan, Ryazan, Murom and the lad of the Vyatichi; as for Vsevolod, his domain in Pereyasavl became complemented with Rostov, Suzdal, Beloozero and the Volga region [or the Kingdom of Volga, as the Golden Horde was often called in chronicles – Auth.]. The Smolensk region included the modern Smolensk province, as well as parts of the Vitebsk, Pskov, Kaluga and Moscow regions” ([363], Volume 2, Chapter 4, page 45). The last principality mentioned by Karamzin is White Russia or the White Horde, a mediaeval Russian principality whose capital had been in Smolensk initially; it had included Moscow as well.

The title of the Great Prince or the Great Khan went to the son of Ivan Kalita = Batu-Khan, Simeon the Proud, whose phantom duplicate in the XIII century is Alexander Yaroslavich Nevskiy. We shall be using the latter name for the most part, since it is known to virtually everyone. Other duplicates of the same historical figure are Chanibek-Khan in the XIV century and Berke-Khan in the XIII.

The expansion of the Horde was frozen during the reign of Alexander, and the principal focus of attention shifted towards the internal affairs of the Empire. Having become the Great Prince (Berke-Khan), Alexander Nevskiy “didn’t go to his domain in Kiev, but headed towards Novgorod instead” ([435], page 193). The capital wasn’t transferred to Kiev, although Alexander’s father, Batu-Khan = Ivan Kalita, had in-

tended to implement this, *qv* above. However, Kiev became the centre of the Severskaya Land (Ukraine-to-be). Another principality whose formation dates to this epoch is the White Russia or the White Horde, which later became known as Lithuania. The principal position was occupied by the Golden Horde, or the Volga Region, whose centre had been in Novgorod, or the Vladimir-Suzdal Russia (Yaroslavl, Kostroma, Vladimir, Rostov and Suzdal). This is where the Khan, or the Great Prince, had lived.

We are now entering an epoch of state construction and organization. A double civil and military governing system was introduced. Supreme power had been in the hands of the warlords known as Khans and ruled by the Great Khan = The Great Prince. Local princes governed over towns and cities; their responsibilities included tax collection (one tenth of all property and every tenth citizen) for the benefit of the Horde, or the army. The domains of the Great Princes were exempt from this taxation ([435], page 189).

3.3. The Sarays as the headquarters of the Great Princes, or Khans

We shall proceed with a more detailed relation of the concept that was first voiced in the Introduction to the present book.

The army of the Russian “Mongolian” = Great Empire had been numerous, with cavalry comprising the majority. This army had been professional – the soldiers, or Cossacks, were recruited as children and didn’t marry. Agriculture had been strictly forbidden for them ([183], page 36). Such an army required depots and storage facilities in general, as well as winter camps. These places were called *Sarays* – the word *saray* is still used in the Russian language and stands for a storage facility. The main military potential of the Horde was apparently concentrated in the Volga region and the Golden Horde, which was given priority. This is why we see the so many cities in the Volga region and Russia in general whose names include the root SAR – SARatov, TSARitsyn, Chebok-SARy, SARansk, ZARaisk, SARay, SARapoul, SARny etc. Actually, the very word Czar (Tsar) consists of the very same root, which was pointed out by Morozov. We see the name Saray in a great many places up

to the Balkans – the city of Sarayevu, for instance. It is supposed that the Mongols had reached those parts as well.

3.4. Imperial communications

As we mentioned in the Introduction, this is also the epoch of communication construction; the issue had been vital for the enormous Empire:

“There were lines of postal communication that connected Saray, the centre of the Golden Horde, with every province; they reached for thousands of verst, and were served by up to 400 thousand horses and a whole army of attendants. Missives delivered by mounted couriers were also doubled by foot couriers, who could run up to 25 verst [1 verst = 3500 ft. – Transl.] in a day ([183], Volume 1, page 42).

The Empire had thrived on trade as well:

“The territory of the Golden Horde occupied the intersection of old trading routes that went from the Black Sea coasts to the North and the West via the steppes adjacent to the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea ... Most of the territory adjacent to the actual River Volga had been in the hands of the Tartars and the Mongols, and this river had been a very important trading route indeed, which became especially vital in the XIV century, when the relations with Russia stabilized in some way ... another important trading route of the XIV-XV century had been the Don, also controlled by the Tartars, who had ruled over the city of Azak (Azov) in the Don estuary. This city had been a prominent trade terminal and a connexion between the sea and river traders, and also the caravans that went northward and eastward” ([674], pages 43-44).

Let us remind the reader that the Don Cossacks are certain that the Azov region had once belonged to them ([183], Volume 2). Therefore, the “Tartar control” over the Azov region serves as yet another evidence to the fact that the Tartars and the Cossacks are the same:

“The Don route was closely related to the Volga route; there had been a portage between the two where the channels of the two rivers are close to each other ... The Golden Horde had traded with Central Asia, Italian colonies near the Black Sea, Byzantium and Egypt; this made Saray an international trading centre, where one could find any Oriental ware as



Fig. 5.1. Golden necklace of a prince with golden medallions equalling 10 centimetres in diameter. Presumably, a masterpiece of the Ryazan school of jewellers dating from the early XII century; in reality, the princes of Ryazan couldn't have afforded such jewellery until the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest, which had placed their lands at the very centre of a worldwide empire, right next to its capital, Novgorod the Great. Postcard published in Moscow by Izobrazitelnoye Iskusstvo Publishers in 1988.

well as Russian furs, leathers etc ... the Khans of the Golden Horde benefited from this trade tremendously, since they collected the numerous taxes paid by the traders ... the Mongol Khans introduced security garrisons that guarded the caravan routes in Persia, and the caravans paid special fees for passing through the guarded territory” ([674], page 45).

At the same time, Arab authors of the XIII-XIV century wrote that the Volga was filled with Russian ships ([674], page 45). We see that trade had been one of the primary activities of the Russians in this epoch, hence the numerous references to the Russian traders in the Horde. Foreigners didn't distinguish between them and the Mongol traders, which is quite natural, seeing as how “Mongol” translates as “the great”.

It is presumed that the “Mongolian” Empire had sold “Russian slaves”, which would be perfectly natural, had the Scaligerian-Millerian version of history been correct – evil invaders selling the conquered nation off as slaves to faraway countries. However, documents leave us with a different impression – there were just as many Tartars among the slaves coming from Russia as there were Russians ([674], pages 34-40). Slave trade had indeed been very common in the XIV century; however, slaves were people of all nationalities and ethnic groups – Russians, Tartars etc.

Thus, the Great = “Mongolian” conquest had led to the formation of the Empire, whose centre was in Russia, playing a key part in international trade; one could find goods from everywhere in the world here. Modern archaeologists occasionally find relics testifying to the splendour of the period, and naturally misdate them to the “pre-Mongolian” period. An example testifying to this can be found below.

In fig. 5.1. we see a golden princely necklace with four golden medallions about 10 centimetres in diameter. The medallions are held together by openwork beads; this luxurious necklace was found on the old site of Ryazan in 1822 and is presumed to represent the XII century Ryazan school of jewellery. One can only imagine the jewellery worn by the Great Princes and their courtiers. Scaligerian history makes it perfectly unclear how this level of luxury could be characteristic for a provincial Russian town – a massive golden necklace covered with filigree and gemstones could hardly be purchased for the proceeds from selling local wares on international markets.

3.5. The Mongols as participants of the XIV century crusades

All the successful XIV century crusades took place with the active participation of the Mongols – Western countries tried to form a union with the Mongols in order to conquer Syria and Egypt. There were many papal envoys sent to Mongolia, likewise envoys of the French king. It turns out that the Mongols had supported the idea of crusades into the Palestine:

“Catholic envoys sent to Mongolia were seeking a union with the Mongols in order to fight against Islam together. The idea of uniting the crusaders and the Mongols against the Muslims, who had seized Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre, had been voiced in the West ever since the conquest of the Muslim Khorasm by Genghis-Khan. Furthermore, the Westerners believed in the legend that there was a Christian state somewhere within the confines of Mongolia ruled by a priest, or Pope John” ([183], Volume 1, page 54). We plainly see the following:

1) Mongolia had been Christian to a great extent. Below we shall discuss the fact that Khorasm is but the Arabic version of the name Kostroma (a town located near Yaroslavl). Kostroma had been one of the

headquarters used by the Great Khan. Let us point out that historians still cannot find the “lost Khorasm”.

2) The Christian Mongolia was ruled by Pope John – this is doubtlessly Ivan Kalita the “*batya*”, or “father”, also known as Batu-Khan. Apart from that, Genghis-Khan was known as Presbyter Johannes (see the alphabetic index of Matuzova’s book [517]). Also bear in mind the fact that Georgiy and Ivan were brothers.

3) From the traditional point of view, a “state ruled by Pope John” is a total absurdity, which is exactly the way in which the modern historians refer to it. Nevertheless, the Westerners had been convinced that such a state did exist up until the XVII century, no less:

“Papal envoys were welcome guests in Mongolian headquarters, and held many negotiations with the Mongols, who spared the Christian population of Asia Minor and Central Asia [during the crusades! – Auth.]; Christians were promised the return of all the lands seized by the Turks; however, the Mongols demanded that the king of France and other kings swear fealty to Genghis-Khan [aka Great Prince Georgiy – Auth.]” ([183], Volume 1, page 55).

“Khulagu-Khan [another version of Georgiy – Gourgou, a name worn by a great many descendants of Genghis-Khan – Auth.] ... had conquered the lands of Asia Minor up to India, and the conquered lands in the West reached Damascus. Baghdad was taken by his troops, the Caliph killed, the city destroyed and the Muslim populace massacred. The same happened in Damascus – the Mongols killed Muslims and protected the Christians. The wife of Khulagu [George – Auth.] had been Christian and a granddaughter of Van-Khan [aka Pope John, or the same old Ivan Kalita = Georgiy = Genghis-Khan – Auth.] ... his military commander Kitbok had been a Christian; even Khulagu himself was greatly affected by the Christian creed, and always had a field church near his headquarters ... in the same year [the alleged year 1257, or 1357 after the compensation of the centenarian shift – Auth.] Khulagu turned his troops towards Egypt.

The successful campaigns of the Mongols in Asia Minor made all the Christians mirthful [historians are of the opinion that the Christian Russians did not rejoice at the news of the Mongolian conquest – Auth.] – the Mongols were seen as ‘yellow crusaders’ of sorts, who had fought against the infidel Muslims.

Khulagu's headquarters were visited by envoys of the Armenian king, the Prince of Antiochia and Louis IX, King of France" ([183], Volume 1, pages 62-64).

Historians are trying to make us believe that the Muslim pogroms take place around the time that the Mongols decided to accept Islam as their official religion; oddly enough, this "conversion to Islam" resulted in a "better organization" of the ecclesiastical Orthodox hierarchy in the Mongolian Empire and the foundation of the Saray Eparchy in the headquarters of the Khan. Gordeyev reports the following:

"Accepting Islam as the official religion did not affect the attitude towards the Christians – on the contrary, the hierarchy of the Christian Church was reorganised to be more efficient. In 1261 an eparchy was founded in the Khan's headquarters in the Golden Horde ... Metropolitan Cyril ... was present at the foundation of the eparchy in Saray" ([183], Volume 1, page 64).

Our opinion is as follows. Islam did not exist as a separate religion back then – the schism between Islam, Orthodox Christianity and the Latin Church

took place later, in the XV-XVI century. This is why we see the crusaders as a joint force of the Catholics (Western Europeans), the Orthodox Christians (Russians) and the Muslims (Mongols).

It was only in the XVI-XVII century that the Western historians decided to present the old crusades as battles against Islam, since the West had already been at war with the Muslim countries in the XVI-XVII century.

In the second part of the XIV century, "Christianity in Asia was spread by the sect of the Nestorians, who were banished from Byzantium ... the sect was named after the Bishop of Constantinople ... who had founded it in Mosul; they obeyed a patriarch of their own" ([183], Volume 1, page 54).

This is where the name Muslim comes from – derived from the name of Mosul, a town in Asia Minor. The first Muslims had been the Nestorian Christians. It was only later, when all of the above had already been forgotten by nearly everyone, the schism between the Muslim and the Christian creeds was backdated by circa 600 years.