

There are several versions regarding the date of Dionysius the Little's death in the 6th c. A.D., viz., c. 540, c. 556, etc. I. Scaliger's and D. Petavius' chronology was born from the controversy surrounding these problems in the 16–17th cc. A.D. Their version was not unique (see above De Arcilla, J. Hardouin, I. Newton). The question arises: why do the rulers coincident under parallels have, mostly, different names? The answer is that ancient names are nicknames rather than names in the modern sense of the word; therefore, they all possess a meaningful translation, e.g., “enlightened”, “powerful”, etc.

It can also be asked why the medieval texts of, say, the 12th c. A.D. contain the names of personages whose originals turn out to have lived, e.g., in the 15th c. A.D. according to the GCD. The answer is that either they should be applied as nicknames to another historical character, or the 12th-c. document with the name is, actually, of later origin, because, e.g., the 330-year shift could as well “lower” the documents from the 15th c. to the 12th c. A.D.

The preserved ancient medieval chronicles are of multilayer character. They were obtained as compositions of individual fragments in the dating which the above errors could be made. The events from different epochs and occurring at different times could thereby be “frozen” into a unified narrative jet.

## 6. Some Other Independent Proofs of the Existence of Three Basic GCD Chronological Shifts

### 6.1. The list of Roman popes as the spinal column of medieval Roman history

In 1981, I applied the above method to the set of popes (pontifices) ordered in time. This list embraces (if dated traditionally) the period from the 1st c. A.D. until the present time [74], [119]. However, according to the results I gathered and ordered on the GCD, it contains duplicates and repetitions (as well as the whole of ancient and medieval history up to the 13th c. A.D.). In other words, it is, probably, the result of repeated overlappings and gluing of several copies of the shorter list of popes, who allegedly lived later. Recall that the basic shifts generating the “lowering” of medieval documents from the 10–17th cc. A.D. are those by c. 333, 1,053 and 1,778 ( $\approx 1,800$ ) years. Since the list of popes embraces the period from the 1st c. A.D. until the present day, i.e., is substantially shorter than, say, that of the whole of Roman history until the 17th c. A.D., the greatest shift by c. 1,800 years does not show itself inside the list. Therefore, the basic shifts involved in forming the list of popes are those by 333 and 1,053 years, and also, possibly, their difference, the 720-year shift (see the GCD in Fig. 65). It is important that applying the above method to the list of popes yields consequences fully consistent with the conclusions made on the basis of the other methods discussed above.

The well-known list of popes is the spinal column of medieval Roman history (along with the list of emperors). Today's list is based on the *Liber Pontificalis*, whose origin can be reliably traced into antiquity to not earlier than the 13th c. A.D. [44]. We have also used the data of [74], [44], [119], [13]. The history of the first