given in accordance with the old trade routes, which hadn’t always been straight, although they were usually designed and constructed to be as short as possible, which means straight. All the distances in the table are given within the aberration threshold of 100 verst. The verst indications in the table have values of 4100, 6300, 2500, 2700, 2900 etc. Therefore, a random distribution should make the share of figures divisible by a thousand roughly equal 1/10. The table contains a total of 56 distances; therefore, random distribution should give us five or six city names whose distance values are divisible by one thousand. What do we see in the table of Vinius?

It turns out that 22 figures out of 56 contained in the table are divisible by thousand – almost one half. This is impossible to explain if the distances are “random”; this fact alone reveals the existence of some pattern in the location of capitals. It turns out that almost half of the large old cities in Europe, including capitals, are located at distances divisible by thousand verst from Moscow.

We believe this to confirm our hypothesis that many of the large cities and capitals in Europe and Asia were founded in the XIV century, forming the communication grid of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, or the Horde, whose centre had been around Vladimir or Suzdal.

Let us list the distances whose value as indicated in the table of Vinius is divisible by a thousand; those values correspond to the radial distances from the centre, which is in Moscow.

1) Alexandria, 4000 verst.
2) Amsterdam, 3000 verst (via Arkhangelsk).
3) Antwerp, 3000 verst (via Riga).
5) Warsaw, 1000 verst.
6) Vienna, 3000 verst (via Riga).
7) Venice, 3000 verst (via Arkhangelsk, maritime).
9) Georgia, 3000 verst.
10) Geneva, 4000 verst.
11) Jerusalem, 4000 verst. There is no indication of any nation whose capital the city may have been.
12) Kandian Island in the White Sea, or the Mediterranean, 2000 verst. A propos, the name Kandian was included in the title formulae of the Russian Czars ([162], page VII; also [193], page 239).
13) Königsberg, or “The King’s City in the Land of the Prussians”, 2000 verst (via Riga).
14) Lahore in Pakistan, 5000 verst. The name Pakistan might be derived from “pegiy stan”, or the residence of the Motley Horde, qv in CHRON5.
17) Madrid, 4000 verst.
18) Paris, 4000 verst.
19) Strait City (possibly, Copenhagen, which is situated right over several straits), 3000 verst.
20) Stockholm, 2000 verst.
22) Stetin-upon-Oder, 2000 verst.

18.3. The European capital circle and its centre

Our opponents might want to suggest that these calculations of Viniius and his predecessors are obsolete, and that nowadays nothing of the kind can be found on any map. The old trade routes are presumed forgotten, and their ancient locations unknown. It is impossible to check Viniius, let alone his ancient source. Moreover, Viniius had introduced some of his own corrections, such as locating Mexico in Sweden … what an odd fellow.

Let us therefore check with the modern globe – a globe and not a flat map that distorts the true distances. Let us mark all the modern European and Asian capitals thereupon: Amman, Amsterdam, Ankara, Athens, Baghdad, Beirut, Belgrade, Berlin, Bratislava, Brussels, Budapest, Bucharest, Copenhagen, Damascus, Dublin, Geneva, Helsinki, Istanbul, Jerusalem, Kabul, Lisbon, London, Luxembourg, Madrid, Moscow, Nicosia, Oslo, Paris, Prague, Rome, Sofia, Stockholm, Tehran, Tirana, Vienna and Warsaw. Now let us select a random point on the globe, which we shall then alter, and measure the distances between this point and all 37 capitals. We shall come up with 37 numbers. Let us emphasise that the distances are measured on a globe, or the model of the real telluric surface, and not a flat and distorting map.

Let us see whether the point we selected can be the centre of several circumferences, whereupon all, or most, of the abovementioned cities lay (see fig. 14.69). If it isn’t, we shall choose another point, and then another, close nearby, thus exhausting all the points on the globe. It is perfectly natural that if the distribution of the capitals across the globe is chaotic, no central point can ever be found by definition. However, if the foundation of the capitals took place in accordance with our reconstruction, there might indeed be a central point. Where shall it be? In Italian Rome, which would be natural for the Scaligerian version of history? Istanbul, which would make the Byzantine Kingdom the former conqueror of Eurasia? Or could it have been in Vladimir and Suzdal Russia, as our reconstruction suggests?

The answer required the performance of some simple, although cumbersome, computations. This was performed by A. Y. Ryabtsev.

The answer is as follows. Indeed, there is a central point that can be considered the centre of the two circumferences upon which we find almost all of the capitals listed above. This point is in the city of Vladimir, Russia. By the way, could this explain its rather sonorous name, which translates as “Ruler of the World”?

Fig. 14.74. Concentric disposition of modern European capitals as compared to the centre – the Russian city of Vladimir. It is obvious that the majority of the capitals are arranged alongside the two concentric circles whose centre is in the city of Vladimir. The radius of the circles equals some 1800 and 2400 kilometres, respectively.
The job in question was performed by A. Y. Ryabtsev, a professional cartographer from Moscow. We must also give him credit for turning our attention to this rather curious effect manifest in the disposition of European capitals. A. Y. Ryabtsev ran into it in course of his professional activity, which has got nothing to do with ancient history.

Let us consider the actual calculation results in more detail. In fig. 14.74 one sees the geographical map of Europe in a special projection that does not distort the distances between the central point of the map and other points taken into account. We see the city of Vladimir in the centre of the “European capital circumferences”, which is where the calculations imply it to be. The first circumference is the most impressive (see fig. 14.74). It spans Oslo, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Bratislava, Belgrade, Sofia, Istanbul and Ankara with great precision, with Budapest and Copenhagen close nearby. The second circumference isn’t any less impressive, but most of it is comprised of maritime distances. These are the cities that we find upon the second circumference or close nearby: London, Paris, Amsterdam, Brussels, Luxembourg, Berne, Geneva, Rome, Athens, Nicosia, Beirut, Damascus, Baghdad and Tehran.

Stockholm, Helsinki, Warsaw, Tirana, Bucharest, Dublin and Jerusalem aren’t on any of these circumferences; Madrid and Kabul might pertain to the circumferences of the next level, being located at the greatest distance from Vladimir.

Let us construct a frequency histogram for the distances between Vladimir and the abovementioned capitals, using the horizontal axis to represent distance, while the vertical lines shall correspond to the statistical frequency of a given distance. We have distributed the distance scale into 50-kilometre fragments, and then used three sliding points for making the histogram look smoother. The result is represented in fig. 14.75.

Two manifest peaks of the histogram make it quite obvious that there are two typical distances between the city of Vladimir and European capitals, equalling roughly 1800 and 2400 kilometres. In other words, the distance between the city of Vladimir and a random European capital is very likely to be close to either 1800 or 2400. There are exceptions, but the general tendency is as described above.

Shall we get a similar picture if we’re to replace Vladimir with some other geographical location – Rome in Italy or Athens in Greece, for instance? The answer is in the negative. In figs. 14.76 and 14.77 we cite similar histograms for all the abovementioned capitals regarded as the possible centre; the histogram of Moscow is the closest, but this is explained by the geographical proximity between the two cities. However, even in this case the peaks look worse than their very distinct counterparts in the Vladimir histogram. The Moscow histogram is worse, and others are even worse than that.

The result that we came up with demonstrates that the very geographic disposition of most European and Asian capitals might reflect a certain ancient construction order, or the concentric disposition of most European and Asian capitals around a certain centre, the Russian city of Vladimir, whose name translates as “Ruler of the World”. This disposition may be of a random nature; however, our reconstruction explains the concentric circles of capitals perfectly well. Let us reiterate that it might owe its existence to the rapid conquest of new lands and the foundation of new settlements by the “Mongols” in the XIV century. The centre of these circles had been in the Vladimir and Suzdal area of Russia. It is possible that prior to the conquest there had been several cradles of civilization, and they had not spanned such enormous spaces as the gigantic Eurasian Empire with its communications, centralised government and powerful rulers. Concentric circles of settlements that later became local capitals emerged at every focal point of the future communication system, at roughly equal distances from the centre.

Of course, the above is nothing but our own reconstruction based on the abovementioned calculation experiment. However, common sense dictates what we have discovered above to look perfectly sane – it is therefore possible that the reconstruction corresponds to the truth.
19. HOW THE FIGURE OF ST. GEORGE ENDED UP ON THE COAT OF ARMS OF RUSSIA

It is usually supposed that the figures of St. George as found on the Russian seals and coins dating from the XII-XIV century had represented a certain Byzantine saint by the name of George, as they are supposed to do nowadays. However, according to our reconstruction St. George (known in Russia as “St. George the Victorious”) is the Russian Czar, or Khan, by the name of Georgiy Danilovich, who had ruled in the early XIV century and instigated the Great = “Mongolian” conquest, also known as the famed Genghis-Khan. One wonders about the exact epoch when this knowledge was lost, and why we believe St. George to be of a Byzantine origin nowadays? It turns out that the answer is already known to historians. This took place in the XVIII century, under Peter the Great, and had been different before. The historian Vsevolod Karpov, for instance, reports that “the mounted knight fighting the dragon as seen on the seals and the coins of the XIII-XIV century … is definitely interpreted … as a representation of the Czar, or the Great Prince in the official documents of that epoch” ([253], page 66). The author is referring to Russia.

Further also: “This is precisely the same way we see Ivan III depicted [as St. George “The Victorious” – Auth.] on one of the earliest artefacts known to us that bears the official insignia of the Russian state – a double-sided seal of red wax on the decree of 1497. The inscription on the seal reads ‘Great Prince Ioan, Lord of All Russia by the Mercy of the Lord’” ([253], page 65).

It turns out that the armed riders depicted on Russian coins were presumed to represent the Great Prince himself in the XV-XVI century: “Under the
Great Prince Vassily Ivanovich the coins bore the image of the Great Prince on a horse, holding the sword; Great Prince Ivan Vassilyevich introduced the custom of portraying the rider armed with a spear, hence the name of the coins – kopeks [kopeiki in Russian; derived from the word for “spear” – “köypo” – Transl.] ([253], page 66).

This is also why St. George would often be depicted without a beard. It turns out that Czar Ivan IV “The Terrible” ascended to the throne at a very early age. According to V. Karpov, “it is significant that upon the first kopeks the ruler represented in this militant manner had really been an infant crowned around that time, who would only become known as Ivan the Terrible much later. He was depicted without a beard in the early coins – it wasn’t until Ivan IV turned 20 that the rider on the coins grew a beard” ([253], page 66).

Since when, then, have the Russian Princes been depicted as St. George the Victorious? The article of the historian V. Karpov gives the following answer to this question, which is in perfect correspondence with our reconstruction. He writes the following: “The seals of Prince Youri Danilovich are an amazing example of such a transformation. He had ruled in Novgorod for a total of 4 years, between 1318 and 1322. About a dozen of his seals are known to us; in most cases, the holy rider is armed with a sword. However, the Prince must have been a very vain man, since he eventually introduced new seals portraying ‘a crowned rider’, or the Prince himself. It is significant that the reverse of the seal retained its original meaning” ([253], page 65).

In other words, we are being told that Great Prince Youri (or Georgiy) Danilovich is the same person as St. George the Victorious, which is precisely what we claim. The sly “theory” about the alleged vanity of Youri, or Georgiy Danilovich only appeared because the historians have forgotten the initial meaning of the symbolism contained in the Russian coat of arms. When was it forgotten? The answer is known to historians well enough – under Peter the Great: “It wasn’t until much later, the XVIII century, that this ambiguity was removed from the interpretation of the victorious figure upon the state symbols of Russia. The heraldic commission founded by Peter the Great made the resolution that the mounted figure upon the coat of arms was to represent St. George the Victorious … In the epoch of Anna Ioannovna, the mounted figure with a spear that one sees on the Russian coat of arms became commonly known as St. George the Victorious” ([253], page 66).

There is a certain contradiction here. Modern commentators fail to realise that St. George the Victorious had not been an ancient Byzantine saint, but rather one of the first Russian Csars, or Khans. The ecclesiastical calendar refers to him as to the Saint Great Prince Georgiy Vsevolodovich, which is a phantom duplicate of Georgiy Danilovich misdated to the XIII century by the Romanovian historians, which is also where they placed the Great = “Mongolian” conquest of the XIV century. Memory of St. George’s real identity had remained alive all across Russia up until the XVII century; however, this memory began to fade after the epoch of the first Romanov, who had launched their massive campaign for the obliteration of the Old Russian history dating from older epochs when there had still been a Great = “Mongolian” Empire.

This resulted in the formation of an odd contradiction in the epoch of Peter the Great. People were confused about the identity of the figure drawn upon the Russian coat of arms. On the one hand, everybody knows it to be St. George; on the other hand, it is supposed to represent a Russian Great Prince, and that’s common knowledge as well. After the Romanovian distortion of history, the combination of the two became impossible, and some choice had to be made. This was promptly done – out came the decree proclaiming that the Russian coat of arms depicted an ancient Byzantine saint by the name of George, bearing no relation to the former Russian Czars whatsoever. This is the time that confuses the commentators to some extent, and traces of this confusion remain until the present day. Let us reiterate – we suggest a total elimination of the problem via the identification of St. George the Victorious as the Russian Czar Georgiy, also known as Youri Danilovich or Genghis-Khan.

The fact that modern commentators have got a real problem with the identity of St. George is mentioned explicitly by V. Karpov: “Specialists in ecclesiastical history as well as theologians have tried their best ‘to shed some light over the obscure origins of
the legend’ [of St. George the Victorious and the dragon – Auth.], as the historian and literary critic of the previous century, A. Kirpichnikov, pits it. Finally, they found a fitting figure – George, Bishop of Alexandria who had been put to death by the pagans in the second half of the IV century. However, historians regarded this candidate as suspicious. Other versions were suggested and rejected; no real historical predecessor of St. George the Dragon-Slayer has ever been found” ([253], page 73).

The famous ecclesiastical hagiography of St. George bears no relation to the legend about St. George and the snake whatsoever; the historical indications given in this hagiography defy comprehension ([253], page 73).

Our reconstruction makes the situation more or less clear. The arbitrary distinction made between St. George the Victorious and the great Czar, or Khan of the XIV century known as Georgiy, or Youri Danilovich, led to the need to search for this character in the ancient history of Byzantium. However, none such has been found to day. This has created a “scientific problem” that is still being “solved”. However, the famous “Legend of George and the Serpent” (or the dragon) claims St. George to have baptised the mysterious land of Lathia: “George … accompanied by the Archbishop of Alexandria, as the legend puts it, ‘baptised the Czar, his government officials, and the entire populace, some 240,000 people, in a matter of fifteen days’ … This legend oddly suppresses the ecclesiastical and the popular memory of all the other miracles wrought by this saint and martyr, as indeed the rest of his biography in general” ([253], page 72).

The location of the mysterious Lathia also remains unknown to modern commentators. We could give them a hint or two. One must remember the common flexion of R and L – the two sounds are often confused for each other; little children often replace their R’s with L’s, finding the latter easier to pronounced. In some languages, L is altogether non-existent, and commonly replaced by R – in Japan, for instance.

The mysterious Lathia easily identifies as Russia. Russian history contains a parallelism between the epoch of Vladimir Krasnoye Solnyshko (nickname translate as “The Red Sun”), who baptised Russia in the alleged X century a.d. and that of Youri, or Georgiy Danilovich, aka Genghis-Khan, qv above – the XIV century.

We are by no means claiming Russia to have been baptised in the XIV century. We do not possess sufficient data for making any such claims. It is most likely that Russia was baptised around the XI century. However, the respective biographies of Genghis-Khan, or Youri, aka Georgiy Danilovich, and Vladimir Krasnoye Solnyshko doubtlessly contain a parallelism, qv above. This may have resulted in the baptism of Russia becoming reflected in the Legend of George and the Dragon. A more detailed analysis of the common mediaeval cult of St. George is given in Chron 5.

20.
THE REAL MEANING OF THE INSCRIPTIONS ON THE OLD “MONGOLIAN” COAT OF ARMS OF RUSSIA. HOW THE ROMANOVS HAD ATTEMPTED TO CONCEAL THIS

20.1. What we know about the history of the Russian national coat of arms

Let us use the collection of Russian emblems and coats of arms that we have already been referring to in the present volume ([162]). The book reports the following: “The national Russian coat of arms … is comprised of a black bicephalous eagle with three crowns over its heads, and a sceptre and orb in its paws. On the chest of the eagle we see the coat of arms of Moscow … and on its wings – those of Kingdoms and Great Principalities” ([162], page 27).

The Imperial Russian coat of arms has undergone many transformations over the years. For instance: “The wings of the eagles had initially been folded; however, several seals of the False Dmitriy depict the eagle with its wings spread. The craftsmanship is Western European. The coat of arms of Moscow that one sees on the eagle’s chest was introduced in the epoch of Alexei Mikhailovich, likewise the three crowns, orb and sceptre… There were two crowns before the epoch of Mikhail Fyodorovich, which were usually separated by the Russian cross of six points… It was customary (especially for the XVIII century coins) to depict the eagle without the Muscovite coat of arms; the orb and sceptre in the eagle’s paws were
occasionally replaced by a sword, a laurel-tree branch or another emblem…

The bicephalous eagle on many of the XVI-XVII century artefacts doesn’t come alone, but rather accompanied by four figures – a lion, a unicorn, a dragon and a griffon. The custom of depicting the Muscovite coat of arms, or a rider slaying a dragon with his spear, is of a later origin” ([162], page 28).

We learn of several allowed variations of the Russian national coat of arms – with folded or spread wings of the eagle etc. One must remember this when one analyses the “ancient” and mediaeval representations of the symbol.

Towards the end of the XIX century, the Russian national coat of arms, ratified in 1882 for the last time, attained the following form. The bicephalous eagle is crowned with three crowns and holds an orb and a sceptre; there is a shield that depicts St. George on its chest – the Muscovite coat of arms. The main shield is surrounded by nine other shields bearing the following coats of arms:

1) The Kingdom of Kazan,
2) The Kingdom of Astrakhan,
3) The Polish Kingdom,
4) The Siberian Kingdom,
5) The Kingdom of Chersonese in the Tauris,
6) The Kingdom of Georgia,
7) The Great Principalities of Kiev, Vladimir and Novgorod,
8) The Great Principality of Finland,
9) The coat of arms of the Romanovs.

Underneath we find the coats of arms pertaining to the following Russian cities and provinces:

10) Pskov; 11) Smolensk; 12) Tver; 13) Yougoria;
29) Estland; 30) Lifland; 31) Kurland and Semigalsk; 32) Karelia; 33) Perm; 34) Vyatka; 35) Bulgaria;
36) Obdorsk; 37) Kondia; 38) Turkistan.

20.2. The national coat of arms of the Russian Empire, or the Horde, in the XVI century

As we have mentioned above, the national Russian coat of arms was subject to variations and has changed over the centuries. It would therefore be very interesting indeed to see how it had looked in the XVI-XVII century, or the pre-XVI century epoch in the Great = “Mongolian” empire, as well as its fragmentation in the XVII century. According to [162], there are four old versions of this old imperial symbol in existence, dating from the XVI-XVII century, namely:

1) The State Seal of Ivan the Terrible. Here we see 12 seals, or coats of arms, that surround the imperial bicephalous eagle ([162], page VIII, and [568], page 161; see also fig. 14.78). Apart from the twelve seals, indicated by words “seal such-and-such”, above we also see the Orthodox cross of eight points with the legend “The tree giveth the ancient legacy”. In fig. 14.79 we see the reverse side of the seal of Ivan the Terrible ([568], page 163). An actual print of the seal can be seen in fig. 14.80.

2) The coat of arms from the throne of Mikhail Fyodorovich. The extra coats of arms that we see here pertain to the 12 imperial provinces.

3) The coat of arms from a silver plate belonging to Czar Alexei Mikhailovich. Here we already see 16 province crests.
4) The Imperial coat of arms as depicted in the diary of a certain Korb, who had accompanied the Austrian envoy of the Habsburgs to Moscow in 1698-1699 on a mission to negotiate about the war with Turkey. Here we already see 32 coats of arms apart from that of Moscow, qv in fig. 14.81.

One must note that the coats of arms that pertain to the same imperial provinces on the two Imperial coats of arms that we see in figs. 14.78 and 14.81 are often completely different. Apparently, “the appearance of the local coats of arms became more or less rigid in the middle of the XVII century … towards the end of the century, the numerous provincial coats of arms attained their final form” ([162], page VIII, section entitled “The coats of arms of the Russian towns and cities. A historical review”). We can clearly see that the old coats of arms could have significantly differed from their modern form. It turns out that they were also edited tendentiously in the epoch of the Romanovs.

Let us now turn towards the national coat of arms of the Russian Empire, or the Horde, in its XVI century version, or the coat of arms that we find on the state seal of Ivan the Terrible (see fig. 14.78).

This coat of arms is presumably the oldest of the four that we list above. Let us consider the twelve provinces that we see around the eagle in this version, for they are extremely interesting to any researcher. We find these provinces are listed on the “Mongolian” Imperial coat of arms in the following order (we go from top to bottom, alternating between the coats of arms listed on the left and on the right – see [162], page VIII):

“Ivan Vassilyevich, Lord of All Russia, Czar and Great Prince of Vladimir, Moscow, and Novgorod; Czar of Kazan;
Czar of Astrakhan;
Liege of Pskov;
Great Prince of Smolensk;
(Great Prince) of Tver;
(Great Prince) of Yougoria;
(Great Prince) of Perm;
(Great Prince) of Vyatka;
(Great Prince) of Bulgaria etc;
Liege and Great Prince of Lower Novgorod;
Liege and Great Prince of Chernigov” (see fig. 14.82).

We must instantly point out the two most conspicuous Great Principalities that became independent from the Russian Empire under the Romanovs –