

opinions of chronology, not always free, as we saw in the case of Matthew Vlastar, of contradictions. I. A. Klimishin writes:

“As for the Eastern Church, it, by evidence of E. Bickermann, avoided using it (the era since the birth of Christ) because the controversy concerning the date of the birth of Christ continued in Constantinople till the 14th century. But probably there were some exceptions. Thus, in the table of Easter dates, compiled in the 9th century for the whole of the 13th indiction (877–1408) by Iohann Presbyter, the years since the birth of Christ were indicated together with the years since the creation of the world, the moon and sun circles and epacts” [335, p. 250].

The agreement of this *unfinished and self-contradictory* chronology with the chronology of Scaliger, which is still accepted today, shows that exactly this chronology, due to Scaliger and his school, served as a basis for the chronological scale of ancient and medieval history we are using today. Figure 131 compares the modern chronology (Scaliger's), the original equinox chronology of Matthew Vlastar, i.e., the chronology of Matthew Vlastar after the correction of one of his two mistakes, namely, the mistake in the rate of the shift of the spring point (note that this causes the lifetime of Vlastar himself to move to the 6th century A.D., where modern chronology “places” Dionysius the Little) and, finally, the equinox chronology of Matthew Vlastar after the correction of both of his mistakes, i.e., the mistake in the rate of the shift of the spring point and the 6-day mistake in the determination of the contemporary equinox.

It can be easily seen that Scaliger's chronology is a “mixture” of Vlastar's original equinox chronology and his equinox chronology with one of the mistakes corrected (compare the second and the third columns in Fig. 131 with the first column). However, Scaliger “specified” all dates, so that they indicated years, months, days, and sometimes hours (!) (modern tradition indicates only the years of Scaliger's dates, omitting the rest). Along with that, for example, in the case of Nabonassar he specified the date within the interval of time as in the original Vlastar's equinox chronology. He “doubled” Vlastar, both leaving him where he was (according to the original equinox chronology—see the second column in Fig. 131) and turning him into Dionysius the Little (by the “half-corrected” chronology in the third column in Fig. 131).

Note that the “completely corrected” equinox chronology of Matthew Vlastar places the most ancient event, the rule of Nabonassar, in the 4th–5th centuries A.D. and gives the interval conforming the above date (the end of the 9th century) for the First Oecumenical Council. But of course, even this “completely corrected” chronology of Vlastar cannot be declared to be close to true unless a thorough investigation is carried out, to say nothing of the “uncorrected” and “half-corrected” versions lying at the basis of the hitherto accepted tradition of Scaliger–Petavius.