The abbreviation and saturation of English history

1. OUR CONCEPTION OF THE ENGLISH HISTORY

A preliminary answer is directly implied by the parallelism that we have discovered, as represented in figs. 15.2 and 15.3, as well as figs. 16.20-16.25.

It would be natural to assume a later epoch to be the original – one that is closer to us chronologically. This is obviously the Byzantine epoch of 1143-1453, or the epoch that we have called Byzantium 3. As it was discovered in Chron1, it is the original of every other phantom reflection – the ones indicated as Byzantium 0, Byzantium 1 and Byzantium 2 in fig. 15.3. To put it more generally, the entire Byzantine history known to us today is a collation of several duplicates of the same epoch – 1143-1453 A.D.

As we have discovered above, the entire English history as constructed around the skeleton of the dynastic current of its rulers duplicates the history of Byzantium and the Horde as a phantom reflection. The parallelism ends in 1327 – some 100 years before the end of the Byzantine epoch (1453). Therefore, the history of England duplicates that of Byzantium or the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XIV-XVI century.

Mediaeval English history up to 1327 comprises several duplicates of the Byzantine epoch of 1142-1453, or the “Mongolian” epoch of the XIV-XVI century. Let us formulate the following hypothesis to serve as the summary of our observations.

1) English history of the alleged years 1-400 in its Scaligerian version describes England as a Roman colony, and relates Roman events for the most part. As we demonstrated in Chron1, Roman history of this period reflects the real events that took place in the “Mongolian” Empire around the XIII-XVI century a.d.

2) Chronicles ascribed to the English history of the alleged years 400-830 describe the phantom Rome and Byzantium 0, therefore reflecting the real Byzantine events of the XIII-XV century a.d., or the history of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XIV-XVI century.

3) Chronicles ascribed to the English history of the alleged years 830-1040 describe the phantom Byzantium 1, acting as the reflection of real events that took place in Byzantium of the XIII-XV century, or the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XIV-XVI century.

4) Chronicles ascribed to the English history of the alleged years 1040-1327 A.D. describe Byzantium 3, which is also the phantom Byzantium 2. These chronicles reflect real Byzantine events of the XIII-XV century, or the history of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of the XIV-XVI century. The name England (Anglia) is apparently derived from the name Angeli.
as borne by the representatives of the regnant Byzantine dynasty in 1185-1204 A.D.

5) Our hypothesis claims that the “ancient” and mediaeval English chronicles that we have at our disposal today describe real events that took place in Byzantium around the XII-XV century, as well as the Great = “Mongolian” Empire in the XIV-XVI century. Historians erroneously date these events to deep “antiquity”, or the epochs that predate the XII century A.D. Generally speaking, the “ancient” English chronicles are of Byzantine and “Mongolian” origin; they were transferred to the modern England in the epoch of its conquest by the Horde and then integrated into the actual history of the British Isles.

6) Real documented history of England, which refers to actual British events, is most likely to begin around the XI-XII century A.D. Whatever stray fragments of information we have at our disposal cover the interval between the XI and the XIII century very sparsely. This layer was then overdubbed by a second layer of chronicles relating the history of Byzantium and the Great = “Mongolian” Empire. Modern textbook history of Britain in the XI-XVI century is thus a collation of the actual British history and the Mongolian/Byzantine layer.

7) English history as we know it today only begins to reflect the actual events that took place in Great Britain starting with the XVI-XVII century, without any Byzantine or “Mongolian” elements. That is to say, the Scaligerian history of England is more or less correct starting with the XVI-XVII century. A schematic representation of our hypothesis can be seen in fig. 17.1.

2. HOW BYZANTINE AND “MONGOLIAN” CHRONICLES BECAME PART OF THE ENGLISH HISTORY

If we are to disregard the picture painted by the Scaligerian chronology, the answer will be simple enough.

Starting with the XI century, waves of crusades sweep over Byzantium, their peak falling over the XIII century. Feudal crusader states of the XI-XIV century are founded all across the territory of Byzantium and neighbouring regions. Their inhabitants are a mixture of the local populace and the crusaders from the Western Europe, Russia and Asia. Said regions develop a cultural life of their very own, likewise Byzantium – in particular, this manifests as the compilation of historical chronicles.

The early XIV century is the epoch of the Great = “Mongolian” conquest. In 1453, Constantinople falls under the onslaught of the Ottomans = Atamans, originally hailing from Russia, or the Horde. Byzantium is laid waste, and a large part of its population decides to emigrate. Many intellectuals and aristocrats flee to Europe and to lands more distant, including the British Isles. These refugees take the Byzantine historical chronicles with them as priceless mementoes of their past. According to our reconstruction, the same epoch of the XIV century marks the conquest of many lands, including the Western Europe, by the Ottomans and the Horde. Britain appears to have been conquered around the same time (see CHRON5). We see the foundation of the enormous Great = “Mongolian” Empire. The island of Great Britain becomes an imperial province of the Horde, whose local governors are subordinate to Russia, or the Horde, and the Ottomans. Chronicles written in Britain around this time reflect the life of the entire Empire and its faraway capital apart from the local events, which were possibly de-emphasised.
After the passage of some time, the inhabitants of the insular Britain begin to write their own history. The “new” history of the “ancient” England gets written in the XVI-XVII century; this takes place in the course of the Reformation. After the fragmentation of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire in the XVI-XVII century, historians of the provinces that attain independence begin to write the “new ancient history” of their countries with great haste. In particular, they try to erase the very existence of the Great Empire from the annals of world history. According to the ploy of the rebellious rulers and their court historians, the Empire must be forgotten forever. See Chron 6 for more on this “progressive Reformist programme”.

A campaign of re-writing and tendentious editing of the old chronicles is launched in England, as well as the Western Europe and the Romanovian Russia. Moreover, after the violent mutiny of the Reformation, many real events of the XIV-XVI were erased from historical memory forever, over the course of several generations. The English Scaligerites of the XVI-XVII century declare the old chronicles of Byzantium, the Horde and the Ottoman Empire, which they edited in accordance with their own agenda. These chronicles serve as basis for the “ancient” history of the actual British Isles.

Large parts of Byzantine and “Mongolian” history that had originally pertained to the vast territories of Europe and Asia become transferred (albeit on paper only, obviously enough) to the relatively small territory of the British Isles and their environs. This leads to the inevitable “shrinkage” of many major events. The great and powerful Czars, or Khans, of the Empire, transform into local rulers under the quill of the Scaligerite editors. This leads to a great distortion of historical proportions. The Great = “Mongolian” Empire vanishes from the pages of the “carefully edited” chronicles for centuries to come. Whatever information defies oblivion despite these efforts gets arbitrarily moved backwards in time with the aid of the erroneous chronology, transforming into “ancient myths”.

This results in the creation of such English chronicles as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Historia Brittonum by Nennius and so on. A while later this recent version of the “ancient” British history rigidifies. Historical research of the XIX and XX century brings nothing but minor amendments, the addition of new data and new layers of varnish. Nowadays, having discovered strange and amazing duplicates inside the “English history textbook” with the aid of statistical methods, we are beginning to realise that the real English history had been a great deal shorter. Our objective can therefore be formulated as the location of Byzantine and “Mongolian” originals inside the Scaligerian version, and the restoration of their true chronological and geographical identity.