Fig. 6.12. River Chura and its environs. We see Nizhniye Kotly right nearby. Taken from [551], map 60.

Fig. 6.13. A close-in of the map of Moscow with River Chura upon it. This is where the army of Dmitriy Donskoi had stood on the night before the Battle of Kulikovo. Taken from [551], map 60.

Fig. 6.14. Fragment of the map of Moscow where we can clearly see an agglomeration of five Mikhailovskiy Drives right next to Chura, with two more (adding up to a total of eight) aren’t indicated on the map, but can be found in the reference book ([858], page 200). Therefore, this part of Moscow may well have been referred to as “Chura, at Mikhailov”, which is what the chronicle is telling us. Taken from an electronic map of Moscow.

Fig. 6.15. River Chura in Moscow. Photographed upstream, facing the modern Leninskiy Avenue. The Muslim cemetery is on the right. Photograph taken by T. N. Fomenko in January 2001.

Fig. 6.16. River Chura in Moscow. We see large-scale construction works in progress, with excavators on the left. A motorway is being built here; the entire territory shall soon look differently. The river will either disappear, or have to run through pipes. We have managed to photograph the river in the last months of its existence. Photograph taken in January 2001.
What can historians tell us about Mikhailovo and River Chura in the Tula region? It turns out that they run into many complications, since there is neither a Chura nor a Mikhailovo anywhere near; this might be why certain historians propose to look for traces of a village called Chur Mikhailov instead of a river (which doesn’t yield any results, either). They rather nebulously tell us that “according to K. V. Koudryashov’s opinion, Chur Mikhailov had stood near the place where river Kochura flows into the Don, some 50 kilometres downstream, next to Nepryadva estuary” ([631], page 106). They also admit the following about the chronicle passage that suggests to search for a village in lieu of a river: “the phrase is unclear due to errors and later misinterpretation of the text obscuring the meaning” ([631], pages 106 and 120).

We are of the opinion that venerable historians are simply looking in the wrong place.

2.17. River Sosna and the Brasheva (Borovitskaya) Road to the Kulikovo Field identified as the Sosenka River and the Old Borovskaya Road leading towards the centre of Moscow

The “Tale of Dmitriy Ivanovich, the Righteous Prince, and the Infamous Mamai, King of the Hellenes” ([631], pages 137-194) reports that Dmitriy Donskoi and Vladimir Andreyevich sent a small party of scouts to the region of River Sosna with orders to bring back a prisoner for interrogation. One of the versions calls the river Bystraya Sosna (see [631], page 147).

Dmitriy proceeded towards the Kulikovo Field, taking the Kotly route, while the army of Vladimir Andreyevich had approached the battlefield from another direction using the Brashev Way ([631], page 354). In another chronicle we read the following: “There was a great noise, loud like thunder, in the morning, when Prince Vladimir was crossing the Moskva on his way to Borovitz upon his gilded princely ferry” ([631], page 235). We see the chronicles refer to the same place under the names of Brashev and Borovitz; therefore, the Brashev Way is another way of the Borovitz Road.

Once again, we find both names characteristic for Muscovite toponymy – there is a river Sosenka (affectionate form of Sosna, literally “pine tree”) at the South-Eastern outskirts of Moscow, right next to Village Sosenki, qv in fig. 6.19 and 6.20, right next to the circular motorway around Moscow. We also find the former Borovskaya Road in this area, known as the Borovskoye Motorway nowadays, qv in fig. 6.19. The names of the roads all but coincide; the names Borovskaya and Brasheva are also similar, bearing in mind the frequent flexion of Sh and S (Ts). The name Sosenki is highlighted in figs. 6.19 and 6.20; the Borovskoye Motorway can be seen in fig. 6.19, in the top left corner. Let us also recollect the Borovitskiye Gate of the Kremlin.

It becomes perfectly clear why the chronicle should
mention a party of scouts sent to River Sosna = Sosenka in the context of Prince Vladimir’s movement via the Borovskaya Road – this road is indeed adjacent to the river Sosenka, qv in fig. 6.19.

A propos, the chronicle name of “Sosna” may also have another relation to the Battle of Kulikovo – there had once been a tract called “Pod Sosenkami”, or (“underneath the pine trees”); nowadays there is a Podsosenkiy Lane there. The following is known from the history of Moscow: “The Podsosenkiy Lane … is located on the site of an old tract known as Pod Sosenkami” ([312:1], page 195). It is however unclear whether any river had ever existed anywhere in this vicinity.

According to our reconstruction, the army of Dmitriy Donskoi was moving in the following fashion (let us use the map called “Archaeological Artefacts from the Second Half of the XIII-XIV Century on the Territory of the Modern Moscow” as provided in [331], Volume 1, Annexes). Dmitriy’s army proceeded towards Kotyol following the Ordynskaya Way, also known as Kolomenskaya Road, qv in the map (fig. 6.21). The troops of Vladimir Andreyevich took the Borovskaya = Borovitskaya Road past River Sosenka, qv in fig. 6.21. Both lead towards the Kulikovo Field in the centre of Moscow. The scouts must have been sent towards Sosenka in order to make sure that the chosen route concealed no hindrances. Vladimir Andreyevich would indeed have to cross the Moskva, as mentioned in the chronicle quoted above. Mamai’s troops had stood to the left of the river, on the other bank.

What can the learned historians tell us about the river Sosna and the Brashev Road as mentioned in the chronicles? Once again, they run into many a problem. They suggest the river Bystraya Sosna, a tributary of the Don; however, they admit it themselves that this version contradicts other indications provided in the chronicle: “The ‘Tale’s’ author must have had a very vague idea of the route chosen by Mamai … Therefore, the reference to the scouts sent to Bystraya Sosna, which is located a great deal further to the South than the Mecha, is erroneous” ([631], page 204).

As for the Brashev Way as mentioned in the chronicles, we learn of the following: “The reference to the troops setting forth from Kolomna and moving along the Brashev Way led by Vladimir of Serpukhov contradicts the information provided in other chronicles … one finds it hard to discuss the authenticity of the source in question and the veracity of the claims made therein” ([631], page 209).

Let us reiterate – the search was conducted in the wrong place.
Fig. 6.21. Fragment of a map entitled “Archaeological Relics of the Second Half of the XIII – XVI Century In Moscow” reproduced in [331], Volume 1 (Appendix). The arrows correspond to the route of the armies of Dmitriy Donskoi and Vladimir Andreyevich (in accordance with our reconstruction).
We have therefore gone through all of the primary geographic names mentioned in the chronicles describing the Battle of Kulikovo. All of them were found in Moscow.

2.18. Yaroslav and Alexander in the description of the Kulikovo Battle

“The Tale of the Battle with Mamai” constantly refers to Yaroslav and Alexander, the famous warlords and the ancestors of Dmitriy Donskoi. However, no other famed predecessors of his are mentioned anywhere else in the chronicle, which is rather odd – two of the ancestors are mentioned all the time, whereas such famous figures as Vladimir Monomakh remain obscured by taciturnity. Modern historians presume that the characters in question can be identified as Yaroslav the Wise from the XI century and the great Alexander Nevskiy of the XII. One can naturally presume that the chronicler had been particularly fond of these two Great Prince, whose had lived 300 and 100 years before the events in question, respectively. Our hypothesis makes things a lot simpler – Yaroslav is a phantom duplicate of Ivan Kalita, the father of Dmitriy, whereas Alexander is a reflection of Simeon the Proud, Dmitriy’s brother and predecessor. The chronicle is therefore referring to Dmitriy’s immediate predecessors and not distant ancestral figures.

2.19. Who had fought whom upon the Kulikovo field?

Modern historians are trying to convince us that the two parties that had fought each other on the field of Kulikovo had been the Russians and the Tartars, and the former defeated the latter. The original sources appear to be of a different opinion – we shall cite their brief overview made by Gumilev. Let us first regard the “Tartar” army of Mamai.

It turns out that “the Tartars from the Volga had been reluctant to serve Mamai, and there were very few of them in his army” ([216], page 160). Mamai’s troops consisted of the Poles, the Genoese (or the Fryagi), the Yases and the Kasogs). Mamai had been financed by the Genoese, no less!

Now let us have a look at the ethnic compound of the Russian army. “Moscow … demonstrated loyalty to the union with the legitimate heirs of the Golden Horde’s khan – Tokhtamysh, who had been the ruler of the Tartars in Siberia and the Volga region” ([216], page 160).

It becomes perfectly clear that we learn of a civil war within the Horde. The Tartars from the Volga and Siberia serve in the Russian army and fight against the Crimeans, the Poles and the Genoese led by Mamai. The Russian troops “consisted of infantry and cavalry squadrons, as well as militiamen … The cavalry … consisted of the Tartars who were converted into Christianity, Lithuanians who had swapped sides and the Russians trained to ride as part of the Tartar cavalry formation” ([216], page 162). Mamai had received assistance from Jagiello, the Lithuanian prince, whereas Dmitriy is said to have been aided by Tokhtamysh and his army of Siberian Tartars.

The fact that Mamai’s troops are referred to as the Horde doesn’t surprise anyone these days; however, it turns out that the Russian army had also been known as the Horde – in the famous Zadonschchina, of all places: “Mamai, thou foul foe, why have you come to the Russian land? Now thou shall be crushed by the Horde from Zalesye” ([635], page 108). Let us remind the reader that the Vladimir and Suzdal Russia had once been known as the Land of Zalesye; thus, the Russian troops are explicitly referred to as the Horde in said chronicle, likewise their “Mongol and Tartar” counterparts, which is in perfect concurrence with our reconstruction.

A propos, the Russians and the Tartars look the same in the ancient Russian miniatures depicting the Battle of Kulikovo – the clothes, the armaments, hats, accessories etc – you can’t tell a “Russian” from a “Tartar” (see the miniatures from the XVI century Litsevoy Svod, for instance, as reproduced in [635]).

Therefore, even if we adhere to the traditional point of view, we cannot claim the Battle of Kulikovo to have been fought between the Russians and the Tartar invaders. Both are mixed to such an extent that you cannot really tell them apart. According to our hypothesis, the word Tartars referred to the cavalry and not an ethnic group, acting as a synonym of the term Cossacks. Apparently, it was introduced in lieu of the latter during subsequent tendentious editing.

Therefore, the Battle of Kulikovo had been fought between the Cossacks from Siberia and the Volga re-
tion led by Dmitriy Donskoi, and the Cossacks from Poland and Lithuania led by Mamai.

2.20. A brief digression and a comparison of the Russian and Tartar architecture

It is traditionally presumed that the Russian architecture differs from its Tartar counterpart to a great extent; however, one can simultaneously see the stunning similarities between the two. Let us cite just one example of many.

The Krutitskiy Tower still exists in Moscow as a relic of the Sarskaya and Podonskaya Eparchies: “This tower’s architectural shape makes it characteristic for the late XVII century; the tower one sees above the gates is embellished by ornaments; despite the fact that the tower is explicitly Russian shape-wise, particularly inasmuch as the windows are concerned, it leaves one with an impression of an Oriental building, resembling the enamelled walls of Persia and the minarets of Turkistan” (“Moskovskiy Letopisets”, [554], page 254). Our opponents might come up with the objection that the Mongolian invaders were forcing their Russian slaves to erect buildings in the Oriental fashion; however, we are of the opinion that several different styles had coexisted in Russian architecture up until the XVIII century, no less – one of them being what we would call Oriental today. The rigid allocation of individual styles to individual epochs only exists in the Scaligerian chronology; we see a very eclectic mixture of architectural styles in virtually every town and city nowadays – why should it have been radically different in the past?

3. THE COMMUNAL GRAVE OF THE HEROES SLAIN IN THE BATTLE OF KULIKOVO IN THE OLD SIMONOV MONASTERY, MOSCOW

3.1. Where are the graves of the warriors who had fallen in the battle of Kulikovo?

According to the chronicles and the “Tale of the Battle with Mamai”, each party had suffered about 250 thousand casualties. This number is most likely to be a great exaggeration, since after the battle had ended “Prince Vassily had stood at Don for eight days, inspecting the battlefield and separating the bodies of the Christians and the heathens … the former were buried in hallowed ground, the latter thrown to the birds and the beasts” ([635], pages 186-187).

The readers accustomed to the Scaligerian and Millerian version of history shall most probably think that all of the above had taken place in the Tula region – upper Don, where the Battle of Kulikovo is presumed to have been fought nowadays.

However, it turns out that the Russian warriors who had died in the Battle of Kulikovo are buried in Moscow and not in Tula – in the Old Simonov Monastery! This is where the most famous heroes of the battle are buried – Russian warrior friars Peresvet and Oslyabya, for instance (see [413] and [678]): “Peresvet and Oslyabya had been buried in the Church of Our Lady’s Nativity … the heroic monks that fell on the battlefield weren’t taken to the Troitskaya Friary, but rather buried at the walls of this church” ([678], page 136; see also [734]).

If we are to assume that the bodies of the heroes have indeed been taken from Tula to Moscow (and that’s some 300 kilometres), why couldn’t they have been taken to the Troitse-Sergiyeva Friary, which is relatively near? Also, Dmitriy had been burying the slain for 8 days; then his army started towards Moscow, which must have taken them a while. Could it be that the corpses of the heroes remained unburied for several weeks?

Since the battle had taken place on the Holy Feast of Our Lady’s Nativity, it is perfectly natural for a church of Our Lady’s Nativity to be erected at the battlefield. This is exactly what we see – this church is still part of the Simonov Monastery in Moscow (see [678], page 136), which was founded right after the Battle of Kulikovo.

According to our hypothesis, the Simonov Monastery was built right on the Kulikovo Field as a last resting place of all the Russian soldiers who had been killed here.

“The Simonov Monastery, founded in 1379, had been one of the most important outposts in Moscow’s line of defence. Most of its buildings were demolished in the beginning of the 1930’s [sic! – Auth.], when the Likhachyov Factory’s Palace of Culture was built here. The southern wall and three towers exist until the present day” ([554], page 295, comment 269). Now-
adays this monastery is located on the factory premises, although one can reach it via a long corridor.

Thus, the Millerian–Romanovian version does not dispute the fact that the Simonov monastery was found virtually simultaneously with the Battle of Kulikovo.

This monastery can be found on the bank of the Moskva, next to the Krasnokholmskaya Embankment that we mentioned earlier. Thus, all of the names and places that bear relation to the Battle of Kulikovo are concentrated in a single area of Moscow, whose boundaries are marked by the Church of All Saints built by Dmitriy to commemorate the battle, and the Simonov Monastery, where the slain soldiers had been buried. Chronicle reports begin to make more sense – the warriors that had died on the battlefield were buried closely nearby and not brought from the Tula region some 300 kilometres away.

One should also mention the following circumstance. It has taken us a great deal of effort in order to find a literary reference to the resting place of the heroes that died in the Battle of Kulikovo, one that one presumes to be famous – yet we haven’t found a single mention of the place in any of the modern fundamental historical publications that we have had at our disposal. The present day historians appear to be strangely reluctant to touch this topic. Moreover, L. A. Belyaev, Head of the Muscovite Archaeology Sector at the RAS Institute of Archaeology, writes the following about the Old Simonov monastery: “There were no large-scale archaeological excavations conducted here. We only know of some perfunctory observations performed by B. L. Khvorostova during the reconstruction of the church in the 1980’s. V. L. Yegorov, the researcher who studied the issue of where Peresvet and Oslyabya had been buried, went so far as to presume the complete destruction of the refectory layer and the futility of further archaeological excavations [sic! – Auth.]” ([62], page 185).

It was only owing to a fortunate coincidence that we managed to find the information we were looking for in a book of 1806, no less, one that M. Pospelov referred to in his 1990 article in the “Moskva” magazine concerned with the scandalous refusal of the “Dynamo” factory to vacate the monastery buildings located on their premises. It was only after we had managed to visit the actual monastery that we found a photocopy of a very rare book there ([734]), one that was published in 1870 and also deals with the issue of Peresvet’s and Oslyabya’s final resting place. Both books (one dating from 1806 and the other from 1870) are concerned with the history of the Simonov Monastery specifically. Not a single fundamental work on history in general that we have at our possession contains any useful information; the same goes for the books written on the history of Moscow. N. M. Karamzin makes a very brief reference ([362], Commentary 82 to Volume 5, Chapter 1, page 31).

What could possibly be the problem here? Why do we find out nothing about the graves of the heroes who had fallen on the Kulikovo field? The answer appears obvious to us – this is due to the fact that the sepulchres in question have got nothing to do with the Tula region, where the Battle of Kulikovo had been relocated in order to make Moscow older than it really is, and have been in Moscow all the time. This is why historians prefer to circumnavigate this issue – anyone in their right mind shall instantly ask about whether the bodies of the deceased heroes had indeed been transported to Moscow from the Tula region, seeing as how the distance between the two is over 300 kilometres. If the burial ground is found in Moscow, the battle had been fought nearby as well; all of this is perfectly obvious. Let us reiterate that there were no signs of any warriors buried anywhere in the Tula region. Even if the number of the deceased was greatly exaggerated, which is likely to be the case, there should be lots of graves left after a battle as great, and some remnants of them should have survived until our day. This is indeed the case with Moscow, but not Tula.

However, it is easy enough to understand the position of the historians – according to their “theory” Moscow had already existed as a large city for quite some time when the Battle of Kulikovo took place; they are of the opinion that the Kulishki in Moscow had also been part of the city, and therefore an unlikely candidate for a battlefield.

According to our version, the epoch of the Kulikovo Battle had been the very dawn of Moscow, which was but a small settlement in those times. The Kulishki had still been a large field without any buildings. Dmitriy Donskoi started to fortify Moscow after the battle, or at the end of the XIV century, as the scribe