The unfamiliar characters declared Arabic today must be old Russian letters of the XIV-XVI century, now completely forgotten. Also, inscriptions on coins are a lot more difficult to read than texts on paper. In the former case it is always a short phrase or a single word; also, the use of abbreviations had been a rule in minting. If the shape of the letters is unfamiliar, the inscription is rendered utterly illegible.

There are also cases when the shape of the letters is quite common, but the text still cannot be read. For instance, on 1-3 February 1998, G. V. Nosovskiy, one of the authors, visited the Ouglich Citadel Museum. As we already mentioned in Chapter 13, several artefacts from an old burial site excavated near the ancient Russian city of Ouglich in 1942 were put up for exhibition in the Tower of Prince Dmitriy – namely, the sarcophagus of a monk and the monastic attire of the latter. The condition of the garments is amazingly good. The dating of the burial site isn’t indicated anywhere, but the guides name it as the XVII century. Since the monk was buried in a sarcophagus in accordance with the ancient custom, it is possible that the grave was really old and may indeed date from the XVII century. The monk’s clothes, which were put up for exhibition, are covered in numerous inscriptions situated around an Orthodox cross of the canonical form and rendered in the Cyrillic alphabet. Every letter is visible perfectly well, but the text as a whole is illegible – many of the words cannot be read in any way at all. We give a more detailed account of this finding in CHRON 4, Chapter 13:3.2, reproducing photographs of the lettering.

We are therefore confronted by a most bizarre tendency. Russian chronicles, books and artwork that are presumed to date from ancient epochs and have de facto been received from the hands of the XVII-XVIII century historians were written in perfectly readable Russian. This makes it very odd indeed that whenever an authentic Russian historical artefact is unearthed, and by authentic we mean one that has fortunately evaded the clutches of the Romanovian editors, we see a completely different picture. The decipherment of such inscriptions always leads to great complications (they literally need to be deciphered), and the obstacles encountered by researchers often prove insurmountable. We are beginning to realise this trait to characterise objects that truly date from pre-Romanovian epochs, and in certain cases also the epoch of the first Romanovs – the destruction of the old Horde tradition had required some time, after all, and so even in case of Romanovian artefacts we occasionally encounter old style lettering. This particularly concerns faraway provinces. Indeed, old traditions die hard.

28.

AN EXAMPLE OF AN OBVIOUSLY COUNTERFEITED RUSSIAN HISTORICAL DOCUMENT – A ROYAL DECREE OF IVAN THE TERRIBLE

Above we wrote a great deal about the falsification of the old Russian documents in the epoch of the Romanovs. It is a commonly known fact that Russian documents of the pre-Romanovian epoch have either vanished or reached us as XVII century copies, already manufactured under the Romanovs. It is known that in the XVII century many of the ministries were compiling books of copies made from old documents. These “copies” are still about, while the originals have mysteriously disappeared. It is believed that the Romanovian officials had diligently copied all the ancient documents, and the copies in question are therefore regarded as bona fide verbatim copies of the perished originals. However, all that we have already managed to find out makes us strongly doubt the hypothesis that the copying campaign of the first Romanovs had pursued the noble objective of conserving the frail scrolls for posterity. It is more likely to have been the reverse – destruction of the originals and their replacement by copies edited in the necessary manner.

Nevertheless, certain documents, in particular, several decrees of the Czars and the Great Princes are presumed to have reached us in their original form. We are of the opinion that one needs to conduct a new and very meticulous study of the presumably authentic pre-Romanovian Russian documents in order to find out whether they have indeed been preserved in their original form. Could the documents that we’re shown today be Romanovian forgeries? The suspicion that the activity in question did indeed take place is confirmed by the following vivid example. The colour insets from the end of [638] contain a
Let us describe the official seals of state as used in that epoch. Several holes were made in the bottom part of the document, and joined with a piece of thread, whose ends would then be woven together and sealed with wax, lead or some other material. The seal itself could not be attached to another document without getting damaged. It is crucial that the holes for the thread were made in the document itself, and not a separate sheet of any kind, which could be easily removed and pasted to another document.

What do we see in the photograph of the royal decree sealed by the seal of Czar Ivan Vassilyevich “The Terrible” (taken from [638])? The seal is quite obviously attached to some small piece of paper or parchment, which, in turn, was pasted to the bottom part of the seal, qv in figs. 14.141 and 14.142. Thus, both the seal and the thread were cut from some other document, and pasted to another. This is obviously a counterfeit item. The first lines of the document say that it was issued by Great Prince Ivan Vassilyevich. This, as well as the fact that historians admit the decree to date from “a later epoch”, spells out as a hoax right away, since “Ivan the Terrible” had been the last Russian Czar named Ivan Vassilyevich.

29. DESPITE ALL THEIR ATTEMPTS, HISTORIANS NEVER MANAGED TO CONCEAL THE FACT THAT THE MUSCOVITE CZARS HAD WORN THE TITLE OF A GREAT EMPEROR

Although school textbooks write nothing about it, historians are aware of the fact that the Russian Czar had been referred to as the Great Emperor in the XVI century Western Europe. This is reported by Karamzin, for instance ([362], Volume 8, column 146). Our reconstruction is in complete concurrence with this fact, since the Russian Czars, or Khans, had been the rulers of the entire Great = “Mongolian” Empire, which had included the Western Europe in particular. This is why all the local kings of the Western Eu-
European countries had acknowledged his higher rank, calling him Emperor. The word originated in the Western Europe; it is used for referring to a single supreme ruler and the liege of the rulers of the imperial provinces, such as kings, dukes etc.

The fact that the rulers of the Western Europe had once used the title “Great Emperor” for referring to the Russian Czar is known to us from the documents of the XVI century. It irritates the learned historians no end, since it contradicts the picture of the “backwards and savage Russia” that they have painted – a country that had repeatedly tried its best to reach the level of the illuminated Western Europe and failed. However, the fact remains, and historians are forced to explain it in some way. They have found a simple solution, presenting matters as though the use of the title were a result of confusion or a mockery. The implication is that the powerful monarchs of the Western Europe had treated their Eastern and somewhat savage neighbour patronisingly, calling him the “Great Emperor” with a half-smile, using the term as a verbal equivalent of the glass beads that the seafarers from the West had traded for gold and other valuables in their interactions with the ignorant savages, who were only too happy to get swindled. This is how historians present the fact that the monarchs of the Western Europe had called the Russian Czar, or Khan, the Great Emperor.

It isn’t all that hard to understand the historians – they have no other option. Let us observe how Karamzin attempts to solve this problem. This is what he writes telling us about the return of the Russian envoy Iosif Nepeya of Vologda from Britain: “Ivan the Terrible had truly enjoyed the kind letters of Mary and Philip, who had addressed him as the Great Emperor; having learnt from Nepeya that the English had treated him with great reverence and sympathy, the court and the people alike, Ivan had made the English welcome guests in Russia… In other words, our relations with Britain, which had been based upon mutual benefits and avoided dangerous political competition … had served as proof of the Czar’s wisdom, making his reign even more splendorous” ([362], Volume 8, Chapter 5, column 146).

Karamzin really tried his best. The Czar is “enjoying” the fact that the English call him Great Emperor, the implication being that he is surprised to be addressed in this manner, and uses it as proof of his wisdom, demonstrating the letter from Britain to his boyars so that they would see just how wise their Czar was – recognised as such by the enlightened Britons, no less. It is also implied that the authority of the refined British made the barbaric Russian throne “all the more splendorous” in the eyes of the somewhat savage Russians.

We must state right away that Karamzin is de facto taking part in a hoax here, since he completely misinterprets the old document’s evidence of England being subordinate to the Great = “Mongolian” Empire and its Czar, or Khan, in the XVI century. He turns everything upside down, presenting us with a fantasy scenario where the rulers of the Western Empire offhandedly use as serious a title as that of the Great Emperor in official missives in pursuit of short-term benefits.

The above also reveals the location of the imperial capital, or the residence of the Great Emperor – Moscow. The very word Emperor is applied to the ruler of an Empire, and there had been just one Empire in that epoch – the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. A single empire implies a single emperor – the Czar, or Khan, or Russia, also known as the Horde. Russian sources refer to the Empire as to the Russian Kingdom, titling its ruler the Great Prince of All Russia. The Muscovite Principality had been the heart of the Empire, but had by no means comprised all of it. There was a distinction between the two terms, which is reflected even in the documents of the XVII century – the famous Council Code of 1649, for instance (see Chron5).

During the epoch of the Great Strife in Russia, when the Empire had already fallen apart, the throne went to Dmitriy Ivanovich, who is wrongly accused of having been an impostor nowadays, qv above. The documents of that epoch, namely, the Polish diplomatic archive, have preserved the following words that he had addressed to the Polish ambassador. We are quoting them in the rendition of Karamzin, who must have done his best to conceal the rough edges. Dmitriy says the following: “I am not merely a Prince, a Czar and a liege; I am the Great Emperor of my vast domain. This title was given to me by the Lord himself, and isn’t a mere word, like the titles of other kings: neither the Assyrian, nor the Median, nor the
Roman Caesars had possessed the right to title themselves thus . . . am I not addressed as Emperor by every European Monarch?” ([362], Volume 11, Chapter 4, column 155).

The above passage tells us all about the Russian Czar being the Great Emperor, stating it blatantly that no other monarch could claim rights to this title. We also learn that the Emperor’s domain had been vast and that every European monarch had addressed him as the Great Emperor. All of this is in perfect correspondence with our reconstruction, according to which the Great = “Mongolian” Empire had existed up until the early XVII century. Czar Dmitriy, the Khan, had naturally tried to hold on to the title of the Great Emperor in its former meaning. However, the fragmentation of the Empire had already started, and the mutinous local monarchs (including the Poles) were striving for independence from the old rulers of the Horde in Moscow.

30.
THE REACTION OF THE RUSSIAN NOBILITY TO THE INTRODUCTION OF THE SCALIGERIAN VERSION OF THE “ANCIENT” HISTORY IN THE XVIII CENTURY

R. K. Almayev was kind enough to point out to us a number of curious facts contained in the article of V. V. Dementyeva entitled “Charles Rolain’s ‘Roman History’ as read by a Russian nobleman” published in a special scientific periodical entitled “Vestnik Drevney Istorii” (“Ancient History Courier”, [238]).

V. V. Dementyeva tells us the following: “The collection of the State Archive of the Yaroslavl Oblast includes the manuscript entitled ‘A Critique of the New Book of 1761 on the Origins of Rome and the Deeds of that Monarchy’s Nations’. It contains 47 sheets, whose reverse sides are also covered in writing, or 94 pages… The reverse of the last sheet says: ‘Critique by Pyotr Nikiforov of the Krekshin family. 30 September 1762, St. Petersburg’” ([238], page 117). The item number of the chronicle in the State Archive of the Yaroslavl Oblast is 43 (431); see [238].

P. N. Krekshin (1684-1763) had been a prominent government official from the epoch of Peter the Great. In particular, he had “kept the journal of Peter the Great, and sorted through the Czar’s papers after Peter’s death” ([238], page 119). He had also supervised the works in Kronstadt ([238], page 117). “Krekshin retired in 1726, after the death of Peter the Great, and started to write his works on history, predominantly Russian history” ([238], page 118). The historical oeuvres of P. N. Krekshin were used by such famed Russian historians as V. O. Klyuchevskiy, I. I. Boltin, M. M. Shcherbatov and V. N. Tatishchev ([238], page 118).

After the death of Krekshin, Empress Catherine the Great demanded “to see some of his chronicles, as well as the papers that had belonged to Krekshin, which she studied with great interest; she decided to keep some of them at her disposal” ([238], page 119).

All of the above demonstrates that Krekshin had been a very prominent figure in that epoch, and that his historical works had been followed with great interest. The entire archive of Krekshin was purchased in 1791, after his death, by Count A. I. Moussin-Pushkin, a famous collector” ([238], page 118).

What does Krekshin write in his critique of the “New Book of 1761 on the Origins of Rome”? It has to be emphasised that the book of C. Rolain, a French historian, had been among the first books on the new Scaligerian history published in Russian. It is reported that “the works of Rolain and Crevier had been the first modern textbooks on the ancient history” ([238], page 119).

V. V. Dementyeva tells us further that “the primary disagreement between P. N. Krekshin and C. Rolain had concerned the claim made by the latter about the invincibility of Rome… The critique cites a great many sources – Joseph Flavius, Pliny, Tacitus, Ovid, Plutarch, Strabon and Herodotus, as well as the ‘Babylonian Chronicle’ of Beros and so on… Which nation had been the conqueror of Rome, making her army and her emperors tremble? Krekshin … claims that Romans had always been defeated by the Slavs, or the Russians. His postulations are as follows:

‘The Slavs are known as the Muscovites (after Prince Mosokh),
the Russians (‘named after Prince Ross’),
the same nation is known as the Scythians, named thus after Prince Skif,
under Prince Sarmat they were known as Sarmatians,
the same nation is known as the Goths (after Prince Gott),
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‘the Vandals are the very same nation’,
‘likewise the Varangians’

Other names were also used, and all of them identify as ‘the Slavic Russian nation as described above’…

The rendition of the defeats of Rome is as follows:
‘In the reign of Augustus Caesar, the Slavic Goths devastated the neighbouring provinces of the Roman Empire’;

‘Attila, Czar of the Huns, known as the Scourge of the Lord, from the land of Russia…’;

‘Odoacer, the Russian Czar, gained control over Italy’ etc” ([238], page 120).

Basically, P. N. Krekshin fully confirms our reconstruction of history, Russian as well as international, despite the fact that he uses the erroneous Scaligerian datings. However, Krekshin isn’t familiar with the Millerian and Romanovian version of the Russian history, since it was still in the making around the time that he wrote his critique. Millerian and Romanovian history strictly forbids any recollections of the fact that the “ancient” Rome, or Russia as the Horde in the XIV-XVI century, had existed simultaneously with the Muscovite Kingdom of Russian in the Middle Ages. However, this restriction does not apply to Krekshin, despite the fact that he had already been taught the Scaligerian chronology; this is why Russian history stretches far back into the “antiquity”.

Could all of the above be seen as nothing else but a personal opinion of Krekshin – wishful thinking, inability to grasp certain details and so on? After all, people’s opinions differ greatly. Not remotely so – V. V. Dementyeva reports the most amazing fact. Apparently, “Krekshin’s knowledge of ancient history had corresponded to the general level of knowledge in that epoch… Ancient studies as a discipline of the Russian historical science have only existed since the end of the XVIII century” ([238], page 121). Apparently, the studies were conducted even before that, but had not been “scientific” enough. It is quite obvious that the term “scientific” is only used by the modern historians in reference to the works of the Millerian and Scaligerian school.

V. V. Dementyeva enquires rhetorically whether the critique of Krekshin “reflected the level of historical knowledge as it was in the middle of the XVIII century”, and answers that it “most definitely did” ([238], page 121). In other words, Krekshin’s views were generally shared by the educated part of the Russian society.

We see that up until the end of the XVIII century, the Russians had adhered to the very version of Russian history rendered by Krekshin. This is in perfect concurrence with our reconstruction. It was only by the end of the XVIII century that the Scaligerian and Millierian version became consensual in Russia as well, and after much effort at that. Nowadays the Millerian and Romanovian version of the XVIII century is already treated as the only one possible – it is presumed to have existed since time immemorial as a common and obvious chronological system. Obvious to the extent that any piece of information that contradicts it is automatically declared absurd.

However, history is a historical science and has no room for dogma. Every scientific postulation requires proof, or at least some validation if the issue at hand is too complex. If the Russian society had an altogether different notion of history in the middle of the XVIII century, what argumentation do modern historians cite in order to prove that the XVIII century Russians had “thoroughly failed” to understand their own history? The alleged “absurdist concept of Russian history” adhered to by the educated Russians in the XVIII century seems highly implausible.

Modern chronological research leads us to another recollection of the forgotten XVIII century disputes, which had been won by the Scaligerian and Millierian school. However, nowadays it turns out that the consensual version contains tremendous contradictions – it is erroneous through and through. On the other hand, it turns out that the Russian concept of history in its XVII-XVIII century form, which was ruthlessly suppressed in the course of introducing the Scaligerian history, is correct in many instances.

31.

VEHEMENT OPPOSITION ENCOUNTERED BY THE PROONENTS OF ROMANOVIAN AND MILLERIAN HISTORY IN THE XVIII CENTURY. LOMONOSOV AND MILLER

In Chapter 1 of Chron4 we emphasise the amazing fact that the consensual version of Russian history was created in the XVIII century, and by foreigners exclusively – namely, the Germans Miller, Bayer,
Schlezer etc. One must naturally wonder about the Russian scientists and the part they played in this process. How could the educated Russian society permit such a blatant intrusion into a matter as important for the science and culture of Russia as its own history? A foreigner would obviously find it much harder to study Russian history than a Russian.

It would therefore be expedient to remove the veil from the almost forgotten history of acute conflicts amongst the academicians of the XVIII century that were concerned with Russian history. Let us turn to a book by M. T. Belyavskiy entitled *M. V. Lomonosov and the Foundation of the Moscow University*, which was published by the Moscow State University in 1955 to commemorate its 200th anniversary and is rather hard to find these days ([60]). It turns out that the battle for Russian history had been one of the most important ones in the course of struggle for the right of the Russian society to have a science of its own in the XVIII century, which had been in mortal danger. Russian scientists were led by M. V. Lomonosov (see fig. 14.143). Their foreign opponents, eager to suppress the Russian scientific school and enjoying direct support of the Romanovian imperial court, were led by the historian Miller, whose portrait can be seen in Chapter 1 of *Chron1*.

In 1749-1750 Lomonosov stood up against the version of Russian history that was being whipped up by Miller and Bayer in his plain eyesight ([60], page 60). He criticised the freshly published dissertation of Miller entitled “On the Origins of the Russian Nation and its Name”. Lomonosov made the following scalding comment in re Miller’s works on the history of Russia: “I believe that he greatly resembles some pagan priest, who puts himself in a trance by burning noxious herbs and spinning around on one leg and makes obscure, unintelligible, dubious and outright preposterous readings” (quoting according to [60], page 60). This is how an all-out war for Russian history began.

“This is the time when historical issues became just as important for Lomonosov as his natural scientific studies. Furthermore, in the 1750’s humanities become the crux of Lomonosov’s studies, with an emphasis made on history. He is even forced to lay down his responsibilities of a professor of chemistry… In his correspondence with Shouvalov he refers to his works entitled ‘On the Impostors and the Mutinies of the Royal Marksmen’, ‘On the State of Affairs in Russia during the Reign of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich’, ‘A Brief Account of the Czar’s Deeds’ [Peter the Great – M. B.] and ‘Notes on the Deeds of the Monarch’. However, neither these works, nor the numerous documents that Lomonosov had intended for publication as appendices, nor the preliminary research materials, nor the manuscripts of the second and third part of the first volume [of Lomonosov’s work under the title of ‘The Ancient History of Russia’ – Auth.] have survived until our age. They were confiscated and vanished without a trace” ([60], page 63).

The first part of “The Ancient History of Russia” did get published nevertheless; however, the history of its publication is bizarre to the extreme: “The publication would be held back in a variety of ways. It commenced in 1758; however, the book only came out after the death of Lomonosov” ([60], page 63).
Seven years later at least, that is, since Lomonosov died in 1765. Considering the violent strife around the issue, it is likely that the book that came out under Lomonosov’s name has got very little in common with his original work. At best, it was heavily expurgated and edited, if not re-written from scratch. This is all the more plausible since a similar thing happened to the works of the Russian historian Tatischev around the same time, qv in CHRON4, Chapter 1. Those were published by Miller after Tatischev’s death and based upon some mysterious “drafts” of the latter. The original of Tatischev’s work vanished without a trace. Who could have stopped the victorious Miller from publishing a distorted version of Lomonosov’s works if the Romanovs had given him full control over Russian history? One must say that the very method of “caringly” publishing the works of one’s opponent after his death is very characteristic for the battles fought over Russian history in that epoch, which had been anything but an abstract academic matter then. The Romanovs needed a distorted version of Russian history, likewise the monarchs of the Western Europe. The publications of Tatischev’s and Lomonosov’s works on Russian history known to us today are most likely to be forgeries, qv below.

Let us return to the earliest stages of the opposition between Lomonosov and Miller. German historians decided to oust Lomonosov and his supporters from the Academy of Sciences. This “scientific activity” was conducted in Russia as well as abroad, since Lomonosov had been famous internationally. All possible means were used for compromising the scientist’s reputation and his works – not just the historical ones, but also those concerned with natural sciences, where his authority had been immense (in particular, Lomonosov had been member of several foreign academies – the Academy of Sweden since 1756 and the Academy of Bologna since 1764” ([60], page 94).

“In Germany Miller would incite public speeches against the discoveries made by Lomonosov, demanding the latter to be expelled from the Academy” ([60], page 61). He didn’t succeed then; however, the opponents of Lomonosov managed to get Schlezer appointed Academician of Russian History ([60], page 64). “Schlezer would call Lomonosov … a ‘total ignoramus who knew nothing but whatever was written in his chronicles’” ([60], page 64). Lomonosov was accused of being well familiar with the Russian chronicles, no less!

“Despite all of Lomonosov’s objections, Yelizaveta had appointed Schlezer Academician. Not only did he obtain full control over all the documents kept in the Academy in this manner, but was also granted the right to demand any document he needed from the Imperial library and other institutions. Another right given to Schlezer was that of presenting his works to Catherine directly… After this appointment, Lomonosov wrote the following in a bitter and enraged ‘memorandum’ of his that accidentally eschewed confiscation: ‘There is nothing left to preserve. The madman Schlezer can access anything. There are more secret materials in the Russian National Library’” ([60], page 65).

Miller and his clique were in full control of both the University of St. Petersburg and the gymnasium that prepared university students. The Gymnasium was presided over by Miller, Bayer and Fisher ([60], page 77). “The teachers of the gymnasium spoke no Russian … the students didn’t speak any German. All the studies were conducted in Latin exclusively. Over the thirty years of its existence (1726-1755), the Gymnasium didn’t prepare a single university student” (ibid). This had led to the claim that “the only solution would be to bring students over from Germany, since the Russians were allegedly unable to learn” (ibid). Indeed – a savage and illiterate country.

“Lomonosov found himself in the thick of the battle… A. K. Nartov, a prominent Russian engineer who had worked at the Academy, registered an official complaint with the Senate, which was also signed by Russian students, translators and chancellery workers, as well as the astronomer Delisle. Their objective was crystal clear – to stop the Russian Academy of Sciences from being only nominally Russian… The commission gathered by the Senate to study the accusations made by the scholars ended up with Prince Yusoupov as its chairman… The commission had decided that A. Nartov, I. V. Gorlitskiy, P. Shishkaryov, V. Nosov, A. Polyakov, M. Kovrin, Lebedev and their supporters were nothing but … ‘hoi polloi bold enough to rebel against their superiors’” ([60], page 82).

One must say that A. K. Nartov had been a prominent specialist in his field – “the creator of the first
mechanical support, an invention that had revolutionised engineering” ([60], page 83). “A. K. Nartov had been an eminent Russian engineer and inventor. His name is associated with the most revolutionary inventions in civil and military engineering... In 1741 Nartov invented a high-speed cannon battery, which is now kept in the Historical Museum of Artillery in St. Petersburg. It consists of 44 small mortars... The mortars would fire one after another, as soon as the fire from a burning gunpowder trail or cord would reach the fuse” ([264], Book 2, page 700).

A portrait of A. K. Nartov can be seen in fig. 14.144, and his high-speed cannon is shown in fig. 14.145.

The Russian scientists wrote the following to the Senate: “We have proven our accusations for the first eight points, and we shall prove them for the remaining thirty if we get access to archives” ([60], page 82). “However... they were arrested for ‘stubborn persistence’ and ‘insulting the commission’. Some of them were chained and incarcerated, refusing to take any of their accusations back after two years of remaining in this condition. The verdict of the commission was nothing short of the most hideous atrocity – Schumacher and Taubert are to be decorated, Gorlitskiy is to be executed, Grekov, Polyakov and Nosov are to be ruthlessly switched and exiled to Siberia, while Popov, Shishkaryov and others should remain under arrest until the solution of the matter by the next president of the Academy.

Formally, Lomonosov had not been included in the group of scientists who filed a complaint against Schumacher; however, his behaviour during the process demonstrates that Miller had hardly been errant with his claim that ‘adjunct Lomonosov had been among the miscreants who filed a complaint against Council member Schumacher and instigated the creation of the prosecution committee’. Lamanskiy, who claimed Nartov’s complaint to have been written by Lomonosov for the most part, must also have been close to the truth. Lomonosov had remained a keen supported of Nartov for the whole time that the commission was active... This is the reason for his violent clashes with some of Schumacher’s most industrious minions, such as Winzheim, Truscott and Miller, as well as the entire academic conference... The commission was enraged by Lomonosov’s behaviour
and arrested him... The report of the commission that was presented to Yelizaveta hardly mentions Schumacher at all; its leitmotifs are the ‘ignorance and incapacity’ of Nartov and the ‘affronting behaviour’ of Lomonosov. The commission claimed that Lomonosov was to be punished by death, or at least switching, voidance of all rights and confiscation of property for ‘numerous discourteous, dishonourable and vile deeds against the academy, the commission and the German land’. Lomonosov had awaited the verdict for seven months, remaining under arrest... Yelizaveta’s edict pronounced him guilty; however, he was made ‘exempt from punishment’ in order to ‘learn a lesson’. However, his salary was halved, and he was made apologise to the professors for his horrendous boldness’... Miller had compiled a mocking ‘Note of Apology’, which Lomonosov had to read and sign in public... This was the first and only time that Lomonosov had to renounce his views in public” ([60], pages 82–84).

The struggle continued until the very death of Lomonosov. “Owing to Lomonosov’s efforts, several Russian academicians and adjuncts appeared in the Academy” ([60], page 90). However, “in 1763 Catherine altogether expelled Lomonosov from the academy” ([60], page 94). However, the edict about his ousting was soon revoked due to the popularity of Lomonosov in Russia and the acknowledgement of his work by foreign academies ([ibid]). Nevertheless, Lomonosov was relieved from being head of the Department of Geography and replaced by Miller. There was also an attempt to “hand all of Lomonosov’s materials on language and history over to Schlezer” ([ibid]).

This last piece of information is very significant indeed. If there were attempts to get hold of Lomonosov’s archive while he was alive, the fate of this unique collection after his death must have been sealed. As one should expect, Lomonosov’s archive was immediately confiscated after his death, and disappears without a trace. “Lomonosov’s archive, confiscated by Catherine II, is lost to us forever. The day after his death the library of Lomonosov and all of his papers were rounded up by Count Orlov at the order of Catherine and taken to his palace, which is where they vanished for good” ([60], page 20). A letter of Taubert to Miller has survived, wherein “Taubert reports the death of Lomonosov without bothering to hide his glee, and also says: “The next day after his death Count Orlov ordered for seals to be put on the doors of his study. It must doubtlessly contain papers that they wish to keep from falling into the wrong hands” ([ibid]).

Apparently, Miller and Schlezer, the “creators of Russian history” managed to lay their hands on the archives of Lomonosov. The archives naturally disappeared as a result. However, seven years later Lomonosov’s work on Russian history was published – obviously under total control of Miller and Schlezer, and just the first volume, which must have been rewritten by Miller in the manner that he saw fit. The other volumes have “disappeared” – apparently, they were too laborious to process. This is how it came to pass that “Lomonosov’s work on history” that we have at our disposal today is, oddly and mysteriously, in total correspondence with the Millerian version of history. One wonders why Lomonosov needed to argue with Miller with such passion and for so many years, accusing him of falsifying the Russian history ([60], page 62), when he so complacently agrees with Miller in every instant in the very book that he is supposed to have published himself, obsequiously agreeing with him throughout the entire text?

We are of the following opinion. The book that came out under Lomonosov’s name has got nothing in common with the one that he had actually written. One must think that Miller had greatly enjoyed rewriting the first volume after Lomonosov’s death – “diligently preparing it for publication”, and destroying the rest. One can certainly tell there were many interesting facts related in the original – something neither Miller, nor Schlezer, nor indeed any other “Russian historian” could bear to see published.

32.

LOMONOSOV’S “HISTORY OF RUSSIA”: AUTHENTICITY ISSUE. LOMONOSOV OR MILLER?

A. T. Fomenko, N. S. Kellin and G. V. Nosovskiy

Above we have voiced the hypotheses that the text known as the “Ancient History of Russia” today and attributed to Mikhail Vassilyevich Lomonosov, which came out several years after the death of the author,
is either a complete forgery, or a substantially distorted version of M. V. Lomonosov’s authentic work on Russian history. We have also made the assumption that the author of the falsification can be identified as G. F. Miller personally, or one of his assistants carrying out his orders.

It has to be pointed out that the manuscript of the “Ancient History of Russia”, which could have served as proof of its authenticity, has not survived ([493]). Seven years after the death of M. V. Lomonosov, his oeuvre on Russian history was finally published, but only its first volume – the rest have gone missing. The publication is most likely to have been supervised by Miller, which leads us to the suspicion that it is in fact a forgery. Firstly, Lomonosov’s “Ancient History of Russia” is miraculously in perfect correspondence with the Millerian version of history. Secondly, the disappearance of the second volume and the rest of them is very conspicuous – it is unlikely that the discrepancies between the versions of Lomonosov and Miller only started to manifest from the second volume on. One gets the suspicion that Miller just made a falsified version of the first volume and destroyed the rest, his possible motivation being the desire to reduce the amount of labour involved in the hoax.

The hypothesis about Lomonosov’s “Ancient History of Russia” being a forgery is verified in the present work with the use of the authorial invariant method, as discovered and developed by V. P. Fomenko and T. G. Fomenko, qv in Annex 3 to Chron2. We come up with the following results.

1) We have compared the authorial invariant values of the “Ancient History of Russia” with those of Lomonosov’s works whose authentic originals are still in existence. The results confirm the hypothesis that the “Ancient History of Russia”, ascribed to Lomonosov today, is a forgery. The hypothesis can therefore be considered proven.

2) We have come up with similar authorial invariant values for the “Ancient History of Russia” and the texts of G. F. Miller ([529]). This fact confirms the assumption that Miller had taken part in the falsification, although it does not prove it.

We are thus faced with the following problem. Is it true that the book published under Lomonosov’s name and entitled “The Ancient History of Russia” is substantially different from Lomonosov’s actual original? If it is, who was responsible for the falsification?

The solution of this problem can be approached with the use of the method developed in [893] and [METH2]:2, pages 743-778. The method allows to identify the author of a text to some extent, and is based on the authorial invariant algorithm discovered by V. P. Fomenko and T. G. Fomenko, qv in Chron2, Annex 3. The invariant turns out to be defined as the frequency of function word usage. The calculation of this frequency gives us an opportunity to expose plagiarisms and find authors with similar styles.

Let us briefly explain the readers just what it is that we’re referring to presently. The “authorial invariants” of literary works might prove a valuable tool for the solution and research of the authorship problems. Under an authorial invariant we understand a numeric parameter related to the text in question whose value can unambiguously characterise the texts of a single author or a small group of authors, but changes significantly in cases of texts written by different groups of authors. It is desirable to have a large amount of such groups, and to have fewer “similar” authors in a single group as compared to the total amount of authors under study.

Numeric experiments demonstrate that the discovery of numeric characteristics that allow to distinguish between the texts of different authors without ambiguity is anything but an easy task. The matter is that the creation of a narrative text is also affected by factors that can be regulated consciously. For instance, the usage frequency of rare and foreign words characteristic for a given author may reflect the author’s erudition to some extent; however, this is a factor that can easily be controlled by the author, which renders this characteristic unusable as an authorial invariant ([893]; see also [METH2]:2, pages 743-778, and Chron2, Annex 3).

Some of the complications also stem from the fact that many numeric characteristics of texts are extremely sensitive to a change of style in the works of one and the same author, namely, they attain significantly different values for the texts written by the author in different periods. Therefore, the estimation of a given author’s unique characteristic is quite complex, especially if we want to assess these individual parameters quantitatively.
The characteristic that we search needs to satisfy to the following conditions.

1) It needs to be very “general” in order to be beyond the conscious control of an author – in other words, the characteristic needs to manifest as an “unconscious parameter”.

2) It needs to be stable for every author, which means that is can only possess a small deviation from some average value, which always remains the same, fluctuating very slightly from text to text.

3) It must be applicable for distinction between several groups of authors – in other words, we need different groups of authors for which the discrepancies between the values of this characteristic are greater than those found within the texts of a single author.

After V. P. Fomenko and T. G. Fomenko had conducted an extensive calculation experiment, it turned out that the numeric parameter of texts that satisfies to the conditions listed above is the relative usage frequency of all function words in the text – prepositions, conjunctions and particles, qv in figs. 14.146-14.149 ([893] and [909]). As one proceeds along the text using 16,000 word samples, the function word usage frequency turns out to be more or less constant for all the works of a given author. In other words, the curve that represents the evolution of said frequency becomes an almost even horizontal line. Minimal and maximal values were taken for every author under study; therefore, the parameter in question is useful for distinguishing between various authors.

Fig. 14.146. The behaviour of the parameter – function word percentage for 2000-word samples. One sees the resulting curves to be chaotic.

Fig. 14.147. The behaviour of the parameter – function word percentage for 2000-word samples. The curves remain chaotic, but there is a tendency for them to become more even.

Fig. 14.148. The behaviour of the parameter – function word percentage for 8000-word samples. The curves still intersect occasionally, but they are getting more and more even.

Fig. 14.149. The behaviour of the parameter – function word percentage for 16000-word samples. The curves transformed into more or less straight lines, which means the parameter has stabilised, with significant discrepancies between its value for different authors. The parameter is therefore a “good” one, it is an authorial invariant and can be used for telling different authors apart.
thors. This is why it was called the authorial invariant. It can be used for attributing anonymous texts as well as hunting out plagiarisms – albeit with a certain degree of caution, since some authors may possess similar invariant values (Fonvizin and Tolstoy, for instance). Moreover, reliable statistical conclusions require the use of voluminous works.

The last condition is met in the case of Lomonosov and Miller. Both have works that can be used for many consecutive 16,000 word samples. The applicability requirements are therefore met for the two authors. Our application of the authorial invariant method in the present case had been as follows.

Step 1. We have considered all available works of M. V. Lomonosov, whose authentic manuscripts written in his own handwriting are still in existence. Out of those we have selected the ones that contain a required volume of text in words.

Step 2. We have calculated the authorial invariant for M. V. Lomonosov, or the evolution of function word percentage, using the method laid out in [893], [909], [METH2]:2, pages 743-778, and Chron2, Annex 3.

Step 3. Next we calculated the authorial invariant for the “Ancient History of Russia” ascribed to Lomonosov nowadays. The volume of text suffices for the authorial invariant calculations.

Step 4. We have studied all available works by G. F. Miller. We only specify the ones that contain a sufficient volume of Russian text.

Step 5. The abovementioned method was then used for calculating the authorial invariant of G. F. Miller, or the evolution of the function word percentage.

Step 6. Finally, we compared the invariant values yielded by our calculations.

We have used the following texts of G. F. Miller as published in [529].

1) “On Reverend Nestor, the First Russian Chronicler, his chronicles and his successors”.

2) “A Proposal to Correct the Errors of the Foreign Authors Writing about Russia”.

3) “A Description of Maritime Voyages into the East Sea and the Arctic Ocean Made by the Russians”.

4) “News about the Latest Maritime Voyages into the Arctic Sea and the Kamchatka Sea, Starting with 1743, or the End of the Second Expedition to Kamchatka. From the reign history of the Great Empress Catherine the Second”.

5) “On the [Russian] Nobility”.

6) “[A Description of towns and cities in the Muscovite province]”.

7) “Biography and Reign History of Fyodor Alexeyevich”.

8) “[Project to create a historical department of the Academy]”.

9) “Important Things and Difficulties Encountered in the Compilation of the Russian History”.

10) “An Instruction to the Translator Andreyan Doubrovskiy”.

11) “Selected Correspondence”.

Only the texts 307 possess a sufficient volume of over 16,000 words. Moreover, one needs to leave out the works that weren’t originally written in Russian, and may have been translated by someone other than Miller. It applies to work #6; the description of Kolomna is rendered in German. Also, work #6 contains many tables, which complicate the calculations. Works 3 and 4 contain a great number of numeric data, which also complicate the calculations. Text #7 contains many tables and numbers; moreover, we had it rendered in a number of different formats, which is a purely technical complication. This text was also discarded.

We have therefore based our research on text #5. Its volume is over 16,000 words. We have excluded the part of the book that consists of a multitude of tables, namely, pages 197-206. The materials we did process therefore amount to pages 180-197 (beginning of the text before the tables), and pages 206-225 (end of text after tables). Page numeration is given in accordance with [529].

The result of our research is as follows: the authorial invariant of Miller equals 28 per cent.

We must make the following important statement. This invariant value is exceptionally large, qv in 14.149. It is the largest of all the invariants calculated for the authors whose texts were analysed in [893] and [909] – see Chron3, Annex 3.

Now let us calculate the authorial invariant for M. V. Lomonosov. We have studied the following works by this author:

1) “A Description of the Marksmen’s Mutinies and the Reign of Czarina Sofia.”
2) “A Brief Account of the Academic Chancellery’s History in the Words of the Wise and the Deeds – from the beginning of the present corpus and until our day”.

3) “The Ancient History of Russia from the Origins of the Russian Nation to the Death of Great Prince Yaroslav I in 1054, Written by Mikhail Lomonosov, State Council Member, Professor of Chemistry and Member of the Imperial Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg and the Swedish Royal Academy of Sciences”.

Other 44 texts of M. V. Lomonosov published in [493], but we didn’t take them into account for various reasons – the ones we listed above for Miller’s texts, as well as the fact that about a third of them are written as poetry and not prose. Let us explain that the authorial invariant can only be applied with confidence to prose. The rejection of many other texts is explained by the fact that their originals have not survived until our day, which is the case with the “Ancient History of Russia” that we’re concerned with presently; therefore, one cannot be quite certain about attributing them to M. V. Lomonosov. As a result, we ended up with work #2, which meets all the conditions listed above.

The result of the calculation is as follows. The authorial invariant of Lomonosov in work #2 equals 20-21 per cent. This is a very small value of the authorial invariant, and corresponds to the lowest threshold of invariant value if we’re to consider all the authors that we have researched (see fig. 14.149).

We see something totally different in case of the “Ancient History of Russia” (work #3). The authorial invariant proved very unstable here – in some samples it equals 27 per cent, whereas in others the amount is 25 per cent. No discrepancies this large have ever been witnessed in case of any text that would belong to the same author. The authorial invariant values for the “Ancient History of Russia” are scattered between 24 and 27 per cent.

The strong fluctuation of the authorial invariant values that we see here implies that work #2 and work #3 listed under Lomonosov’s name belong to different authors. However, in case of work #2, the authorship of Lomonosov is indisputable, since it still exists as a manuscript set in Lomonosov’s own handwriting. This means that the “Ancient History of Russia” was not written by M. V. Lomonosov.

Also, the invariant values for the “Ancient Russian History” ascribed to Lomonosov is in ideal correspondence with the value discovered for the works of G. F. Miller. Strictly speaking, this is not yet sufficient proof that Lomonosov’s history was falsified by Miller in particular, since several different authors may possess similar or even identical invariant values ([893]). We have only proven the fact that the work in question is a forgery.

However, previous results make Miller a very likely candidate for having falsified Lomonosov’s work on Russian history, all the more so considering that the invariant values of Miller’s texts and those of the “Ancient History of Russia” ascribed to Lomonosov are very rare among the Russian authors, qv in CHRON2, Annex 3. This makes chance coincidence between the invariant values for Miller and the hypothetical falsifier of Lomonosov’s “Ancient History” a lot less likely, and makes Miller the most conspicuous suspect.

The unnatural invariant value aberration range of the “Ancient History” is therefore explained in a very simple manner. The falsifier had used Lomonosov’s original text as a basis. Apparently, the distortion of the original in the process of re-writing was uneven, hence the erratic fluctuations of the invariant and the abnormality of their range.

Let us also emphasise that the authorial invariant values for the “Ancient History of Russia” are drastically different from what we see in case of Lomonosov’s authentic works, namely, the fluctuation range equals 3-4 per cent, whereas it is normally confined within the limits of one per cent in the texts of a single author ([803]). It becomes quite obvious that the published version of the “Ancient History of Russia” contains very little of the original text – it is a forgery for the most part.

**Corollary 1.** It has turned out that the authorial invariant of the “Ancient History of Russia” confirms our hypothesis about the original text of Lomonosov’s history becoming greatly distorted – virtually written anew before the publication that took place seven years after the death of M. V. Lomonosov.

**Corollary 2.** We have discovered the authorial invariant of the “Ancient History of Russia” to be very close to that of G. F. Miller, a prime suspect for the falsification of the book. This doesn’t yet prove that Lomonosov’s “History” was corrupted by Miller – we
know of texts written by different authors a priori, whose authorial invariants are nonetheless similar to one another (I. S. Tourgenev and L. N. Tolstoy, for instance, qv in [893] and [909]). However, in the present case, given the long and arduous struggle between Lomonosov and Miller, the discovery of similar authorial invariants in Miller’s text and the “Ancient History of Russia” is most likely to indicate that it was none other but G. F. Miller who had either radically edited or completely falsified the text of M. V. Lomonosov’s “History”.

33. FOREIGN EYEWITNESSES OF THE XVI CENTURY LOCATED NOVGOROD THE GREAT ON RIVER VOLGA

Our reconstruction as related above suggests that Novgorod the Great as described in Russian chronicles can identify as either the city of Yaroslavl on the Volga, or a group of famous Russian cities around Yaroslavl. A. I. Karagodov and V. P. Cherepanov from the Saratov State University of Technical Sciences, pointed out to us some direct proof of our reconstruction that has survived in mediaeval texts of the XVI century. Apparently, Taube and Kruse, the presumed eyewitnesses of the events that took place in the epoch of the oprichnina, made direct references to the fact that Novgorod the Great stood on River Volga. We are quoting a passage from [117]: “Foreign chroniclers and historians of the epoch [the alleged XVI century – Auth.] painted a horrible and repulsive picture of the Oprichnina and its creator [Ivan the Terrible – Auth.]. However, can one really trust the evidence of Taube and Kruse? In their account of the Novgorod murders they locate the city on the banks of the Volga as eyewitnesses of said events” ([117], page 287).

We see that the author, a historian of the Scaligerian school, urges the reader to distrust Taube and Kruse, citing their claim about Novgorod the Great located on the banks of the Volga, which naturally contradicts the Scaligerian and Romanovian history, as an argument. However, this report of Taube and Kruse is in ideal concurrence with our reconstruction. It has fortunately evaded the attention of the Romanovian editors in the XVII-XVIII century, who were very diligent in their attempts to remove every truthful evidence from the annals of Russian history.

By the way, one has no reason at all to doubt the competence of Taube and Kruse, who were well aware of what they wrote about. They weren’t mere eyewitnesses of the events that took place in Novgorod on the Volga. It turns out that they were made members of the Oprichnina by Ivan IV. (“The Czar didn’t just protect the heretics, but also made some of them very close to himself. He made … I. Taube and E. Kruse members of the Oprichnina” ([775], pages 281-282). One must assume that Taube and Kruse had been well aware of the location of Novgorod, which was destroyed by Ivan IV (“The Terrible”).

34. THE ALEXANDROVSKAYA SLOBODA AS THE CAPITAL OF RUSSIA, OR THE HORDE, IN THE XVI CENTURY

In Chron6 we demonstrate that the Muscovite Kremlin, likewise other constructions of Moscow as a capital city, were built in the second half of the XVI century the earliest. We have dated the foundation of the Kremlin in Moscow to the epoch of the Oprichnina, identifying the construction of the city as the famous foundation of Ivan’s capital in the epoch of the Oprichnina. We have made the assumption that the royal procession only stopped temporarily in the famous Alexandrovskaya Sloboda en route from Suzdal to Moscow. We must also remind the reader that the Biblical city of Souza is most likely to identify as Suzdal, qv in Chron6. A further study of the issue revealed the fact that the picture must have been of even greater interest to us as researchers.

It is assumed that the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda (the modern town of Alexandrov in the Vladimir Oblast) had been the capital of Russia in the full meaning of the word for some 20 years, starting with the beginning of the Oprichnina epoch in 1563 ([12], page 17). This appears to be true. Sources report that a luxurious palace complex with a number of secondary constructions had been erected in the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda: “The Czar’s court in the Sloboda included the palaces of the Czar and the noblemen, likewise auxiliary constructions, the royal garden, a unique system of ponds and locks, which
had served the purpose of filling the moat with water. State services of all sorts were active in the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda, including the Duma of the Oprichnina, the royal court, diplomatic offices and the Ministry of Foreign Relations” ([11], page 7). Apparently, “the best icon artists and builders lived and worked here; they built a magnificent ensemble of palaces and temples, second only to the Muscovite Kremlin in its splendour” ([11], page 5). As we realise today, things are likely to have happened in a different order – the capital in the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda predated the Kremlin, which was built in its image somewhat later, in the XVI century.

The Alexandrovskaya Sloboda had been the place where the Czar met foreign envoys; this fact became reflected in the memoirs of Ulfeldt, the Danish Ambassador, dating to the XVII century: “The impressions of the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda and the Russian Czar (the “cruel Pharaoh”) were reflected in the ambassador’s book entitled ‘A Voyage to Russia of Jacob Ulfeldt, the Danish Envoy’” ([11], page 9). A propos, the fact that the Danish ambassador calls the Russian Czar Pharaoh isn’t a mere literary comparison – the Czar had indeed been the Egyptian Pharaoh as described in the Bible; some parts of the Bible were written in this very epoch, qv in CHRON6. The chronicles of the epoch appear to have called used the term “Egyptian Alexandria” for referring to his capital in the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda. The memories of the Library of Alexandria appear to date to the very same epoch, referring to the library of the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda, or the famous library of Ivan the Terrible ([11], page 6). In this case, the demise of the famous “ancient” Library of Alexandria in a blaze might be a legendary reflection of the real destruction of the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda by the Romanovs in the epoch of the XVII century: “During the Great Strife, the palace ensemble was destroyed and pillaged” ([11], page 11). Nowadays, the territory of the former Alexandrovskaya Sloboda is occupied by the Svyato-Ouspenskiy nunnery.

A propos, it is presumed that “prince Ivan [the son of Ivan “The Terrible” – Auth.] died in the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda after a mortal wound inflicted by the Czar in a fit of rage” ([12], page 16). It is further presumed that “the Czar departed from the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda as a result of his elder son’s death” ([11], page 11). It is also possible that some of the events reflected in the Biblical book of Esther took place right here, in the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda, in the XVI century, qv in CHRON6.

Modern historians are confronted with the necessity to explain why the capital of Russia was in the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda and not Moscow. They write the following: “Another paradox is that the Oprichnina Court in Moscow, which was constructed in the first months that had followed February, 1565 … had been an affiliate of the Oprichnina capital, or the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda, in general. All the governing functions became concentrated in the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda towards the autumn of 1565… Starting with 1568, the royal scribes and the publishing house became concentrated here” ([12], page 16; also [11], page 6). Apart from the publication of books, this was also the place where they cast bells” ([11]). And so on, and so forth. Historians “explain” it suggesting that Ivan the Terrible had been an eccentric tyrant, who had decided to transfer the court to the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda from Moscow. We are of a different opinion, which can be encapsulated as follows. The construction of a capital in Moscow had not yet started by that time. At the very beginning of the Oprichnina epoch, the royal capital of Russia and the headquarters of the Czar, or the Khan, became relocated to Alexandrovskaya Sloboda from Suzdal, or the Biblical Souza, and remained there for some 15 years. It is likely that another transfer of the capital was instigated by Khan Ivan Simeon at the end of the XVI century, after the defeat of the Oprichnina, to move it even further westwards by some 100 kilometres. This is how Moscow was built.

The strife flared up again in the beginning of the XVII century. Moscow fell prey to fire, and the Muscovite Kremlin changed hands a number of times. It is presumed that Moscow had been burnt to the ground. Thus, Moscow was either burnt down completely or at least destroyed to a large extent at the very end of the Great Strife, during the epoch of the interregnum and civil wars of the early XVII century, right before the ascension of the Romanovs. This must have resulted in the destruction of the Muscovite Kremlin. According to I. A. Zabelin, even at the end of Mikhail Romanov’s reign, in 1645, “the entire Kremlin lay desolate; many layers of bricks were miss-
ing from the wall of the citadel and some of the towers, the walls caved in, and the white stones fell out. The domes of some towers were in a decrepit state, or fell in altogether”. The reconstruction of the Kremlin began ([284], page 165).

35.
THE COUNTERFEITED INSCRIPTION WITH THE NAME OF THE MONARCH ON THE ALLEGED PORTRAIT OF IVAN THE TERRIBLE DATING FROM THE XVII CENTURY

We have encountered many occasions when the Russian historical documents dated to the XVI century nowadays underwent a tendentious editing or became falsified all in all. Our experience of dealing with historical materials left us with the impression that it is very difficult to find authentic artefacts of the XV-XVI century that have survived the Romanovian censorship among the documents available to us today and the objects exhibited in museums. This censorship has left a mark on the artefacts exhibited in the museum of the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda and dated to the XVI century in particular. Among other objects from the museum of the Pokrovskaya Church (XVI-XVII century) and the Dining Hall (XVI century), qv in figs. 14.150, 14.151 and 14.152) we see a royal portrait (fig. 14.153). It is presumed to depict Czar Ivan Vassilyevich “The Terrible”. Modern historians date this portrait to the end of the XVII or the beginning of the XVIII century ([11], page 4). It is often called a “unique XVII century painting” ([11], page 9). Therefore, what we have at our disposal is a very rare image of a Russian autocrat.

At the bottom of the portrait we find an inscription that appears to suggest that the Czar in question is indeed Ivan Vassilyevich. By the way, the photograph of the portrait cited in the album ([11], page 4) leaves the inscription out for some reason – we only see the first line and a part of the second. Is there any reason behind this? Let us turn to the fundamental edition that tells us about the museum of the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda in detail ([1373]). The very first pages of the book contain a reproduction of this portrait; however, an even greater part of the inscription is left out – we only see a vague outline of the first line, and nothing but.

This detail alone would not have been worthy of our attention, if it hadn’t been for the fact that the inscription in question is of the utmost interest. We only realised this upon visiting the museum of the Alexandrovskaya Sloboda. We have photographed the entire inscription, which can be seen in figs. 14.154 and 14.155. As we can see, the following is written on the portrait:

“Ivan Vassilyevich, Czar and Great Prince of Russia, the wise and valiant ruler. The Czar had conquered three kingdoms – Astrakhan, Siberia and the Land of the Khazars, making them part of his domain; he had also defeated hosts of the Swedes, and taken much of Russia’s land back from them. The first one to be crowned and…”