



Fig. 18.35. Close-in of a French map of Britain dating from 1754. The name of the capital is *Londres* in French – possibly, “Land of the Russians” (Land + Res). Taken from [1018].

the second part may be a derivative of the Old Russian word for “horses” – “*komoni*”. Also, let us remind the reader that our reconstruction suggests the word “Irish” to be another form of the word “Russian”.

Also, let us recollect the ancient names of London. According to the ancient English chronicles, the city had been known under a variety of different names ([155]). Among them – New Troy, Trinovant, Caerlud, Caeludane, Londinium, Lundres and, finally, London ([155], pages 18, 37 and 232). As we mentioned above, the name *Londres* is used by the French until the present day, qv in the French map of 1754 referred to above (see fig. 18.28). A close-in with the name *Londres* can be seen in fig. 18.35. This leads us to the following hypothesis. Could the name *Lond-Res* have initially stood for “Land of the Russians”? The phonetic similarity is definitely there. Later on, in the epoch of the Reformation, many of the old names transformed into something else – for instance, the British Reformists were offended by such references to the old Imperial power, and replaced *Londres* by *London*, which is already harmless enough. The French, who had lived across the channel, were more concerned with problems of their own and less so with the ancient names of foreign lands, which might be why the word *Londres* has survived in French.

Thus, we see a large number of vivid “Russian traces” left by the Ottoman (Ataman) conquest of the XIV-XV century in certain maps of Britain up until the XVIII century. These “anachronisms” were eventually replaced with other names.

We have discussed the name of Scotland in the Middle Ages at length (Ros, Ross, Rossia and so on). There are other Slavic roots in the toponymy of the British Isles. Another good example is Moravia, qv on the old map in fig. 18.25. This area is adjacent to Ross, and its border is defined by River Ness. It is common knowledge that Moravia is a Slavic region of Europe – a part of the modern Czech Republic, to be more precise. The name must have also been brought to Britain by the “Mongolian” conquerors; however, it is absent from the modern maps of Britain. In the map of the XVIII century we see it transformed into Murray. This form doesn’t resemble “Moravia”, and shouldn’t provoke any unnecessary questions.

Let us return to the chronicle of Nennius, who reports the following in the chapter entitled “Adventures of the Scots and their Conquest of Hibernia”.

“If anyone wishes to know more about the times when... Hibernia had remained desolate and wasn’t inhabited by anyone, this is what I have learnt from the wisest of the Scots. When the Children of Israel were making their escape from the Egyptians across the Black Sea, the latter party was swallowed by the watery depths, according to the Holy Writ... There was a distinguished Scythian living in Egypt around this time, with a large kin and a great many servants, a refugee from his own land... The surviving Egyptians decided to banish him from Egypt, lest their entire country should fall under his rule” ([577], page 174).

The Scythians were banished as a result, sailing forth and conquering Hibernia. Nennius describes this event as the conquest of Hibernia by the Scots ([577], page 175). The mediaeval Hibernia is identified as Ireland nowadays; however, it may well have been Spain (Iberia), or some other land. The Great = “Mongolian” Conquest had engulfed enormous parts of Europe, Asia, Africa and America. The descendants of the conquerors who had finally settled in England may have written about the conquest of other lands in their chronicles.

And so, the English chronicler Nennius traces the genealogy of the Scots to the Scythians. His legend of the Egyptian Scythian, who had conquered Britain when the Pharaoh drowned in the Black Sea, chasing the Biblical Moses, allows us to date the conquest of Britain. We shall come up with the XV century A.D. according to CHRON6, which is a perfectly natural

date for the colonisation of England by the Scythians, or the army of the Russians (the Horde) and the Ottomans. This expansion wave must have reached England in the XV century, followed by expeditions to America sailing across the Atlantic (see CHRON6 for more details).

Let us revert to the book of Nennius. It is little wonder that the commentary of the modern historians is somewhat irate. They write the following: “Which Scythia does he mean? Bede the Venerable uses the name ‘Scythia’ for Scandinavia. The legend of the ‘Scythian’ origins of the Scots may owe its existence to the phonetic similarity between the names Scythia and Scotia” ([577], page 272). For some reason, the modern commentator doesn’t mention the fact that the name “Scots” is transcribed as “Scythi” (Scythians) in certain British chronicles ([1442]). Nothing is gained from the replacement of Scythia by Scandinavia – as we discuss it above, some of the old British chronicles identify Scandinavia (Cansi) as Russia: “Cansi, which I believe to be Rosie [Russie in another copy – Auth.]” ([1030]). Let us reiterate that Cansi must be derived from the word Khan, which leaves us with “Khan’s Russia”.

If Scythia was known as Scotland at some point, the following issue becomes all the more important to us. We have seen that the Russian Czar Yaroslav the Wise became reflected in British chronicles as Malescoldus. Therefore, his full title must ring as “Malescoldus, King of Scotland”. Scaligerian history is aware of several such kings – could one of them identify as Yaroslav or one of his ancestors who had wound up in “insular Scotland” after a chronological and geographical shift?

12.

THE FIVE PRIMORDIAL LANGUAGES OF THE ANCIENT BRITAIN. THE NATIONS THAT SPOKE THEM AND THE TERRITORIES THEY INHABITED IN THE XI-XIV CENTURY

We find some important information on the very first page of the Anglo-Saxon chronicle: “Five languages were spoken on this island [Great Britain – Auth.]:

- English,
- British or Welsh,

- Irish,
- Pictish,
- Latin.

... The Picts came from Scythia in the south on battleships; their numbers were few. They had initially disembarked in Northern Ireland and asked the Scots whether they could settle there... The Picts asked the Scots to provide them with wives... Some of the Scots came to Britain from Ireland” ([1442], page 3; see Comment 7).

Does this information contradict the superimposition of the events in question over the epoch of the crusades to Byzantium (the XI-XIII century), or the epoch of the “Mongolian” conquest? It does not; moreover, we find facts to confirm our reconstruction.

1) The name of the Angles (who spoke English) as manifest in the ancient history of Britain reflects that of the Byzantine imperial dynasty – the Angeli.

2) The name Latin must be a reference to the Latin Empire of the XIII century; alternatively, it may be derived from the Slavic word for “people” – “*lyud*” or “*lyudi*”.

3a) The name “British” and its equivalent “Welsh” can also be found in the Byzantine and “Mongolian” history of the Middle Ages. It is a trace of the word Brutus (Brother?), and possibly also a reflection of the name Prutenians, or White Russians, *qv* above.

3b) The English term “Welsh” was also known well in mediaeval Byzantium – it suffices to turn to the table that we have compiled after the book of V. I. Matouzova ([517]) in order to get an answer: the Welsh, or the Wlachians, are identified as the Turks.

In general, the term Wlachian (Wolochian) was common for the mediaeval European discourse. The Wlachians had lived in Romania starting with the alleged IX century A.D. ([334], page 352). They founded the Walachian Principality. It is very significant that another name of Walachia had been Czara Romynyanska, or the Romanian Kingdom ([334], page 354). Walachia had reached its peak in the XIV century; its history is closely linked to the history of Turkey. Mediaeval Walachia had waged violent wars against the Ottoman Empire, which were occasionally successful. In the late XIV – early XV century the rulers of Walachia were forced to become vassals of the Ottoman = Ataman Empire ([334], page 356). Thus, the name

of Walachia is closely linked to that of the Ottoman Empire.

Moreover, the name Wlachian is also known to us from the actual history of Constantinople. One of the emperor's primary residences had been the Wlachern Palace ([286], pages 226-229). "The palace had been a residence favoured by the Comneni" ([729], page 137). The Greeks called it Wlachernes.

"Walachia (transcribed as "Blakie") is a geographical term frequently used by Robert de Clary (as well as Geoffroi de Villehardouin) for referring to some part of the Eastern Balkans, as it is believed" ([729], page 135). Byzantine authors called this territory the Great Wlachia; in other words, the principality had been located on the territory of the modern Bulgaria.

Thus, the Old English term Welsh originally referred to the Balkan Walachia of the XI-XV century, or, alternatively, to Byzantium and the Ottoman Empire of the XV-XVI century.

4) We needn't look long to find the prototype of the English Picts in the East. It is common knowledge that the old name of Egypt is Copt, or Gypt ([99]). Therefore, the Picts of the ancient English chronicles are most likely to identify as the Gypts or the Copts – Egyptians or Kipchaks, in other words.

A propos, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is perfectly correct when it tells us that "the Picts came from Scythia in the South" ([1442], page 3). Indeed, according to our reconstruction as presented in CHRON6, the Biblical Egypt can be identified as Russia, or the Horde, whose southern regions had been inhabited by the Kipchaks. African Egypt is also a southern country in relation to Scythia.

5) Finally, how can we identify the Irish language? *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* tells us that some of the Scots came from Ireland ([1442], page 3). Moreover, during some historical periods at least, "the term Scots was used for referring to the Scots of Ireland and to the Irish Kingdom of Argyll" ([1442], page 3, Commentary 5; see also Comment 8). Therefore, Ireland had once been inhabited by the Scots. The fact that we managed to identify the Scots of the XII-XV century as the Scythians must also imply that the term "Irish" had been synonymous to the term "Russian" in the epoch in question (RSS or RSH = Russia sans vocalizations); the name "Ireland" may also have referred to Russia once.

The fact that we identify mediaeval Ireland during a certain historical period as Russia (and Scotland, as Scythia) may be perceived as irritating by some of the readers who were raised on Scaligerian history. Nevertheless, this is precisely what the ancient English chronicles are telling us.

Galfridus names the Normans, the Brits, the Saxons, the Picts and the Scots among the nations that had inhabited Britain initially ([155], page 6). We have already mentioned the Brits, the Picts and the Scots; let us now consider the Normans and the Saxons.

6) The Normans did play an important role in mediaeval Byzantium and took part in crusades. However, it is possible that the name is another variation of "Roman" (same old Romans, aka, Romanians, aka Romeans). We already mentioned the fact that in Europe and Asia the word commonly used for "Norman" had been "Rus" (Russian) – in Arabic and in Greek, for instance, qv in [866], Volume 3, page 522). Furthermore, Mauro Orbini, a XVI century historian, believe the Normans to be of a Slavic origin (see [617], page 111; also CHRON5).

7) This is what historians tell us about the Saxons: "The Saxons were German tribes who had lived in the North of Europe – primarily, in the territories adjacent to the North Sea. In the V-VI century Britain was conquered by the Germanic tribes... Most often, Galfridus uses the term "Saxons" for referring to all these Germanic conquerors, although he occasionally mentions the Angles separately" ([155], pages 229-230).

According to N. M. Karamzin, "Herodotus reports that the Scythians, whom the Persians called Sacs, called themselves Scolots [or Scots – Auth.]" ([362], Volume 1, Comment 1). Furthermore, the same author tells us that "Menander calls the Turks 'Sacs', and Theophanos uses the term Massagets" ([362], Volume 1, Comment 51). Thus, the mediaeval Saxons, or Sacs, can be identified as the Scythians, or the Turks. It also becomes clear why Theophanos also used the term "Massagets" – it can be interpreted as "Muscovite Goths", since they had been Slavs and originated from Russia, or the Horde. The European origins of the Turks also become obvious from the following passage of Karamzin: "Oriental historians claim Japheth's oldest son to have been called Turk, and the patriarch of said nation ... which is of the same root as the

Tartars” ([362], Volume 1, Comment 51). Mediaeval chroniclers classified all Europeans as descendants of Japheth – see the “Lavrentyevskaya Chronicle”, for instance ([460], columns 3-4).

Therefore, the ancient English chronicles aren’t referring to hypothetical minor nations that had inhabited the modern British Isles in times immemorial, but rather gigantic mediaeval nations and kingdoms that had played important roles in European and Asian history of the XI-XVI century. This history was localised and compressed much later, when the Byzantine and “Mongolian” chronicles were transferred to the British Isles, giving birth to local history, compressed geographically and expanded chronologically.

13. THE LOCATION OF THE SIX INITIAL BRITISH KINGDOMS: EAST ANGLIA, KENT, SUSSEX, WESSEX, ESSEX AND MERCIA

The answer to the question formulated in the name of the section was de facto given to us in the previous section.

East Anglia, Kent, Sussex, Wessex, Essex and Mercia can be identified as mediaeval European nations of the XIII-XV century that took part in the conquest of Byzantium and the Great = “Mongolian” Invasion, namely:

1) East Anglia is most likely to identify as White Russia (cf. Albion) – also known as Prutenia and Prussia (cf. Britannia), or the White Horde. In fig. 18.36 we reproduce a fragment of an old map that allegedly dates from 1501, where the name “White Russia” is transcribed as *RVSIA ALBA SIVE MOSCKOVIA* ([1218], Map 4). In other words, White Russia or Moscovia. Apparently, the name Alba was transferred here after the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest of the British Isles, being the name of the white horde – hence Albion.

2) The inhabitants of Kent identify as the Saxons according to J. Blair ([76]). A part of Germany is still known as Saxony. As we explain above, mediaeval Saxons can be identified as the Scythians, the Russians and the Turks, all of them being different names of a single nation.

3) Sussex, the land of the South Saxons, identifies



Fig. 18.36. Map fragment from an edition of Ptolemy’s “Geography” allegedly dating from 1513. Muscovite Russia is called *RVSIA ALBA SIVE MOSCKOVIA* – “White Russia, or Moscovia”. Taken from [1218], map 4.

as the Southern Saxony or Southern Scythia, qv above.

4) Wessex, the kingdom of the West Saxons as described in the old English chronicles, identifies as Western Saxony or West Scythia, qv above.

5) Essex as described by the old English chronicles identifies as East Saxony or East Scythia, qv above.

6) Mercia from the old English chronicles. The picture isn’t quite clear here; we can suggest several variants. For instance, it might identify as Germany (from its mediaeval name Moesia, qv in the table of mediaeval synonyms above). The city of Marburg, for instance, was formerly known as Merseburg ([517], page 263). Alternatively, ancient British chronicles may have used the name Mercia for referring to Turkey (one might recollect the city of Mersin in Turkey). Marseilles in France comes to mind as well.

At any rate, we see all of the “ancient Saxon kingdoms” can be located in the XIII-XVI century Europe – it wasn’t until much later that their names were

transplanted to the insular British soil. As a result, these territories have “shrunk” and entered school textbooks as the first six kingdoms of England in this shape (dated to the alleged V-VIII century A.D.)

14. THE FAMOUS KING ARTHUR AS A LEGENDARY REFLECTION OF THE HORDE THAT HAD INVADDED THE BRITISH ISLES IN THE XIV-XVI CENTURY

Some of the readers may be unaware of the fact that the legendary English King Arthur, who is considered one of the greatest rulers of the “ancient” England and whose lifetime is dated to roughly the V century A.D. (qv in [564], page 835) had maintained relations with the Russian Czar. One of King Arthur’s companions refers to “the King of Russia, the most austere of knights ...” This fact is reported by Liamon, the author of the poem cycle entitled “Brutus, or a Chronicle of Britain” ([1239]. His lifetime is dated to the beginning of the alleged XIII century (see also [517], pages 247-248). It is believed that a Russian princess or queen was stolen away from Russia and taken to Britain under King Arthur ([517], page 248).

In fig. 18.37 we reproduce a drawn copy of the cross upon the grave attributed to King Arthur nowadays ([155], pages 64-65). The lettering upon it is of the utmost interest to us. It can be interpreted as Latin (“Here lies ...” etc). On the other hand, the first word may be read as the Greek word *Nicia* (see fig. 18.37) – Nicaea or Nike, in other words, which translates from the Greek as “victor”. Also, the representation of Arthur’s name is extremely interesting – we see it transcribed as *Rex Artu Rius* (*Rex Horde Rus*, in other words, or the King of the Russian Horde). Mark the fact that “ARTU” and “RIUS” are written as two separate words; had the author of the lettering wanted to transcribe

the name as a single word, he could have done it easily – there is plenty of space, qv in fig. 18.37. However, if the two words needed to be separated by some sign, the amount of space available would not have sufficed, which is why we see the word “Rius” written below “Artu”.

Later on the name of the king transformed into *Arturus*, which is also a collation of “Horde” and “Rus”, but less obviously so – this appears to have happened in the XVIII century, the objective being to make the Russian (Horde) origins of the title more vague.

It would also be expedient to note that in the Old English texts the name “Arthur” had been transcribed as “Ardur” ([517], page 247). This makes it sound even closer to the word “Horde” (“*Orda*”, or “*Arda*”). Moreover, some modern philologists point out that the name Arthur had initially been written as two words, AR + DU, the second one translating from the Celtic as “black”; they cite Celtic mythology as proof (see [564], page 835, Comment 5, for instance). In this case the name “Arthur” translates as “Black Horde”. Let us remind the reader that Russia had consisted of several Hordes (White, Blue, Golden etc). It is possible that the entire Horde had once been known as the “Black Horde” in the Western Europe, hence the name Arthur.

Therefore, what we learn from the ancient sources is that the legendary English King Arthur had in reality been a Czar of the Russian Horde. We encounter another trace of the Russian, or “Mongolian” conquest of the XIV-XV century, whose waves had also reached the British Isles.

The legends about the Knights of the Round Table are very famous ([564], pages 135 and 573). It is presumed that the knights had formed a state council of sorts, presided by King Arthur, and occupied themselves with the affairs of the state. We are beginning to realise that this English legend must carry an echo of the Horde



Fig. 18.37. An old stone cross on the grave ascribed to the “ancient” English King Arthur. Taken from [155], pages 63-65.

Council, also known as the Cossack Circle (hence the round shape of the English “Council Table”). In Ukrainian, the State Council is still called “*rada*”, or “Horde”.

The Russian word for “artillery weapon” (“*orudiye*”) may be derived from the word “Horde” (“*orda*”), likewise the word *artillery*. Let us also discuss the possible etymology of the English word “cannon”, which may be derived from the Russian word “*samopal*” (transcribing as “самопал”). It had been used for referring to firearms up until the XVII century ([187], page 154). If a foreigner attempts to read the Cyrillic word “*camon*” as though it were set in Romanic characters, he shall come up with the word CANNON, seeing how M had occasionally been transcribed as two letters N collated into one (this is still visible in case of “m” and “nn”). The Russian letter *и* could have been read as “n”. This is how the Russian word “*samop*” (“*samopal*”) transformed into the English word “cannon”.

It is most likely that Arthur had never been a local English king; the legend of King Arthur reflects the memories of Russia, or the Horde, which had once conquered the British Isles. This is why the Scaligerian history of Britain cannot find a proper place for King Arthur – his reign is dated to the dark ages these days, an epoch we know nothing of, and one that can house virtually anything. Starting with the XVII-XVIII century and on, Arthur has been regarded as a legendary character for the most part. For instance, we encounter the following words in William Caxton’s preface to Thomas Malory’s “Le Morte Darthur”:

“Then all these things considered, there can no man reasonably gainsay but there was a king of this land named Arthur. For in all places, Christian and heathen, he is reputed and taken for one of the nine worthy, and the first of the three Christian men. And also, he is more spoken of beyond the sea, more books made of his noble acts, than there be in England, as well in Dutch, Italian, Spanish, and Greekish, as in French... Then all these things aforesaid alleged, I could not well deny but that there was such a noble king named Arthur” ([564], page 9).

This preface was presumably written to the 1485 edition of “Le Morte Darthur”; in reality, the text cannot predate the XVII century. In CHRON6 we demonstrate that the books printed in the alleged XV-XVI

century were most often printed in the XVII century the earliest – backdated, with erroneous release dates indicated in their title pages. This was done in the course of the pan-European campaign for the obliteration of all signs betraying former subordination of the Western Europe to Russia, or the Horde.

15. WILLIAM I THE CONQUEROR AND THE BATTLE OF HASTINGS DATED TO THE ALLEGED YEAR 1066. THE FOURTH CRUSADE OF 1204

15.1. A mutual superimposition of two famous wars in England and in Byzantium

Below we provide an example of English and Byzantine historical events identified as one and the same, respectively. Namely, we shall compare the Scaligerian version of the famous war waged by William I the Conqueror around the alleged year 1066 to its duplicate – the famous Fourth Crusade of circa 1204.

As we have seen in fig. 15.3, which is a scheme of the dynastical superimposition of Byzantine history over its British double, the epoch of the Fourth Crusade falls right over the epoch of William I.

15.2. The English version of William’s biography

In brief, the biography of William in its Scaligerian rendition is as follows (see [64], page 343, for instance). His full name reads as follows: Duke William I of Normandy, also known as the Conqueror and the Bastard ([1442], page 197; also [64]). An old portrait of this monarch can be seen in fig. 16.6.

Edward the Confessor died heirless in 1066. The crown went to one of his dukes, a very powerful figure – Harold II Godwinson, King of Norway and England, without any claims for the throne made by any party ([1442], pages 196 and 197). However, a short while after the ascension of Harold to the throne, William the Bastard, Duke of Normandy, came up with a claim for the kingdom. William declared that Edward had singled him out as his heir on his deathbed; then he turned to the Pope for help, and managed to make him an ally. Next he sent embassies to Germany and France with pleas for help. William had gathered “a large army of adventurers who came from France,



Fig. 18.38. “The Conquest of England by the Normans. An XI century carpet from Baille” ([264], Volume 1, page 577). What we see is but a fragment of a truly enormous carpet. Taken from [264], Book 1, page 577.



Fig. 18.39. Fragment of the ancient carpet kept in the city library of Baille. Wool on linen. Manufactured around the alleged years 1073-1083 ([930], page 156). Taken from [930], page 155.

Flanders, Brittany, Aquitania, Burgundy, Apulia and Sicily – a whole horde of swashbucklers ready to loot and pillage England” ([64], page 343). William gathered a huge fleet to invade England. It is interesting that a gigantic old carpet still exists in Baille, 70 metres long and 50 centimetres wide – it is dated to the alleged XI century. The carpet depicts the fleet of William the Conqueror who raises his sails. There are at least 1255 faces and objects depicted on the carpet; some of its fragments can be seen in figs. 18.38-18.42.

While William was waiting for a suitable wind, the Norwegians cast anchor in the Gamber estuary, led by the treacherous Tostig, brother of Harold.



Fig. 18.40. Fragment of the ancient carpet from Baille. Taken from [1052], inset between pages 52 and 53.



Fig. 18.41. Fragment of the ancient carpet from Baille. Taken from [1052], inset between pages 100 and 101.



Fig. 18.42. Fragment of the ancient carpet from Baille. Taken from [1052], inset between pages 100 and 101.

Harold had turned his army against the enemy and defeated Tostig at York. However, the coast was left unprotected, and a host of Normans disembarked at Pevensey. In spite of his wounds, Harold hastened to drive his army back and to meet his enemy. He did not wait for reinforcements. A violent battle was fought at Senlac Hill near Hastings. Harold got killed, and his army was crushed. “The victory at Senlac Hill was one of the most decisive ones in history; the entire England fell in the hands of the Norman duke, who got crowned in London” ([64], page 344).

William became the lawful monarch of England after his inauguration. He had launched a wave of

terror; many Englishmen were declared traitors, and their estates were confiscated. This had provoked a series of rebellions, which were suppressed with great cruelty and savoir-faire. His reign is considered a breakpoint in English history; many pages of the English chronicles are dedicated to his biography – the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, in particular. William is the founder of the Norman dynasty, which had lasted until the alleged year 1154 and was later replaced by the Anjou dynasty.

15.3. The Conquest of Constantinople: Byzantine version

Now let us give a brief synopsis of the conquest of Czar-Grad, or Constantinople, in its Scaligerian version, using [334] for reference. The Fourth Crusade of 1202-1204 was a brainchild of Pope Innocent III. The crusade ended with the conquest of Constantinople and a change of dynasty in the Byzantine Empire. This crusade is presumed to be the most famous in European history. There are many sources in existence that relate this campaign, presumably written by its actual participants. However, the campaign might be another reflection of the Great = “Mongolian” conquest of the early XIV century, which ended up in the XIII century as a result of a chronological error. See more on Innocent II above (Chapter 13, section 23).

The Crusaders requested ships from Venice. Soon, a large fleet set forth towards Constantinople with an army of crusaders. “The plea for help addressed to the Pope and the German king by Prince Alexis, son of the Byzantine emperor Isaac II Angelus, deposed in 1195, served as the *casus belli*” ([334], page 209). The crusaders were supported by the affluent citizens of France and the German Empire. The Pope also supported the crusaders, albeit having formally “forbidden” them to harm the Christian lands. “Thus, all the most influential political forces of Europe were urging the crusaders to invade Byzantium” ([334], page 209). The crusaders were led by a special council of high-ranking leaders. Boniface of Montferrand was appointed the formal leader of the crusade; however, the military council of the crusaders was presided by Geoffroi de Villehardouin, the famous Marshal of Champagne. He was “an eminent crusader politician

and took part in every important diplomatic transaction” ([729], page 125). There is another reason why Villehardouin’s name is associated with the Fourth Crusade the most often – he is considered the author of the famous book of memoirs entitled “The Conquest of Constantinople” ([1471]; see [286] for more details). Presumably, he had dictated them at the very end of his life.

Scaligerian history proceeds to tell us the following. Having besieged Constantinople in the alleged year 1203, the crusaders restored the power of Emperor Isaac II Angelus. However, he didn’t manage to pay them the entire sum that he had initially promised. The infuriated crusaders took Constantinople by storm in 1204 and pillaged it mercilessly. Whole quarters of the city were burnt to the ground; the famous Temple of Hagia Sophia was looted, and its great treasures disappeared without a trace. The crusaders founded a new state in Byzantium – the Latin Empire (1204-1261). 1204 marks the beginning of the last period in Byzantine history (Byzantium 3, qv above). The new Greek dynasty of Byzantium begins with Theodore I Lascaris (1204-1222). His ascension to power is a direct result of the Fourth Crusade, the war against Byzantium and the conquest of Constantinople.

15.4. The parallelism between the events related in the English and the Byzantine chronicles

-
- a. *England* of circa 1066.
 - b. *Byzantium* of circa 1204.
-

- 1a. *England*. A great war in England, considered a breakpoint in English history. The alleged year 1066.
- 1b. *Byzantium*. The famous war known as the Fourth Crusade of 1202-1204. Considered a breakpoint in Byzantine history ([287]).
- 2a. *England*. The Norman dynasty comes to power in England in 1066; it remains regnant until 1154.
- 2b. *Byzantium*. In 1204 the new Latin Empire emerges on Byzantine territory, likewise the Nicaean Empire.

3a. *England*. The Norman dynasty ends in 1154, remaining regnant for circa 88 years.

- 3b. *Byzantium*. The Latin Empire ceases to exist in 1261, after 60 years of existence.

The scheme in 15.3 superimposes both these dynasties, or empires, over each other, with a rigid shift of some 100-120 years. The Byzantine epoch of 1204-1453 becomes superimposed over the English epoch of the alleged years 1066-1327.

4a. *England*. The events are centred around London, the capital of England, and its environs.

- 4b. *Byzantium*. The events are centred around Constantinople, the capital of Byzantium, and its environs.

We have already identified London of the XII-XIV century as Constantinople. Therefore, both capitals become superimposed over each other within the framework of the parallelism in question yet again, confirming the correctness of prior identifications.

5a. *England*. Harold II is the King of England, regnant as a lawful heir. Harold is considered to have been an Anglo-Saxon king ([334], page 244).

- 5b. *Byzantium*. Isaac II Angelus is the emperor of Byzantium and a lawful ruler.

6a. *England*. Harold II reigns for some 9 months – less than a year. The previous ruler named Harold was Harold the Dane (regnant in 1036-1039). The reign durations of Harold II and Isaac II coincide and equal 1 year in both cases.

- 6b. *Byzantium*. Isaac II remains regnant for about 1 year in 1203-1204. This is his second reign; the first one dates from 1185-1195. As we have mentioned above, his first reign must have become reflected in English history as the reign of Harold I.

7a. *England*. Let us point out the number II in the title of Harold II.

- 7b. *Byzantium*. Similarly, we have II in the title of Isaac II.

8a. *England*. “Anglo-Saxon” sounds similar to Angelus KS.

- 8b. *Byzantium*. “Angelus” followed by the unvoiced version of the name Isaac shall sound like Angelus SK. We see similar terms as parts of royal titles in England and Byzantium. We shall voice our considerations in re the name Harold below.

9a. *England*. William I, 1066-1087. King of England. The founder of a new dynasty; regnant for 21 years. His title includes the number I, likewise the title of his Byzantine duplicate.

- 9b. *Byzantium*. Theodore (Tudor?) I Lascaris, 1204-1222. Byzantine emperor; regnant for 18 years, also a founder of a new dynasty. Some sources indicate 1208 as the beginning of his reign.

Let us point out that the English name Tudor is obviously a version of the Byzantine name Theodor. William comes to power after a war. The biography of Theodore Lascaris is similar – he becomes enthroned after the turmoil of the Fourth Crusade. The “early biography of William” was also affected by the actions of another prominent political figure of the crusade epoch – de Villehardouin, who had contributed to the early political biography of Theodore Lascaris.

10a. *England*. William the Conqueror sets forth against Harold, seeking to seize the throne. William invades England from abroad as an external hostile force and a leader of a large army.

- 10b. *Byzantium*. Villehardouin, the leader of the crusaders, acts as the chief rival of Emperor Isaac II Angelus. Villehardouin comes to Byzantium from abroad as a conqueror, being among the leaders of a large army.

Let us comment the possible similarities between the names of the characters listed above. It is obvious that the names are not and cannot be fully identical. Had this been the case, historians would have noticed it a long time ago and studied the sources with the utmost diligence, possibly discovering the

parallelism as a result. However, it is perfectly clear that we are comparing two different groups of sources written in different languages and by representatives of different historical schools, who may also have resided in different countries. The authors of both descriptions are most likely to have lived in the XVI-XVII century, and therefore weren't actual eyewitnesses of the events in question. Each author, or group of authors, was using ancient documents of the distant XIII century for reference.

These texts were laconic, written in an obscure language and very difficult to decipher. The chronicles were trying to reconstruct a more or less coherent picture of past events, fishing for facts in the murky waters of the past. Fragments of different names may have got shuffled as a result, and passed from character to character.

What we have in the present case is this: William the Conqueror and the Anglo-Saxon King Harold II in the English version versus Villehardouin and Isaac II Angelus in the Byzantine version. The name William may be a derivative of "Ville", whereas the name Harold may be derived from "Hardouin". We shall come up with the following table of correspondences:

1) William = Ville; the second part of Villehardouin's name may simply translate as "Horde" ("Hardou"). The name Villehardouin must therefore translate as William of the Horde. This is what we get as a result.

2) Conqueror = Conqueror.

3) Normandy = Roman (?).

4) Harold = Hardouin.

5) Anglo-Saxon = Angelus + Isaac.

We must be looking at the same names filtered through the chronicles written by different scribes in different languages. Phonetic parallels of this sort are by no means considered valid scientific argumentation; nevertheless, similar names emerging in the English and the Byzantine history simultaneously deserve a closer study, since we are comparing two lengthy dynastic currents, superimposed over each other by a rigid chronological shift that makes the parallelism cover a period of several hundred years.

11a. *England*. The war begins with the invasion of a large military fleet that disembarked on the English coast.

■ 11b. *Byzantium*. The crusaders come to Byzantium with a huge military fleet and disembark on the coast of the Byzantine Empire.

12a. *England*. The Pope supported William's invasion.

■ 12b. *Byzantium*. The crusade was sanctioned by the Pope, who had nevertheless "begged to have mercy on the Christian halidoms".

13a. *England*. William addresses several European monarchs with a request of military assistance, which results in a motley army that represented a great variety of nations.

■ 13b. *Byzantium*. Villehardouin addresses the envoys of different European countries with the suggestion to launch a crusade ([286], page 160).

COMMENTARY. A propos, mediaeval sources that describe the Fourth Crusade keep talking about the "march to Babylon". However, according to the Scalligerian version, Babylon had been destroyed many centuries before the crusade epoch and never rebuilt. This is how the modern commentators try to reconcile the embarrassing situation: "The city in question is Cairo in Egypt, which was known as Babylon in the west" ([286], page 161). On the other hand, we already know "Caer", or "Cairo" to be the British word for "city". Also, the Fourth Crusade had Czar-Grad as its primary target; "Czar" and "Caer" are the same word. The mediaeval authors who wrote about this crusade must have referred to Czar-Grad as to Babylon.

14a. *England*. Harold II is killed in the battle.

■ 14b. *Byzantium*. Isaac II Angelus is killed in the course of the war ([729], page 164).

We can sum up as follows: the written history of the British Isles does not begin with local history, but rather the Trojan War fought at the walls of Czar-Grad in the XIII century A.D. – an event of paramount importance for global history. Byzantine chronicles got included in the local history of the British Isles by mistakes. The chroniclers of the XVI-XVII century mistook the imported old "Mongolian" and Byzantine chronicles for descriptions of ancient events pertaining to the islands.

16.

MEDIAEVAL RUSSIA, OR THE HORDE, AS REFLECTED IN LATER ENGLISH CHRONICLES. The identity of the Galatians, who had received an epistle of Paul the Apostle, and the dating of this event

The results related above lead us to an important corollary. We must thoroughly reconsider the role of the mediaeval Russia, or the Horde, in European and Asian history. After the restoration of the events described in the old English chronicles to their proper chronological place, the epoch of the XI-XVI century, from “deep antiquity”, we discover that these chronicles constantly refer to ancient Russia and the Russians, or the Scythians. Ancient Russian history becomes complemented with a great deal of new information, formerly misdated and misplaced geographically.

The Russian chronicles of the Horde that related the history of Russia and Byzantium wound up in different European, Asian, Northern African and even American countries as a result of the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest. They frequently became part of the “ancient” history in its local versions, which had spawned a great many duplicates of important historical events that took place within the actual Empire – in Byzantium and Russia (the Horde). These duplicates have been part of the “ancient” history of different nations ever since – the “ancient” history of England, for example. Nowadays we are capable of discovering them with the use of formal methods enabling us to tell between various historical duplicates.

It is therefore little wonder that our analysis of the English history gives us a great many new facts to confirm the conception of Russian history related above.

Let us briefly remind the reader that the primary idea voiced in the course of our reconstruction of the Russian history was that the so-called invasion of the Tartars and the Mongols, interpreted by modern historians as a period of slavery when Russia had been conquered by a hostile foreign force of the Tartars and the Mongols, is really a special period within the actual history of Russia. This was the reign of the Russian Horde dynasty, the Horde being the regular Cossack army responsible for guarding the borders of

the country and maintaining order within the Empire. Apart from the horde, there was the civil administration of the princes, whose power had rested on the Horde as a military power and the foundation of peace and order. The name Mongolia must be a corrupted version of the Russian words for “many” and “power” (“*mnogo*” and “*moshch*”, respectively) – hence the Greek word for “great”, “Megalion”.

The old Russian and Cossack dynasty of the Horde was deposed in the epoch of the Great Strife (the XVI – early XVII century), and the Great = “Mongolian” Empire fell apart into a multitude of independent states (see CHRON6 for more details). The dynasty of the Romanovs became installed in Russia, the centre of the Empire. Their reign was based on altogether different principles. The previous epochs in Russian history were misrepresented by the Romanovian historians in order to justify the usurpation of power by the dynasty in question. In particular, the epoch of the Horde dynasty was declared the “epoch of foreign invasion”, when the country had allegedly been conquered by “malicious invaders” – the Tartars and the Mongols.

We come to the conclusion that the references to the Tartars and the Mongols made by the Western European chroniclers really apply to the ancient Russian kingdom and its regular army, which had conquered the Western Europe and many other lands to boot.

We have pointed out that Western chronicles (English ones in particular) describe Russia under the names of Ruthenia or Rusia (qv in the glossary of mediaeval synonyms above). According to V. I. Matouzova, “the fact that the English were interested in Russian history is also explained by the event that had shook the mediaeval Europe thoroughly – the invasion of the nomadic hordes of the Tartars and the Mongols... The reports of some foreign nation, wild and godless, whose very name was interpreted as “Hordes from Tartar”, had made the mediaeval chroniclers consider them to be the manifestation of divine retribution for human sins” ([517], page 10).

Nowadays it is presumed that the “Mongol and Tartar yoke had severed the ties between Russia and the rest of Europe for a long time. The relations between Russia and England were only resumed in the XVI century – both nations were “rediscovering” each

other, in a way... Nearly all the information about Russia accumulated in the British written sources by the end of the XIII century was forgotten... The geographical tractate of Roger Barlow that dates from circa 1540-1541 is rather vague when it locates Russia somewhere in the vicinity of the ‘Sarmatian’ and ‘Gyrcanian’ mountains” ([517], page 12). The latter name might be a reflection of “Georgiy the Khan”.

It is perfectly fascinating that a work written in the XVI century still describes Russia as a mysterious and distant land. However, it is presumed that English embassies had already existed in Russia, likewise the embassies of Austria and other nations. Russia was visited by many foreigners. However, none of it had sufficed for giving the Westerners a correct view of Russia.

We believe this “wall of silence” to date from the XVII century, when the Empire became fragmented. Every independent nation that came to be as a result had tried its best to forget about having been formerly subordinate to the Russian Empire, or the Horde. Ancient documents, maps etc were destroyed and replaced by freshly-made falsified “ancient sources”. These were conspicuously silent and vague in referring to the land of their former masters so as not to awaken any dangerous memories. This is the very epoch when the tales of the Western chroniclers about the “vicious Tartars and the Mongols” were written – the presumed conquerors of Russia and a menace to the West. All of this was written in the XVII-XVIII century. This epoch also gave birth to the false concept of the reign of the Russian dynasty as a “harsh foreign yoke over Russia”.

Let us see what the mediaeval English chronicles have to say about Russia. Bartholomaeus Anglicus reports the following, for instance: “Ruthia [the Horde – Auth.], also known as Ruthena, a province of Maesia, is located at the borders of Asia Minor, bordering with the Roman territories in the East, Gothia in the North, Pannonia in the West and Greece in the South. The land is vast; the language spoken here is the one spoken by the Bohemians and the Slavs. A part of this land is called Galatia, and its denizens were formerly known as Galatians. Paul the Apostle is believed to have sent them an epistle” ([1026]; see also [517], page 85, and Comment 9).

Many historians commented on this famous me-

diaeval text. Maesia is believed to be the old name of Germany ([517], page 93), while Ruthia, or Rutena, identifies as Russia, *qv* above. Moreover, “under Galatia Bartholomaeus Anglicus understands the Galitsk and Volynsk Russia” ([517], page 91). However, as one may expect, modern historians declare the reference to the epistle sent by Paul the Apostle to the Russians erroneous. Indeed – Scaligerian chronology separates the epoch of Paul the Apostle from the events related here by a thousand years at least. The commentary of modern historians to this passage is rather austere: “The Epistle to Galatians written by Paul the Apostle is included in the canon of the New Testament; it obviously bears no relation to the Galitsk and Volynsk Russia” ([517], page 93).

However, the New Chronology gives us no reason to doubt the report of Bartholomaeus, since the epoch of Jesus Christ identifies as the XII century of the new era; thus, the Galatians mentioned in the New Testament as the addressees of Paul the Apostle must have indeed lived in Galitsk and Volynsk.

Another report dates from the alleged XIII century. We find it in the “Annals of the Melrose Monastery” (“*Annales Melrosenes*”), South Scotland. The correct dating according to the New Chronology is the XIV century – about a century later. This report is presumably the earliest reference to the “Tartar and Mongol invasion” contained in British sources: “This is when we have first heard of the iniquitous hordes of the Tartars that had lain many a land waste” ([1121]; see also [517], page 98, and Comment 10).

Once again we see that certain English chronicles of the alleged XIII century (the *Chronica Monasterii Sancti Edmundi*, for instance) consider Russia an island for some reason: “A tribe of great vileness known as the Tartarins came forth from the islands in great multitudes, wreaking havoc upon Hungary and the adjacent lands” ([1446] as well as [517], page 101). However, we have already explained it to the readers that the word “island” must be read as “Asian land” – Russia can indeed be considered one (see Comment 11).

Another possible explanation to the presumed insular nature of Russia is that the old Russian word “*ostrov*” had other meanings besides “island”, one of them being “forest”. I. Y. Zabelin reports this in particular ([283], page 55). This interpretation leads us

to a natural reconstruction – the initial reference had been to a “land of forests”. The scribes eventually forgot the meaning of the Russian word “*ostrov*” and translated it as “island”. A propos, a part of Moscow is called “*Losiniy Ostrov*” – literally, “Elk Island”; however, there isn’t any water anywhere around it – the area in question is in fact a forest.

Let us also consider the aliases of the famous Genghis-Khan used in the Russian and the European chronicles: “The name *Cliyrkam* ... is another alias of Genghis-Khan, known as *Chanogiz* and *Chigizakon* in the Russian chronicles. Other European sources call him *Gurgatan*, *Cecarcarus*, *Zingiton*, *Ingischam*, *Tharsis*, *David*, *Presbyter Johannes* etc” ([517], page 185).

We find the above in the “*Annales de Burton*” dating from the end of the alleged XIII century. Thus, the Western Europeans had called Genghis-Khan *Gurgatan*, or *Georgiy* (*Gyurgiy*), as well as *Caesar the Cyr* (*Cecarcarus*), *Tharsis* (Persian or P-Russian – White Russian), *David* and *Presbyter Johannes*.

Presbyter Johannes can therefore be identified as Genghis-Khan, according to the Western European chronicles. The Westerners must have identified Russia, or the Horde, as the Kingdom of Presbyter Johannes. We must recollect a very interesting statement made by the English chronicles in this respect, namely, that “their leader [leader of the Tartars – Auth.] is St. John the Baptist” (quotation given according to [517], page 152). We see that some of the English chroniclers identified Genghis-Khan the conqueror as the Evangelical John the Baptist. See more on Presbyter Johannes in CHRON5.

There are many other mediaeval chroniclers that refer to the Tartar and Mongol Horde swarming Europe as a mortal peril; we cannot quote all of them here (see [517], for example). This Horde can be identified as the Russian Army, according to our reconstruction.

Let us conclude with the following fragment. Ethicus Istricus, who had lived in the alleged III century A.D., according to the modern historians, “tells of a vile nation, the descendants of Gog and Magog, which had once confronted Alexander the Great. Ethicus prophesises dramatically that this nation ‘shall bring great devastation in the times of the Antichrist, proclaiming him the Lord of Lords’” ([517], page 221).

Ethicus claimed this nation to be “locked away behind the Caspian gates” (*Die Kosmographie*, page 19).

What epoch did Ethicus Istricus really live in? The III century A.D.? How about Alexander of Macedon, who had fought against Gog and Magog, or the Tartars and the Mongols? We realise that the epoch in question is really the XIV-XVI century A.D. See CHRON6 for more details.

17. THE DATING OF THE MAPS COMPILED BY MATTHEW OF PARIS.

The epoch when Scythia, or the Horde, became known as “the mother of dragons, the cradle of scorpions, the nest of snakes and the hotbed of demons”, and the reasons behind this reputation

The Great = “Mongolian” Empire fell apart in the XVI-XVII century. A “history rectification campaign” began in the epoch of the mutinous Reformation. The attitude to the “Tartars and the Mongols” changed drastically – they became heavily demonised. In fig. 18.43 we see an illustration to the *Chronicle of Matthew of Paris*, who had lived in the alleged XIII century. We see the “Tartars and the Mongols” enjoy a quiet meal; the legend underneath the illustration tells us that “the Tartars eat human flesh”. We see a roasting human carcass (fig. 18.44) with severed human heads and limbs piled up nearby. A very vivid illustration to the customs of the Tartars – savages and cannibals that have got nothing in common with the enlightened West Europeans.

Similar tales were told about the Scythians. Solinus, for instance, is very confident when he tells us about “the Scythians from the inland regions who live in caves like savages... They rejoice in battles and drink the blood from the wounds of the slain. Their glory grows as they kill more people; it is a disgrace not to kill anyone” (quotation given according to [953], page 219).

Another outburst of similar sentiments comes from Ethicus Istricus, who addresses the North-East in the following manner: “O Aquilon, thou mother of dragons, cradle of scorpions, nest of snakes and hotbed of demons!” (quotation given in accordance with [953], page 20).

All of the above horror stories are nothing but



Fig. 18.43. Ancient illustration from the Chronicle of Matthew of Paris depicting the “Tartars and Mongols” having lunch. The commentary is authoritative enough: “Tartars eating human flesh”. This is how they started to portray warriors of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire a posteriori, in the XVI-XVII century, after the victory of the mutinous Reformers in the Western Europe. Taken from [1268], page 14.



Fig. 18.44. Fragment of the previous illustration: a close-in. Such visual aids were used in the XVII-XVIII century in order to make the Tartars and the Mongols look disgusting and ugly to the Western Europeans.

Western European agitprop of the Reformation epoch (the XVI-XVIII century). Another vivid image they used was that of the vicious Russian bear looming over Europe. Modern historians tell us the following about the “Ursus”, or the bear as depicted in the mediaeval maps: “The bear in the North-East of Europe. The Hereford map might shed some light over the origins of the ‘Russian Bear’ as an English stereotype that became common in the Elizabethan epoch... There were attempts to trace the origins of this Elizabethan stereotype to the early Christian symbolism, where both the North and the bear were considered symbols of evil forces... Finally, both unclean animals [the bear and the ape – Auth.] were included in the

diet of the “Turks of the Gog and Magog genus” ([953], page 230. The very Latin word for “bear”, “*ursus*”, might be another version of the word Russian.

Let us also consider “an engraving that depicts the Goths entitled ‘On the Goths and their Cruelty’ from the “Cosmography” of Sebastian Munster published in the alleged year 1550 ([578], Book 1, page 71, ill. 61; see fig. 18.45). We see the Goths (or the Cossacks). The fourth one from the left has the head of a bird of prey with a large beak – it is obvious that the characters in question are extremely malicious and evil, isn’t it?

Let us conclude with the following curious detail. In fig. 18.46 we reproduce “The Map of Great Britain by Matthew of Paris”. Historians call it “a famous map known in four versions” ([1177], Volume 1, map 29). Nowadays it is dated to the XIII century, or the presumed lifetime of Matthew of Paris. Historians are very fond of including this map into various publications as an example of the cartographic art of the XIII century. It is treated very reverently these days. The map is a real work of art, accurately and lavishly coloured. A fragment of the same map in a different version was reproduced above in fig. 18.14.

However, a detailed study of the “famous ancient map” by Matthew of Paris, qv in fig. 18.46, leaves us confused. For instance, we notice that the area of Scotland called Ros or Ross has disappeared without a trace (see fig. 18.47). We have however seen that this name had been present on the map of Scotland up until the XVIII century (qv in the fragment of a map dating from 1755 reproduced in fig. 18.18, for example). It wasn’t until much later that the “dangerous” name had disappeared from the map of Britain. As we can see, somebody had also removed it from the “famous ancient map” compiled by Matthew of Paris, whose portrait can be seen in fig. 18.46. However, another version of the same map as reproduced in fig. 18.14 above retains the name Ros as part of the Scottish geography. This version appears to be older – it must have escaped the clutches of the XVIII-XIX century historians. Possibly, it was edited less fastidiously.

It is therefore likely that the “famous ancient version” of Matthew’s map as reproduced in fig. 18.46 was created by hoaxers in the XVII-XVIII century the earliest as a “visual aid” to the Scaligerian history,



Fig. 18.45. Ancient engraving from Sebastian Munster’s “Cosmography”, allegedly dating from 1550. The French inscription on top translates as follows: “The Goths and their Cruelty”. This is a typical example of what the Reformation epoch agitprop had looked like. This is how the Goths, or the Cossacks, have been portrayed since the XVII-XVIII century. Taken from [578], Volume 1, page 71, illustration 61.



Fig. 18.47. Fragment of the map drawn by Matthew of Paris: a close-in. We don’t see the name Ros (or Rossia) applied to any part of Scotland. Taken from [1177], Volume 1, map 39.



Fig. 18.46. The famous map of Britain ascribed to Matthew of Paris nowadays (he is presumed to have lived in the XIII century). However, it is most likely to be a recent forgery dating to the XVII-XVIII century the earliest. Taken from [1177], Volume 1, map 39.



Fig. 18.48. Fragment of a map dating from 1606 where the word “Britannicus” is transcribed as two words – “Brita Nicus” – Brutus the Victor, or the Victory of Brutus (Brother?). Taken from [1160], page 105, map 4.18.



Fig. 18.49. Fragment of George Lily’s map allegedly compiled in Venice in 1526. The sea is called Mare Britannicum, or Sea of Brutus the Victor. Taken from [1160], page 161, map 5.43.

which was introduced around this time. The map was made to look “ancient” – however, it was done way too accurately. It is obvious that all the old names had been edited tendentiously. In particular, this “ancient” map refers to the capital of England as to London, which is a modern term.

We have already mentioned the fact that several ancient English chronicles trace the name “Britain” to Brutus – possibly, a brother of Julius Caesar, or Youri the Czar. Some of these maps transcribe “Britannicus” as “Brita Nikus” – two separate words (see a fragment of a map compiled by Jean-Baptiste Wrientz in 1606 reproduced in fig. 18.48). The two words must have once stood for “Brutus the Nicaean”,

or “Victory of Brutus”, or “Brutus the Victor”, bearing in mind the Greek word for Victory, “*nike*”.

Another map, compiled by George Lily in the alleged year 1526, contains the name “Mare Britannicum” – “Sea of Brutus the Victor”, in other words. A fragment of the map can be seen in fig. 18.49.

The name “Germany” may also bear relation to the word “*brat*”, or “brother” – Brutenia, Pruthenia and so on. The fact that the Spanish word for “brother” is “*hermano*” is hardly a chance occurrence. The name “Germany” may have been synonymous to “Britain”, translating as “Brotherly Nation”. One must also note the phonetic similarity between the word “Britannia” and the Slavic word “*brataniye*”, “brotherhood”.

Comments

COMMENT 1. “The question of provenance and interdependence of the various versions [of the Chronicle] are so complicated that any discussion soon assumes the appearance of an essay in higher mathematics” ([1442], page xxxi).

COMMENT 2. “Any account of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is necessarily based on Charles Plummer’s revision of the edition of John Earle (1865) which was published in two volumes by the Oxford University Press in 1892-9... Plummer’s edition ... gives prominence on opposite pages to manuscripts A and E, associated respectively with the names of Archbishop Parker (1504-75) and Archbishop Laud (1573-1645)... The other manuscripts were once in the possession of Sir Robert Cotton (1571-1631), and are to be found in the Cottonian collection of manuscripts in the British Museum” ([1442], page xxxi).

COMMENT 3. “Thanks to the example of Bede, the Chronicle is the first history written in English to use his mastery innovation of reckoning years as from the Incarnation of Our Lord – ‘Years of Grace’ as they were called in England” ([1442], page xxiv).

COMMENT 4. “In this year the city of Romans was taken by assault by the Goths, eleven hundred and ten years after it was built. Afterwards, beyond that, the kings of the Romans ruled no longer in Britain; in all

they had reigned there four hundred and seventy years since Julius Caesar first came to the country” ([1442], page 11).

COMMENT 5. “Une isle i a par non Cancie [Canzie in manuscript B, qv in [517], page 240, - Auth.] e si crei bien que c’est Rosie [Russie in manuscript B, qv in [517], page 240 – Auth.] qui est de la grant mer salee de totes parz avironnee. Dunc autresi com les euetes de lor diverses maisonnetes de ceus qui sunt irie’ sunt en estor glaive sachie’, tost e isnel d’ire esbrasez, trestot eissi e plus assez seuct icil poples fors eissir por les granz rennes envair e por faire les granz ocises, les granz gaaz e les conquises.”

COMMENT 6. “The first inhabitants of this land were the Britons, who came from Armenia” ([1442], page 3).

COMMENT 7. “Here in this island are five languages: English, British or Welsh, Irish, Pictish, and Latin... Picts came from the south from Scythia with warships, not many, and landed at first in northern Ireland, and there asked the Scots if they might dwell there... And the Picts asked the Scots for wives... A part of Scots went from Ireland into Britain” (*ibid*).

COMMENT 8. “Down to the time of Alfred this term Scottas refers either to the Scots of Ireland or of

the Irish kingdom of Argyll” ([1442], page 3, Comment 5).

COMMENT 9. “Ruthia, sive Ruthena, quae et Mesiae est provincia, in Minoris Asiae confinio constituta Romanorum terminos est habens ab oriente, Gothiam a septentrione, Pannoniam ab occidente, Graeciam vero a meridie. Terra quidem est maxima concordans cum Bohemis et Sclavis in ideomate et lingua. Haec autem quadam parte sui Galacia est vocata et eius incolae quandam Galathae vocabantur, quibus

dicitur Paulus Apostolus direxisse epistolam. Quaere supra Galacia” ([1026]; also [517], page 77).

COMMENT 10. “Hic primo auditur in terra nostra, quod nefandus exercitus Tartareorum multas terras vastavit” ([1121]; also [517], pages 98—99).

COMMENT 11. “Gens nefanda dicta Tartarins que nuper de insulis ebuliens superficiem terre impleuerat Hungariam cum adiacentibus regionibus devastat” ([1446]; also [517], page 101).

