There is a list of the sarcophagi kept in the basement of the Arkhangelskiy cathedral that contains the names of the deceased, some of which ring rather dubious to our ears today. The numbers correspond to those on the plan in fig. 14.14:

1. Nameless sarcophagus.
2. Nameless sarcophagus.
3. Yevdokiya, the widow of Dmitriy Donskoi, 1407.
4. Maria Borisovna, the first wife of Czar Ivan III, 1467, see fig. 14.16.
5. Sofia Vitovtivna, the wife of Czar Vassily II, 1453, see fig. 14.17.
6. Sofia Palaiologos, the second wife of Czar Ivan III, 1503, see fig. 14.18.
7. Yelena Glinskaya, the second wife of Czar Vassily III, 1538, see fig. 14.19.
8. Anastasia Romanovna, the first wife of Czar Ivan IV (“The Terrible”), 1560.
9. Maria Temryukovna, the second wife of Czar Ivan IV (“The Terrible”), also known as Maria Cherkeshenka (“The Cherkassian”), see fig. 14.20.
11. Maria Nagaya, the sixth wife of Czar Ivan IV (“The Terrible”), 1608.
12. Irina Godunova, the wife of Czar Fyodor Ivanovich, 1603.
14. Maria Vladimirovna Dolgoroukaya, first wife of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich Romanov, 1625.
15. Yevdokia Loukianovna, the second wife of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich Romanov, 1645.
17. Paraskyeva, the daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1620.
18. Pelageya, the daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1620.
19. Maria, the daughter of Czar Ivan V Alexeiyevich, 1692.
20. Fyodor Ivanovich Belskiy, 1568.
22. Yevdokiya Fyodorovna Mstislavskaya, 1600.
23. Nameless sarcophagus.
24. Feodosiya, daughter of Czar Fyodor Ivanovich and Irina Godunova, 1594.
25. Anastasia, daughter of Vladimir Staritskiy, 1568.
27. Nameless sarcophagus.
28. Anna, daughter of Czar Alexei Mikhailovich, 1659.
29. Theodora, daughter of Czar Alexei Mikhailovich, 1678.
30-36. Nameless sarcophagi.
37. Sofia, daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1636.
38. Marfa, daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1632.
39. Yevdokiya, daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1637.
40. Theodosia, daughter of Czar Ivan V Alexeyevich, 1691.
41. Anna, daughter of Czar Vassily Shouyskiy, 1610.
42. Nameless sarcophagus.
43. Yevdokiya, second wife of Vladimir Staritskiy, 1570.
49. Yevdokiya, daughter of Vladimir Staritskiy, 1570.
50. Yefrosinya, mother of Vladimir Staritskiy, 1569, see fig. 14.22.
51. Maria, daughter of Vladimir Staritskiy, 1569.
52. Anna, daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1692.
53. Tatiana, daughter of Czar Mikhail Fyodorovich, 1706.
54. Natalia Kirillovna Naryshkina, second wife of Czar Alexei Mikhailovich, mother of Peter the Great, 1694.
55. Agafia Semyonovna Groushetskaya, wife of Czar Fyodor Alexeyevich, 1681.
56. Maria Ilyinichna Miloslavskaya, first wife of Czar Alexei Mikhailovich, 1669.

The general disposition of the sarcophagi alongside one of the basement’s walls can be seen in fig. 14.23. This is where we presumably find the graves of the famous Russian Czarinas of the XV-XVI century.

Nevertheless, the consensual attribution of some of the sarcophagi is very dubious indeed. This concerns the pre-Romanovian graves; the Romanovian sarcophagi are all bona fide.

We notice the following oddities:
1) It is perfectly unclear just why Sarcophagus 6, qv on the plan in figs. 14.14 and 14.18 should be attributed to Sofia Palaiologos, wife of Ivan III. This is a partially demolished sarcophagus; its lid is completely intact, albeit shattered. It has no inscriptions upon it, except for the roughly-scratched word sofea (see fig. 14.24). Could this “inscription” have sufficed for attributing the sarcophagus in question to the famous Sofia Palaiologos? The rough and sketchy character of the inscription is also emphasised by its slanted alignment in relation to the sides of the lid; the scratches are shallow, and it takes an effort to make them out upon the surface of the stone. A brief glance leaves us with the impression that the lid is altogether void of lettering, it looks just the same as the lids of the nameless coffin. How could this unseemly, slanted piece of graffiti, scratched with a nail or something similar, have appeared on a royal sarcophagus? Also, the poor quality of this so-called “royal sarcophagus” (as well as of other pre-Romanovian sarcophagi housed in the cathedral’s basement) is confusing at the very least.

2) The very same question can be asked in reference to Sarcophagus 5, qv on the scheme in figs. 14.14,
14.17 and 14.23. This sarcophagus is ascribed to Sofia Vitovtovna, the wife of Vassily II (XV century) nowadays. There are no inscriptions anywhere on the lid apart from another rough, sketchy and slanted inscription that is very shallow and may have been made with a nail: “So[fe] [a] inoka”, or “Sofia the Nun”, qv in fig. 14.17. In fig. 14.25 one sees a drawn copy of this inscription, which is very hard to make out. We have used a very high-quality photograph for this purpose, where the letters were as distinct as they could get. Could this simple and cheap stone coffin with a piece of graffiti scratched thereupon in an unhandy manner be a sarcophagus of a Czarina as well? Could it be true that the two famous Czarinas, Sofia Palaiologos and Sofia Vitovtovna, did not get so much as an accurately carved lettering on the coffin lid? Are we being told that these famous Russian Czarinas were buried ceremonially, with their relations, the entire court and a great many visitors present, in these primitive and cheap coffins with clumsily-scratched letters on the lid? For some reason, upon the sarcophagi of the Romanovian epoch we find long and detailed epitaphs, carved in stone skilfully and deeply. Other old nameless sarcophagi are also covered in beautiful carved ornaments.

3) Moreover, how could the name “Sofia the Nun” have appeared upon the sarcophagus of Sofia Vitovtovna? This is simply an impossibility. If Sofia had indeed taken the vows, she should have received a new name as a nun, one that had to differ from her old name, Sofia. However, the graffiti on the sarcophagus tells us that Sofia had been the monastic name of the deceased, which can only mean that before taking the vows she had been known under a different name than Sofia, whereas Sofia Vitovtovna was definitely
called Sofia. This implies that what we see is an outright hoax. This grave can by no means contain the remains of Sofia Vitovtovna, the famous Russian Czarina. We are being lied to.

4) A careful study demonstrates that the overwhelming majority of the sarcophagi attributed to the Russian Czarinas of the XV-XVI century nowadays weren’t made of individual stone slabs, but rather bits and pieces of stone held together by copper rods or brackets. This rather frail construction would then be covered in a layer of plaster, which made it look like a sarcophagus. It is natural that the transportation of these “composite sarcophagi” from the Voznesenskiy monastery to the basement of the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral had not been performed with sufficient care, which has resulted in some of the plaster coming off the sarcophagi, and the subsequent collapse of the latter. However, the Romanovian sarcophagi made of whole stones did not come apart, unlike their “composite” counterparts. Some of the sarcophagi (those belonging to “Sofia Palaiologos” and the relation of Staritskiy, for instance) are in a very poor condition—almost completely in pieces, the lid as well as the actual sarcophagus (see figs. 14.18, 14.23, 14.24 and 14.22). The cracks reveal the brackets, apparently copper ones, seeing as how they’re green and not rusty. These brackets had served for holding various parts of the “composite sarcophagi” together. Some of the brackets have fallen out, and now lie alongside the bones of the deceased, qv in fig. 14.18, for instance.

We can clearly see that the coffins had not been made of whole limestone slabs, but rather fragments, or trash, which can only mean that the coffins in question belonged to common folk and not the XVI century members of the royal family. It is obvious enough that stone or concrete sarcophagi must have been expensive, and few could afford them; a “composite sarcophagus” would be much easier to make.

Thus, the Romanovs must have simply used a number of anonymous sarcophagi in the middle of the XVII century, or chiselled the lettering off a few coffins in order to have some body of evidence required for proving the veracity of their fallacious history. The authentic sarcophagi of the Russian Czarinas must have simply been destroyed by the Romanovs, if they had indeed been in Moscow and not the royal cemetery in Egypt, Africa—Giza valley or the famous Luxor. However, the Romanovs needed some artefacts to support the historical credibility of their artificial “Old Russian history”. We see how the Romanovian historians and archaeologists concocted their “successful discoveries” of allegedly authentic ancient sepulchres of Yaroslav the Wise, Vladimir the Holy and so on around the same time as their colleagues in Moscow were diligently stocking up on sarcophagi for the “royal necropolis of the XI-XVI century”.

The “ancient royal coffins” were made in haste; their construction was ordered by the Romanovs. It has to be said that the sarcophagi were constructed rather clumsily—it could be that they simply decided to convert the old graveyard of the monastery into the allegedly ancient “final resting place of the old pre-Romanovian Czarinas”. The names of the nuns were chiselled off the lids, and covered by headstones with “apropos inscriptions”. The old sarcophagi were thus concealed by the headstones, and so the actual perpetrators hadn’t been too careful about the lettering on the sarcophagi, which is understandable, since the latter were to be buried in the ground right away, at any rate. Some of the sarcophagi were left without any inscriptions whatsoever; in two cases, the names of simple nuns, scribbled with a sharp objects, weren’t obliterated in time. This is how unscrupulously the Romanovs had created the false “royal necropolis” of the Muscovite Kremlin. We are beginning to realise that there must have been no royal necropolis in existence before the Romanovs. The Great Czars (Khans) of Russia, or the Horde, as well as their wives, were buried in the imperial royal burial ground—the famous pyramid field or Luxor in Egypt, Africa.

Less distinguished persons would be buried in Russia. However, the Romanovs had been striving to destroy all the really old sarcophagi that could have told us about the true history of the pre-Romanovian Russia, or the Horde, ever since their enthronement in the XVII century. What we are demonstrated nowadays as “authentic ancient artefacts” is nothing but Romanovian simulacra or sarcophagi of the common folk, which the Romanovian historians have declared royal without bothering about such trifles as proof.

Ancient Russian sarcophagi of white stone were used as construction material in the Romanovian
epoch, which reflects the attitude of the Romanovs towards the ancient history of Russia. Let us ponder this for a moment. Would any construction workers we know vandalise a nearby cemetery in order to procure stone for building a residential house? Would any of the readers feel like inhabiting a house like that? Such actions have always been considered sacrilege or signs of scorn and hatred directed at the deceased. This is precisely what we see in the behaviour of the Romanovian usurpers. Let us quote a passage from the book written by L. A. Belyaev, a modern archaeologist ([62]). He reports the following as he tells us about the excavations conducted in the cathedral of the Muscovite Bogoyavlenskiy monastery: “The ornamented headstones dating from the early XIV century (?) used as filling material in one of the dining-room’s walls” ([62], page 297). Thus, the old pre-Romanovian headstones were used as construction material for a dining room (see fig. 14.26).

We must also pay attention to the fact that the headstones that L. A. Belyaev refers to in [62] look very much like the headstone from the Old Simonov monastery (see fig. 6.28), as well as the old child’s sarcophagus from the basement of the Arkhangelskiy cathedral (see fig. 6.30). They are all made of individual limestone slabs and covered in the same kind of deep ornamental engraving; this must have been the standard appearance of the pre-Romanovian headstones, which had all been destroyed and pointedly used as construction material.

Let us return to the graves from the basement of the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral that presumably belong to the Russian Czarinas. We must remind the reader that all of the sarcophagi, with the exception of the ones installed in the Romanovian epoch, were made of a very cheap material – stone shards held together by copper brackets and plastered over. Our opponents might declare this to be an ancient Russian custom, claiming that before the Romanovs even the Czars were buried in such cheap and unsophisticated coffins, citing Russian poverty, primitive rituals of the Asian nomads and so on.

However, this isn’t true. The numerous remnants of the limestone sarcophagi dating from the pre-Romanovian epoch were all made of individual stone slabs and decorated with deep and accurate carvings. You can still see similar stone slabs or their debris in many of the old monasteries in Russia. No plaster here. Why would Russian Czarinas be buried in cheap sarcophagi made of plastered-over flotsam and jetsam, then? We are of the opinion that there’s just one answer to this – the Romanovs had replaced real sarcophagi by cheap unsophisticated imitations, which were instantly buried and removed from anyone’s sight, and so no special effort was invented into their production. The Romanovian hoaxers did not use any limestone or cover it with carvings, deciding that plaster should do the trick.

5) Let us now turn to the sarcophagi of the Romanovian epoch, starting with the XVII century and on. Those appear to be authentic. Bear in mind that there are two types of these sarcophagi – the anthropomorphically decorated stone coffins with a head compartment, and
the rectangular sarcophagi of stone with a wooden coffin inside of them. The sarcophagi in question are numbered 24, 28, 29, 37, 39, 40 and 52-56 in fig. 14.14. All of them date from the Romanovian epoch, except number 24, which must make them authentic.

A more careful study reveals a fascinating detail. It turns out that all of the Romanovian anthropomorphic sarcophagi date from before 1632, which is the dating that we find on the last of them (number 38). All the other Romanovian sarcophagi of this type date from earlier epochs, or the beginning of the XVII century.

On the other hand, all the Romanovian sarcophagi of the second type (rectangular with a coffin inside) date from 1636 and on. This is very interesting indeed – apparently, the Russian burial rituals were reformed between 1632 and 1636 (insofar as royal burials were concerned, at least). We see that before 1632 the first Romanovs had still adhered to the old burial customs of the Horde. However, they have subsequently decided to abandon this practice in a very abrupt way – starting from 1636, they have been doing it differently. This detail might be of great importance; a reform such as this one would naturally have to be a large-scale event, ecclesiastical as well as secular. It must have taken place in the middle of the XVII century, namely, in 1632-1637.

It is all the more amazing that nothing is told about this important event in Russian history nowadays. For instance, A. V. Kartashev’s Essays on the History of the Russian Church ([372], Volume 2, pages 110-112) refers to the period between 1634 and 1640 as to the epoch of Patriarch Ioasaf I, who must have taken part in the preparation and the implementation of the reform. However, A. V. Kartashev, famous scientist and the author of a fundamental work ([372]) does not utter a single word about it. He discusses other reforms of lesser importance credited to the same patriarch in great detail; however, burial rituals, which are much more important, aren’t mentioned anywhere.

Let us turn to another fundamental multi-volume oeuvre of Makariy, Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna, entitled History of the Russian Church ([500]). The patriarchy of Ioasaf is discussed on pages 314-325 of Volume 6; however, not a single word is uttered about the burial reform. However, we do find what must be a trace of this reform. Makariy writes the following about the ritual of burying priests as described in the Prayer-Book of Patriarch Filaret: “Ioasaph’s prayer-book of 1639 abolishes this ritual as presumable heritage of Yeremey, the heretic Bulgarian priest” ([500], Volume 6, page 322).

This discovery of ours – namely, the change of the Russian burial ritual around 1632-1637, instantly allows us to discover the forgery among the sarcophagi kept in the Arkhangelskiy Cathedral of the Muscovite Kremlin. Let us consider Sarcophagus 24. It is ascribed to Theodosia, the daughter of Fyodor Ioannovich and Irina Godunova, qv in fig. 6.30 and the list above. The actual sarcophagus is void of lettering; the inscription must have come from some external headstone in the Voznesenskiy monastery that was lifted in order to transfer the sarcophagus to the basement of the Arkhangelskiy cathedral. However, it is obviously a forgery. If it had indeed been a pre-Romanovian sarcophagus, it would belong to the old anthropomorphic type, which is not the case with Sarcophagus 24; it is of the new type, and therefore cannot predate 1632. We catch the falsifiers of the Russian history red-handed once again.

It becomes obvious why the Russian history textbooks of the Romanovian epoch don’t mention the reform of the burial ritual in the 1630’s – one of the reasons must be that the historians are very eager to date some of the XVII century sarcophagi (of the new type) to older, pre-Romanovian epochs. This is why they remain taciturn about Ioasaf’s reform (if it isn’t out of ignorance).

7.


One of the oldest Russian monasteries, the Bogorodite-Rozhdestvenskiy Louzhetskiy friary, is located in Mozhaysk. The friary is presumed to have been “founded by St. Ferapont in 1408 at the request of Andrei Dmitrievich of Mozhaysk, son of Great Prince