



Fig. 6.33. The wall behind the altar of the Church of Our Lady's Nativity. One sees factory buildings behind the wall; the remains uncovered during construction works are buried next to the wall. Some of the graves are marked with crosses. The grave that we saw in 1994 is marked by a heavy stone and a small fir tree. Photograph taken in 2000.



Fig. 6.34. The cross behind the church altar with a piece of an old headstone next to it. Photograph taken in 2000.



Fig. 6.35. The cross behind the altar of the Church of Our Lady's Nativity. Photograph taken in 2000.



Fig. 6.36. Another cross behind the altar of the Church of Our Lady's Nativity. This is where the skulls and bones uncovered during the paving of the yard were buried in 1999. Photograph taken in 2000.



Fig. 6.37. The heavy stone upon the flowerbed that marks the place where the huge wooden box with the remains of the heroes slain in the Kulikovo Battle was buried in 1994. There is no cross here, for some reason. Photograph taken in 2000.



Fig. 6.38. The heavy stone upon the flowerbed that marks the place where the huge wooden box with the remains of the heroes slain in the Kulikovo Battle. The actual burial was filmed by the authors in 1994.

with cellars and manifolds built on this site. The remnants of the soldiers are discarded, or, at best, re-buried in communal containers with a Christian service.

One would think that historians could really perform a large body of work here – how can it possibly be true that there’s an ancient burial ground that still exists in the very centre of Moscow, and there wasn’t a single historian or archaeologist to ask the question about the identity of the dead that were buried here?

However, let us assume that historians know nothing about the communal graves of the warriors who had fallen at the Kulikovo Field that were found in the Simonov monastery; after all, it is but a hypothesis of ours for the time being. Yet these very historians know perfectly well that the remains of Peresvet and Oslyabya are buried in this church. One would think that their ancient headstones were still guarded with awe.

This is not the case. When one enters the church, one sees the new gravestones made a couple of years ago, qv in fig. 6.31. An old photograph hanging nearby (fig. 6.32) demonstrates this place the way it had been in 1985, which is when the church was vacated by the factory authorities – there isn’t so much as a trace of any grave at all. The ancient headstones must have been destroyed or relocated by then.

The real XIV headstone from the grave of Oslyabya and Peresvet as mentioned by N. M. Karamzin in [365], Volume 5, Chapter 1, comment 82, isn’t anywhere to be seen nowadays – it may still be part of the church masonry, as Karamzin suggests. However, no one knows anything about any old headstones nowadays – the one that interests us is most likely to have been taken outside and destroyed by paving breakers in the 1960’s during one of the *subbotniks* (Saturday collective labour meetings conducted by volunteers free of charge in the Soviet epoch). One of the workers who had participated in these *subbotniks* told us about them; he carried the stones out of the church personally. At any rate, we neither managed to locate the old headstone, nor to learn of what was written thereupon.

Moreover, the text of the inscription wasn’t found in any historical work, either. What could have been written there? How could it be that the barbaric order to destroy these priceless old stones with paving breakers was given in the 1960’s, cynically and in full awareness, when the ferocious anti-religious cam-

paign had already been way past its peak? They managed to survive the 20’s and the 30’s, after all.

Could the matter at hand be related to the very roots of Russian history and not just religion? As for the authors of the present book, the facts that we know lead us to the conclusion that the methodical destruction of certain ancient artefacts (the ones that could have helped us understand the real meaning of the Old Russian history) has been taking place in Russia for many years now, without any publicity and in the most despicable way possible.

In 2000 we visited the Old Simonov monastery once again; by that time, many other bones were unearthed from the ground around the church. These bones were buried once again next to the wall one finds behind the church altar, qv in fig. 6.33; there are two new crosses marking the graves, qv in figs. 6.34, 6.35 and 6.36. We managed to converse with the person who had personally mounted the cross shown in fig. 6.36 in 1999. One of the parishioners was paving the yard of the church; the layer of the ground that became removed in the process had equalled a mere 2 or 3 feet in thickness. Nevertheless, this shallow layer of ground had contained a multitude of human bones and even the remains of several skulls; the parishioner buried the bones in hallowed ground and put a cross on top of them. Apparently, the neighbouring cross that one sees in figs. 6.34 and 6.35 was mounted in a similar fashion. It is perfectly obvious that the ground around the Church of Our Lady’s nativity is filled with bones up to the shallowest layers; the old gravestones must have been right on top of them. After their removal, the bones lie right underneath our feet.

However, oddly enough, there is no cross over the spot where the gigantic container with skulls and bones was buried in 1994. This place is just marked by a large piece of rock and nothing else – neither plaques nor inscriptions (see figs. 6.37 and 6.38). The reasons for such secretiveness remain perfectly unclear to us. Why has there been no cross mounted on this site? The piece of rock and the flower bed are definitely serving some memorial purpose; however, if you don’t know that underneath one really finds a large container with skulls and bones exhumed from the collective grave of the heroes that had died at the Kulikovo Field, it is impossible to find it out by mere guesswork.

3.3. The location of the Rozhestveno village that Dmitriy Donskoi had granted to the Old Simonov monastery after the Battle of Kulikovo

The *History of the Church of Our Lady's Nativity in the Old Simonov, Moscow* ([734]) states explicitly that Dmitriy Donskoi granted the village of Rozhestveno to the church in question right after the battle; the village had stood at the actual Kulikovo Field:

“The Great Prince had granted the village of Rozhestveno to the Old Simonov monastery on the day of Our Lady's Nativity; it was located on the battlefield where the troops of Mamai had been crushed by Dmitriy's army” ([734], pages 7-8).

Historians are of the opinion that the Battle of Kulikovo had been fought in the Tula region. Doesn't it strike the reader as uncanny that a Muscovite church should be granted a village that had been some 320 away from Moscow? Apart from that, the Tula region had not been part of his principality, and belonged to other princes! Nothing of the sort has ever taken place in veritable Russian history.

This absurdity ceases to exist once we relocate the Battle of Kulikovo to Moscow, which is where one finds the Simonov monastery. The latter had possessed no lands in the Tula region for the last 200-300 years, according to the chronicles; however, it did possess the village of Simonova right next to it – the residence of “the monastery's workers – smiths, ironmongers, carpenters et al” ([734], pages 11-12). Everything becomes clear instantly.

3.4. The battle between Mamai and Tokhtamysh in 1380 as yet another reflection of the Kulikovo Battle of 1380

We are told that immediately after the Battle of Kulikovo, “Mamai, who had fled to his steppes, faced a new enemy: Tokhtamysh, the Khan of the Horde whose lands lay beyond River Yaik, a descendant of Batu-Khan. He sought to wrest the throne of the Volga Horde away from Mamai in order to salvage the heritage of Batu-Khan's descendants. Jagiello, the ally of Mamai ... had deserted the latter. Tokhtamysh put Mamai to rout on the banks of Kalka and proclaimed himself liege of the Volga Horde. Mamai had fled to

Kapha ... which is where he was killed by the Genoese” ([435], page 233).

We instantly mark the similarities between the descriptions of the two battles:

1) Both great battles take place in the same year – namely, 1380.

2) Both battles end with the defeat of the same military leader – Mamai.

3) One battle takes place at Kalki (KLK unvocalized), whereas the second is fought upon the Field of Kulikovo, which also transcribes as KLK without vocalizations.

We already pointed out the similarity between both names.

4) Both battles feature Mamai's Lithuanian ally who either deserts him or doesn't manage to come to his rescue in due time.

5) Mamai flees to Kapha after the battle with Tokhtamysh, and does the very same thing after the Battle of Kulikovo ([635], pages 108-109).

This is virtually all that we know about the defeat of Mamai at Kalki.

Our hypothesis is as follows:

The defeat of Mamai at Kalki is but another account of the Kulikovo Battle that wound up in certain chronicles in a condensed form, which is drastically different from the battle's detailed descriptions found in other chronicles.

This implies that Tokhtamysh-Khan can be identified as Dmitriy Donskoi, which is a very important fact, and one that concurs with our general reconstruction ideally – indeed, we already know that the chronicles call Tokhtamysh a descendant of Batu-Khan, whom we already identified as Ivan Kalita, the grandfather of Dmitriy Donskoi. The latter is therefore a bona fide descendant of Batu-Khan; the chronicles are correct.

4. THE BATTLE OF KULIKOVO AND OUR GEOGRAPHICAL RECONSTRUCTION THEREOF

The real geography and the general scheme of the Battle of Kulikovo in Moscow have been reconstructed by the authors to the best of their knowledge, qv in figs. 6.4 and 6.5.

5. APPARENTLY, MOSCOW WAS FOUNDED AROUND 1382.

The “Battle of Moscow” allegedly fought between the Russians and the Tartars in 1382 as yet another reflection of the Kulikovo Battle

Traditional history is of the opinion that Moscow was founded by Yuri Dolgoroukiy in 1147, since the first reference to a town by that name is dated to 1147 in Scaligerian-Millerian chronology. However, the Kremlin in Moscow was built under Dmitriy Donskoi, and none other, for the very first time – at the end of the XIV century, that is (see [284], pages 87-88). We have already identified Dmitriy Donskoi as Tokhtamysh-Khan. Two years later than the Battle of Kulikovo, in 1382, Tokhtamysh comes to Moscow together with his army and two Princes of Suzdal, no less. Moscow fell. Who defended it from Tokhtamysh? Dmitriy Donskoi? This is an impossibility, since the two are the same figure, which is why the Khan was accompanied by two princes of Suzdal. Indeed, we learn that shortly before the arrival of Tokhtamysh, Dmitriy had gone to Kostroma. We are of the opinion that Kostroma had been the residence of the Great Prince, and this is whence he came to Moscow, accompanied by his army. This is why he hadn't been in Moscow, which was defended by “Ostey, a Lithuanian prince” ([36], page 78).

This conquest of Moscow in 1382 marks the beginning of a new “Tartar” era, according to some chronicles ([759], page 25). The construction of the Kremlin and the real dominion of Dmitriy date back to this year, which also appears to mark the foundation of Moscow as a large fortified city. As we can see, the foundation of Moscow took place shortly after the Battle of Kulikovo, and right next to the battlefield at that.

Our reconstruction is also backed by the following legend.

In the XVI century, when the concept of Moscow as the Third Rome was being introduced, “it had been necessary to prove that the very foundation of Moscow resembles that of its sisters [the first two Romes, that is – Auth.] – it had also been marked by a large-scale bloodshed” ([284], page 50). The bloodshed in question is most likely a repercussion of the memory

that the city had been founded right next to a battlefield.

The chronicle report about Russians fighting against the Tartars in Moscow that we find at the distance of a mere two years from the Battle of Kulikovo might be yet another report of the same battle, albeit a more concise one. The scribes didn't manage to recognize the two as duplicates, and set them apart in time by a mere two years. A propos, the Battle of Kulikovo took place in early September, on the 8th, whereas the 1382 Battle of Moscow took place in late August, on the 26th ([36], pages 76 and 78).

Prince Dmitriy Donskoi won the Battle of Kulikovo, whereas the Battle of Moscow that dates to 1382 was won by Tokhtamysh-Khan, or the very same Dmitriy, according to our reconstruction.

Let us point out an interesting detail to demonstrate how historians alter history on the sly. It turns out that “M. N. Tikhomirov had considered certain chronicle episodes untrustworthy, and did not include them into his research – for instance, the version about the betrayal of the Great Prince Oleg Ivanovich of Ryazan, who had allegedly pointed out the convenient fords upon River Oka to Tokhtamysh ([841], page 59, comment 106). Our reconstruction makes this episode easily understandable – why wouldn't Oleg show the fords to his liege Dmitriy Donskoi, aka Tokhtamysh-Khan? No betrayal anywhere – what we see is an example of perfectly normal collaboration between the Russian princes of the Horde.

We must also say a few more words about Oleg of Ryazan – he is presumed to have been frightened by Mamai's troops right before the Battle of Kulikovo, and was begging the Russian princes to refrain from military actions against Mamai. This event is dated to 1380; Oleg all but became labelled a traitor and an ally of the “Tartars” ([635], pages 157-158).

A similar version of Oleg's betrayal is included in the 1382 legend about the “Battle of Moscow” – Oleg of Ryazan went to Tokhtamysh and “became his assistant in the conquest of Russia to the greater grief of all the Christians” ([635], page 191). Oleg becomes an ally of the “Tartars”. This is most likely to be the same legend that became duplicated due to a minor chronological error.

The battle of 1382 is described as very fierce – it

is reported that “Moscow had been crushed in the most horrendous fashion – there were 10.000 dead bodies buried” ([841], page 50).

Let us return to the issue of mass burials in Moscow that date from 1380 or 1382.

Tikhomirov reports the following about the battle of 1382: “there were lots of skulls and bones found in the side of the hill during excavations in the Kremlin, all of them buried in the most chaotic fashion [cf. the abovementioned chaotic burials in the Old Simonov monastery – Auth.]. In some places the amount of skulls obviously failed to correspond with the amount of bones; it is obvious that we have discovered a number of communal graves where parts of dismembered bodies had been buried in a disorderly fashion – most likely, the pits where the fallen defenders of Moscow were buried in 1382” ([841], page 50).

According to our hypothesis, this large communal burial ground on the territory of the Kremlin (another Red Hill?) is another group of communal graves where the Russian warriors of the Horde were buried, the ones who had fallen in the Battle of Kulikovo. The traditional dating of these graves (1382) virtually coincides with the year of the Kulikovo Battle (1380). The Kremlin burial ground is right next to a substantially more recent monument to Alexander II ([841], page 59, comment 107).

More communal graves with the remains of the Kulikovo heroes can be found in the Old Simonov monastery.

6. TOKHTA-KHAN AND THE MILITARY LEADER NOGAI AS DUPLICATES OF TOKHTAMYSH-KHAN AND THE WARLORD MAMAI

The centenarian chronological shift inherent in Russian history created a phantom duplicate of the Kulikovo Battle events known as the strife in the Horde, which is presumed to have taken place at the end of the XIII century – a conflict between Nogai and Tokhta. We already mentioned Nogai being the double of Mamai in our discussion of the 100-year shift that we found in the consensual chronology of Russian history.

7. THE CAPITAL OF DMITRIY DONSKOI = TOKHTAMYSH-KHAN AND ITS LOCATION BEFORE THE BATTLE OF KULIKOVO

Let us turn to ecclesiastical tradition. The end of the XIV century (which is the date of the Kulikovo Battle) is commonly associated with the famous ecclesiastical Purification Feast associated with the Vladimir Icon of the Blessed Virgin Mary. The Russian name of the feast is *sretenye*, and we still find a street named Sretenka in Moscow, which was named so to commemorate the arrival of this icon in these parts due to the presumed invasion of Timur-Khan, shortly after the Battle of Kulikovo.

Unfortunately, we have found no details pertaining to the origins of this feast, which had once been a very important Holy Day in the Orthodox calendar, in any of the old clerical texts that we have studied – in particular, there is no ecclesiastical canon to describe them. However, there is an old Russian ecclesiastical canon associated with the Fyodorovskaya Icon of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which is known a great deal less than its Vladimir counterpart. The events of Russian history related in this canon date from the same epoch – the very beginning of the XV century, the Battle of Kulikovo still a very recent memory. This canon is most likely to contain the answer to our question about the real location of Dmitriy’s capital.

The ecclesiastical canon tells us quite unequivocally that the capital of the Russian prince who had reigned in that period was in Kostroma: “How fair art thou, o great Kostroma City, and the entire land of Russia ...” (canon troparion); “... for mighty armaments against all foes have been bestowed upon thy city, Kostroma, and the entire land of Russia” (canon kathisma), qv in the ecclesiastical sources of the XVI–XVII century.

It is presumed that Dmitriy Donskoi had “escaped” to Kostroma shortly before the advent of Tokhtamysh; it becomes clear just why the chronicles refer to Kostroma – the city had been the capital of Czar Dmitriy, also known as Tokhtamysh-Khan, and this is where he had prepared his army for the march to Moscow. Kostroma is a large city and a close neighbour of Yaroslavl, or Novgorod the Great, as we are beginning

to realise. Vague recollections about Kostroma striving to become the capital of Russia still survive in history – its competitor had been Moscow. Kostroma had been the third largest city in Russia back then after Moscow and Yaroslavl ([438], page 97).

Our hypothesis is as follows: the city of Kostroma had been the residence of the Russian Czar, or Khan, at the end of the XIV – beginning of the XV century. Moscow had not been anything remotely resembling a capital, but rather a disputed territory where the princes of the Horde, or Russia, came to contend against one another (the word “*kalki*” stands for a special place for tournaments, or a battlefield). The construction of Moscow was instigated by Dmitriy Donskoi right after the Battle of Kulikovo; however, it had not been anything remotely resembling a capital back then, nor had it been known as Moscow before the XVI century, which is when the Russian capital was transferred there.

8.

ON THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF OUR LADY'S NATIVITY, WHICH IS PART OF THE OLD SIMONOV MONASTERY

It is presumed that “the first wooden church was constructed here in 1370” ([13], #25). Later on that year, “the Simonov Monastery was founded on the site of the Church of Our Lady’s Nativity, which was later transferred to a new place, half a verst to the north, where it stands until this day” ([706]; see also [803], Volume 3, page 111). Thus, the Old Simonov monastery is nothing but the Church of Our Lady’s Nativity and the cemetery that surrounds it. We see that when a real monastery was being founded here, complete with walls, towers and utility buildings, the chosen construction site lay at some 2000 ft from the old church, which means that the old burial ground had been so big that it could not be made part of the monastery’s premises. The Simonov monastery as it was in the XVIII century can be seen in fig. 6.39; the drawing is accurate and clear – we checked this ourselves when we visited the Old and the New Simonov monasteries in 2000 and compared many of the old drawing’s details to the surviving constructions.

We see a white church in this XVIII century drawing, to the left of the monastery and underneath the

hill with the Krutitsy monastery. It is the Church of Our Lady’s Nativity in the Old Simonov; oddly enough, it differs from the modern church to a great extent (see fig. 6.24). In fig. 6.39 the church looks like a tall tower with a hipped roof; it has a superstructure topped by a small dome, qv in fig. 6.40. We see a long row of windows right underneath the roof, and a large semicircle altar wing with a dome of its own. This church looks drastically different nowadays (see fig. 6.24). As we can see, it has undergone a radical reconstruction – this is most likely to have happened in the XIX century and resulted in the destruction of all the inscriptions and the relics related to the Battle of Kulikovo. This destruction must have been the real reason for the “reconstruction” of the church of Our Lady’s Nativity in the XIX century.

We learn that “in 1870, a cast iron memorial was put up over the graves of Peresvet and Osl'yabya, which have been known to us since 1660. The following passage, written by a person who had frequently visited the church in the early XX century, is most edifying indeed: ‘... we have been to the Old Simonovo, where we looked at the church through a window and bowed to the sepulchre of Peresvet and Osl'yabya, which one can see through the window, meditating on the icon of St. Sophia above the altar ... on 23 June 1915, we have been to the Old Simonovo again, peering through the windows of the church and trying to see the sepulchre of Peresvet and Osl'yabya. Some youth engaged in conversation with us, probably, a son of some member of their clergy; he told us that the ground around the church was packed with human bones; whole skeletons were found’” ([306], issue 6, pages 311 and 319-320).

We see the sepulchre of Peresvet and Osl'yabya treated in an odd fashion – the visitors who wish to view them are forced to walk around the church peering into windows. It is also noteworthy that it has been “known to us since 1660”, qv above. Could this mean that the old headstones of Peresvet and Osl'yabya were destroyed in 1600? This must have been the case indeed, since the middle of the XVII century had been the epoch when the memory of the pre-Romanovian Great = “Mongolian” Russian Empire, also known as the Horde, was being destroyed, thoroughly and with great vim and vigour.

“After the temple had stopped functioning, the cast