

N. A. Morozov's manuscript on Russian history

1. SUMMARY

It is known that N. A. Morozov has managed to publish 7 volumes of his fundamental oeuvre entitled "Christ (Human History from the Natural Scientific Point of View)",[544]). This oeuvre was published again in Moscow in 1998 due to the heightened interest in the problems of chronology stirred up by our research. The eighth volume has never been published before, and its manuscript is still kept in the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences. The text is typewritten, with many handwritten insertions made by N. A. Morozov. In March 1993 A. T. Fomenko, V. V. Kalashnikov and G. V. Nosovskiy studied this oeuvre in detail, having made a copy of the manuscript's key sections by kind permission of the RAS Archive. We would like to express our gratitude to the staff of the Archive for this unique opportunity. Later, in 2000, Kraft + Lean, a publishing house in Moscow, published copies of the fragments from Morozov's manuscript that we have made as a separate volume ([547]). These materials can be considered a comprehensive summary of the whole chronicle.

Judging by the nature of the manuscript, N. A. Morozov couldn't find the opportunity to prepare it for publication – in a way, it is still a draft, which reflects a large number of the author's profound observa-

tions and his theory of Russian history. The general ideas presented in Morozov's manuscript can be encapsulated thus.

1) The verification of the chronology of the Russian chronicles by observations of solar and lunar eclipses, as well as comets.

The verification performed by N. A. Morozov demonstrates that none of the datings ascribed to the "Russian eclipses" and preceding 1064 A.D. as recorded in chronicles can be verified astronomically. The first eclipse that can more or less claim to possess an astronomical verification is the eclipse of 1064. However, the latter was only observable from Egypt and parts of Europe – not Russia. The descriptions of eclipses in the Russian chronicles can only be confirmed astronomically in cases that postdate the XIII century. N. A. Morozov had in fact discovered the XIII century to be the very threshold at which Scaligerian chronology begins to make some sense astronomically.

Having analysed other calendar indications contained in the Russian chronicles, N. A. Morozov discovered discrepancies inherent in the consensual chronology up until the beginning of the XIV century. The corollary is as follows: Russian chronology before the XIII-XIV century needs to be revised.

2) N. A. Morozov has managed to find out the following by his analysis of the *Povest Vremennyh Let*.

2a) The existing copies of this chronicle are virtually identical; their latest edition dates from the XVIII century. Therefore, one of the fundamental texts that constitute the backbone of the entire Russian chronology happens to be of a recent origin.

2b) Many sections of the *Povest Vremennyh Let* are concerned with Byzantine events much more than they are with Russian history. For instance, we encounter accounts of earthquakes, although they are extremely rare for Russia.

2c) All the copies of the *Povest Vremennyh Let* end with the year of Constantinople's fall – 1204 A.D., that is. However, this crucial event isn't mentioned in any of them for some odd reason. This is how N. A. Morozov discovered the breakpoint in Russian history that falls over 1204 A.D.

3) The existing version of Russian history can be traced to Miller's epoch, or the second half of the XVIII century. Tatishchev's history, which was presumably written before Miller's time, disappeared without a trace – in a fire, as it is believed. The sum total of all the works published under Tatishchev's name today amounts to Tatishchev's "drafts" as published by Miller. Our modern view of the Russian history is thus of a rather recent origin.

4) N. A. Morozov discovered that the Russian year began in March, according to the chronicles. He believed this tradition to be of Western European origin, and therefore made the conclusion that the Russian culture came from the West as a result of the crusader conquest. However, it is common knowledge that the Byzantines had also associated the beginning of the year with March (see [393], for instance). The indiction, or the ecclesiastical year, began in September. It is peculiar that N. A. Morozov was unaware of this fact, or didn't pay any attention to it, perhaps. A possible explanation is that Byzantines had two alternative beginnings of the year – the secular and the ecclesiastical, instead of observing both, in the manner of the Russian calendars.

N. A. Morozov also believed that the Russian Church had remained merged with the Western until the reign of Ivan III (1481). The evidence he cites to prove this is that there hadn't been any religious impediments to marriages between Russians and Catholics – in particular, the custom of baptising brides for the second time dates from the XVI century. This

should indicate the unity of the Russian and the Western Church before the XV century. However, Morozov's general conception appears to be wrong, and it doesn't provide for the fact that the very definition of ecclesiastical unity wasn't introduced until the Council of Florence and Ferrara in 1439, according to the New Chronology – shortly after Great Schism, which split apart the Catholic Church, or, possibly, the entire Ecumenical Church, in 1378-1415.

We intend to share one of our general observations with the reader. Having made an extremely important advance in the critical analysis of the Scaligerian chronology, N. A. Morozov nevertheless failed to develop this idea logically. He "stopped", misled by the false opinion that Scaligerian chronology could be considered more or less correct starting with the IV-V century A.D. and on. This is why he generally trusted the data ascribed to the epochs that postdate the VI century. However, today we know that Scaligerian chronology can only be trusted from the XIII-XIV century and on, while events dating from earlier epochs are but phantom reflections of the epoch of the XI-XVII century. This is the reason why N. A. Morozov was making certain claims that we believe to be blatantly wrong – however, these mistakes can by no means compromise the remarkable achievements of N. A. Morozov in the reconstruction of humankind's authentic history.

5) N. A. Morozov cites a number of phonetic parallels between different words in order to validate his theory of the Russian culture's West European crusader roots – the one we expose as erroneous. For example:

Vatican = Vati-Kan = Priest's House (in Hebrew).

Horde (Orda) = order (cf. also the Latin *ordo*).

Ataman = Getman = Hauptman (German).

Khazars = Hussars (who are known to have been present in the Hungarian army.

Czar = Sar (Hebrew).

The Tartars = "The Infernal Ones" in Greek; also possibly a reference to the Hungarian Tatra Mountain range.

Mongol = Megalion = "Great" (in Greek).

Basurman = Wesserman (German).

The above are Morozov's primary linguistic observations.

6) Morozov cites no other proof of his theory that

the Russian culture is Western European in origin, save the references to the beginning of the year, Latin names of the months, a number of Latin words used in ecclesiastical jargon and the phonetic parallels mentioned above. In general, the issue of who borrowed words from whom is approached from the stance of consensual Scaligerian chronology. Its alteration will automatically change our conceptions of etymology and the real nature of borrowing.

7) N. A. Morozov also voiced the idea about the cultural expansion going hand in hand with colonization instigated by the old and highly developed centres located in the vicinity of the ancient iron mines. Such proximity is important for the high-priority manufacture of tools and weapons. The oldest iron mines are located in the Balkans, the Ural Mountains and Germany. This is why N. A. Morozov believed that the colonization of the entire world, including India, Tibet and China was a military campaign launched from the Balkans.

Let us quote a few fragments of Morozov's manuscript ([547]) and provide our commentary thereto.

N. A. Morozov writes: "The Russian chronicle in question had once been attributed to Nestor; however, ever since I. S. Kazanskiy first ousted Nestor from the chronicle union in 1851, it has been known as "The Primordial Russian Chronicle". It bears distinct marks of Western Slavic influence everywhere.

This chronicle has reached us as several copies; the following ones were known best in the early XIX century.

1. "Povest Vremennyh Let by Nestor, the Friar of Feodosyev Monastery in Pechora".

This copy is one of the few that bear the legend "Nestor". It is believed to have initially belonged to Pyotr Kirillovich Khlebnikov, a prominent collector from Moscow who died in 1777 – the ownership history remains enigmatic in this case. The next owner was S. D. Poltoratskiy (1803-1884). This document is written on paper of small format and uses the type of font known as "poluustav"; it covers the historical period until 1198.

2. "The Russian Chronograph Comprising the History of Russia between 6370 (or

862 A.D.) and 7189 (or 1681 A.D.) Moscow, 1790".

3. "The Russian Chronicle Comprising Russian History between 6360 (or 862 A.D.) and 7106 (or

1598 A.D.) Moscow, 1781". This is the Arkhangelsk copy.

However, these copies have all been dated as more recent today" ([547]).

2.

THE RADZIVILOVSKAYA CHRONICLE

N. A. Morozov: "Nikon's chronicle [which is how N. A. Morozov refers to the *Radzivilovskaya chronicle* – Auth.] is the most interesting copy that exists to date; one must also believe it the oldest. It is set in the poluustav font of the late XV century and decorated with 604 interesting drawings of great archaeological significance.

At the end of the chronicle we find the indication that it was given to Prince Janusz Radzivil by Stanislaw Zenowicz. In 1671, Prince Boguslaw Radzivil gave it away to the Königsberg library, judging by the seal, whereupon we see the city's coat of arms and the following inscription:

"A celissime principe Dno [or Domino – N. M.] Boguslo Radsivilio bibliothecae quae Regiomontani [or Königsberg – N. M.] est electorato donata".

In 1716 Peter the Great ordered to copy this manuscript so that further generations of copies could be made in Russia... During the seven-year war, in 1760, the actual Königsberg original was obtained as well, and handed over to the Russian Academy of Sciences. In 1767, six years later, it was published in St. Petersburg ... as part of the edition entitled "The Russian Historical Library. Ancient Chronicles" ([547]).

Let us interrupt our Morozov quote with the following remark. It is true that the so-called first Russian chronicles were written by the Slavs from the South-East, or even the Slavs that had resided on the territory of the modern Poland or Prussia. In this case, it is perfectly obvious that they should retain certain vestiges of the West Slavonic influence, and those were brought to light by none other but N. A. Morozov.

Apart from that, as we demonstrate in the present book, these first chronicles were transformed by heavy editing under the Romanovs, but they aren't entirely fictitious. The chronicles in question are based on authentic ancient documents of the XIV-XVI century.

It is a common belief that Peter “opened a gateway to Europe”. Europe? Western Europe, or the Catholic and Protestant Europe of the XVII-XVIII century, already Latinised after the mutiny known as the Reformation. As we realise today, many of the innovations and reforms initiated by Peter the Great were serving the purpose of erasing the Horde past of Russia and introducing Western traditions, ideology, and even religion, to a certain extent. It suffices to study the architecture of St. Petersburg, the city built by Peter the Great, and that of its churches. The style is easy to identify as the Western Mediaeval style of the Reformation epoch.

The official Orthodox Church has been a hybrid between the initial Orthodox faith of the Horde Empire, Western Catholicism and Protestantism of the XVII century ever since Peter’s epoch. The only people who have managed to preserve some of the old ecclesiastical tradition and its lore are the so-called “Old-Believers”.

It was one of the Romanovs’ greatest concerns to distort the history of the lawful Russian dynasty (the Khans of the Horde). Therefore, Romanovian historians masterminded a very important propaganda campaign, having received their orders from the Romanovs themselves. One of the campaign’s primary objectives had been to vanquish the history of the Great = “Mongolian” Empire by means distorting it beyond all recognition.

Historians have done their absolute best to comply with the royal orders. It is hardly their fault that many traces of the real history have survived, quite in defiance of their efforts, and that we can reconstruct a great deal from those. Incidentally, if Germany (or Prussia, one of its parts) used to be a province of the Great Empire, it is easy enough to understand the fact that Romanovian history had a strong bond with Germany – Schleswig-Holstein in particular, the birthplace of many Romanovs. These parts had at some point been provinces of the “Mongolian” Empire – however, the latter has split up, and the German parts of the Empire soon forgot their mediaeval Slavic past. Let us carry on quoting from N. A. Morozov: “These are the true origins of the Russian chronicles, and if anybody tells me that ‘Nestor’s Chronicle’ had existed before Peter the Great, I shall have to ask the reader for some proof of this claim ... Then it was

copied and continued; among the most important ‘continued copies’ we can mention the following:” ([547]).

3.

THE LAVRENTYEVSKAYA CHRONICLE

“The Lavrentyevskaya copy (also known as the Suzdal copy, or Moussin-Pushkin’s copy) is entitled as follows: ‘Here be the Chronicle Recording the Origins of the Russian Land and the Names of Kiev’s First Princes’. Underneath we see the legend “Book of the Rozhdestvenskiy Monastery of Vladimir”.

The manuscript is written on parchment. Its author has copied the entire *Radzivilovskaya Chronicle* with minor corrections, extending it to the year 6813 (1305 in our chronology). However, he concludes it with an unexpected addendum dating from 6885, or 1377 A.D., which postdates the end of the chronicle by 72 years.

Just why the narrative line of the chronicle interrupted 72 years before the final entry is anybody’s guess. The origins of this copy cannot be traced any further back than the very end of the XVIII century, or even the beginning of the XIX, when Count A. I. Moussin-Pushkin, the famous collector of books (died in 1817), gave it to Emperor Alexander I; the latter handed it over to the Public Library, and we know no more of the matter” ([547]).

4.

THE MANUSCRIPT FROM THE ECCLESIASTIC ACADEMY OF MOSCOW

“The manuscript from the Ecclesiastic Academy of Moscow is second only to the *Radzivilovskaya Chronicle* in importance. It is written on 261 pages and set in the “poluustav” font. On its first page we find the legend ‘Life-Giving Trinity’, which is why the copy is known as ‘Troitskaya’ – literally, ‘Trinity Chronicle’ (in the first volume of the Complete Collection of the Russian Chronicles); also, on its last page we find the legend “Monastery of St. Sergiy” (also known as the Trinity Monastery).

The manuscript all but copies the *Radzivilovskaya Chronicle* verbatim, with very minor corrections. As for the part of the narration that follows the end of

the original, it is joined to the previous part seamlessly, although the nature of the chronicle alters completely as compared to the account of the same events contained in the Lavrentyevskaya chronicle. This chronicle ends with the events of 1419, and the report it contains can be identified as dependent. In other words, it does not replicate the original part of the Lavrentyevskaya chronicle" ([547]).

5. COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT COPIES

"Discrepancies between the first parts of the Lavrentyevskaya and the Troitskaya copies and the *Radzivilovskaya Chronicle* are minute (qv in the table). It is significant that the chroniclers cease to report any of the events to follow the conquest of Czar-Grad by the crusaders and the foundation of the Latin Empire in the Balkan Peninsula in 1204, which isn't mentioned in any of the Russian chronicles" ([547]).

We shall omit the comparative table compared by N. A. Morozov.

"Although there are minor stylistic corrections and small insertions, it is obvious that the main body of text remains the same for all three chronicles. Nevertheless, they were discovered in different locations – the *Radzivilovskaya Chronicle* comes from Königsberg, the Lavrentyevskaya is believed to hail from Suzdal, and the Troitsko-Sergiyevskaya was written near Moscow.

If all of the above could be identified as copies of a more recent handwritten original made before the invention of the printing press, even if we considered nothing but their first parts, we would have to conclude that it was common in every part of the territory between Königsberg and the Vladimir province, or maybe an even greater one, and it is therefore very odd that its copies discovered at such distance from each other fail to contain discrepancies of a more drastic sort.

We are thus led to the conclusion that both the anonymous imitator from the Troitse-Sergiyev Monastery and the Suzdal friar named Lavrentiy used the popular edition of 1767 and wrote their copies at the end of the XVIII century, shortly before their discovery by fanatic collectors such as Moussin-Pushkin; alternatively, the compilers could have used the *Rad-*

zivilovskaya Chronicle. Nevertheless, the following parts are original in each of the copies" ([547]).

6. THE ETYMOLOGY OF THE "ANCIENT" GREEK WORD FOR "HELL" – "TARTAROS"

N. A. Morozov believed that many Greek and Latin words came to Russia during its conquest by the crusaders ([547]). Our point of view is completely at odds with his. The correct etymology is the reverse, and can be traced back to the Great = "Mongolian" conquest of Europe in the XIV-XV century.

We are of the opinion that the Russian word "Tatar" (or "Cossack") transformed into the Greek word "Tartaros" – "hell", or "the underworld". The formerly neutral word "Tartar" (or "Tatar") became tendentiously warped and transformed into "Tartary", which stands for "a perilous place" in Russian.

The Latin word for yoke ("jugum") is obviously similar to its Slavic synonym ("igo", qv in [547]). The Greek and Latin formula "jugum tartaricum", or "the infernal yoke", might be a derivative of the Russian "Tatarskoye Igo", or "the yoke of the Tartars". These are the words that we find in the chronicles written by the Slavs from the Southwest, a fact emphasised by N. A. Morozov as well.

As we point out above, the first Russian chronicles possess distinctive characteristics of the Southwestern Slavonic style, and may even originate from the Southwest of Russia. However, these regions and their inhabitants were the first to be colonised by the Russians, or the Horde, during their expansion Westward. It is little wonder that the descendants of the conquered Southwestern Slavs, who were in close contact with the Greek and the Latin nations, got into the habit of referring to the Great Russian = "Mongolian" Conquest as some "infernal enslavement", or "Tartar yoke".

These sentiments became reflected in the South-Eastern Russian chronicles of the XVII-XVIII century. The memory of their origins was lost and became partially distorted. These are the very chronicles that the Romanovian version of the Russian history was based on, much to the confusion of later historians.

Therefore, our idea can be formulated thus. The

descendants of the Southwestern nation colonised in the XIV-XV century by the Great = “Mongolian” Empire of Russia, or the Horde, labelled that entire epoch in the history of the Great Empire “jugum tartaricum”, or “the Tartar yoke” (see Dahl’s dictionary – [223]), in the XVII-XVIII century. They were correct in general – however, the reformists of the XVII century have tainted these words with a negative connotation, confusing matters greatly.

As we have already mentioned, the word “igo” exists in the Russian language, and therefore also in Latin. It had initially stood for “power” or “administration” in Russian (according to V. Dahl’s dictionary – see [223]). The name “Igor” may be derived from this word – it was borne by several Russian princes including the son of Rurik. It apparently translates as “Lord” or “Ruler”.

As for the issue of who has really borrowed words from whom, its nature is purely chronological.

7.

OCcidental MOTIFS IN THE RECENT RUSSIAN CULTURAL TRADITION OF THE XVII-XIX CENTURY

According to N. A. Morozov, “Historical science before the XIX century had been serving the ideology of the ruling classes, which one finds perfectly easy to understand. The first records of the affairs of state were made by court chroniclers... As for later compilers, or the orthodox historians of the XVIII-XIX century, they had another typical trait – the kind of patriotism that urges one to trace the history of one’s homeland as far back into the past as possible by all means available.

The Tower of Babel, which we believe to be some edifice from ancient history, owes its existence to such tendencies; it needs to be destroyed completely and replaced by a new scientific history of mankind ... This purpose stipulates going hand in hand with natural sciences, which is what I have attempted to achieve insofar as the ancient history is concerned. Now I intend to speak pro domo suo – on behalf of my own homeland, that is” ([547]).

N. A. Morozov proceeds to voice his theory of the Western origins of many Russian cultural elements. However, according to our reconstruction, all the oc-

cidental motifs that he lists have only been associated with Russian history since the XVII century, after the enthronement of the Romanovs, and especially the creation of the “gateway to Europe” in the reign of Peter the Great, when the occupation regime drowned Russia in the deluge of Western innovations.

On the other hand, common elements shared by the respective cultures of Russia and the Western Europe may be a consequence of the Great = “Mongolian” Conquest, when the Horde, or Russia, expanded its power to the West.

8.

THE MEDIAEVAL GEOGRAPHY OF EUROPE AND RUSSIA

In the epoch of the Great = “Mongolian Empire”, the Ottoman (or Ataman) Empire and Russia, or the Horde, were close allies, or two parts of a single Empire. Hence the following observations of N. A. Morozov:

“In Bulgaria ... there is still a town called Tatar-Bazardjik (or simply “bazarchik”, “small bazaar”, on River Maritsa; population, sixteen thousand). There is also the Bulgarian town of Tatar-Konchak next to the estuary of the Dniester, with several thousand inhabitants” ([547]).

Everything is perfectly correct. The strong Ottoman, or Ataman influence has always been felt everywhere in Bulgaria; this is a known fact. It is little wonder that the Bulgarian toponymy has preserved the old name of the Turks – Tartars. Morozov himself was confronted by the obvious link between the two, pointing out that in Georgia, for instance, the word “Tartar” was commonly used for referring to the Turks”.

N. A. Morozov tells us further: “Right next to this area in the region of the Danube we find the Upper Tatra Mountains (Upper Tartars?) at the border of Galitsiya, Moravia and Hungary, whose main peaks are called Gerlakhovka, Lomenitskiy Verkh and Ledenitskiy Verkh. They are taller than 2600 metres above sea level. To their south we find the Lower Tatra Mountains (Lower Tartars), also known as the Lithuanian Tatra and the Zvolensk Alps, whose main peak, Dumber, is 2045 metres above sea level” ([547]).

Everything appears to be correct. The Czech Republic, likewise Prussia, or P-Russia, had once been part of the Great = "Mongolian" Empire; this fact became reflected in the name of the mountain range. The toponymy of the Estonian city of Tartu might be the same.

According to the Russian chronicles, the Tartars were also called Pechenegi. For instance, when the Lavrentyevskaya Chronicle reports the invasion of the Tartars, it tells us of "the advent of strangers unknown to anyone; some call them Tatars, others, Tatars and Pechenegi".

N. A. Morozov is of the following opinion: "The name Pechenegi is distinctly Slavonic phonetically. It can be translated as 'The Oven Country People'. There was an actual country by that name."

"Let us recollect the county of Pest (Pest-Pilis) in Hungary (between the Danube and Tissa), whose capital is called Budapest. The name 'Pest' is but a slightly distorted version of the Russian word for 'oven', which is 'pech'; this is also confirmed by the German name for Pest – 'Ofen', which also translates as 'oven'" ([547]).

However, Hungary was by no means the only country to have ovens. The "vast land with ovens galore" can easily be identified as mediaeval Russia, where there was an oven in every household, stipulated by the rough climate of Russia. It is indeed a "land of ovens", and some of the chroniclers may have educed the name of this land's people from the word "oven", or "pech" – hence "Pechenegi".

The name Budapest may still reflect this fact. To Morozov, it meant that the Pechenegi should be identified as the Hungarians, and the Hungarians exclusively. We suggest a more plausible version, namely, that the Pechenegi may be identified as the inhabitants of a country that had a large number of ovens, or Russia, as well as a number of adjacent territories, including Hungary, in particular. The obvious superimposition of the Pechenegi over the Russians identifies the mediaeval Russia, or the Horde, as the Great = "Mongolian" Empire once again.

N. A. Morozov contemplates about this matter: "Where should we search for Khazaria, also known as Tmutarakan? The last word is obviously Greek – 'Thema Turokanae', or the 'Turkish Autonomy', the latter word a translation of the Greek word 'thema',

which was used for referring to the Byzantine provinces in the Middle Ages" ([547]).

We already mentioned Khazaria, or the land of the Khazars, also known as the Kozars and the Cosacks (see also CHRON5, Chapter 3:9). Tmutarakan is the old name of Astrakhan. In the reign of Ivan the Terrible it was widely believed that Astrakhan had once "been known as Tmutarakan" ([183], Volume 2, page 28). Astrakhan, or Tmutarakan, used to belong to the domain of Vladimir the Holy (ibid).

"The name Hebrew ('Hebreu' in French) means the same as 'Jever', 'Heber' and 'Guever'. The Spanish peninsula is still called 'Iberian', or 'Hebraic' (Jewish); we find River Ebro here – Hebraic, or Jewish, river. The same applies to Gibraltar – Gibr Altar, or 'Jewish Altar', let alone the vast array of other examples of Biblical toponymy...

The word 'Galilee' ... formerly known to nobody in the area of the modern Palestine in Asia had stood for Gaul in the Middle Ages, or the area that lays to the north of the Iberian (Jewish) Peninsula.

As for Canaan in Galilee, it can be identified as Cannes in Gaul, or the French city of Cannes. This is where Christ performed his first miracle, the transformation of water into red wine, as the Gospels are telling us. This city still exists under the very same name; there is a large number of vineyards here...

The Evangelical Zion still exists under the name of Siennes (Tuscany, Italy)" ([547]).

Let us point out that a large city called Zion still exists in modern Switzerland, on River Rhone, right next to Lake Geneva.

Romanovian history is trying to convince us that Russia was conquered by enigmatic "Tartar and Mongol" nomadic nations.

However, N. A. Morozov was perfectly correct to point out that nomadic nations could hardly act as the conquerors of large cultivated areas or civilized nations.

He wrote: "The very way of life typical for the nomadic nations prescribes them to remain scattered across vast uncultivated areas and form individual patriarchal tribes incapable of organised action, which requires economical centralisation – namely, taxation that could provide for enough resources to keep a large army of unmarried adults. As for nomadic nations – they resemble agglomerations of molecules,

since every patriarchal tribe tries to get as far as possible from another seeking more pastures for their herds.

A group of several thousand nomads must also imply a herd of several thousand cows and horses, and even more sheep belonging to different patriarchs. All the pastures in the vicinity of such a congregation would soon become depleted, and the entire host would have to divide into the former small patriarchal groups and scatter so as to eschew daily migration.

This is why the very theory of a large nomadic nation being capable of organised collective action such as a successful military campaign against a non-migrant nation needs to be rejected as pure fantasy, unless a whole nomadic nation was threatened by some natural cataclysm and swarmed its neighbours – like desert sand burying an oasis.

However, even in Sahara, no large oasis ever becomes buried in the sand completely; each one is restored after the hurricane was over. Similarly, the whole bulk of documented history doesn't contain a single true account of a nomadic nation conquering a civilised country, whereas the reverse has happened many a time.

This is why no such event could have taken place in the prehistoric past, either. All these migrations of nations should be rendered to the mere drifting of their names, or rulers at best – from the more civilised countries to the less civilised, and never vice versa" ([547]).

9.

N. A. MOROZOV ON THE SOLAR AND LUNAR ECLIPSES DESCRIBED IN RUSSIAN CHRONICLES

N. A. Morozov demonstrated that no chronicle descriptions of "Russian eclipses" that predate 1064 A.D. can be verified astronomically. The first description of an eclipse that may be confirmed by astronomy to some extent pertains to 1064; however, this eclipse was only visible from Egypt and some areas of Europe – not Russia. References to eclipses found in Russian chronicles can only be confirmed astronomically from the XIII century onward. Millierian chronology of Russian history only begins to

make sense to an astronomer starting with this period.

As we have discovered in the course of our own research (see CHRON1-CHRON3),

Scaligerian chronology of Europe, the Mediterranean region, Egypt and other countries has been more or less veracious starting with the XIII-XIV century A.D. However, it was afflicted by the centenarian chronological shift that only ceased to manifest after the XVI century. Therefore, the breakpoint in Russian chronology falls over the XIII century, likewise the chronology of every other European country.

N. A. Morozov continues: "Let us now use the astronomical verification method. As I mentioned above, the first 200 years of 'The Initial Pseudo-Chronicle' neither contain any eclipses, be they solar or lunar, nor a single comet, and only describe three or four astronomical phenomena that can be verified by calculation.

I have already pointed out the following: 'The very same year [in 1102 – N. M.] there was an eclipse of the moon, on the fifth day of the month of February'.

The 5th February is indeed the date of the full moon, and one would only be justified to expect a lunar eclipse if one's knowledge of astronomy wavered... However, in reality, or according to the precise astronomical calculations available to us today, this eclipse only took place two lunar cycles later, namely, on 5 April 1102, with a significant maximal phase of 9"2, around 8 AM Kiev time, when the moon was already setting.

How could the author have mentioned a nonexistent eclipse in February without saying a word about the real thing two months later?

Wrong name of the month? This could serve as an explanation – however, in the XIV century, the epoch that the first Russian chronicles need to be dated to ... there were three eclipses in a row by the 19-year cycle, all of them taking place on 5 February – in 1319, 1338 and 1357.

These eclipses were visible perfectly well in every Slavic country of the Eastern Europe – right after sundown, when the moon had just risen" ([547]).

Could this first reference to a lunar eclipse really date from the XIV century? In this case, the first Russian chronicle shall begin its account with a date that postdates the consensual by several hundred years.

N. A. Morozov continues as follows:

“At any rate, the lunar eclipse of 5 February 1102 has been recorded erroneously. Yet it is the only one in the chronicle.

Let us now consider the solar eclipses. The chronicle is traditionally believed to span the time that comprises 10 solar eclipses, full or annular, observed in the Dnepr area of Russia and with large enough phases to be observable from Kiev. They are as follows:

939-VII-19, significant for Kiev, before midday. Not described in the chronicle.

945-IX-9, significant for Kiev, in the morning. Not described in the chronicle.

970-V-8, significant for Kiev, in the morning. Not described in the chronicle.

986-VII-9, total in Kiev before sundown. Not described in the chronicle.

990-X-21, almost total in Kiev after midday. Not described in the chronicle.

1021-VIII-11, almost total in Kiev after midday. Not described in the chronicle.

1033-VI-29, significant for Kiev after midday. Not described in the chronicle.

1065-IV-8, hardly visible from Kiev, yet observable in Egypt and in Greece and Sicily (in a small phase). Described in the chronicle.

This is very strange indeed, since the implication is that the chronicler was based in Egypt, or, at the very least, in Italy or Greece. Kiev is right out of the question, though.

1091-V-21, significant for Kiev in the morning. Described in the chronicle.

1098-XII-25, significant for Kiev in the evening, right on Christmas day. Not described in the chronicle.

Therefore, it turns out that the only eclipses mentioned by the author are the ones that fall over the 21 May of 1091 and the 8 April of 1065, although the latter was hardly visible from Kiev. The rest are missing, although they must have been a great deal more ominous for the inhabitants of Kiev and the entire Dnepr area of Russia...

It is impossible to assume that every eclipse mentioned herein took place in cloudy weather – even in that case, one would need to point out “total darkness descending during the day”; an even less plau-

sible assumption is that the Kiev monk that wrote the chronicle slept through the eclipse. Therefore, the very absence of such indications from Nestor's chronicles implies that it is of a much later origin than the last event it describes, and that it wasn't compiled from some Slavonic chronicles that became lost initially, but is an independent source which is partially based on the West Slavonic annals.

First of all, I must point out that the solar eclipse of 21 May 1091 was described by the Lavrentyevskaya Chronicle correctly – this is the very chronicle that I was using for reference. It says the following:

“This year [6599 according to the chronicle and 1091 in modern chronology – N. M.] there was an omen in the Sun, which had acted as though it were dying, looking thin as the crescent of a moon, in the second hour after noon, on the 21st day of May’.

This eclipse really fell over 21 May, and it took place at 8:30 Kiev time; about 4/5 of the solar diameter became obscured.

However, the most peculiar thing is that the III Manuscript of Novgorod uses the very same words as it describes the eclipse in question: “This year there was an omen in the Sun, and it behaved as though it were dying, looking thin as the crescent of a moon, in the second hour after noon, on the 21st day of May’.

Yet this account is misdated by 13 years and ascribed to 6586, or the year 1078 in our chronology, when there was no eclipse in Russia. How could an eyewitness have written this?

The same account was copied by the Pskov Chronicle and the Voskresenskaya Chronicle – in the same words, but dating to 6596 (or 1088), predating itself by 3 years. The only eclipse that happened then was the one of 20 July, and it was only observable from the North Pole.

The so-called “Chronicle of Nikon” dates it to 6601, two years later than it actually happened (1093 instead of 1091 in modern chronology). There was an eclipse observable well from the entire Western Russia, however, it occurred on 23 September and not 21 May.

Let me now finish my account of the eclipses that are so conspicuously missing from the manuscripts of Nestor and Sylvester.

Consider the attached table for a list of further eclipses, taken from the book of Daniil Svyatskiy entitled “Astronomical Events in Russian Chronicles”

written in 1915, when he was still a staff member of the Astronomical Department of the Lesgaft National Scientific Institute, accompanied by M. A. Vilyev, another colleague of mine from the same institution.

The initiative of compiling this source belonged to Academician A. A. Shakhmatov, who had asked me to do it a while ago; I was forced to delegate the task to my assistants Vilyev and Svyatskiy due to the shortage of time.

However, neither Shakhmatov, nor Svyatskiy, nor Vilyev had the courage to draw the self-implied conclusions from this comparison. Suffice to study my table [N. A. Morozov's tables are reproduced below – Auth.]. It contains all 27 centuries filled with more or less unusual celestial events, presumably recorded by many generations of learned monks from Kiev.

It is plainly visible that there isn't a single eclipse record anywhere on the 212-year interval between 852, which is when they have allegedly started their "chronicle", and 1065, even though eclipses were considered important omens by our ancestors, who knew nothing of the mechanism behind them. Although the first eclipse was recorded correctly, the eclipse of 1064 only got a passing reference, as though it was a distant recollection:

"Before this time [6572 "since Genesis", or 1064 – N. M.] the sun did blacken, and did not shine, but rather hung there as a crescent. The ignorant believed it had been devoured"

Moreover, the observer of this event needed to be located somewhere in the Mediterranean region and not in Kiev!

Next we have the eclipse of 1091, which different

copies date to different years – once again, it seems to be recorded after somebody's accounts as opposed to actual observations.

However, once we get to the parts that serve as the "extension" of the initial chronicle, whose records I managed to trace up until the year 1650, we see an altogether different picture. Almost a half of the eclipses visible from Russia in a sufficiently large phase are mentioned correctly ... the absence of the rest can be explained by cloudy weather. However, we can by no means assume that Kiev had remained obscured by clouds in the preceding 200 years between 850 and 1064, or even 1091. A similar average number of solar eclipses were probably observed during those years as well, and if Nestor (or Sylvester) had indeed based his chronicle on the accounts of his predecessors, he would have copied the records of the eclipses that terrified them so.

Since he had no such records at his disposal, there weren't any others, either, which makes every account of Nestor's semi-figmental and dates his lifetime to the beginning of the XIII century, or an even earlier epoch" ([547]).

"Semi-Figmental" is hardly the word to use here – we are referring to a simple chronicle that was in fact compiled several centuries later than it is generally claimed to be (in the XVI-XVII century). The epochs it describes are a great deal closer to our time. The chronicle was also edited heavily under the Romanovs, in the XVII-XVIII century.

Let us reproduce the tables of the solar and lunar eclipses compiled by N. A. Morozov after the Russian chronicles.

Table 1. A visual statistical comparison of solar eclipses marked in pseudo-Nestor's pseudo-chronicle with the accounts provided by his alleged descendants (the very first chroniclers in reality).

NESTOR'S CHRONICLE CONTINUED				NESTOR'S CHRONICLE	
<i>Eclipse year according to the chronicle</i>	<i>Time scale</i>	<i>Eclipse year according to the chronicle</i>	<i>Time scale</i>	<i>Eclipse year according to the chronicle</i>	<i>Time scale</i>
1386		1113 & 1115			
	1390		1120		850
1399		1122 & 1124			
	1400		1130		860

NESTOR'S CHRONICLE CONTINUED				NESTOR'S CHRONICLE	
<i>Eclipse year according to the chronicle</i>	<i>Time scale</i>	<i>Eclipse year according to the chronicle</i>	<i>Time scale</i>	<i>Eclipse year according to the chronicle</i>	<i>Time scale</i>
1406		1131 & 1133			
	1410	1140	1140		870
1415		1146 & 1147			
	1420		1150		880
1426					
	1430		1160		890
1433		1162			
	1440		1170		900
	1450		1180		910
		1185 & 1187			
1460	1460		1190		920
	1470		1200		930
1476 & 1475		1207			
	1480		1210		940
1486 & 1487					
	1490		1220		950
1491					
	1500	1230	1230		960
		1236			
	1510		1240		970
	1520		1250		980
	1530		1260		990
1533					
1540	1540	1270	1270		1000
1544					
	1550		1280		1010
		1283			
	1560		1290		1020
1563					
1567	1570		1300		1030
	1580		1310		1040
	1590		1320		1050
		1321			
	1600		1330		1060
1605		1331		1064?	
	1610		1340		1070
	1620		1350		1080
	1630		1360		1090
		1361 & 1366		1091	
	1640		1370		1100
1645		1375		1106	
	1650		1380		1110

Table 2. A visual statistical comparison of lunar eclipses marked in pseudo-Nestor's pseudo-chronicle with the accounts provided by his alleged descendants (the very first chroniclers in reality).

NESTOR'S CHRONICLE CONTINUED				NESTOR'S CHRONICLE	
<i>Eclipse year according to the chronicle</i>	<i>Time scale</i>	<i>Eclipse year according to the chronicle</i>	<i>Time scale</i>	<i>Eclipse year according to the chronicle</i>	<i>Time scale</i>
1389*	1390		1120		850
1392*		1122)			
	1400		1130		860
1396* 1395*					
1399*	1410		1140		870
1406* 1403*		1146*			
1407*	1420		1150		880
		1150*			
	1430		1160		890
1432* 1431)		1161*			
1433*	1440		1170		900
	1450		1180		910
1461* 1460)	1460		1190		920
1468* 1465*					
1471*	1470	1200*	1200		930
1477* 1476*		1208*			
	1480		1210		940
	1490		1220		950
	1500		1230		960
	1510		1240		970
	1520		1250		980
		1259)			
	1530		1260		990
1536)					
	1540		1270		1000
		1276*			
	1550	1280*	1280		1010
		1289*			
	1560		1290		1020
1566*		1291*			
	1570		1300		1030
	1580		1310		1040
		1316*			
	1590		1320		1050
	1600		1330		1060
	1610		1340		1070
	1620		1350		1080
1624*					

NESTOR'S CHRONICLE CONTINUED				NESTOR'S CHRONICLE	
<i>Eclipse year according to the chronicle</i>	<i>Time scale</i>	<i>Eclipse year according to the chronicle</i>	<i>Time scale</i>	<i>Eclipse year according to the chronicle</i>	<i>Time scale</i>
	1630	1360*	1360		1090
	1640		1370		1100
1645		1378*			
	1650		1380		1110

* stands for a total eclipse,) stands for an incomplete eclipse.

N. A. Morozov tells us more: “In 945 A.D., the ‘Novgorod Synodal Copy Chronicle’ begins to reproduce its own considerations as contained in the Radzivilovskaya copy.

However, starting with 1015 A.D. we see a much smaller number of such complete duplicates. Gradually, they became replaced by figmental accounts, sometimes pure fantasy. This is what we have for 1107 A.D., for instance:

‘The year of 6615. Earth shaking on 5 February’.

More for 1230: ‘The year of 6738. The Earth shook on the Friday of the fifth week from the Great day, at noon, when lunchtime was due’.

The Troitsko-Sergievskaya copy made by the Muscovite Ecclesiastic Academy also reports: ‘In the year 6738 (=1230) the Earth shook and the Sun darkened’.

Indeed, on 14 May 1230 A.D. there was an eclipse of the Sun in the Baltic region, observable as a total eclipse in Sweden.

However, there are no earthquakes in either Novgorod the Great or Moscow, which means the records were copied from some southern chronicle, if not altogether figmental” ([547]).

References to earthquakes as given by the Russian chronicle once again confirm our idea that there was a “Byzantine layer” absorbed by the early Russian chronicles. Byzantium is a region afflicted by earthquakes, some of them quite formidable.

10. N. A. MOROZOV ON THE RECORDS OF COMET OBSERVATION IN RUSSIAN CHRONICLES

N. A. Morozov should have thought better than to trust the West European and Chinese records of comet observations in the Middle Ages. In CHRON5, Chapter 5, we shall explain in detail why their Scalligerian datings are unreliable.

The irregular periods of comet observations, comet Halley being no exception, as well as the vague descriptions and the extraordinarily high record frequency of figmental comet sightings in the ancient times, make it impossible to use comet records for the dating of documents. In particular, our analysis of Chinese and European comet rosters demonstrates that the records of Comet Halley observations have been fabricated and should in no case be used for chronological verification purposes, qv in CHRON5, Chapter 5.

Nevertheless, we reproduce the Russian chronicle comet sighting review of N. A. Morozov as potentially valuable reference material.

According to N. A. Morozov, “asterisks mark the dates when Comet Halley was [allegedly – Auth.] sighted. Brackets < > refer to the sightings of [the alleged – Auth.] Comet Halley as recorded in Byzantine chronicles” ([547]).

Table 3. A visual statistical comparison of comet sightings recorded in the *Nachalnaya Chronicle* with the sightings reported by the alleged successors of the scribes (the original scribes in reality).

NIKON'S CHRONICLE CONTINUED				NIKON'S CHRONICLE	
<i>Years of comet sightings in the chronicle</i>	<i>Time axis</i>	<i>Years of comet sightings in the chronicle</i>	<i>Time axis</i>	<i>Years of comet sightings in the chronicle</i>	<i>Time axis</i>
	1390		1120		850
1402	1400		1130		860
	1410	1145*	1140		870
	1420		1150		880
	1430		1160		890
	1440		1170		900
None*	1450		1180	<912>*	910
1468	1460		1190		920
1472	1470		1200		930
	1480		1210		940
1490	1490	1222*	1220		950
1500?	1500		1230		960
	1510		1240		970
1520?	1520		1250	<989>*	980
1531*	1530	1264	1260		990
1532	1540	1266?	1270		1000
1533	1550		1280		1010
1556	1560		1290		1020
	1570	1301*	1300		1030
1580	1580		1310		1040
1585	1590		1320		1050
	1600		1330	<1064>* instead of 1066	1060
None*	1610		1340		1070
1618	1620		1350		1080
	1630	1366	1360		1090
	1640		1370	1100?	1100
	1650	1382?	1380	1105?	1110