

is based on the date of compilation of the *Easter Book*.

Conclusion. "As a rough approximation" contemporary dating of the Council of Nicaea existed as an "insufficiently well-founded hypothesis" in the 14th century already. Its "scientific" grounds are connected with the astronomic contents of the *Easter Book*. Therefore, *today's traditional "scientific" dating of the Council of Nicaea is a dating from the Easter Book. This dating is based on an insufficiently thorough analysis of the matter.*

1.10. *The main conclusions.* Thus, we have shown that:

1) The *Easter Book*, based on events of astronomic nature, "contains" the date of its compilation (that is, it admits independent dating);

2) This date is later than is usually assumed: it is at least a few centuries later than 325 A.D.;

3) This very date, not the now accepted in Scaliger's chronology, was known in Constantinople in the 14th century and, consequently, is a part of the Orthodox tradition.

2. The Birth of Christ and 1 A.D.

2.1. *History of the problem.* It is well known that no continuous count of the years was done from the first year A.D. till nowadays. The first year of the Christian era was calculated much later than the year of the birth of Christ. It is considered that the Roman monk Dionysius Exiguus (= the Little) was the first who calculated this year in the 6th century, more than 500 years after the event he dated. Moreover, Dionysius first calculated the date of the First Easter (the resurrection of Christ), and then used the legend according to which Christ was crucified on the 31st year since his incarnation. The date of the First Easter, according to Dionysius, falls on March 25, 5539 since Adam, and the year of the birth of Christ, consequently, is 5508 since Adam (in the Byzantine era; all other eras "since the creation of the world" appeared later, when the era "since the birth of Christ" had been already commonly accepted).

The calculations of Dionysius gave rise to doubts in the West up to the 15th century, and they were never considered canonical in Byzantium.

"This era (of Dionysius) was approved in 607 A.D. by Pope Boniface IV, and it appears also in documents of Pope John XII (965–972). But since the time of Pope Eugeny IV (1431), the era "since the birth of Christ" is used regularly in documents of the popes' chancellery ... The discussion on the date of the birth of Christ continued in Constantinople right up to the 14th century" [335, p. 250].

Moreover, today we know that the calculations of Dionysius are in fact incorrect (because of the insufficient development of astronomy in that time). Its incorrectness was already known in the 16th–17th centuries, and since then several attempts were made to recalculate after Dionysius and to correct the dates of the birth of Christ and of the First Easter. For example, one can read in a chronograph of the end of the 17th century:

"There are many (more than 40) opinions concerning the year when Christ was born" [334, sheet 102].

Let us list some of the attempts "to correct Dionysius":

- Christ was resurrected on April 3, 33 A.D., on the 35th year of his life [334, sheet 109];