Empire and Russia as the Horde. The exhilaration about final liberty from the Great = “Mongolian” Empire had been truly great, and its wave rolled over the entire Western Europe, some of the echoes surfacing as late as in the XIX century. A minor, but illustrative detail is the map of Europe that was published in England in 1877, qv in figs. 14.105 and 14.106. The map is kept in the British museum; one of its reproductions was included into the fundamental atlas entitled *The Art of Cartography* ([1160], pages 337-338). Russia is represented as a gigantic repulsive kraken that looms over Europe; the graphical allegories for all the other European countries are much more attractive. This agitprop tradition can be traced to certain mediaeval Western European stereotypes known to us from the *Chronicle* by Matthew of Paris, for instance ([1268]; see *Chron* 4, Chapter 18:17). Matthew had used the entire weight of his authority to claim that “the Mongols and the Tartars only drink water when they can get no fresh blood” ([722], page 240).

5) A large-scale campaign for the editing of the ancient chronicles commenced in the XVII century, when the new “authorised” version of history was replacing the old. The most blatantly “heretical” chronicles were destroyed, likewise the more “radical” versions of the Bible, while others were re-written. Freshly written literary works became declared “ancient” and therefore of great authority. Unpleasant and embarrassing events became dated to phantom epochs in the distant past, and some of the key terms have altered their meanings as a result, such as “Catholicism”, “Empire”, “The Reformation” and so on. The events of the pre-XVII century epochs have therefore become distorted to a large extent by the XVII-XVIII century editors, and are extremely difficult to reconstruct nowadays.

21. **THE OLD COAT OF ARMS OF YAROSLAVL DEPICTING A BEAR HOLDING A COSSACK POLE TOPPED BY AN OTTOMAN CRESCENT.** These poles were considered a symbol of power all across Europe up until the XVII century.

We have already seen the Ottoman, or Ataman crescent on many ancient Russian coats of arms. This isn’t quite as obvious nowadays, owing to the second historical and geographical reform launched by the Romanovs at the end of the XVIII century. The usurpers also instigated a second wave of mass renaming, which had concerned urban and regional coats of arms in particular. As a result, the Ottoman (Ataman) crescents vanished from the Russian coats of arms. We already mentioned the first Romanovian renaming plague that had struck Russian history in the XVII century. Apparently, it had not been sufficient, and so the Romanovs decided to finally streamline Russian history, polishing it off, in a way. Pay attention to the fact that many Russian coats of arms were re-introduced around 1781 and often also modified rather drastically, qv in the section on the coats of arms of the Russian cities above (*Chron* 4, Chapter 10:2; also [162]). One must also point out the disappearance of the Ottoman (Ataman) crescent from the coat of arms of Kostroma.

The above cannot fail to make one wonder about Yaroslavl’s old coat of arms as reconstructed within the framework of our theory. Nowadays the bear is holding a poleaxe on its shoulder, but one must remember that this version of the crest was only introduced in the second half of the XVIII century, namely, in 1777 ([409], page 10). An older drawing of the coat of arms of Yaroslavl is known to us from the “National Almanac” compiled in 1672. “The city coat of arms of Yaroslavl … depicts an erect bear that holds a protasan on the right shoulder” ([409], page 9). In 1692 this drawing was used in the making of the principality seal accompanied by the legend “Royal Seal of the
Principality of Yaroslavl”. Historians claim that this version of Yaroslavl’s coat of arms only dates from the XVII century; however, they admit that the design was based on folk tradition traceable all the way back to the foundation of Yaroslavl ([409]). We shall shortly see just why historians are so reluctant to recognise the version of the coat of arms with the protasan-carrying bear as being much older than the XVII century.

What is a protasan, actually? Let us take a look at an old drawing of the Yaroslavl coat of arms taken from the Great Seal of State dating from the XVII century ([162], page XI; see fig. 14.81). The drawing comes from the diary of Korb, which is known well enough. We can see the bear hold a pole topped with a crescent (see fig. 14.107). A protasan is therefore a spear-like construction where the spearhead is replaced by a crescent. Moreover, it turns out that the pole of a protasan would usually be decorated in some way: “painted and upholstered in silk or velvet” ([85], Volume 35, page 111). And so, according to the above description, protasans were completely identical to the famous Cossack bunchuks, which were likewise adorned and had crescents on their ends. The bunchuk is presumed to be a purely Turkish symbol nowadays – however, one finds it on the crest of the Yaik Cossacks, for instance (see fig. 10.7). Consequently, the bunchuk had been the state symbol of the entire Great = “Mongolian” Empire, and not just its former Ottoman part. Moreover, we learn that bunchuks with crescents, or protasans, had been used as a symbol of power up until the XVII century. We learn of the following: “the protasan had been used as a weapon … used by the bodyguards of the feudal lieges in the Western Europe up until the XVII century. In Russia, protasans were used by bodyguards in the XVII century, and in the XVIII century the protasan eventually transformed into a ceremonial weapon worn by officers of high rank, losing its utility as a combat weapon” ([85], Volume 35, page 111).

All of the above is in perfect correspondence with our reconstruction. The Ottoman, or Ataman bunchuks with crescents had indeed symbolised royal power in the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, all across its vast territories, which had at some point included Western Europe in particular. It is perfectly obvious that the bear on the crest of Yaroslavl should have initially been drawn holding a protasan, or a Cossack bunchuk topped with an Ottoman = Ataman crescent. The Machiavellian transformation of the protasan into a poleaxe took place under the Romanovs, and rather late, at that – already in the XVIII century. The reason why they did it is right out there in the open – the usurpers were methodically destroying whatever evidence of the fact that the Ottoman = Ataman conquest was launched by the Horde, or Russia, had still remained intact by that time.

Actually, the Great Seal of State from Korb’s diary contains yet another distinctly visible Ottoman (Ataman) crescent, which can be found in the coat of arms of Byeloozero (see fig. 14.108). The latter happens to be a historical Russian city situated to the north of Yaroslavl. What we see is obviously a constellation of old crests with crescents upon them around Yaroslavl – the actual city of Yaroslavl has one on its crest, likewise its neighbours, such as Kostroma and Byeloozero.

22. THE “ANCIENT OLYMPUS” AND RUSSIA AS THE HORDE IN THE XIV-XVI CENTURY

22.1. Kronos and other Olympian deities of the Western Europe

As most of us were getting acquainted with the Classical mythology for the first time as children and adolescents, it was instilled into our heads that the gods of the ancient Greece had presumably lived in times immemorial, upon the mountain of Olympus in Greece. The representatives of the pantheon in question are the protagonists and participants of a great many poems and legends declared “ancient” nowadays – Kronos, Zeus, Athena, Aphrodite and many other powerful deities formerly worshipped by the Greeks.

Let us turn to the History by John Malalas, a prominent Byzantine historian of the Middle Ages ([938], [338] and [503]). Apparently, Malalas is of the opinion that Kronos, Zeus and other “ancient” Greek deities had started their divine careers as the first kings of Assyria, or the first Czars of Russia, as we realise nowadays – namely, the Russian Czars of the XIV century: Ivan Kalita, or Caliph, Georgiy Dani-lovich, and their numerous descendants.
This is what John Malalas reports: “The very tribe of Shem that had been in command of Syria, Persia and many other Oriental lands traces its ancestry all the way back to the first son of Noah, a giant named Kronos, named thus by his father Damius … He had been of formidable strength, which became famous even before he became king… And he had reigned over Assyria for many a year … fierce and fearsome in battle had he been, showing no mercy” ([338], page 24; also [503], pages 195-196).

Malalas proceeds to report that the wife of Kronos had been known by the name of Semiramis or Area, or Ira/Irene. The children of Zeus were called Zeus, Nin and Ira ([338], page 24; also [503], page 196). We see several references to the same female name of Irene, or Ira. Zeus had also been known as Pik and Diy ([503], page 196). The son and heir of Zeus, or Pik, had been known as Velon ([338], page 25). According to our reconstruction, the first Assyrian Czars had been the Khans, or the Czars of the Horde, or ancient Russia; they lived in the XIV century. In particular, Ivan Kalita = Caliph, also known as Batu-Khan, became reflected in a number of chronicles as Kronos, the Olympian deity.

Let us return to the name Diy, which had belonged to the Olympian god Zeus according to Malalas, as well as an Assyrian king ([503], page 196). We know of no such name nowadays, but there is evidence that suggests that it had once been used, in Russia at least. One might recollect the large village that still exists near Yaroslavl called Diyovo Gorodishche (the name translates as Diy’s settlement); it is presumed to have been founded in the XV century (see [409], page 66). The village had initially been a fortified settlement. We can thus see that the name Diy was not invented by the Byzantine author Malalas, and that its traces can still be found in Russian toponymy.

John Malalas gives an in-depth account of the Western campaign launched by Kronos, aka Ivan Kalita, aka Batu-Khan, and tells us about a number of important new details: “Kronos left his son Pik in Assyria, likewise his wife Area, also known as Semiramis, and marched forth towards all the Western lands that had no kings to rule them, leading an enormous army … and Botiu had remained in the West, ruling over the entire land thence” ([338], page 25). The word “Botiu” strikes one as odd initially, but it is most likely to be a variation of the name Batu that the commentators failed to recognize as such.

Thus, according to Malalas, Kronos, King of Assyria, also known as Ivan Kalita and Batu-Khan, who had later transformed into the Olympian god Kronos in numerous “ancient” poems and legends, did not return from his campaign, having founded a new capital in the West. Apparently, during the first years, when communications had not yet been developed to a sufficient extent, the Russian Czar, or Khan, was finding it very difficult to rule over the distant Western provinces from his capital on the Volga, Novgorod the Great. John Malalas specifies that the Western capital of Kronos, King of Assyria, had been in Italy ([338], page 26; also [503], page 196). This makes it instantly clear to us why the residence of the Holy See is called the Vatican – even N. A. Morozov mentions that the name Vatican translates as “Batu-Khan” ([547]).

We feel obliged to remind the readers that the Scaligerian chronology misdates the campaign of Batu-Khan = Ivan Kalita = Kronos the Assyrian to the XIII century, which is a hundred years off the mark. Once we turn to the history of Vatican in the XIII century,
we learn of the most amazing fact – it turns out that right at the beginning of the XIII century Pope Innocent appears on historical arena – the name translates as Ivan-Khan! He is reported to have been a secular ruler of the entire Europe apart from being the Holy Pontiff (see fig. 14.109). The whole of Europe had simply paid tribute to him: “Innocent had been an extremely ambitious and vain person… Innocent III managed to gain control over not only the episcopate, but secular rulers as well. He became the sovereign of vast territories in Europe – the kings of Scandinavia, Portugal, Aragonia and England, likewise the rulers of Serbia and Bulgaria, recognised him as their liege, and paid him large tribute. Other countries had also paid St. Peter’s fees [once again, a tax that went to Innocent, or Ivan-Khan – Auth.], and were forced to bear with the Pope meddling in their affairs of state… He was assisted by a perfectly organised administrative and fiscal agent framework. The Curial Council and legates sent to every country in Europe had controlled the implementation of the Papal orders” ([492], page 124).

Let us also ponder the name “Curial Council”. The Latin word “curia” stands for a confederation of ten clans ([85], Volume 24, page 99). The Russian word kuren, used by the Cossacks historically, means pretty much the same thing and also sounds similar, which makes the Latin word likely to derive therefrom. The actual “ancient” division of the Roman populace into curia must have been introduced after the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest of Europe in the XIV century, and by none other than Ivan Kalita = Batu-Khan the Assyrian = Pope Innocent.

It also turns out that Ivan-Khan, or Innocent, had been “the mastermind of the Fourth Crusade [which had resulted in the fall of Constantinople – Auth.], the foundation of the Latin Empire on Byzantine territory and the universities of Paris and Oxford. The emerging new monastic orders had brought fourth a new era in mediaeval Christianity. The transformation of the Apostolic Capital [or Vatican, aka the House of Batu-Khan – Auth.] … into one of the most powerful financial powers in Europe is also credited to Pope Innocent III” ([402], page 125). Let us remind the readers that, according to our reconstruction, the word Order (Ordo) is also a derivative of the Russian word for “horde”, “orda”.

Our reconstruction gives us an altogether new perspective of the Pope’s endeavours. They came in the course of the actual Great = “Mongolian” Conquest of the Western Europe by Batu-Khan = Kronos the Assyrian = Pope Innocent. We see the introduction of a new clan organisation system – the curia, or the kureni, the foundation of Vatican, or the residence of Batu-Khan in Italy – his Western capital, the state-sponsored construction works all across the Western Europe and so on.

It is also most likely that Innocent III = Ivan Kalita had not been buried in Moscow, but rather in Egypt, qv fig. 14.110.

A propos, one cannot fail to note that the very physical type reflected in the portrait of Pope Innocent III, qv in fig. 14.109, is dramatically different from that of all the other Popes, obviously his suc-
cessors. Innocent’s cheekbones are typically Slavic, and he also wears a long beard.

Let us however return to the description of the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest as rendered in the Chronicle of John Malalas, who reports that after the troops of Kron had left Assyria and marched Westward, his son Zeus remained in charge of affairs at home. This historical personality had eventually transferred into the legendary image of the Olympian god Zeus. His duplicate in the Russian version of history bears the name of Simeon the Proud — the son of Ivan Kalita. A while later, Simeon, or Zeus, joined his father in the West and also stayed there to reign. The Assyrian, or Russian, throne, soon went to Nin, the second son of Kronos.

The name Nin appears to be a slight corruption of Ioann/Ivan/John. Malalas must be referring to Ivan Ivanovich Krasniy (“The Red”), the second son of Ivan Kalita = Kronos the Assyrian = Batu-Khan, who had indeed ascended to the throne after the “mysterious disappearance” of Simeon the Proud (according to the learned historians, he had expired of plague). According to Malalas, Simeon the Proud (aka Zeus and Pik) did not die of any plague, having moved to Italy instead, and ruled there as the successor of his father for many years ([338], page 26; see also [503], page 196).

Malalas describes Western Europe of that epoch as a wild and largely uncultivated land, without so much as towns and cities: “There had been neither cities, nor fortifications in the Western lands — just a few nomadic descendants of Japheth living here and there” ([338], page 28). It appears as though in many parts of the Western Europe the people had still maintained a very primitive lifestyle, neither building cities, nor even making fortifications of any kind. Malalas is therefore of the opinion that Kron the Assyrian (who apparently identifies as Batu-Khan, or Ivan Kalita), may have had the Western lands all but fall into his hands.

We also encounter an interesting reference to the “ancient” Diodorus made my Malalas — it concerns the burial site of Zeus (Simeon the Proud?) on the Isle of Crete. He was buried in a temple erected specifically for that purpose:

“And his sons had erected a temple in memory of his father, and they laid him into a casket on the Isle of Crete; the coffin exists to this day” ([338], page 29; also [503], page 196).

It is possible that some remnant of the tomb of Zeus, or Dimeon, had survived until our day and age. This issue is worth of a further study.

It becomes clear why the Isle of Crete had formerly been known as Candia, which is the name we discuss above. It was present on certain maps up until the XIX century — see the map in fig. 14.101, for instance. The reason might be that the name Candia derives from Khan Diy. According to Malalas, this name had been worn by Zeus, or Simeon the Proud, a Russian Great Prince. The old name of the island implies Zeus, of Diy, to have been a Khan, which is in perfect correspondence with our reconstruction.

Malalas also mentions other descendants of the Assyrian King Kronos = Ivan Kalita (Caliph), such as Hermes etc. All of these “ancient Greek deities” had once been kings of Persia or Assyria according to Malalas, or the Russian Czars (Great Khans) in our reconstruction. They had reigned in Italy, Egypt and other countries that had been under the rule of Assyria, or Russia, in the XIV-XVI century ([503], page 196).

Our reconstruction makes everything crystal clear. Malalas is telling us about the first Czars of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, who had reigned in Russia, or the Horde (also known as the Biblical Assyria) ever since the XIV century. It is natural that the inhabitants of all the lands owned by the Horde had regarded the Khans as their mighty lords and rulers. Later on, in Greece and other warm countries on the coast of the Mediterranean, the memories of the former Assyrian, or Russian, rulers, transformed into myths of mighty gods that had lived on the faraway Mount Olympus, tall and misty, from whence they cast their thunderbolts (fired cannons), making the rebels tremble in fear. They would also occasionally visit their worshippers in the human form, take mortal concubines and sire demigods. The latter had subsequently reigned on the behalf of the “authentic Greek gods” in the beautiful “ancient” Hellas, Italy, Gaul, Egypt and so on.

Let us also point out that the name Ira, or Irene (Irina) had really been common among the wives of the first Assyrian rulers (subsequently deified). There is a possible connexion with the Temple of St. Irene in Constantinople.
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22.2. The name Irina reflected in the historical toponymy of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire

The oldest temple in Czar-Grad had been known as the Temple of St. Irene, qv in Chron6. The name Ira, or Irene, obviously became reflected in the toponymy of the regions that had been directly related to the Great = “Mongolian” Empire – Ireland, Iran (Persia) and so forth. Let us also remind the reader that the name Persia is a version of the name Prussia, or White Russia, according to our reconstruction. We must also point out the fact that the wife of Yaroslav the Wise was called Irina ([404], page 264). Our reconstruction identifies Yaroslav as Batu-Khan, Ivan Kalita and John the Caliph. This is why we believe it likely for the name of his wife to have been immortalised in the names of places that had once been part of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire.

And now for a rather surprising fact. It turns out that the name Irina had been borne by the mother of the Biblical King Solomon, or the wife of the Biblical King David. Let us turn to the famous Guennadiyevskaya Bible, allegedly dating from 1499 (more precisely, a photocopy thereof that was published in 1992 – see [745]). In the first lines of the Gospel according to Matthew we read that “King David begat Solomon from Irina” ([745], Volume 7, page 15; see figs. 14.111 and 14.112). Could this very Irina be represented by the mosaic from Hagia Sophia in Czar-Grad that we reproduce in fig. 14.113? This would be more than natural, since, according to our reconstruction, the Biblical King Solomon identifies as the famous Ottoman, or Ataman Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent, who is also known as the XVI century “restorer” of Hagia Sophia. According to our reconstruction, he didn’t “restore” anything – he built the temple (see Chron6, Chapter 12).

This fragment of the Guennadiyevskaya Bible must have really sounded heretical to the meticulous XVII century editor, who had done his best to make the name Irina contrast the neighbouring names of David and Solomon as little as possible. As one sees in fig. 14.112, a small circle of O has been put in front of the name’s first letter; this would transform the sound from I to OU. Old Russian texts, such as the Guennadiyevskaya Bible, used to transcribe the letter U as either the handwritten Greek γ, or a combination of two letters, O and U (Ου). The letter that stands for the sound I is called “izhitsa” (ι), which looks very much like γ; however, it needs to be preceded by an O to sound as “OU”. The missing letter was happily provided by the editor. Let us emphasise that it is obviously a later subscript, since the “alleged letter Ου” isn’t transcribed in this odd a manner anywhere else in the Guennadiyevskaya Bible. Moreover, there are two horizontal strokes over the izhitsa (see fig. 14.112), which is a diacritic sign used in cases when the letter stands for the sound I exclusively, and never used in combination with the Ου at all.

What does the modern Synodal translation say? Could it have preserved the name Irina? Obviously not – the modern translation is rather oblique, and goes like this: “King David begat Solomon from one
of Uriah’s kin” (Matthew 1:6). See fig. 14.114 for the Church Slavonic original.

The editors went even further here, having transformed Irina into an anonymous relation of Uriah, a male. Apparently, they didn’t count on the old text of the Gennadiyevskaya Bible to fall into too many hands, presuming that no one shall ever bother too hard about trying to decipher the real name. This is the way the ancient history was “amended” – slyly and succinctly; the “amendments” later became presumed to have been in the text from the very beginning.

The above quotation was taken from the genealogy of Jesus Christ, which is what we find in the beginning of the Gospel according to Matthew. This genealogy also ties the Gospels to the Old Testament chronologically, placing them at the very end of Biblical history. Another fact that needs to be mentioned in this respect is that the genealogical passage from Matthew had not been included in the list of “Evangelical readings” contained in the Gennadiyevskaya Bible. This means that this part of the Gospel had never been read aloud in mediaeval churches, and could therefore become expurgated from the so-called Aprakos Gospels used for reading aloud during service. The “chronological passage” is therefore likely to be apocryphal and introduced by Scaligerian and Romanovian historians, which may also explain why it spells the name of Jesus as Иисус, with two letters и, which is the spelling introduced after the reforms of Nikon in the middle of the XVII century. It is spelt as Исус in every other passage – the old way, that is (see [745]).

Corollary: It is most likely that the first page of the Gospel according to Matthew from the Gennadiyevskaya Bible was replaced by another, written anew in the XVII century in order to correspond with the Scaligerian and Romanovian historical chronology.

23.

WORLD HISTORY ACCORDING TO SOME GERMAN AUTHORS OF THE XVII-XVIII CENTURY.

The book of Johannes Heinrich Driemel

We would like to bring an extremely interesting XVIII century book to the attention of the reader. It has been pointed out to us by Y. A. Yeliseyev, who had also been kind enough to copy a number of passages for us.
The book in question was written by Johannes Heinrich Driemel (or Drümel) published in Nuremberg in 1744. A Russian translation came in St. Petersburg in 1785 under the following title: “A Specimen Historical Demonstration of the Genealogy of the Russians as the First Nation after the Deluge”. A copy of this book is kept in the National Library of Russia, which is where Y. A. Yeliseyev had come across it.

The contents of this rather small book in German can be rendered in the following manner. History of the world begins with the Assyrian Kingdom, which Driemel also identifies as the Kingdom of the Scythians, or the Cossacks, or Gog and Magog, or the Russian Kingdom. The Biblical Nimrod was of Scythian, or Russian, descent. These are the very words that Driemel uses! In the XIII century the Russians, known as the Tartars in the West, invaded into the Western Europe. The memory of this invasion is kept alive in the toponymy of Germany, for instance. Driemel cites the name of Mount Risen as an example, and explains that the name translates as “Russian Mountain”.

Driemel concludes in the following manner: “The word Ris is Scythian without a doubt… The word Ris is said to be German, but it can equally be Scythian. The Germans and the Scythians have many common names, and had once been brothers. This is why the Russian are also known as the Rises, the Giants, the Scythians, the Sacians, the Kurds and the Araritians” ([261], page 46-47).

The fact that Driemel identifies the Russians as the Tartars in a perfectly casual manner must seem astonishing to a modern reader, but it had appeared perfectly natural to a XVIII century citizen Nuremberg, who doesn’t even bother with citing any evidence to support this claim, being very pedantic about it normally. He considers it axiomatic!

One must realise that the book of Driemel had been written before the propagation of the theory about the “horrendous yoke of the Mongol and Tartar invaders in Russia” thought up by the “eminent Russian scientists” Bayer and Schlezer. Driemel had simply remained unaware of their great discovery, and had adhered to the old German way of thinking about the Russians and the Tartars being but two names of a single nation.

As for the Russian origins of the Biblical Nimrod, Driemel already needs to prove those, since the Scligerian version of the Biblical history had already become widely used in Western Europe.

We shall proceed to give a few quotations from Driemel’s book that speak for themselves.

Driemel starts with references to a number of the “ancient” authors, proving the first nation after the Deluge to have been the Kurds, whose very name can actually relate to the words “Horde” and “gordiy” (“proud”). What makes him think so? Apparently, Driemel reckons that the modern Kurdistan is part of Assyria, and every mediaeval chronicler knew about the Assyrian Kingdom being the first one ever founded. As we have tried to demonstrate in the present book, the true meaning of this statement is that the “Mongolian”, or the Great, or the Russian = Assyrian Empire had been the first kingdom to span the whole world. Driemel’s further elaborations de facto confirm our reconstruction, since he later identifies the Biblical Assyrians as the Scythians and the Russia. However, Driemel follows the erroneous Scligerian geography and fails to understand that the Biblical Assyria had really been Russia, or the Horde, all along. This is why he traces the origins of the Russians to the ancient inhabitants of the modern Mesoopotamia, or Assyria.

Driemel reports the following: “The northern part of this land [Kurdistan – Auth.], which comprises most of Assyria, is called Adiabene… It is mentioned by Strabon in the ninth book of his ‘Geography’, wherein he says that the inhabitants of the land are called the Sacopods or the Sacs… Ptolemy in his ‘Asian Tables’ mentions the Sacian Scythia to be the place where Noah had stopped… Solinus writes in Book XLIX that the Persians had originally been known as the Korsaks, and that the name translates as “Cordian Sacs” ([261], pages 26-27). Driemel comments these quotations from the “ancient” authors in the most remarkable manner indeed: “These may be the ancestors of the Cossacks” ([261], page 27). Therefore, Driemel openly identifies the Scythians and the “ancient” Sacs as the Cossacks.

Driemel proceeds to tell us the following: “The Sacs are the main ethnic group in Scythia (Strabon, Geography, Book XI)… The Sacs are identified as the Scythians everywhere (by Isidore in the ‘Characteristics’ and by Arian in the ‘Tale of Alexander’s Campaigns’, Book 3)” ([261], page 29). Driemel’s own
comment is as follows: “The name Scythian translates as ‘catcher’… the word ‘catcher’ is translated as ‘giant’ in the Greek Bible; other nations use the word ‘Scythian’… Therefore, the words “Catcher”, “Kurd”, “Giant” and “Scythian” are synonymous… the Bible refers to the ‘Catchers’ as to a nation” ([261], page 30). Driemel is therefore proving that the Biblical King Nimrod, the founder of the first kingdom upon the face of Earth after the deluge, had been a Scythian. This last word is erroneously translated as “catcher” in the modern version of the Bible. Driemel further identifies the Scythians as the Russians.

“The names of Gog and Magog are Scythian in origin as well” ([261], page 33). Driemel’s commentary in re the passage from Ezekiel that mentions Gog and Magog is as follows: “The 70 Translators render this passage as follows: ‘Thou art facing Gog, Prince of Rosh, Meshech and Thubal’… Since Magog is translated as ‘Rosh’, which is the name of a nation that the translators must have been familiar with, they [Gog and Magog – Auth.] had also been Scythian, since the nations of Magog, Meshech, Thubal, Homer and Farhaman had been Scythian – the first nations of the North (Moses, Book I, Chapter X 2.3), most of which had been known as the Scythians in the epoch that this prophecy is telling us about … Joseph Flavius, a Judean historiographer, states it explicitly that Gog and Magog are Scythian (Book VII, Chapter 1)… Stromberg, who had lived among the descendants of the Scythians, and a most trustworthy source, writes in the ‘Description of Europe and Asia’ (page 42), that the Scythians refer to themselves as Goug and Gioug, and that the affix Ma stands for the Orient; and so, Gog and Gioug are the same thing, whereas Magog is the name of the Oriental Scythians” ([261], pages 34-36).

After that, Driemel proves (quoting several “ancient” and mediaeval authors, as usual) that the Scythians can be identified as the Persians, quoting an entry from a mediaeval encyclopaedia: “Right after the entry ‘Magic’ we read that the Persians are referred to as Magog and Nagouzei [a reference to Nogaisk? – Auth.] by their neighbours… Upper Assyria is the motherland of the Scythians. Persia lies to the East… However, no other nation fits to represent the Eastern Scythians better than the Persians… Hodollogomor, King of Elim or Persia (Genesis, Chapter XIV) is referred to as the King of the Scythians (see comments to Genesis, letter H) – therefore, Gog, Magog and Giug are all names of the Scythians” ([261], pages 37-38).

One might think that the nations in question are Oriental in origin, and have always inhabited the territory of the modern Persia. This doesn’t contradict Scaligerian history that much; however, Driemel goes on to prove that the Russians and the Germans are both of Scythian descent. Such claims naturally sound outlandish insofar as consensual history is concerned (and coming from a German author, at that), but they are in perfect concurrence with our reconstruction, according to which the Biblical Assyria, also known as Persia and the land of Gog and Magog identifies as mediaeval Russia, or the Horde, while the Germans are likely to be the descendants of the Slavs that came from Russia, or the Horde, during the Great = “Mongolian” conquest.

Let us carry on with quoting from Driemel: “The forefathers of the Germans had been known as the Scythians (Pliny, ‘Natural History’, Book IV, Chapter 25), the Gettians, the Celtic Allemannians, the Franks and the Germans… ‘Japhet’ translates as ‘giant’, which is also the word used in the Sarmatian Chronicle, whereas the Chronicle of Alexandria says ‘Scythian’… The Germanic peoples (Gudlingian, Book 1) translate the Greek ‘giant’ into German as ‘Riesen’… the Holy Writ refers to peoples of exceptional height, strength and bravery, such as the Nephaim, Emin and Enakkim… The Norwegian and Danish chronicles report the Risi to be a Baltic nation that had signed a peace pact with the Normans” ([261], pages 39 and 42).

Driemel then tells us directly that “the Risi are the Russians” ([261], page 43). “The name Russia is Latin, whereas the Greeks use the word ‘Rosses’ (those are mentioned by the Greek authors as a Scythian nation; in the X-XIII century, Kedren wrote the following in his ‘Brief History’ (page 453): ‘The Rosses are a Scythian tribe that occupy the Northern part of the Tauris). They call themselves Reises (Russians)… The Germans pronounced the name as ‘Riesen’” ([261], pages 42-43).

“And thus I enquire – what are the origins of Mount Riesen’s name, whence did the name come to the hills between Bohemia and Silesia? The only reason I be-
lieve to be true is that the Tartars, also known as the Rises and the Russians, had sadly invaded Silesia as a hostile force in the XIII century” ([261], page 45).

This is how Driemel casually refers to the Tartar and Mongol invasion, calling it the Russian conquest and obviously unaware of the extent to which he compromises the pact made by later historians about never ever recollecting that the Russians were formerly known as the Tartars, or that the Horde had colonised the West.

Further also: “The writers of all epochs recognise the Rises, the Rosses or the Reises as a Scythian nation (Kedren)” ([261], page 46).

This is how a German author from the early XVIII century saw global history. The adepts of the modern textbooks shall of course treat the above information as utter nonsense and wonder about how an author as ignorant as Driemel could possibly have written a book and get it published. Actually, in Chron 5 we explain (referring to A. D. Chertkov) that there were many such books published in Germany. It would be very interesting to analyse all of them. We haven’t done this and just used a single example – the book of Driemel, which also exists in Russian translation. As we can see, many Germans had still remembered the true course of world history in the early XVIII century, albeit vaguely.

24. THE IMPERIAL BICEPHALOUS EAGLE AND THE POSSIBLE ORIGINS OF THE SYMBOL

In 1997 the book of G. V. Vilinbakhov entitled The Russian National Coat of Arms: 500 Years ([134]) was published. The author writes about the history of the Russian coat of arms – the bicephalous eagle, deeming it perfectly natural that the Russians had lacked the imagination necessary to invent a symbol of their own and had to adopt it from elsewhere. Three possible sources are named – Byzantium, Western Europe and the Golden Horde ([134], page 23). Apparently, “the eagle figure on the coinage of the Golden Horde is likely to be Oriental in origin and not a Byzantine import, as some of the researchers suggested. V. I. Savva came up with the theory that the bicephalous eagle on the Juchid coins had stood for the seal of some Khan of the Golden Horde” ([134], page 23).

This idea corresponds with our reconstruction, according to which the bicephalous eagle of the Golden Horde had been a Russian symbol used in the Horde from the very beginning.

We must also recollect that the seal of Ivan III is very similar to that of Ivan IV, which is precisely how it should be, according to our reconstruction. Both seals are simply inscribed with the name Ivan; one obviously finds no “numbers” here (see figs. 7.6 and 7.8, as well as Chron 4, Chapter 7:7).

Vilinbakhov’s book also tells us about the ancient Russian banners, that have apparently borne the “symbol of the sun and the crescent” ([134], page 31). It is very likely that in some of them at least the symbol was that of the star and crescent, well familiar to us from the Ottoman = Ataman Empire. It is odd that the publishers of the album ([134]) for some reason didn’t reproduce a single photograph or at least a drawing of some such banner. Could it be due to the overly explicit representation of the star and crescent, perhaps? It is also said that the “sun symbol and the crescent” had once accompanied the imperial two-headed eagle ([134], page 31): “The composition consisting of a crowned bicephalous eagle with
that had nothing in common with biology. What is the real reason? Although the issue is of no principal importance to us, it is rather curious in itself. Let us put forth a certain hypothesis in this respect.

We shall turn to the extremely rare and utterly fascinating engravings of Albrecht Dürer that comprise his famous “Glory Arch of Maximilian I” – the so-called “Ehrenpforte” ([1067]). In fig. 14.115 we see a detail of one such engraving that shows a coat of arms drawn by Dürer. It is perfectly obvious that we see a crescent here, with shining rays on its both sides that look remarkably like the feathers of the two raised bird’s wings formed by the crescent. There is no head here – however, it becomes obvious that the famous bicephalous eagle must really be another rendition of the same old star (or cross) and crescent symbol. The two heads of the eagle with their backs to each other can be regarded as yet another version of the star, or the cross, that rests upon the crescent, or the eagle’s wings. Therefore, the bicephalous eagle with its wings raised is yet another version of the Christian cross (of
six or eight points), or the Ottoman star and crescent, all of them ultimately standing for the same thing.

In fig. 14.116 we reproduce another coat of arms from Dürer’s “Ehrenpforte” that depicts a bicephalous eagle, whose wings obviously form a crescent, whereas the body and the two heads are arranged as a part of the cross. What we have in front of us is therefore yet another form of the six-pointed or eight-pointed Christian cross. It also becomes clear why the initial version of the eagle had raised wings – they were representing the crescent. Folded wings are a result of later modifications introduced when the initial meaning of the symbol had already been perceived rather vaguely; eventually, it became forgotten for good. The eagle’s wings must have been folded in the epoch of the Reformation so as to get as far away as possible from the possible associations with the Christian cross, or the Ottoman star and crescent.

In fig. 14.117 we see another coat of arms taken from Dürer’s “Ehrenpforte” that depicts a bicephalous eagle, whose wings obviously form a crescent, whereas the body and the two heads are arranged as a part of the cross. What we have in front of us is therefore yet another form of the six-pointed or eight-pointed Christian cross. It also becomes clear why the initial version of the eagle had raised wings – they were representing the crescent. Folded wings are a result of later modifications introduced when the initial meaning of the symbol had already been perceived rather vaguely; eventually, it became forgotten for good. The eagle’s wings must have been folded in the epoch of the Reformation so as to get as far away as possible from the possible associations with the Christian cross, or the Ottoman star and crescent.

In fig. 14.118 we see four heraldic eagles with their wings raised and obviously representing crescents ([1067], Page 16). Here the crescents, or the wings, are drawn right on the body of the eagle. We see the same to be the case with the coats of arms reproduced in figs. 14.119-14.122. This effect is the most observable in fig. 14.122, where the crescent is perfectly blatant and instantly recognizable.

**25. THE GENEALOGY OF THE GREAT PRINCES OF MOSCOW AS RE-WRITTEN IN THE XVII CENTURY**

It appears that the genealogy of the Muscovite Great Princes had been written anew in the XVII century, no less ([134], page 37). This is what we know about the matter at hand: “Around 1673 Emperor Leopold I had sent his heraldic expert, a Slav named Lavrentiy Khourelich (or Kourelich), to Moscow at the request of the Czar [Alexei Mikhailovich – Auth.]. In 1673 Lavrentiy Khourelich wrote a tractate entitled “Genealogy of the Most Holy and Reverend Great Princes of Moscow et al…” The “Genealogy” was sent to Moscow from Vienna in 1674 personally by the author, who had entrusted it to Paul Menesius for that end; this was recorded in the documents of the Posolskiy Prikaz [royal service in charge of foreign relations – Transl.] Apart from the actual genealogies of the Russian Czars, from Vladimir Svyatoslavich to Alexei Mikhailovich, and the description of the family ties between the Czar and the monarchs of nine other countries, the work of Khourelich contains portraits of the Czars and the Great Princes” ([134], page 37).

Therefore, historians themselves are telling us that some new version of the genealogy of the Russian Czars and Great Princes was written in Vienna in the second half of the XVII century, and then posted to the Czar in Moscow, apparently, as a reference manual for the “authorised version” of history – one that was meant to be followed obligatorily, perhaps? A propos, the “Genealogy” (commonly referred to as the Titular Book) has never been published – it is still being kept in an archive, waiting to be destroyed in another “random conflagration”.

**26. THE BAPTISM OF RUSSIA**

Modern readers are most likely to be familiar with the history of the baptism of Russia from the *Povest Vremennyh Let* ([716] and [715]). The latter is a source that dates from the early XVIII century, as we demonstrate in Chapter 1 of CHRON4. According to this chronicle, the one and only baptism of Russia took place under Prince Vladimir in 986-989 A.D. En-
voys of different lands presumably came to Vladimir in 986, offering to convert him into their faith ([716] and [715], pages 65-66). This is how the preparations for the baptism started. The actual baptism took place in 989, according to the Povest Vremennyh Let ([715], pages 84-85). The Christian ecclesiastical hierarchy is said to have been nonexistent prior to that; when it did appear, it had initially consisted of foreign priests from Greece. The first Russian metropolitan is said to have appeared several decades later, under Yaroslav the Wise, which is also the time when the ecclesiastical literature was translated from Greek into Slavic. This is how the Romanovian version of Russian history relates the baptism of Russia – the one that was created in the XVII-XVIII century. This is also the official version, and one that we’re accustomed to.

But let us see how the baptism of Russia, doubtless a major event in the ecclesiastical Russian history, was described in the canonical church literature of the early XVII century. Let us consider the Great Catechesis, published in Moscow under Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich Romanov and Patriarch Filaret in 1627 ([86]). This book contains a special section on the baptism of Russia ([86], sheets 27-29). The version it contains is greatly at odds with the one we’re accustomed to. According to the Great Catechesis, Russia was baptised four times. The first baptism was by Apostle Andrew, the second performed by Fotius, Patriarch of Czar-Grad “in the reign of the Greek King, Basil of Macedonia, and Ryurik, Great Prince of Russia, with Askold and Dir regnant in Kiev” ([86], sheet 28, reverse). The Great Catechesis doesn’t indicate any dates for either baptism – all of this in the early XVII century!

Unlike the first two, the third baptism of Russia is dated in the Catechesis. It is said to have taken place under the Great Princes Olga, in the year 6463 since Adam, or around 955 A.D. We shall withhold from discussing why the Catechesis insists on converting this date into the B.C./A.D. chronology somewhat differently (the book insists on 963 A.D.). This must be explained by the poor correlation between the “Adam era” and the B.C./A.D. chronology, which had still been in a state of flux around that time.

The fourth baptism of Russia is the famous baptism under Prince Vladimir. The Great Catechesis dates it to 6497, which is roughly 989 A.D. This is what we read: “And so he had ordered to the whole people of Russia to get baptised by the Holy Patriarchs in the year of 6496 – Nikola Khrusover, or Cicinius, or Sergiy, Archbishop of Novgorod, under Mikhail, the Metropolitan of Kiev” ([86], sheet 29).

This description rings very odd nowadays. We “know” that Russia had been pagan before the baptism, and that no ecclesiastical hierarchy had existed until Prince Vladimir summoned the first members of the Christian clergy from abroad. Yet the XVII century Catechesis claims the baptism to have happened in the epoch of Sergiy, Archbishop of Novgorod, and Mikhail, Metropolitan of Kiev, which means that two church hierarchies had existed at least – in Novgorod and in Kiev. However, as one may have expected, the Scaligerian and Romanovian version of history knows nothing about any archbishops in Novgorod or metropolitan in Kiev under Vladimir. Nowadays we are told that all of the above is but a “mediaeval fancy” – “fantasies of the Catechesis” in the present case.

One is also instantly confronted with the following question. Could the people in the XVII century have known nothing of substance about the baptism of Russia? Have they never read the Povest Vremennyh Let? One must think that if even the authors of the Catechesis possessed no definite information about this event, the rest of the people, those who had used the Catechesis as a learning aid, must have known even less. Therefore, later historians must have been the first to discover “truth about the baptism of Russia” – Bayer, Miller and Schlezer, who had “read about it” in the Povest Vremennyh Let. This oeuvre was naturally unknown to their predecessors in the XVII century for the simple reason that the version of this chronicle known to us today had not yet been written; it had only attained its Romanovian and Millerian characteristics in the XVIII century, qv in CHRON4, Chapter 1. As we can see, the history of Russia’s baptism in its consensual version also cannot predate the end of the XVII century, since it had still been seen in a totally different light in the early XVII century.

However, let us return to the Great Catechesis, which reveals more curious facts, and begin with the date of the baptism. According to our research, the epoch when Russia was baptised becomes superimposed over the XI and the XV century (see the chronological tables in figs. 2.4 and 2.5 in CHRON4, Chap-
ter 2). Bear in mind that the XV century is the famous epoch of the Great Schism. According to the New Chronology, this is when the formerly united Christian Church had become divided into several separate branches. This is why the issue of confession choice had been a poignant one for the secular authorities of the XV century. Mark that the baptism of Russia under Prince Vladimir was described in the *Povest Vremennyh Let* as a choice of faith and not a simple baptism ([86]). This explains the several baptisms of Russia, which must indeed look odd if we regard a baptism as the conversion of the pagans into Christianity – we see nothing of the kind in the history of any other country. Who would there remain to baptise? However, if we are to view the consecutive baptisms of Russia as confession choices made during religious schisms, the picture becomes perfectly clear.

Another thing that ceases to look odd is the way the patriarchs are listed – the baptism was supposed to be performed by either Nikola Khrusovert, or Cicinius, or Sergiy. If the above patriarchs all took part in the baptism of a pagan country, wherefore the “or”? “And” would have been more appropriate. If they didn’t take part in the baptism, why mention them at all? However, if the baptism of Russia is to be regarded as a choice of confession, everything starts to look normal – different patriarchs must have sided with different branches, and the indication of a chosen confession must have also contained the names of its most distinguished patriarchs. There could have been several; the use of “or” becomes justified if we’re to assume that all of them had been in consensus – any of them could have supervised the “confession choice” with the same result. Therefore, the conjunction “or” is used by the Great Catechism in order to hint at the atmosphere of an ecclesiastical schism.

Let us now consider the way the date of the baptism is transcribed in the original – “six thousand УЧЗ”. It contains the Slavic letter У, which stands for “400”. However, in many old texts the letter in question is virtually indistinguishable from Ц, qv in fig. 14.123. The difference between the two had been truly minimal (see fig. 14.124). This is how these letters were written in most of the old texts – all but duplicating one another. Examples of just how similar the two letters had been in writing are abundant in the illustrations to [745].
However, when these letters would actually come up in texts, the letter \( Y \) would as a rule be accompanied by the letter \( O \) – in other words, the sound \( \text{OU} \) was transcribed as two letters. Therefore, the similarity between the letters \( Y \) and \( I \) did not usually lead to any confusion in the interpretation of narrative text. However, when used as digits, the letters would immediately become very confusing, since there were no additional \( O \)'s next to the \( Y \)'s, and the similarity between the shapes of the two letters proved problematic. Both letters also referred to the hundreds place, which would lead to occasional 500-year errors in dating. The matter is that the letter \( I \) had stood for 900, whereas \( Y \) had meant 400. In cases when the letter became confused for the former, the dating written in these digits immediately gained 500 years of extra age. Such cases were numerous, since confusion came easy. Thus, if a certain Slavic date has the letter \( Y \) in the hundreds place, the very same date may have been transcribed with \( I \) in the old original that it was copied from, and there is a possibility of a 500-year chronological error inherent in the newer copy.

This is the very situation that we have with the date of Russia's baptism. The date in question is 6497 since Adam and is transcribed with the use of the latter \( Y \), which stands for 400. If the letter in question were \( I \), the dating would become 6997 since Adam, or 1489 A.D. Therefore, it is possible that the original old document had dated the baptism of Russia to 1489 instead of 989, which is the date that we’re accustomed to using nowadays. The baptism is thus dated to the end of the XV century, while the previous baptism of Russia instigated by Olga shifts to the middle of the XV century.

However, it is this very century that the largest reform of the Russian Church falls upon, which was in direct connexion with the religious schism, the famous Council of Florence and the failed attempt of a religious union. The story is known to everyone very well, and related in numerous textbooks on ecclesiastical history. Nowadays this reform is presented to us as an important moment in the history of the Russian Church, but not really a crucial one. However, the contemporaries of this event had written some interesting things about it. A. V. Kartashev reports the following: “Simeon of Suzdal in his ‘Tale’ likens Vassily Vassilyevich not only to his predecessor St. Vladimir, but also Constantine, the great Czar and the ‘founder of the Orthodox faith’ considered equal to the Apostles in rank by the Church” ([372], page 374). Vassily Vassilyevich is the Great Prince Vassily II Tyomniy, who had lived in the XV century. Apparently, the *Povest Vremennyh Let* describes this very epoch as the last baptism of Russia under Prince Vladimir. Let us also remind the reader that the given name of Vladimir the Holy had actually been Vassily, which is common knowledge – see the Great Catechesis, for instance ([86], page 29).

However, one is confronted by the natural wish to find out the identities of Nikola Khrusovert, Cicinius and Sergiy, Archbishop of Novgorod, whose faith had been chosen at the baptism of Russia. No archbishop of this name exists anywhere in the epoch of the X century, which is the epoch that the Millerian and Romanovian textbooks place it. Indeed – what Orthodox hierarchy could possibly exist in the pagan Novgorod “before the baptism”?

However, let us turn to the XV century and look for the abovementioned characters there. We do find them here; moreover, they are actually rather famous.

Nikola Khrusovert is most likely to identify as the famous Nicolaus Chryppsf Cusanus, who had lived in 1401-1464 ([936], Volume 2, page 212). He is known as “the greatest German humanist … theologian, theologian, mathematician and a public figure, ecclesiastical and secular” ([936], Volume 2, page 212). The nickname Cusanus is presumed to have derived from the village of Cusa, which is where he was born ([936], Volume 2, page 212). We find it odd that he was named after a village that nobody has ever heard of instead of the province or the country that he had hailed from. We believe his nickname to translate as “native of Kazan” – a famous city in the XV century.

The origins of the name Khrusovert as mentioned by the Great Catechesis also become clearer. Nicholas Cusanus had also borne the name Chryppfs, qv above, which may have read as “Khrus” in Old Russian. But where does the word “vert” come from, and what does it mean? The following explanation is possible. Apparently, Nicholas Cusanus had written a tractate on telluric rotation, no less – “a hundred years before Copernicus”, as it is generally assumed ([936], Volume 2, page 212). In this case, the word “vert” might refer to his discovery (cf. the Russian word “vertet”, “to rotate”, etc.).
and the Latin “vertō” – “I turn”. Thus, the name Khru-sovert might stand for “Khrus, the discoverer of tel-luric rotation” – or even “the Christian who had dis-covered the rotation of the Earth”. Possibly, KHRUS+ VERT may have stood for “converting to Christianity”, especially seeing how the Great Catechesis names him among the founding fathers of the Orthodox Chris-tianity. The nickname Khrus could have stood for “Christian” and been derived from the name Christ, or Horus. As we are beginning to realise, Great Prince Vladimir (aka Vassily) must have baptised Russia while Khrusovert had still been alive, or shortly after his death.

Now, who could the Cicinius character possibly be? He is the ecclesiastical activist mentioned second in the Great Catechesis. The Christianity encyclopaedia ([936]) doesn’t mention any known XV characters under that name. However, we did find Zosima, one of the most famous Russian saints and the founder of the famous monastery at Solovki. Zosima died in 1478 ([936], Volume 1, page 562). Could he be the person mentioned in the Great Catechesis as Cicinius? Moreover, it turns out that Gerontiy, the Metropolitan of Moscow, died in 1489, which is the very year of the baptism, and his successor had been Metropolitan Zosima ([372], Volume 1, page 387). The biography of Metropolitan Zosima is complex and very convoluted; his entire life was spent in the atmosphere of a heated ecclesiastical schism. The details aren’t known all that well ([936], Volume 1, page 562). It is possible that Cicinius from the epoch of Russia’s baptism as mentioned in the Catechesis is Zosima, the Muscovite Metropolitan from the end of the XV century.

What can we say about Sergiy, the Archbishop of Novgorod, who is also mentioned among the actual instigators of Russia’s baptism, according to the Great Catechesis? There is but a single person suitable for that role – Sergiy of Radonezh. Although his death is dated to the end of the XIV century nowadays, he was canonised in 1452 ([936], Volume 2, page 553) – the very epoch of the “fourth baptism of Russia” under Prince Vladimir, or Vassily. The lifetime of Sergiy falls on the epoch of the ecclesiastical schism, which had already been in its budding stage around the beginning of the XV century, according to our reconstruction.

A propos, to come back to Nicholas Cusanus (possibly, Nicholas Khrusovert) – it must be pointed out that “in 1453, being deeply impressed by the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks, he had published a tractate … wherein he had emphasised … the possibility of a Christian agreement between all the nations. Next he had published a work entitled … ‘Sifting through the Koran’ … which is concerned with pointing out the close ties that exist between Islam and Christianity” ([936], Volume 2, page 212). This demonstrates his positive attitude towards the Ottomans, or the Atamans, which hints at his connexions with the mediaeval Russia, or the Horde. Let us reiterate that the Ottoman = Ataman conquest, had been launched from Russia, or the Horde, according to our reconstruction.

27.

HOW THE ROMANOVIAN FALSIFICATION OF DOCUMENTS WAS REFLECTED IN THE HISTORY OF RUSSIAN HANDWRITING

Above we have said a great deal about the global falsification of the ancient Russian documents that took place in the epoch of the first Romanovs (starting with the middle of the XVII century, that is). Let us ponder how this tremendous hoax should have affected the history of Russian handwriting. Handwriting styles are subject to change in the course of time; this can greatly affect the manner in which certain letters and combinations of letters are written. As a result, texts written in an archaic and uncommon handwriting are often very hard to read – due to the simple fact that some of the letters will be impossible to recognize at the very least.

However, let us imagine that at some point in history all the documents of the previous epochs were edited and written anew, and the originals destroyed. This shall leave us with a situation where all of the falsified “ancient” documents are written in more or less the same style of handwriting – the one that had been used in the epoch of the falsification. This is the handwriting that the scribes of the late XVII century were taught as children. No matter how hard they may have tried to make the handwriting look “ancient”, the manner of writing adopted in the childhood should have affected the end result in one way or another. Thus, the modern reader shouldn’t have
that many problems with reading the “ancient” (falsified and edited) texts. It suffices to read two or three such “ancient documents” to get accustomed to the manner of writing. The rest of the “ancient” documents shouldn’t present any difficulties, since the shape of letters and the manner of writing should remain more or less the same.

This is precisely what we see happen with the history of the Russian handwriting. All of the “ancient” texts allegedly dating from the pre-Romanovian epoch can be read without much trouble. If you can read a text dating from the alleged XVI century, you will find it easy to read the texts from the alleged XI and XII century as well, etc. The same applies to texts dating from the second half of the XVII century. It seems as though the shorthand texts of the first half of the XVII century are the only exception, notwithstanding the fact that the shorthand of the alleged XVI century is usually a lot more accessible. We are quite naturally referring to published specimens exclusively – there is no way of knowing what is concealed in the closed archives.

And so, something strange happened to the Russian handwriting in the first half of the XVII century, or the epoch of the first Romanovs, starting around the beginning of the XVII century and up until 1630. The handwriting in these documents is drastically different from any other handwriting dating from any other historical period. For some mysterious reason it is the epoch of roughly 1613-1630 that had the handwriting one finds particularly hard to interpret, occasionally failing altogether. This is primarily due to the outlandish shape of most letters, which often resemble Arabic script more than they do Slavic characters. In reality, the letters are Slavic – it is only their shape that we find uncommon today. This effect is truly of great interest, and vividly manifest in the series of specimens of Russian handwriting reproduced in the multi-volume edition entitled the Dictionary of the Russian Language of the XI-XVII century ([782]-[791]). Twenty-three volumes of the dictionary have been published to date. Each of them contains two different examples of the old handwriting reproduced on the title page. We have chosen twelve handwriting specimens – documents concerning trade for the most part, qv in fig. 14.125 – 14.140. Let us point out that the specimens we do not reproduce herein are all written in a perfect calligraphic hand that shall be easy to decipher for any modern reader, despite the several centuries that had passed since the epochs in question.

Our recommendation to the readers familiar with the Cyrillic alphabet is to try and actually read these specimens, and then estimate which ones are the hardest to decipher. Those are doubtless the specimens of shorthand writing dating from 1613-1614 and from 1629. This fact can obviously be explained in a number of ways – however, our reconstruction makes it look perfectly natural. Moreover, it would be strange if things had been any different. Indeed, during the Romanovian document falsification campaign, which falls on the second half of the XVII century, the scribes would understandably enough leave the documents of the Romanovs themselves intact – the ones that dated from the epoch when their dynasty had just come to power. After all, these documents already fell into the “authorised” category, and didn’t need any amendments, unlike the bulk of earlier documents, which were either destroyed or edited.