1. A ROUGH COMPARISON OF THE DYNASTIC CURRENTS OF ENGLAND AND ROME (BYZANTIUM)

As we already know, the “ancient” English chronicles claim that England had remained a Roman colony for approximately the first four hundred years. Moreover, chronicles that relate the English history of this period refer to Rome and Byzantium more often than to England. One therefore comes up with the obvious idea of comparing the respective dynastic currents of England and Rome (Byzantium). This comparison was made somewhat easier to us, since the global chronological map as compiled by A. T. Fomenko and presented in CHRON1 and CHRON2 already depicts all the primary dynastic currents of Europe and the Mediterranean region as distributed along the time axis, including the emperors of Rome, Byzantium and England. A cursory glance thrown at these two currents of rulers reveals an amazing fact – the reign densities are distributed across both currents with exceptional similarity. Moreover, the dynastic currents of England and Rome (Byzantium) are unique in this respect. There are no other dynastic currents with similar characteristics. Let us explain just what we mean.

Let us divide the period of English history that is of interest to us (the alleged years 1-1700 A.D.) into decades and then count the kings regnant within each decade. For instance, if there was just one monarch within a given decade, the decade in question shall be marked as 1. If there were two kings – either in succession, or as co-rulers, the decade shall be marked as 2, and so on. We shall thus come up with a certain graph that demonstrates the density of a given dynastic current, or the quantity of kings per decade.

Since there were no independent rulers in England between the alleged years of 1 and 400 A.D., qv above, the graph corresponding to the English rulers of this period shall have zero density. Starting with the alleged year 440 A.D. we see six independent dynastic currents in England, qv above, existing up until the alleged year of 830, marking the unification of the country. After that we have a single dynastic current that continues until the present day ([1442]).

We have performed the same operation for the dynastic current of Rome, or Byzantium, of the period between the alleged years 1 and 1500 A.D. Here we have collected all the data concerning the emperors of Rome and Byzantium regnant between the alleged I and XV century A.D. In the Scaligerian version, this dynastic current is concentrated around Rome and its colonies on the interval of the alleged I-IV
century a.d. After the alleged year 330, it is adjoined by the independent dynastic current of Byzantium with the capital in New Rome, or Constantinople. Both currents coexist and are intertwined to a great extent up until the middle of the alleged VI century a.d. It is presumed that in the VI century Western Rome had lost its imperial dynasty after the famous Gothic War, erroneously dated to the VI century a.d. by Scaliger. From this moment on we only have a single Roman dynastic current – the Byzantine. It ends in 1453 with the fall of Constantinople and the entire Byzantine Empire.

The results of density calculation are presented in figs. 16.1 and 16.2. The bottom graph corresponds to the density of the Roman and Byzantine dynastic current, and the top one – to the English. We have shifted the Scaligerian dates pertaining to the history of England backwards by some 275 years in this comparison.

One doesn’t need to study the two graphs (figs. 16.1 and 16.2) for too long in order to notice the extreme similarity of the rough characteristics of both dynastic currents under comparison. Indeed, the initial reign densities of both currents are rather low; then we observe the numeric characteristics of both currents soaring simultaneously. Then we see similar density amplitudes of both currents – the English and the Roman, or Byzantine.

Next we see both density characteristics plummet – once again, almost simultaneously, without any substantial changes to follow. They oscillate around the values of 1 and 2 for the next couple of centuries.

The zone of high dynastic frequency for England covers the period between the alleged years 445-830 a.d., whereas for Rome and Byzantium it falls over the alleged years 170-550 a.d. The length of these dense dynastic intervals is equal for both currents and amounts to circa 380 years. The general duration of the historical intervals under comparison (English and Roman, or Byzantine) equals some 1500 years in both cases.

As we have already mentioned, this pair of graphs is unique. We managed to find no similar dynastic currents in any other country or epoch.

In fig. 16.3 the same data are represented more roughly. We have highlighted the two zones of high dynastic frequency, corresponding to the number of rulers, on the time axis. We can see the chronological shift that combines the two zones roughly equals 275 years. This fact leads one to the following considerations.

The quantitative comparison that we have just made is very rough, and allows no definite claims; however, the information that we already know leads us to a serious suspicion. Could this strange similarity be explained by the fact that one of these dynastic currents is a mere copy of the other? Alternatively,
can both of them be copies of a single original? As soon as we formulate the “heretical” question, we start to discover the facts that make the situation look even stranger. For instance, we are told that the old name of the English is Angles ([1442], pages 12-13), whereas the country itself was known as Angel, Anglia or Angeln ([1442], page 189). “Angles” as the name of a nation is first encountered in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (section corresponding to the alleged year 443 a.D.). This term runs through the entire history of England. It is also presumed that the first ruler to call himself the king of England, or Anglia, was called Ethelstan (925-940) – see [64], page 340.

On the other hand, we know of the famous imperial dynasty of the Angeli in Byzantium – a distinguished feudal clan active in the alleged years 1185-1204 a.D. ([729], page 166). Is it really so strange? Could the dynasty of the Angles in the West of Europe and the dynasty of the Angeli in the East have emerged simultaneously in a random way?

This makes sense so far – after all, we have no data to arrive at any radical conclusions so far. However, let us see whether a more in-depth analysis should reveal new facts.

Let us make the following observation to evade confusion. When we refer to a dynasty of the English rulers, for instance, we merely mean the sequence of rulers arranged in succession along the time axis by the Scaligerian chronology. We are not interested in kinship, which is taken into account in studies of dynastic heritage.

---

2. THE DYNASTIC PARALLELISM BETWEEN THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND AND BYZANTIUM. A general superimposition scheme of the two

We claim that there is a distinct parallelism between the reign durations of the English kings regnant between the alleged years of 640 and 1327 a.D. and those of the Byzantine emperors between the alleged years of 378 and 830 a.D., and then 1143-1453 a.D. The parallelism is represented schematically in fig. 15.3. In particular, we claim the following to be true.

1) The dynastic history of England between the alleged years of 640 and 1040 a.D. (400 years altogether) duplicates the dynastic history of Byzantium between the alleged years 378 and 830 a.D. (452 years all in all). The two dynastic currents superimpose over each other after a shift of 210 years.

More specifically, we have discovered a separate dynastic current within the saturated dynastic current of England that duplicates the Byzantine in the specified epoch. This “Byzantine current”, duplicated in the English history, is part of the dynastic current of Rome and Byzantium saturated with jointly ruling emperors.

2) The next period in the dynastic history of England (the alleged years 1040-1327), whose duration equals 287 years, duplicates the dynastic history of Byzantium of the alleged years 1143-1453 (a sequence of 310 years). These two dynastic currents superimpose after a shift of 120 years.

3) The period of the Byzantine dynastic history between the alleged years of 830 and 1143 also identifies as the same English dynasty of the alleged years 1040-1327. There is nothing surprising about this fact, since the history of Byzantium contains duplicates of its own. In particular, Byzantine history of the alleged years 830-1143 is a phantom reflection of the subsequent period in Byzantine history, namely, the alleged years 1143-1453. See more on this topic in Chron1 and Chron2.

4) The boundaries of the English historical periods that duplicate Byzantine history correspond to the periods of English history discovered above.

5) The boundaries of the Byzantine historical periods that duplicate the respective periods in the history of England are also of a natural character, and
divide the Byzantine history into four segments, which we shall name Byzantium 0, Byzantium 1, Byzantium 2 and Byzantium 3.

3. THE DYNASTIC PARALLELISM TABLE

3.1. The English history of the alleged years 640-830 A.D. and the Byzantine history of the alleged years 378-553 a.d. as reflections of the same late mediaeval original.

A shift of 275 years

a. English epoch of the alleged years 640-830 A.D. The royal dynasty of Wessex. This is one of the six dynastic currents of the early English history (the alleged years 400-830). This dynastic current moves within the period of the “early” English history saturated with rulers, qv in figs. 16.1, 16.2 and 16.3. The names and the reign durations are taken from [1442] and [76].

b. Byzantine epoch of the alleged years 378-553 A.D. The dynasty of Byzantine emperors that actually begins with the foundation of the New Rome, or Constantinople, around the alleged year 330 A.D. This dynastic current moves within the period that is saturated with other Roman emperors. Depicted as Byzantium 0 in fig. 15.3. The reign durations are taken from [76].

Commentary. The chronological data were taken from Blair’s tables [76] and complemented by the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle ([1442]). We must point out that there are certain discrepancies between the reign durations indicated in different chronological tables; however, these fluctuations do not affect the general picture of the parallelism. Sections marked “a” contain the full sequence of the English kings, whereas the “b” sections list the Byzantine emperors identified as their doubles, or prototypes. This list appears to contain nearly every emperor of Byzantium. It is very significant that only a very small number of short-term rulers and co-rulers of England and Byzantium were left outside the discovered parallel.

1a. England. Cenwalh, reigned in 643-673 as King of Wessex, and in 643-647 as King of Sussex. The summary reign duration equals 29 years, or 25 years if we are to consider his Wessex reign after 647 exclusively.

1b. Byzantium. Theodosius I, reigned since 378 and until 395 (16 years).


2b. Byzantium. No corresponding duplicate here.

3a. England. Cens, reigned for 12 years between 674 and 686 according to Blair ([76]). The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle ([1442]) names two kings, Eswine and Centwine, whose summary reign duration equals 9 years.

3b. Byzantium. Arcadius, reigned for 13 years between 395 and 408.


4b. Byzantium. No corresponding duplicate.

5a. England. Ine, reigned for 39 years between 686 and 727 according to Blair, and 37 years according to [1442].

5b. Byzantium. Theodosius II, reigned for 42 years between 408 and 450.

6a. England. Aethelheard, reigned for 13 years between 727 and 740. [1442] indicates the duration of his reign as 14 years.

6b. Byzantium. Leo I, reigned for 17 years between 457 and 474.

7a. England. Cuthred, reigned for 14 years between 740 and 754 according to Blair ([76]), and for 17 years according to [1442].

7b. Byzantium. Zeno, 474-491, reigned for 17 years. This monarch was regnant twice.


8b. Byzantium. No corresponding duplicate.

9a. England. Cynewulf, 754-784. Reigned for 30 years according to Blair, and for 31 years according to [1442].
9b. *Byzantium*. Anastasius, 491-518, reigned for 27 years.


10b. *Byzantium*. Justin I, 518-527, reigned for 9 years.

11a. *England*. Egbert, reigned for 38 years between 800 and 838. In 828, the 28th year of his reign, he united six kingdoms into one. This is how England is supposed to have come to existence. He ruled as the king of England for the last ten years of his reign. Egbert is considered to be a prominent ruler in English history.

11b. *Byzantium*. Justinian I the Great, reigned for 38 years between 527 and 565. In 553, the 26th year of his reign, he defeats the Goths in the course of the famous Gothic War of the alleged VI century. After that, Justinian becomes the sole ruler of Rome and Byzantium. The last 12 years of his reign are marked by the absence of co-rulers in the West of the empire. He is one of the most famous Byzantine emperors. We see a good concurrence of dates: fundamental events taking place in the 28th and the 26th year of reign, and equal durations of total rule (38 years for each).

**Commentary.** Let us point out that the English chroniclers swapped the respective places of Aethelwulf and Aethelbert ([334]). Their Byzantine doubles, Justin II and Mauritius, are arranged in the opposite order. This confusion is easy to explain – all four English kings of this periods have similar names beginning with “Aethel”.


13b. *Byzantium*. Tiberius Constantine, 578-582. Reigned for 4 years.


**3.2. English history of the alleged years 830-1040 A.D. and the Byzantine history of the alleged years 553-830 A.D. as two reflections of the same late mediaeval original.**  
A shift of 275 years

*a. England* of the alleged years 830-1040. England is already a united kingdom in this period ([76]).

*b. Byzantium* of the alleged years 553-830 A.D. Marked as Byzantium 1 in fig. 15.3.

16a. *England*. Alfred I the Great, Singer of Psalms. Reigned for 28 years between 871 and 901 according to [76], or for 30 years between 871 and 901 according to [64], page 340.


18a. *England*. Athelstan, 925-941. Reigned for 16 years. Presumably, the first monarch to have titled himself King of England ([64], page 340).

18b. *Byzantium*. Constantine IV, 668-685, reigned for 17 years.

19a. *England*. Period of strife; a war with Northumbria. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle mentions three kings of this period – Edmund I, regnant for 7 years between 941 and 948, Eadred, regnant for 7 years between 948 and 955, and Eadwig, regnant for 4 years between 955 and 959. All of their reigns were short.

Thus, the two periods of turmoil in English and Byzantine history, superimpose well over each other, which makes them simultaneous after the superimposition of the English and the Byzantine history. We have refrained from delving deeper into this period, due to the fact that the respective chronicles are extremely confused.

20a. England. Edgar, 959-975, reigned for 16 years, and Edward the Martyr, 975-978, reigned for 3 years. The sum of their reigns equals 19 years. Their names are similar, and the chroniclers may have collated them into a single monarch.

20b. Byzantium. Leo III the Isaurian (or Syrian), reigned for 24 years.

21a. England. Aethelred II the Unready, 978-1013, reigned for 35 years. An ancient coin depicting this monarch can be seen in fig. 16.4.

21b. Byzantium. Constantine V the Copronymus, 741-775, reigned for 34 years.

22a. England. Canute the Great (the Dane), 1017-1036, reigned for 19 years. His death brings forth the dissolution of the Danish Empire. Thus, the epoch in question ends with another breakpoint in the history of England. Let us note that the fragment of the English history that we have under consideration can be identified as the respective period in Byzantine history after a shift of circa 210-275 years.

22b. Byzantium. Constantine VI Porphyrogenetus, 780-797, reigned for 17 years. We have come to the end of the period marked in Chron 1 as the First Byzantine Empire of the alleged years 527-840. We have also approached a natural breakpoint in Byzantine history.

English chronicles conclude this epoch with two short-term rulers: Harold I the Dane, regnant for 3 years between 1036 and 1039, and Harthacnut, regnant for 2 years between 1039 and 1041. We have found no Byzantine duplicate for Harthacnut, but there is one for Harold I, which shall be discussed below. One must also note that the name Hartha is very similar to the word “Horde”. It is possible that Harthacnut isn’t a name in the modern sense of the word, but rather an alias – Horde-Khan, Khan of the Horde, or something along those lines. Since the name Cnut resembles Can-T, or Khan-T, it is possible that the last letter was added later as a suffix. Alternatively, the name may translate as “The Horde’s Whip”, or “The Scourge from the Horde”, “knut” being the Russian word for “whip”. There were many similar aliases in the middle ages – for instance, Attila was known as “the Lord’s Scourge”. In fig. 16.5 one sees an ancient coin portraying Harthacnut ([990], table 42).

We continue our uninterrupted motion forward along the timeline of the English history. The discovered parallelism with Byzantium continues; however, it becomes all the more vivid if we are to skip the following epoch of Byzantium 2 (see fig. 15.3) and proceed directly with Byzantium 3 (1143-1452). As we have already explained, the two epochs duplicate each other in Scaligerian history. The duplication isn’t exact; therefore, the sections marked as “b”, which contain the emperors of the Third Byzantine Empire, shall also be complemented by their duplicates from...
the Second Byzantine Empire. We shall thus consider our motion forward along the respective timelines of England and Byzantium. It turns out that the parallelism that we have discovered continues, up until the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

3.3. English history of 1040-1327 A.D. and Byzantine history of 1143-1453 A.D. A shift of 120 years.

23a. England. Edward the “Confessor”, 1041-1066, reigned for 25 years. The death of Edward signifies the beginning of the so-called Norman invasion, which must be the reflection of the Great = “Mongolian” conquest of the XIV century as reflected in the English chronicles. Some of the old chronicles used the term “Normans” for referring to the Slavs; the Slavic origins of the Normans were also pointed out by the XVI century historian Mauro Orbini ([617], page 111). Normans were called Russes in the old Arabic and Greek texts ([866], Volume 3, page 522).

Commentary. It is presumed that after the death of Edward (of the Horde?) the Confessor, the throne went to Harold II Godwinson. He only reigned for one year, and got killed in the Battle of Hastings in the alleged year 1066. However, it is known that he had de facto acquired great power as early as in 1054, when Edward was still alive ([64], page 343). At the same time, the English chronicles place another “short-term” Harold before the reign of Edward the Confessor, namely, Harold I the Dane (“Harefoot”), who had reigned for three years between 1036 and 1039. It is possible that this Harold I is merely a reflection of Harold II.

24a. England. The “double Harold”, or Harold I the Dane, 1036-1039, followed by Harold II, 1066. Harold II reigned for a mere 9 months. Apparently, this “double Harold” is a reflection of the “double Isaac Angelus” of Byzantium, who had reign twice – his second reign lasted less than a year.

24b. Byzantium. Isaac II Angelus, 1185-1195. He lost the throne in 1195, and ascended to the Byzantine throne for the second time in 1203. His reign lasts for less than a year; his final dethronement results from the conquest of Constantinople by the crusaders in 1204.


25b. Byzantium. The conquest of Byzantium by the crusaders. The famous Fourth Crusade of the alleged years 1199-1204. We shall consider the parallelism between these events in more detail below.

26a. England. William I the Conqueror (“the Bastard”), also known as William I of Normandy, 1066-1087, reigned for 21 years. He founds the new Norman dynasty in England (see fig. 16.6).


27a. England. William II Rufus, or “the Red”, 1087-1101. Reigned for 14 years (see fig. 16.7). We have a 14-year reign here; his Byzantine duplicate reigned for 11 or 12 years, qv below.

27b. Byzantium. Apparently, there is another confusion in the chronicles that describe the early days of the Norman dynasty in England and the Nicaean Empire in Byzantium. The duplicate of William II is either omitted, or identifies as the same Isaac II Angelus, with his full reign counted this time – 1185-1195.
and then 1203-1204, or 11-12 years in total. The chroniclers may have been confused by the double reign of Isaac II.

28a. England. Henry I Boclerc, 1101-1135, reigned for 34 or 35 years (see fig. 16.8). We reproduce a photograph of an old coin minted under Henry I. The inscription on the coin instantly draws our attention – it is set in some unusual script, which has got nothing in common with the Romanic characters. It would be interesting to decipher the writing on the coin. However, the commentary given in the modern publication ([1221]) doesn’t utter a word about the lettering, which can nevertheless be read and translated. The inscription begins to make sense if we are to read it using the Old Russian alphabet, which is forgotten today. Nevertheless, several specimens of this alphabet have survived (see fig. 3.23 in Chapter 3), and it was deciphered by N. Konstantinov ([425]). Let us reproduce this table once again (see fig. 16.9). If we are to use this alphabet, we shall come up with a coherent Russian text: “Avva + Or Ianoviche (or Iakoviche)” – Avva Uar Ivanocich (or Yakovich). The first word was commonly used for addressing the nobility in the Middle Ages, and Uar is either a Christian name or the word “Czar”. The last word is a patronymic. The letter for N or K is
Fig. 16.8. A mediaeval English coin with “illegible” lettering. Presumably minted by Henry I, King of England (the alleged years 1100-1135). It is most noteworthy that the application of N. Konstantinov’s table ([425]) to the decipherment of the lettering upon the coin leaves one with a coherent Slavic (Russian) text: “Avva Or Ianoviche (or Iakoviche)”. Taken from [1221].

Fig. 16.9. Table for converting the Russian letters that strike us as uncanny nowadays as found in a number of Russian texts dating from the XVII century into modern Cyrillic characters. Compiled by N. Konstantinov. See fig. 3.23 (Chapter 3) for an example of such a text. Taken from [425].

Fig. 16.10. Stained glass window with the alleged portrait of Stefan, King of England (the alleged years 1135-1154). Taken from [1221].

Fig. 16.11. The sculpture that is presumed to represent Henry II, King of England (the alleged years 1154-1189). However, there is no old lettering to be seen anywhere. Taken from [1221].
Fig. 16.12. The Scaligerian history of England. This portrait is presumed to represent Richard II, King of England (the alleged years 1377-1399). The English king looks just like a Byzantine emperor, with an orb and a sceptre in his hands. From [1221].

Fig. 16.13. The statue that is presumed to represent the English king Richard I Coeur de Lion (the alleged years 1189-1199). It is likely to be of a very recent origin. Taken from [1221].

Fig. 16.14. Painted sculpture presumed to represent King John (the alleged years 1199-1216). No old lettering anywhere. Taken from [1221].

Fig. 16.15. Stained glass presumably depicting the English king Henry III (1216-1272). No old lettering anywhere. Taken from [1221].
Fig. 16.16. Old drawing from the manuscript of Matthew of Paris, allegedly dating from the XIII century. We see the Archbishop of Canterbury blessing the English King Henry III. The name Henry is transcribed as three consonants – HNR. Taken from [1268], page 131.

Fig. 16.17. Close-in of a fragment of the previous illustration with the name HNR. Taken from [1268], page 131.

Fig. 16.18. Scaligerian history of England. Presumably, a portrait of Edward I (the alleged years of 1271-1307). Taken from [1221].

Fig. 16.19. Painted sculpture presumed to represent Edward II (the alleged years 1307-1327). There is no old lettering to be seen anywhere. Taken from [1221].
the only one that wasn’t included in N. Konstantinov’s table; we reconstructed it contextually.

One must also mention the name Henry (or Heinrich) in this respect. There are many kings bearing that name in the mediaeval history of the Western Europe. It is possible that the name had once stood for Khan-Rex, or Khan and Czar. This may be the manner in which the chroniclers of the Western Europe used to address their faraway and powerful rulers – the Czars, or Khans, of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire, who had controlled nearly all of the Eurasian continent in the XIV-XVI century, according to our reconstruction. After the fragmentation of the Empire, the initial meaning of the title Khan-Rex was forgotten in Europe, and the former title transformed into the name Henry (Henri, or Heinrich).

28b. Byzantium. John III Duca Vatas, reigned for 32 years between 1222 and 1254 or 1256. His reflection in the phantom duplicate of Byzantium 2 is Leo VI the Philosopher, regnant for 26 years between 886 and 912.

Commentary. We must make the following observation that concerns the graphical representations of the mediaeval English kings. As we shall see below, many of the “royal portraits” shown to us today are of a very late origin. This is clearly visible from a pe-
rual of [1221]. Authentic old portraits, such as the coarse “portrait” of Henry I as seen on one of his coins, are extremely scarce. There is also this tendency that whenever we are confronted with an authentic old inscription that accompanies such a portrait, it usually says something that radically differs from whatever modern historians suggest. It is little wonder that the representatives of the so-called historical science prefer to remain reticent about such inscriptions (declaring them “illegible”, for instance).

Thus, authentic old portraits of the English kings that predate the XV century are either altogether non-existent, or of dubious origins.

29a. England. Stephen of Blois, 1135-1154, reigned for 19 years (see fig. 16.10). Stephen is the last representative of the Norman dynasty in England ([64], page 357). The next king, Henry II, is the founder of the new Anjou dynasty.

29b. Byzantium. Michael VIII, reigned for 23 years (from 1259 or 1260 until 1282 or 1283). His reflection in the phantom duplicate of Byzantium 2 is Roman I, regnant for 26 years between 919 and 945. Michael VIII is the founder of the new Byzantine dynasty – the Palaiologi (regnant in 1261-1453).

Thus, a rigid chronological shift that superimposes the respective historical periods in England and Byzantine history, the English dynasty of the Nor-

---

Fig. 16.21. The dynastic parallelism between the English kings and the Byzantine emperors with a rigid chronological shift of 275 years. Continued.
mans identifies as the Byzantine dynasty of Angeli. The Anjou dynasty that came in its wake can be identified as the Byzantine dynasty of Palaiologi.

30a. **England.** Henry II Plantagenet, reigned for 35 years between 1154 and 1189 (see fig. 16.11). One must point out the semantic identity of the names Plantagenet and Porphyrogenetos – they both mean “born in a shirt”, which is a common medical term (see below).

- 30b. **Byzantium.** Andronicus II Palaiologos, regnant for 46 years between 1282 or 1283. If we are to count the period between 1283 and 1320, when his co-ruler Andronicus III began his reign, we shall come up with a figure of 37 years. His duplicate in Byzantium 2 is Constantine VII Porphyrogenetos (910-959 or 912-959, regnant for 47 or 49 years).

**Commentary.** The name Porphyrogenetos translates as “porphyry-born” – “born in a royal attire”, in other words. This is apparently a reference to one of the rare cases when a child is born in a “shirt”, or wrapped up in the placental remains. “Planta” sounds similar to “placenta”. Such births were considered omens – good or bad, but at any rate a mark of a special destiny. The name we see in the English version is “Plantagenet”, which translates as “wrapped in a sheet at birth” ([237]) – obviously the same thing.
31a. **England.** Henry II is the founder of the famous House of Plantagenet, which ends in 1399 with Richard II (see fig. 16.12). This dynasty spans the period of 1154-1399 ([1447], page 346).

31b. **Byzantium.** Michael VIII, the immediate predecessor of Andronicus II, is the founder of the famous Palaiologi dynasty, which spans the period between 1261 and 1453 and ends with the fall of Constantinople in 1453 ([1447], page 636).

Thus, the rigid chronological shift that we have discovered superimposes the two famous dynasties over one another – the Palaiologi and the House of Plantagenet. The reign of the Byzantine Palaiologi ends in 1453, and the English Plantagenet dynasty ends in 1399.

32a. **England.** Richard I Coeur de Lion, 1189-1199, reigned for 10 years (see fig. 16.13). The duration of his reign is close to 13 years, or the duration of the individual reign of his Byzantine duplicate, qv above.

32b. **Byzantium.** Andronicus III Palaiologos, 1320-1328-1341. Formally, his reign duration equals 21 years (1320-1341); however, his individual reign only lasted for 13 years (1328-1341). His co-ruler Andronicus II ceased to reign in 1328.

33a. **England.** John Sunter the Landless, 1199-1216, reigned for 17 years (see fig. 16.14).

33b. **Byzantium.** John VI Cantacusen, 1341-1355, reigned for 15 years.

34a. **England.** Henry III, 1216-1272, regnant for 56 years, qv in fig. 16.15. Henry III is the last representative of the Anjou dynasty in England. The Byzantine dynasty of Palaiologi remained regnant only marginally longer.

34b. **Byzantium.** John V Palaiologos, 1341-1391, reigned for 50 years. His reflection in Byzantium 2 is Basil II, Scourge of the Bulgars, regnant for 49 or 50 years (975-1025 or 976-1025).

35a. **England.** Edward I, 1272-1307, regnant for 35 years (see fig. 16.18).

35b. **Byzantium.** Manuel II Palaiologos, 1391-1425, reigned for 33 or 34 years.

36a. **England.** Edward II Caerwarven, 1307-1327, reigned for 20 years (see fig. 16.19).

36b. **Byzantium.** John VIII Palaiologos, 1424-1448, reigned for 23 or 24 years.

3.4. **The end of the parallelism. The conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans in 1453. The fall of Byzantium**

In figs. 16.20-16.24 one sees the scheme of the parallelism that we discovered. Let us reiterate that such excellent concurrence is only possible after a rigid chronological shift. In other words, we shift the entire dynasty, without making any relative changes inside it. In fig. 16.25 the scheme of the parallelism is drawn differently, so as to allow for a visual estimate of the reign duration correlation. It turns out that the numeric value of this “distance” between the English and the Byzantine dynasties is very small, and falls into the range of values characteristic for the a priori dependent dynasties (see CHRON1 and CHRON2 for more detail). Let us remind the reader that under “dependent dynasties” we understand different reflections of the same original.

Thus, the English and Byzantine dynasties of the Middle Ages are dependent statistically. This brings us to the question about their original. What did mediaeval history look like in reality?
Fig. 16.23. The Anglo-Byzantine dynastic parallelism. A general view. The initial phase.

The English dynastic current of 643-1036 A.D. superimposed over the Byzantine dynastic current of 378-797 A.D. with a rigid shift of approximately 275 years.
Fig. 16.24. The Anglo-Byzantine dynastic parallelism. A general view. The final phase.
Fig. 16.25. A comparative reign duration graph for the mediaeval English kings and the mediaeval Byzantine emperors. These two dynastic currents prove mutually dependent. They are most likely to be duplicates of a single real dynasty dating from the epoch of the XIV-XVI century.