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*History: Fiction or Science?* is the most explosive tractate on history ever written – however, every theory it contains, no matter how unorthodox, is backed by solid scientific data.

The dominating historical discourse in its current state was essentially crafted in the XVI century from a rather contradictory jumble of sources such as innumerable *copies* of ancient Latin and Greek manuscripts whose originals had *vanished* in the Dark Ages and the allegedly *irrefutable* proof offered by late mediaeval astronomers, resting upon the power of ecclesial authorities. Nearly all of its components are blatantly untrue!

For some of us, it shall possibly be quite disturbing to see the magnificent edifice of classical history to turn into an ominous simulacrum brooding over the snake pit of mediaeval politics. Twice so, in fact: the first seeing the legendary millenarian dust on the ancient marble turn into a mere layer of dirt – one that meticulous unprejudiced research can eventually remove. The second, and greater, attack of unease comes with
the awareness of just how many areas of human knowledge still trust the elephants, turtles and whales of the consensual chronology to support them. Nothing can remedy that except for an individual chronological revolution happening in the minds of a large enough number of people.
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History is a pack of lies about events that never happened told by people who weren’t there.

George Santayana,
American philosopher
(1863-1952)

Be wary of mathematiciens, particularly when they speak the truth.

St. Augustine

History repeats itself; that’s one of the things that’s wrong with history.

Clarence Darrow

Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past.

George Orwell, 1984
The first stage – the XVI-XX century, when various researchers periodically discovered major inconsistencies in the edifice of the Scaligerian chronology. We shall quote the names of some familiar scientists that dissented with the chronology of Scaliger-Petavius and reckoned that the real ancient and mediaeval chronology differed significantly.

De Arcilla – the XVI century, Professor of the Salamanca University, see Chron1, Chapter 1. The information on his chronological research is of a rather volatile nature, and it was only by accident that N. A. Morozov managed to learn of it. It is known merely that De Arcilla claimed “ancient” history to have been forged in the Middle Ages. However, we regrettably failed to have found any of his works. The Salamanca University could not give us any information about them, either.

Sir Isaac Newton (1643-1727) – the great English scientist, physicist, and mathematician devoted a large part of his life to chronology and published a large volume entitled The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended. To which is Prefix’d, A Short Chronicle from the First Memory of Things in Europe, to the Conquest of Persia by Alexander the Great. See [1298]; more details in Chron1, Chapter 1.

Jean Hardouin (1646-1729) – eminent French scientist and author of a large number of works on philology, theology, history, archaeology, and numismatics. He was also Director of the French Royal Library, and wrote a few chronological works with sharp criticisms of the entire Scaligerian chronology. He was of the opinion that most of the so-called “ancient artefacts” were either counterfeit, or belonged to a much more recent age. See details in Chron7, Appendix 3.
Peter Nikiforovich Krekshin (1684-1763) – the personal secretary of Peter the Great wrote a book criticizing the contemporary version of Roman history. It was “still fresh” in his day and age, and wasn’t taken for granted the way it is today. See details in Chron4, Chapter 14:30.

Robert Baldauf – the German philologist of the late XIX – early XX century. Assistant professor at the Basel University and author of the four volumes entitled History and Criticisms ([1025:1]). He came to the conclusion that the “ancient” literary works had been a lot more recent than one was accustomed to think, guided by philological considerations. Baldauf proved that those works were all mediaeval in their origins. See details in Chron7, Appendix 3.

Edwin Johnson (1842-1901) – English historian of the XIX century, criticized the Scaligerian chronology severely in his works ([1214] and [1215]), claiming that they needed to be truncated drastically. See details in Chron1, Chapter 1.

Nikolai Alexandrovich Morozov (1854-1946) – a prominent Russian scientist and encyclopedist, made a breakthrough in chronological studies. He criticized the Scaligerian version of chronology and history extensively. He offered the concepts of several new natural scientific methods of analyzing chronology and introduced scientific approaches to chronology making the latter a science de facto. See details in Chron1, Chapter 1.

Wilhelm Kammeyer (late XIX century – 1959) – a German scientist and lawyer, developed a method of verifying the authenticity of ancient documents. He discovered nearly all of the ancient and early mediaeval Western European documents to have been either copied or forged in a more recent age. He came to the conclusion that both ancient and mediaeval history were falsified, and wrote several books on the topic.

Immanuel Velikovsky (1895-1979) – a prominent psychoanalyst of Russian origin lived and worked in Russia, the UK, Palestine, Germany, and the USA. He wrote a number of books on ancient history that concerned several contradictions and peculiarities of ancient history. He also made an attempt of explaining them in relation to the Catastrophism
Theory. He is considered to be the founder of the “critical school” in chronology, but what he really did can be regarded as an attempt to protect the Scaligerian chronology from drastic changes, so his inclusion in the list of the founding fathers of the new chronology is rather arbitrary. Velikovsky’s works are much better known than the earlier and more detailed ones by N. A. Morozov; this must have inhibited the development of the new chronology in the Western Europe of the XX century considerably. See details in *Chron7*, Appendix 3.

All in all, one has to state that the precariousness of the Scaligerian chronology was mentioned rather explicitly in the scientific works of the XVII-XIX century. The Scaligerian version of history had been subjected to extended criticisms, and the thesis of the global fabrication of ancient texts and artifacts was formulated. Nevertheless no one with the exception of N. A. Morozov managed to find a way of constructing a proven version of the correct chronology; even his version was hardly based on any substantial evidence, being incomplete and having inherited a number of substantial flaws from the chronology of Scaliger and Petavius.

**The second stage** – first half of the XX century. This stage should doubtlessly be linked to the name of N. A. Morozov. He was the first to have understood and formulated the fundamental idea about Scaligerian chronology being in need of a complete revision, not just the “ante-mundane” part, but also its entire edifice up to the VI century A.D. N. A. Morozov had used a number of innovative natural scientific methods for chronological analysis and quoted a number of indisputable arguments for proving his brilliant idea. The publication of his main works on the revision of the ancient history occurred in 1907-1932 ([542]-[544]). However, he held the erroneous opinion that post-VI century chronology had been basically correct. See details in *Chron1*, Chapter 1:3.

**The third stage** – the period of 1945-1973, can be characterized as one of “deliberate muting”. The historical science tries to cast the chronological research of N. A. Morozov and his predecessors into oblivion. The chronological discussions in Russia cease altogether, and an “alienation
zone” of sorts is created around N. A. Morozov’s works on chronology, whereas in the West, the debate becomes circular and doesn’t venture outside I. Velikovsky’s hypothesis of “Catastrophism.”

The fourth stage – which was the period of 1973-1980, commenced in 1973, when A. T. Fomenko, faculty member of the Department of Mathematics and Mechanics of the Moscow State University, was researching several problems related to celestial mechanics. He had noticed the 1972 article of the American astrophysicist Robert Newton ([1303]), where the latter described a strange leap in lunar acceleration, and the so-called parameter \( D'' \). The leap occurred around the X century A.D. Using the Scaligerian datings of the writings that make reference to lunar and solar eclipses, R. Newton computed lunar acceleration as a time function on the interval of the I-XX century A.D. The leap in question comprises an entire mathematical order (!), and cannot be explained by the gravitational theory in any way. It was the issue of the discussion organized by the Royal Society of London and the British Academy of Sciences in 1972, and one that had spawned major controversy ([1453]). The discussion had failed to elucidate the situation in any way, and so R. Newton suggested to attribute the leap to certain mysterious extra-gravitational forces in the Earth-Moon system.

A. T. Fomenko noted that all the attempts of explaining the gap in the behaviour of \( D'' \) failed to raise the issue of the veracity of the eclipse datings that were the actual basis for R. Newton’s calculations. However, despite the fact that A. T. Fomenko was well outside the paradigm of historical research back in the day, he had heard that N. A. Morozov offered some new datings of the “ancient” eclipses in his work entitled Christ, published in 1924-1932. It has to be said that A. T. Fomenko’s initial attitude towards N. A. Morozov’s works was rather sceptical and based on whatever random information he had received on the subjects during informal discussions with fellow faculty members. Nevertheless, having overcome his scepticism, A. T. Fomenko unearthed an astronomical table by N. A. Morozov that contained the new datings and
performed a new calculation of the parameter $D''$ using the same algorithm offered by R. Newton. He was amazed to discover the disappearance of the mysterious leap and the transformation of the $D''$ diagram into an even, practically horizontal line. A. T. Fomenko’s work on the topic was published in 1980 ([883]).

However, the elimination of the enigma from celestial mechanics led to another question of paramount importance: what was one supposed to do with the chronology of the ancient times in this case? The eclipse dates were supposed to be evidentially linked to a vast array of historical materials. Since N. A. Morozov’s works helped to solve a complex celestial mechanics problem, A. T. Fomenko decided to study them in more detail. The only professor from the MSU Department of Mathematics and Mechanics to have had Morozov’s *Christ*, already a bibliographical curiosity by that time, in his possession, was M. M. Postnikov. He was interested in N. A. Morozov’s research and occasionally told his colleagues about it. In 1974, A. T. Fomenko approached M. M. Postnikov with the suggestion of reading a series of introductory lectures on N. A. Morozov’s works. M. M. Postnikov had acquiesced after a brief hesitation, and read five lectures for a group of mathematicians that worked in the MSU Department of Mathematics and Mechanics later the same year.

As a result, a group of mathematicians developed an interest in chronological problems, regarding them from the point of view of applied mathematics. It became obvious that the complexity of this issue demanded the development of new independent methods of dating. Hence the main focus in 1973-1980 was on developing methods of analyzing historical texts that were based on mathematical statistics, a number of which was proposed and formulated by A. T. Fomenko in 1975-1979. They allowed for the elucidation of the global picture of chronological misdatings in Scaliger’s version and elimination. More specifically, A. T. Fomenko had discovered three important chronological shifts, of roughly 333 years, 1053, and 1800 years respectively. These shifts are only inherent in the erroneous chronology of Scaliger-Petavius, and have nothing to do
with the correct one. It turned out that “the Scaligerian textbook” was compiled from four copies of one and the same brief chronicle.

The first scientific publications on this topic were composed and prepared for publishing in 1973-1980. The fifth stage – 1980-1990 can be characterized by the publication of articles on the new methods of dating and achieved chronological results in specialized periodicals dedicated to pure and applied mathematics. The first publications on the topic were the two articles by A. T. Fomenko ([883] and [884]) published in 1980, as well as the preprint by A. T. Fomenko and M. M. Postnikov ([681]), published the same year. In 1981 a young mathematician by the name of G. V. Nosovskiy, specializing in probability theory and mathematical statistics, actively joined the new chronology research. This period saw the publication of several dozens of scientific articles on independent empirical-statistical and astronomical methods in chronology. They were written by A. T. Fomenko, either alone or in collaboration with the mathematicians G. V. Nosovskiy, V. V. Kalashnikov, S. T. Rachev, V. V. Fyodorov, and N. S. Kellin (see Bibliography).

It has to be mentioned that the research was supported by Academician E. P. Velikhov, the physicist that proposed two of A. T. Fomenko’s articles with the description of methods and a global picture of chronological misdatings to be submitted to the Doklady AN SSSR (a periodical of the USSR Academy of Sciences), and Academician Y. V. Prokhorov, the mathematician who had done the same for two articles by A. T. Fomenko, V. V. Kalashnikov, and G. V. Nosovskiy on the issue of dating Ptolemy’s Almagest.

A. T. Fomenko made reports concerning the new dating methods at scientific seminars on mathematics conducted by Academician V. S. Vladimirov, Academician A. A. Samarsky, Academician O. A. Oleynik, and Corresponding Member S. V. Yablonsky, as well as a scientific seminar on history conducted by Academician I. D. Kovalchenko, a specialist on applying mathematical methods to history, who was
genuinely interested in those methods and claimed that historians needed to delve deeper into chronology issues.

Over the period of 1980-1990, A. T. Fomenko, G. V. Nosovskiy, and V. V. Kalashnikov presented their reports on the new methods of independent dating at a number of scientific conferences on mathematics.

The position of Academician A. N. Kolmogorov in this respect is most interesting. When A. T. Fomenko was presenting a scientific report on the new methods of dating at the Third International Conference on Probability Theory and Mathematical Statistics in Vilnius, 1981, A. N. Kolmogorov came to the presentation and spent the entire forty-plus minutes that it took standing in the back of the hall, having strategically chosen a spot where he wouldn’t be seen from the hall, retaining the ability to see and hear everything that was going on at the blackboard. A. N. Kolmogorov departed immediately after the presentation and did not approach the person at the blackboard. It has to be said that A. N. Kolmogorov’s health was already quite frail by that time, and being forced to stand for forty minutes must have taken a considerable effort on his part.

Later on, in Moscow, A. N. Kolmogorov invited A. T. Fomenko over to his residence and inquired whether he could borrow any of his publications on chronology. He was given a brief 100-page essay written by A. T. Fomenko in 1979 that had circulated around as a manuscript prior to its publication as a preprint in 1981 ([888]). Apart from that, A. T. Fomenko had given A. N. Kolmogorov a more exhaustive 500-page typewritten text on the topic. In two weeks’ time, A. N. Kolmogorov invited A. T. Fomenko to converse with him once again. During the two-hour discussion it became clear that A. N. Kolmogorov had made a thorough study of the materials. He had asked a large number of questions, and his primary concern was about the dynastical parallelisms between the ancient dynasties, including the biblical ones, and those of the Middle Ages. He said he was frightened by the possibility of a radical reconstruction of several modern conceptions based on ancient history. He
had no objections to the legitimacy of the methods. Finally, A. N. Kolmogorov gave the 500-page text back to A. T. Fomenko and asked whether he could keep the 100-page essay as a present. The request was complied with.

One has to add the following report that A. T. Fomenko received orally from one of the partakers of the conversation that is to be described below. A while ago, Professor M. M. Postnikov submitted an article with an overview of N. A. Morozov’s chronological research in a journal titled *Uspekhi Matematicheskikh Nauk* (The Successes of Mathematical Sciences). The following dispute among members of the journal’s editing board, among them Academicians P. S. Alexandrov and A. N. Kolmogorov, ensued. A. N. Kolmogorov refused so much as to touch the article, saying something along the lines of “This article is to be rejected. I spent enough time and effort fighting Morozov in the days of yore.” However, he added the following: “And yet we shall all look perfectly idiotic if it turns out that Morozov was right.” The article was rejected.

This conversation sheds some light on the events of the days when N. A. Morozov’s research was practically vetoed. Today we are being convinced that everything had happened “automatically” and that N. A. Morozov’s research was of little enough interest to have been forgotten by everyone in a short time. We are now beginning to understand that the forces opposing N. A. Morozov were all the more formidable to have needed the assistance of A. N. Kolmogorov. It is also noteworthy that A. N. Kolmogorov considered it possible for N. A. Morozov to have been correct.

Apparently, ever since the time N. A. Morozov’s research was cast into oblivion, historians have been constantly bothered by the possibility of someone resuming it. It is hard to find another explanation for the peculiar fact that as early as 1977, when the research conducted by the Moscow State University mathematicians was in its earliest stages without any publications on the topic, the *Communist* magazine published an article by A. Manfred, Doctor of History, with a severe criticism of “the new
mathematical methods” in history. The names of the methods’ authors weren’t mentioned, but the implications were perfectly clear. A. Manfred wrote the following: “If these ‘young’ scientists are given any degree of liberty at all, they will drown the book market in summaries of numeric data. The ‘new’ tendencies need to be overcome by scrupulous critical analysis, since they are holding back the progress of global historical science…” (Communist, July 1977, issue 10, pages 106-114).

In 1981, immediately after our first publications on chronology had come out, the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences gathered for a special session on June 29, 1981, the criticism of our work being its main objective. The Learned Secretary of the History Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Cand. Hist. Sci. V. V. Volkov, and the Learned Secretary of the Principal Tendencies of Human Society Development Council of the History Department of the Academy N. D. Loutzkov sent A. T. Fomenko an official note saying, among other things, that: “The Department’s session took place on 29 June, 1981, conducted by the Vice Academician Secretary of the Department, Academician Y. V. Bromley… Your conclusions were sharply criticized by the specialists of six humanities institutes as well as the staff members of the Sternberg Institute of Astronomy” (8 May 1984).

The most vehement criticisms of the 1981 session belonged to the Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Z. V. Udaltsova, and the chairwoman of the commission, Y. S. Goloubtsova, both of them historians. Y. S. Goloubtsova was in charge of a special commission of historians that had been assembled to analyze our works. The materials of this discussion have provided the basis for a series of articles with harsh criticisms of our research in various historical periodicals.

A similar “discussion” recurred in 1998-1999, as shall be mentioned below.

The sixth stage – the post-1990 period. It can be characterized as “the stage of publishing books on new chronology.” This is when the books
that covered our chronological research, as well as those containing derived hypotheses about what pre-XVII century history had really looked like, started to appear. The first book on this topic was A. T. Fomenko’s *Methods of Statistical Analysis of Narrative Texts and their Application to Chronology* (MSU Publishing, 1990). The foreword was written by A. N. Shiryaev, President of the International Bernoulli Society for Mathematical Statistics and Probability Theory in 1989-1991, Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Doctor of Physics and Mathematics, Head of the Probability Theory Studies Section of the Moscow State University Department of Mathematics and Mechanics, Head of the Probability Theory and Mathematical Statistics Department of the V. A. Steklov Mathematics Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

It has to be mentioned that this book was supposed to have been published much earlier. It was already typeset by the Publishing House of the Saratov University in 1983-1984 and edited by Cand. Hist. Sci. S. A. Poustovoyt (Moscow). However, the publishing house received a sudden missive from the historians of Leningrad, Head of the Universal History Sector, the Leningrad division of the USSR History Institute, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, V. I. Routenburg, Learned Secretary T. N. Tatsenko, Cand. Hist. Sci., Head of the History of Ancient States Formerly on USSR Territory and the Ancient World Group, I. A. Shishova, Cand. Hist. Sci., Learned Secretary I. V. Kouklina, Cand. Hist. Sci. Among other things, they wrote that our research was “obviously contradicting the founding principles of the Marxist historical science… the Universal History Sector as well as the history of Ancient States Formerly on USSR Territory and the Ancient World Group considering the publication of A. T. Fomenko’s *Methods of Statistical Analysis of Narrative Texts and their Applications to Chronology* an absolute impossibility”. The historians demanded the publication of the book to be stopped in the most categorical way, and so the typesetting of the book was recycled.
The Nauka Publishing House planned to publish our book titled *The Geometrical and Statistical Analysis of Star Configurations. The Dating of the Star Catalogue of Almagest* authored by A. T. Fomenko, V. V. Kalashnikov and G. V. Nosovskiy in 1991. It was reviewed and submitted for publishing. However, when a significant part of work had already been done, the Nauka publishing house all but ceased its publishing activity due to the change of the political and economical climate in the country. The book was published later, in 1995, by the Faktorial Publishing House that had received the prepared materials from Nauka, which would subsequently resume work and publish two more of our books on chronology in 1996 and 1997.

As we can see, the release of A. T. Fomenko’s *Methods* in 1990 was followed by a break of sorts. After that, starting in 1993, a number of books covering the current stages of our research eventually got published. This was when the term *New Chronology* had been coined in reference to the chronology that was beginning to emerge due to the application of our new dating methods. It was new in the sense of differing from the consensual chronology of Scaliger-Petavius, and should have really been called *the Correct Chronology* due to its freedom from the errors of the Scaligerian school.

The publication of books on the new chronology was undertaken by a number of Muscovite publishing houses: MSU Publishing, the MSU Educational Centre of Pre-University Education Publishing, as well the publishing houses Nauka, Faktorial, Kraft, Olimp, Anvik, and Delovoi Express. Outside Russia our books on chronology were published in both English and Russian by Kluwer Academic Press (the Netherlands), CRC Press (USA), and Edwin Mellen Press (USA). In 2000-2003 the entire material was collected, processed and arranged as the seven volumes of *Chronology*.

Starting in 1995-1996, a large number of articles discussing our books on the new chronology began to appear in various newspapers and magazines. Most of them expressed two polar points of view. One camp
enjoyed our books a great deal, whilst the other was positively infuriated by them. About a hundred of such articles appeared every year; their numbers surged dramatically in 1999-2000.

In 1998, the Free Russia radio station had been broadcasting a series of radio programmes for over six months, where Y. S. Chernyshov brilliantly rendered the contents of our books. Namely, he had read the nearly complete text of the two of our books on the radio – *The Empire* and *The New Chronology of Russia, England, and Rome*. In addition to that, the first couple of chapters of *The Biblical Russia* also received a reading. The programmes were resumed in 2001, but ceased shortly after that, despite Y. S. Chernyshov being ready to continue with them.

In 1998, seven series of the Night Flight programme on TVC (produced by ATV Studios, a.k.a. Author Television, hosted by A. M. Maksimov) featured A. V. Podoinitsyn, a Muscovite economist and a member of the informal “New Chronology” organization as their special guest. A. V. Podoinitsyn had related the main points of our research and answered a great many of the viewers’ questions live. The programmes had caused a great resonance.

In 2001 and 2002 G. K. Kasparov, the World Chess Champion, voiced his support of the critical part of the New Chronology publicly.

In 1999, the prominent writer, sociologist, logician, and philosopher A. A. Zinoviev, who had just returned to Russia after many years spent in emigration, got in touch with us. Having read some of our publications, he decided that our concept was generally a correct one, concurring well with his own research in the field of history and historical falsifications. He voices a number of related ideas in his preface to the new edition of our *Introduction to the New Chronology*, 2001, Kraft Publishing (read it in Book 1 of the *History: Fiction of Science* series).

In 1996, our materials on the new chronology started to appear online. The number of related web sites keeps on growing and at the moment there are about ten of them in Russia and at least one in Germany, which is the brainchild of Professor E. Y. Gabovitsch (Karlsruhe and Potsdam,
Germany), the founder of the new German Salon of History – the institution where the new chronology has been discussed very actively over the last couple of years. E. Y. Gabovitsch has also helped us immensely with archive research he had conducted in Germany. A number of valuable ideas and considerations of his have helped with the reconstruction of the true history.

The web site is currently becoming increasingly popular in Russia, offering constant discussion opportunities for both proponents and opponents of the new chronology; its URL is chronologia.org.

The reaction of historians during the period of 1990-1998 was rather lukewarm and didn’t go beyond the odd occasional article whose authors didn’t even bother to give scientific counter-arguments but merely expressed their disapprobation. The radical change came about in 1998. One of the Presidium sessions of the Russian Academy of Sciences was gathered with the sole purpose of discussing our research.

Later on, the History Department Bureau of the Academy was called for a special session, and the issue was also discussed at the subsequent session of the Mathematics Department Bureau. The History Department Bureau had proposed an entire combat plan for opposing the new chronology, which was implemented most visibly in December 1999, when the History Department of the MSU organized a large conference suggestively enough named “The Myths of the New Chronology”. The main point of the conference agenda was that of a categorical deprecation of our research, and the conclusion was made that the new research should be pronounced perfectly unacceptable, all research concerning the New Chronology was to be banned, and its authors reprimanded severely. (See details in Chron7, Appendix 4). A rather amusing process commenced shortly afterwards. The materials of this conference were published several times under different titles and covers, with minute variations. Our opponents went so far as to publish a whole series of book under the title of “Anti-Fomenko”. There are seven such books to date, and all of them duplicate each other; it looks like their number might grow
in near future. We familiarized ourselves with the criticisms thoroughly and learned that the historians haven’t managed to find any original counter-arguments. The material was presented in a more “scientific” and “advanced” manner, with considerable progress made in the fine art of attaching labels. We have written a detailed reply, see *Chron7*, Appendix 4.

Starting with 1996, a number of books proving the falsity of Western European mediaeval chronology were published by German scientists (see *Chron7*, Appendix 3). However, the authors of works appear to misperceive the entire scale of the problem, thinking that several minor local corrections of the Scaligerian chronology should suffice. This is a mistake that they need to become aware of before they succeed in any of their endeavours. At the same time, the critical part of those works is written thoroughly enough. The first book that has to be mentioned in this respect is Uve Topper’s *The Great Campaign* on the falsification of history, as well as *C-14 Crash* by Blöss and Nimitz that conveys to us the knowledge of radiocarbon analysis (see *Bibliography*).

The years 2000–2001 have been marked by the publication of such books as *The True History of Russia* and *Multi-Optional History* by Alexander Goutz, a mathematician from Omsk, and N. I. Khodakovsky’s *The Temporal Spiral*. A. Boushkov’s *The Russia That Never Was* is also visibly influenced by our works. This list can be continued. Despite the fact that the key chronological issues are not related in these books, they unravel several new and interesting facts that confirm our general concept.

However, we must firmly disagree with a number of ideas voiced in these works and ones similar to them. Being in favour of such activity in general, we beg to differ between these works and our scientific research of chronology. We regard ascribing what we clearly did not say to us, or speaking on behalf of the New Chronology without our consent, as perfectly unacceptable. All that we deem worth relating is already published in our books, or will be formulated in the upcoming ones. They
remain the original source for the entire concept of the New Chronology. It is also unacceptable to ascribe our ideas and results, leave alone the basic postulates of our concept, to others. We thoroughly depurate the use of the term that we coined along with the entire concept of New Chronology for the propaganda of views that we do not share.

Let us mention another interesting effect. The recent publication of certain authors is clearly derivative, spawned by the “echoes” of the New Chronology. Such “informational reverberations” are doubtlessly of use; nevertheless, one has to bear in mind that they neither constitute the essence of the New Chronology, nor its foundations, namely, the natural scientific dating methods and the new concept of history that has evolved from those as our hypothesis. Any attempts to replace the foundations of the New Chronology with derivative observations of linguistical or historical nature may create the illusion of being essential or evidential to the New Chronology. This is untrue. The conception is based on statistical and astronomical dating methods first and foremost.

A. T. Fomenko, G. V. Nosovskiy
April 2001
“Peculiar” geographical names on the maps of the XVIII century
1. Introduction

“The history of Russia has been written by many, but how imperfect it is! So many events remain unexplained, lost and distorted! For the most part, authors have been copying each other’s works, reluctant to sift through the sources, since research work requires a great deal of time and efforts. Such copyists were concerned with nothing but making themselves noticed for sophistication, boldness of deceit and even the audacity to slander their very ancestors.”

Zoubritskiy. History of Russia. Quoted from [388], p. 6.

Let us briefly remind the readers of the research results related in Chron4. According to our hypothesis, the Horde, or the Army, had not been any foreign force that invaded Russia from abroad, but rather the regular Russian army, which had been an integral part of the ancient Russian state.

1. The “Tartar and Mongol yoke” was merely a period of military rule in Russia, which has never been conquered by any foreign force.

2. The supreme ruler was the military leader, known as the Khan or the Czar, whereas the civilian rulers, or the princes, were in charge of the cities and provinces, responsible for collecting the tax that went to support the Russian army.

3. Ancient Russia can therefore be regarded as a unified state – the “Mongolian” = Great Empire, which had a regular army of professional warriors (the Horde). There was also the civilian part, with no regular army, since all the military personnel was serving in the Horde.

4. The Horde, or the militarized Russian Empire, existed between the XIV and the early XVII century. Its history ends with the notorious Great Strife, when the Russian Czars of the Horde, the last one being
Boris “Godunov,” were massacred in the course of the civil war. The Horde, or the imperial army, was crushed by the opposition, or the “pro-Western party.” The throne was usurped by a radically new dynasty of the pro-Western Romanovs, who had also seized ecclesiastical power (installing Filaret as the new Patriarch).

5. The new dynasty was in need of a “new history” required as an ideological justification of its reign; after all, the Romanovs acted as usurpers insofar as the old history of Horde Russia was concerned. They needed to introduce a radically novel interpretation of the previous period in Russian history. One must admit that they managed to do it aptly enough: keeping most of the actual facts intact, they distorted the entire history of Russia beyond recognition. The history of Horde Russia, whose populace had been divided into civilians and professional warriors (the actual Horde), was declared to have been the epoch of a “foreign conquest.” As a result, under the quills of Romanovian historians, the Horde transformed into a host of foreign invaders from some mysterious distant land.
2. The meaning of the word “Mongolia” as used by the authors

In the present book (likewise *Chron4*) we often use the words “Mongolia” and “Mongols,” inevitably confusing the readers despite our intention. The problem is that these words are already used in an altogether different meaning, referring to a certain racial type known as “Mongoloid.” However, our research demonstrates that the mediaeval meaning of the word had differed from the modern completely – Mongolia, or Tartar Mongolia (Tartary), was the name of the mediaeval Russian empire, which we also call Horde Russia. It is similar to the terms “Russian Empire,” “Soviet Union,” and “Russian Federation,” in the sense that its populace has always been multinational; the Slavs have always coexisted with other ethnic groups.

As we frequently mentioned above, the word “Mongolia” translates from Greek as “Great Empire,” or “Great Kingdom.” Alternatively, it may be derived from the Russian words for “many,” “might,” and “multitude” (“mnogo,” “moshch,” and “mnozhestvo,” respectively). A great many terms have changed their meanings over the years. We couldn’t think of another word to replace the term “Mongols,” which translates as “the great ones,” although it may have been expedient so as not to confuse the readers who are naturally accustomed to the modern meaning of the word “Mongol.” We must therefore urge the readers to keep this in mind all the time: we use the words “Mongol” and “Mongolian” in their mediaeval meaning exclusively, referring to the Great Empire of the Middle Ages, whose centre was in Russia, founded by the Russians as well as numerous other ethnic groups that populated its territory.

From the one hand, we are referring to the same phenomena as modern
historians, the Great Mongolian Empire with its centre in Russia, or the Golden Horde on the Volga. We agree that it had really existed; however, unlike the historians of the Romanovian school, we suggest that Great “Mongolian” Empire was in fact Russian, built by the Slavs and the Turkic peoples (the Russians and the Tartars, for instance).

As for the court historians of the Romanovs, they declared the “Mongolian” Empire to have been founded as a result of a military conflict between these peoples, which had resulted in the victory of the Tartars over the Russians. We are of the opinion that the Tartars and the Russians had never fought against each other, with the exception of the internal civil wars, wherein each of the conflicting parties included warriors from both ethnic groups.

Church Slavonic had been the official language of the “Mongolian” = “Great” Empire. We have made this conclusion since we never managed to find any official imperial documents written in a Turkic language, q.v. in *Chron4*. However, there were at least two spoken languages – Russian and Tartaric. It wasn’t just a case of the Tartars speaking Russian, the way it is today; the Russians had also spoken Tartaric, as we demonstrate below, citing Afanasiy Nikitin’s *Voyage*, for instance. See also *Chron4*, Chapter 13:3.1.

The regions where Islam had prevailed after the schism adopted Arabic (and later Turkic) as their official language.
In the present section (as well as several others that follow) we relate a number of valuable observations made by A. V. Nerlinskiy. We would like to express our gratitude to him. A. V. Nerlinskiy has conducted a research of antique Russian military maps, in particular the naval charts kept in the Navy Archive of St. Petersburg.

Let us turn to the atlas, entitled *Russian Naval Charts of 1701-1750. Copies from originals*, published by Captain Y. N. Biroulya in St. Petersburg in 1993 ([73]). As Y. N. Biroulya writes in the introduction, the collection is comprised of “the charts that demonstrate the evolution of naval cartography over a period of 50 years, from the first charts compiled with the participation of Peter the Great to the more recent ones, belonging to ‘the younglings from Peter’s nest’.”

We shall turn to the drawn map of the Azov Sea compiled in 1702. “Observations and measurements performed with the participation of Peter the Great” ([73]). See fig. 1.1.
Fig. 1.1. Hand-drawn map of the Azov Sea dating from 1702. The map is inverted, with the North at the bottom and the South at the top. Taken from [73].

First of all, let us point out that the map is inverted as compared to the modern tradition, with the North at the bottom and the South at the top. As we mentioned in *Chron1*, Chapter 1:10.3, such orientation of maps might strike the modern viewer as uncanny, but it was used commonly in mediaeval and "ancient" cartography. Inverted maps aren’t quite as innocuous as they may seem initially. Imagine reading a chronicle that mentions geographical locations of certain places. If we know nothing about the kind of map used by the scribe, we may easily confuse directions and come up with a distorted reconstruction of the past. There are actual examples of such confusion, q.v. in *Chron1*: Babylon gets confused with Rome, France is mistaken for Persia, etc.

Peter’s map indicates the presence of Crimean Tartars in Crimea. There is nothing surprising about this fact, of course. However, another area (which has always been populated by the *Kuban Cossacks*) is marked as
the home of *Kuban Tartars*, q.v. in fig. 1.2. The legend is translated into Latin as “Cubanse Tartari,” as seen on the same illustration. Incidentally, the lower-case letter “κ,” as seen in the Russian version, is a spitting image of the double “c”; we see even in the epoch of Peter the Great different Cyrillic characters used to resemble each other in writing, and very strongly so, which could be very confusing, especially for foreigners.

![Map of 1702](image)

Fig. 1.2. The map of 1702 refers to the inhabitants of the area that has always been populated by the Kuban Cossacks as to “Kuban Tartars.” Therefore, the Cossacks were still known as the Tartars in the epoch of Peter the Great. Taken from [73].

Thus, Peter the Great and his cartographers must have thought it perfectly normal to use the word “Tartars” for referring to the *Cossacks*. This fact concurs perfectly with our reconstruction of the ancient Russian history, q.v. in *Chron4*. This can only mean that the *synonymy of the words “Tartar” and “Cossack”* was perfectly commonplace in the epoch of Peter the Great and routinely referred to on naval charts.

Possible counter-argumentation may be formulated as follows: Kuban Cossacks are the descendants of the Zaporozhye Cossacks who had migrated to Turkey in the reign of Peter and returned to Russia in the XVIII century, settling in the Kuban region. However, if the region in question had once been populated by the “*Kuban Tartars,*” *how come they disappeared without a trace?* Had these “Tartars” really been Tartars in the modern sense of the word, the population of Kuban would become *mixed* after the advent of the Cossacks, who settled there in the XVIII century. This happened in the Caucasus, conquered by Russia in the early
XIX century. What has become of the *Kuban Tartars*?

We are of the opinion that *Kuban has always been populated by the Cossacks*, before and after the migration of their cousins from Zaporozhye. Romanovian historians must have conducted an enormous body of work in order to vanquish all such “harmful” traces of the authentic pre-Romanovian Russian history, q.v. in *Chron4*. However, they appear to have missed a few naval charts. It seems as though military archives (and archives in general) must contain a considerable amount of interesting information.
4. The identity of Persia

On the military map of Peter the Great dating from 1702 we see the legend “Moskowiæ Pars” next to “Country of Moscovia,” q.v. in fig. 1.3. Therefore, “pars” must be a synonym of the word “country,” which resembles the word “Persia,” or PRS without vocalizations.

Fig. 1.3. The Land of the Muscovites is also referred to as Muskowiæ PARS – the word “PARS,” which also stands for “Persia,” translates as “part” or “area” in this case. Taken from [73].

The implication is that the word “Persia” as used by many of the “ancient,” mediaeval, and even late mediaeval cartographers, did not necessarily concur with the modern geographical localization of Persia. We see that the word could simply be used as a synonym of “country.”

Due to the emergence of a great many countries, or fragments of the former “Mongolian” Empire, in the epoch of the XVI-XVII century, many “Persias” appeared on the maps of the epoch. We have already seen that the name Persia was used for P-Russia (or B-Russia) = White Russia, France, Turkey, and Iran, q.v. in Chron1, Chron2 and Chron4.

By the way, the Azov Sea is referred to as “Meootiss” on a military map of 1702: “Zee Paless Meootiss,” q.v. in fig. 1.1, which is the very name that the “ancient” historians had used. Thus, the “ancient” name of the Azov Sea was still used in the XVIII century, under Peter the Great.

Let us turn to a Russian military map of the Black Sea that was compiled somewhat earlier, in 1699-1700 (see fig. 1.4). Upon it we see the name
“Kuban Tartars” yet again (fig. 1.5). We see that the Kuban Cossacks were still referred to as “Tartars” around the end of the XVII century. We also see the Budjak Tartars next to Basarabia. The Crimean Tartars are naturally present as well. Turkey is referred to as Anatolia, whereas the former Byzantium is called Romania.

Fig. 1.4. Map of the Black Sea dating from 1699-1700. “Compiled in accordance with the surveys and measurements made by the Russian warship ‘Krepost’ (‘Fortress’).” Taken from [73].

Fig. 1.5. The Russian military map of 1699-1700 refers to the Kuban Cossacks as
“Kuban Tartars.” Taken from [73].
5. Czar-Grad and the multiple Saray cities on the maps dating from the epoch of Peter the Great

It turns out that Constantinople as indicated in the Russian military maps of the XVIII century ([73]) was neither called Istanbul, nor even Constantinople, the way it should have been referred to in the XVII-XVIII century if we are to believe in the veracity of the Scaligerian chronology, but rather “Czar-Grad,” which is presumably its “ancient” name. In particular, this implies that the use of an “archaic” name in a given text does not imply the text itself to be “ancient.”

In the same military map of 1699-1700, we see another city next to Czar-Grad, possibly a suburb thereof – Greater Saray, q.v. in fig. 1.6. Therefore, the two names are in close proximity on the map, which is in full accordance with our reconstruction, q.v. in Chron4. The word “Saray” is a vestige of the Russian Empire, or the Horde, which had once been united with Turkey, or the Ottoman Empire. The word “Saray” is derived from the word “Sar” (or “Zar”), which could mean “Czar” (Czar-Grad = “Czar City”). The names of the two cities really translate in the same way, hence their proximity on the map, q.v. in fig. 1.6.

Fig. 1.6. Constantinople is called Czar-Grad in the Russian military naval chart of
1699-1700. Therefore, the allegedly “ancient” Russian name “Czar-Grad” was still used in Russia at the end of the XVII century. Taken from [73].

To the north of Czar-Grad, on the other side of the Golden Horn strait, we find another Saray – the Azure Saray, q.v. in fig. 1.6. The city of Czar-Grad was virtually surrounded by various Sarays.
The dating of 750, as inscribed upon a Russian naval chart, proves that Empress Yelizaveta Petrovna reigned in the VIII century as counted from the Nativity of Christ, and not the XVIII century.

Let us now consider the Russian naval chart that was compiled in the XVIII century, the epoch of the Russian empress Yelizaveta, by Captain Nagayev, q.v. in fig. 1.7. Bear in mind that Yelizaveta Petrovna reigned between 1741 and 1762, in the *XVIII century*, that is. Nevertheless, we can clearly see the writing on the map: “Kronstadt. Accurate naval chart… Measurements and descriptions made on the orders of Her Imperial Majesty in the year of 740 by Captain Nagayev of the Russian Navy… Compiled in 750,” q.v. in fig. 1.8.
Fig. 1.7. “Naval chart of 1750. Compiled in accordance with the materials of the Russian hydrographic surveys” ([73]). Eastern part of the map. Taken from [73].

Fig. 1.8. Fragment of the Russian military naval chart of Captain Nagayev (Nogai?) compiled in 1750. The date that we see on the map is transcribed as 750, the *millennial figure of one is missing!* This could theoretically suffice for dating it to the VIII century A.D. and not the XVIII as suggested by the Scaligerian chronology. Taken from [73].

We can see that even in the XVIII century some of the datings were still
transcribed in the archaic manner, without the figure of one in the thousands place, with 740 and 750 meaning 1740 and 1750. This implies the count of years from the XI century A.D. (Let us remind the reader that the XI century is the erroneous dating calculated by mediaeval chroniclers instead of the real one, the XII century.) This isn’t a random error; there are two dates in the description of the map: 740 (measurements and description) and 750 (actual compilation), q.v. in fig. 1.8. If we didn’t know that Yelizaveta lived in the XVIII century A.D., we could have easily dated this map to the alleged VIII century A.D. in Scaligerian chronology, which would make the dating a thousand years off the mark, which is the precise value of the Roman chronological shift, already known to us quite well. This is how phantom reflections of mediaeval documents appeared in deep antiquity.

The dating of the map from the Yelizavetian epoch to 750 is in fact quite correct. According to our reconstruction, Jesus Christ was born in the XI century (q.v. in Chron1), and the Yelizavetian map was compiled in the Scaligerian XVIII century, about 750 years after. This is written on the map in plain text. Such date transcription is quite correct! It doesn’t contradict anything but Scaligerian chronology.
Let us take another naval chart of Captain Nagayev, dating from 1750 (fig. 1.9). The date in the top right corner is already transcribed in the modern fashion, as 1750, q.v. in fig. 1.10. However, in the top left corner we see the date and the name of the map’s actual compiler, which, amazingly enough, tells us that one part of the map was described by Nagayev in the year of 721, and the other in 743, by the same character. Once again, there is no figure of one in the beginning of the date (fig. 1.11). Therefore, both dates were transcribed in the old fashion, sans “thousand.” The cartographers of Captain Nagayev must have vaguely remembered the mediaeval tradition (which was a hundred years off the mark), according to which Jesus Christ was born 750 years before their time, and not 1750; simultaneously, we see the very same date transcribed on the same map as 1750, which is the modern format. (Incidentally, the date transcription as 1750 corresponds to the Nativity of Christ in the XI century just as well.)
Let us remind the reader that in *Chron1*, Chapter 6:13, A. T. Fomenko formulated the hypothesis of how the chronological shifts came into being, including the millenarian one. The first figure of one, presumed to stand for a “thousand” today and introduced in this capacity as recently as in the XVIII century, had originally transcribed as the letter I or J, or the first name of the name Jesus (Иисус). Therefore, the symbol I in the transcription of the dates could have initially stood for the name of Jesus and not a figure. In other words, “I. 740” stood for “the 740th year since Jesus.”

By the way, it is rather curious how Captain Nagayev uses in his descriptions a Russian letter looking like “п” (q.v. in figs. 1.12, 1.13 and
1.14). In this regard, it may be useful to know that in old Russian texts the transcription of letters “в,” “п” and “к” was *virtually identical*. This detail should always be kept in mind when reading old names. Letters “в” and “п” were also often confused and replaced each other due to the known linguistic rule of homophony.

Fig. 1.12. The inscription on the map of Captain Nagayev writes the letters в (“v”) and п (“p”) in the same manner. The name Шпецкой (Shpetskoi) would be written as Швецкой (Shvetskoi) nowadays. Thus, the transcription of certain Cyrillic letters wasn’t yet established in the XVIII century.

Fig. 1.14. The word “фарпапер” (“farpater,” for “navigating channel”) would be spelled as “фарватер” (“farwater”) nowadays.

Also curious is the map published in 1701 as “the first geographical map that was printed in Russia.” The measurements were performed under the supervision and with personal participation of Peter the Great, q.v. in fig. 1.15.
Fig. 1.15. Map dating from 1701 that is considered to be the first one ever printed in Russia. Most probably, earlier maps of the XIV-XVI century were destroyed. The Romanovs presented themselves as enlighteners, claiming to have brought culture to Russia and taking the credit for the birth of cartography, the formation of the fleet and the first timid steps of science.

The southern coast of the Azov Sea’s Taganrog Bay, which is located at the estuary of the Don, is referred to as “The Land of Nagay.” The modern Crimea is called “Crimean Part,” q.v. in fig. 1.15. This is quite natural. However, the area that lies to the north of the Azov Sea, above Taganrog Bay, is called “Crimean Land.” This is very odd from the point of view of Millerian and Romanovian history.

One must pay attention to the obvious propaganda stunt in the bottom right of the map, q.v. in fig. 1.16. The Cossacks (Tartars, apparently Nogai in origin) lay down their Cossack *bunchuk* poles, decorated with Ottoman crescents and stars, at the feet of the Romanovs. The gigantic Muscovite Tartary had still been very strong in the epoch of Peter the Great; the
victory over “Pougachev” only took place in the XVIII century, q.v. in *Chron4*. However, in order to raise the spirits of his allies, Peter the Great must have been very eager to emphasise the Romanovian control even over a small part of the Nogai land adjacent to the Azov Sea.

Fig. 1.16. The map of Peter the Great demonstratively portrays the conquered Nogai Cossacks = Tartars, who lived in the region of the Azov Sea. The Cossack bunchuks and the flags with the Ottoman crescents and stars are laid down at the feet of the Romanovs. Taken from [73].
7.
On some maps of the XVIII century Russia and Moscovia are written as names that refer to different regions.

We shall refer to the unique antique editions of the XVIII century, the geographical atlases of the world [1018] and [1019]. The first of them was dedicated to “The Prince of Orange,” and its compilation took the effort of a whole team of cartographers in London, Berlin and Amsterdam.

Let us, for instance, turn to the map of Europe dating from 1755 and entitled “4e Carte de l’Europe divisée en ses Principaux États. 1755,” with comments in French, q.v. in fig. 1.17. What we see in fig. 1.18 appears to be a preliminary version of the same map compiled a year earlier, in 1754.
The detailed map that dates from 1755 (fig. 1.17) depicts Russia (Russie) in the area of the modern Ukraine, whereas the large area to the North and the East is called Moscovia (Moscovie). The city of Moscow is located on the border of Russia and Moscovia, halfway in between. The area around Moscow is called “Gouvernement de Moscou,” q.v. in fig. 1.19.
This is in good correspondence with our reconstruction, according to which the new dynasty of the Romanovs had only managed to seize a relatively small area adjacent to Moscow, known as Moscovia, after the fragmentation of the gigantic mediaeval Russia (Horde) in the XVII century. Other regions had either still remained independent from the Romanovs or, like the countries of Western Europe, tried to forget their former ties with Russia.

Within Russia, we see an area around Kiev marked as “Gouv. de Kiowie,” or “Kiev Government,” q.v. in figs. 1.19 ad 1.20. Therefore, the
Kiev region was still known as Russia in the XVIII century. The Ukrainian scientists are therefore correct to refer to the Kiev state as to Russia. However, we all know the old name “Kiev Russia.” So, even in the XVIII century, some geographical maps compiled in the West preserved information about Russia, or the Horde, of the XIV-XVI century.

As a matter of fact, the very same map refers to the South of the modern Ukraine as “Lesser Tartary” (“Petite Tartarie”), q.v. in fig. 1.20. It is significant that inside the “Lesser Tartary” we see the area called “Zaporozhye Cossacks” (Cosaques Zaporiski). That is to say, the Cossacks of Zaporozhye lived on the territory of the Lesser Tartary. This is also in perfect concurrence with our reconstruction, according to which the Tartar Horde is the Cossack Horde. Thus, the fact that the Tartars and the Cossacks were really the same is directly mentioned on the maps of the XVIII century. Later on it was forgotten.
To the west of Lithuania and to the north of Poland, on the coast of the Baltic Sea, the area around Königsberg and Danzig (Dantzick) is marked “Russe,” or “Russia” (figs. 1.19 and 1.21). Modern readers might suggest that the country in question is really Prussia; however, we don’t see the Roman letter $P$ anywhere. The Prussians were still occasionally referred to as Russians in the XVIII century, in other words.

Fig. 1.21. A part of the modern Prussia is referred to as “Russie,” or Russia. Map fragment dating from 1754. Taken from [1018].

It is also noteworthy that the Russians are also mentioned, as “Russie Noire,” upon the region in the south of Poland, right next to Lvov (Lemberg), q.v. in fig. 1.22. The name “Russia” is thus encountered in at least three different parts of a map of Europe dating from the XVIII century.

Fig. 1.22. We see the area of “Russie Noire” (“Black Russia”) next to Lemberg (Lvov). Map fragment, 1754. Taken from [1018].

Let us turn to another French map of 1754, entitled “IIIe Carte de l’Europe. 1754,” q.v. in [1018], [1019], and fig. 1.18.
Once again, we see *three different regions* adjacent to each other: *Russia, Moscovia,* and *Lesser Tartary.* Lesser Tartary is the South of the modern Ukraine, Russia identifies as the rest of the Ukraine, and Moscovia starts from Moscow and reaches the Zapadnaya Dvina in the West, the Arctic Ocean in the North, and the 75th meridian in the East, well beyond the Ural, spanning more than half of Siberia (see fig. 1.18).
According to Millerian and Romanovian history, the “yoke of the Mongols and the Tartars” over Russia ended in 1480, under Ioann III Vassilyevich. One must expect that after liberating themselves from the rule of the hated foreigners, who are said to have oppressed Russia for some 240 years, Russians would sigh with relief and do their best to forget the centuries of slavery and terror. At any rate, one would expect them to revive the old Russian names of cities and regions and obliterate the ones coined by the “Tartars and the Mongols.” The process would be perfectly natural; every enslaved nation having got rid of a bloody and merciless yoke as a result of a liberating war is only overjoyed to revive the original names on the map of their country.

But what do we see happen in Russia? What was the name of the Russian Empire in the middle of the XVIII century? The readers raised on the Romanovian version of Russian history would instantly reply that it was called precisely that, the Russian Empire. The answer is correct. Maps of the XVIII century really bear the legend “Russian Empire.” But let us enquire about whether the Russian Empire had any other names in the XVIII century. One should ponder this well, because modern textbooks on Russian history report nothing of the sort.

Let us turn to the map of 1754 entitled “IIe Carte de l’Asie,” q.v. in figs. 1.23 and 1.24, as well as the map reproduced in fig. 1.25. We shall see the gigantic inscription that says “Empire Russienne” that runs across the entire territory of the Russian Empire, up to the Pacific, including Mongolia and the Far East. However, the same enormous territory has a second legend ascribed to it: “Grande Tartarie,” or the Great Tartary, or
simply Tartary; the letters are *three times bigger*. If we are to recollect that the word “Great” was occasionally read as *Megalion*, or *Mongolia*, we shall come up with “Mongol Tartary.” The map in fig. 1.25 is actually the same map, dating from 1754, only entitled “Iᵉ Carte de l’Asie.”

Fig. 1.23. Map of 1754 entitled “IIᵉ Carte de l’Asie” from the Atlas of 1755. Northern part of the map. The legend “Grande Tartarie” (Great Tartary) is set in huge letters that cover the entire territory of the Russian Empire. Taken from [1018].
Fig. 1.24. Map of 1754 entitled “IIe Carte de l’Asie.” Southern part of the map. Taken from [1018].
Thus, as recently as *in the XVIII century*, the Russian Empire was also called “*Mongol Tartary*.” The fact that the two names refer to the same territory is explicitly written on the map of the XVIII century. How can this be? Romanovian history assures us that the “terrible yoke of the Tartars and the Mongols” was lifted some 300 years before the compilation of this map at least. Could it really be that three centuries did not suffice to make foreigners forget the “Tartar and Mongol” name of Russia?

Actually, there is nothing mysterious about this fact. The “Mongol” empire of the Tartars, also known as the Great Russian Empire in the pre-Romanovian epoch, had existed for several centuries before the
Romanovs came to power in the early XVII century. After the deposition of the old dynasty, which we shall be referring to as the Horde Dynasty, the process of rewriting Russian history in the pro-Romanovian vein commenced as a political necessity. This editing process resulted in the creation of a political fairy tale about the “vicious” Mongols and Tartars, who had enslaved Russia in the days of yore. The old Russian word “Horde” (army) was demonised by Romanovian historians, eager to please. All was done gradually, carefully, step by step.

Nevertheless, the name of the famous Great Empire, or the “Mongolian” Empire of the Russians and the Tartars, was kept for centuries to come, since the entire world had known Russia under this very name for many centuries.

It took the Romanovs an enormous amount of time to put a layer of plaster over the authentic history of Russia. This must have been done relatively quickly in Russia. Yet the foreigners didn’t part with the habit of using the old name for referring to Russia for a long time. As we have just seen, they carried on writing both names on the maps, Russian Empire and Great Tartary). The old name eventually went out of use with nothing but the “Russian Empire” remaining in its place. This is how the last traces of the “Mongol and Tartar” dynasty of Horde Russia were obliterated. Russians would refer to it as the Cossack Dynasty of Great Russia, or the Great Cossack Dynasty. Bear in mind that “Mongol Tartary” was the name used by foreigners, and apparently hadn’t existed in the Russian language. The name “Mongolia” must be of the same origin as the Russian words “mnogo,” “moshch” and “mnozhestvo,” translating as “many,” “might” and “multitude,” respectively.

We see the same to be the case with a number of other maps dating from the XVIII century. For instance, there is the “First Map of the Russian Empire in Europe” (“Ie Carte de l’Empire de Russie en Europe. 1755”) and its more detailed version of the same year entitled “2e Carte de l’Empire de Russie en Europe.” See figs. 1.26 and 1.27. The old name, “Grande Tartarie” (translated as “Mongol Tartary”), is written all across
the Russian Empire.

Fig. 1.26. Map of Europe and the Russian Empire entitled “Ie Carte de l’Empire de Russie en Europe. 1755.” The words “Grande Tartarie” (Great Tartary) are stretched across the entire territory of the country. Taken from [1018].
Next we have another map of the XVIII century under the following title: “L’Asie dressé sur les observations de l’Academie Royale des Sciences et quelques autres, et sur les memoires les plus recents. Amsterdam. Par G. de l’Isle. Geographie à Amsterdam. Chez R. & J. Ottens” (see figs. 1.28 and 1.29). The exact date of its compilation is unfortunately missing. To the West of the Volga River, we see “European Moscovia” (“Moscovie Europeane”). The entire territory of the Russian Empire to the East of the Volga is marked “Grande Tartarie” in large letters – Great (“Mongolian”) Tartary, in other words (see fig. 1.30). It is significant that we see “Muscovite Tartars” residing inside Great Tartary. The area marked “Tartarie Muscovite” is quite large, much bigger than many countries of the Western Europe, and covers a significant part of Siberia, q.v. in fig.
1.30.

Fig. 1.28. Map of Asia dating from the XVIII century. An enormous part of Eurasia that includes many other countries besides Russia is referred to as “Grande Tartarie.” Western part of the map. “L’Asie dressé sur les observations de l’Academie Royale des Sciences et quelques autres, et Sur les memoires les plus recens. Amsterdam. Par G. de l’Isle Geographie a Amsterdam. Chez R. & J. Ottens.” Taken from [1019].
Fig. 1.29. Eastern part of a map of Asia dating from the XVIII century. Taken from [1019].
By the way, we see other “Tartar regions” on the territory of the Russian Empire, or Great Tartary: Independent Tartary (Tartarie Independante), Chinese Tartary (Tartarie Chinoise), a Tartary next to Tibet, and Lesser Tartary comprising the Crimea, the South and the East of the Ukraine.

The North of India is called “The State of the Great Moguls,” q.v. in fig. 1.31. But the Moguls are the same as the “Mongols,” or the Great Ones. In *Chron4*, we cited the evidence of certain mediaeval chroniclers who mentioned that the Russian language “might have been used” in many parts of India. This might have been the gigantic region known as “États du Grand Mogol” comprising almost all of India, up to the 20th degree of northern latitude.
It is noteworthy that Great Tartary included *Chinese Tartary*, q.v. in fig. 1.29. It covered a part of the modern China as well as the “Great Tibet.” We shall relate the history of China, its real events and chronology in the chapters to follow, coming back to these remarkable maps of the XVIII century.

The “Tartar” geographical terminology had been used on Russian maps.
up until the XVIII century. For instance, in fig. 1.32, we see a map of Asia taken from the “first Russian atlas of world geography,” originally known as “The Atlas Compiled for Prudent Use by the Youth and All Readers of Chronicles and Historical Books,” published in 1737 by the Russian Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg (map 18 of [679], page 48). We see numerous Tartaries on the map – simply Tartary, Independent Tartary, and Russian Tartary, q.v. in fig. 1.32. A. V. Postnikov, the compiler of the atlas ([679]) couldn’t restrain himself from the following sceptical comment: “Apparently, the sources of the maps were foreign maps of poor quality in different languages” ([679], page 48).

Fig. 1.32. Russian map of Asia dating from 1737 that still indicates several Tartaries. Taken from [679], page 48.
Great Tartary is also marked on a Russian map dating from the middle of the XVIII century, a fragment of which is reproduced in fig. 1.32a.

Fig. 1.32a. Fragment of the Russian map entitled “A View of the Earth Globe” dating from the middle of the XVIII century. Apart from Great Tartary, we also see Free Tartary and Chinese Tartary. Taken from [306:1].

Incidentally, a map of 1737 (fig. 1.32) refers to the area of Burma (Myanmar) as to “Pegu,” q.v. in fig. 1.33. Could this be a relic of the “Pegaya Orda” (“Motley Horde”, described in Chron5, Chapter 6) that gave names to Peking and Pakistan?
Fig. 1.33. Fragment of a map of Asia dating from 1737, which indicates an area called Pegu. The name is likely to be derived from “pegaya orda” (“Dapple Horde”). The name “Pakistan” could be of the same origin as well. Taken from [679], page 48.
9.
The former identity of Lithuania

Let us turn to Y. Y. Shiryaev’s collection of geographical maps entitled *Byelorussia: White Russia, Black Russia and Lithuania in Maps* ([977]).

1. It turns out that up until the XIX century *Lithuania was the name used for the territory known as Byelorussia today, whereas the modern Lithuania was known as Zhemaytia or Zhmud.*

2. It turns out that the Lithuanian language had not been used as the official language of the Great Principality of Lithuania – the populace spoke Russian, or Old Byelorussian (a western dialect of the Old Russian language).

Let us quote what Y. Y. Shiryaev has to say on the subject:

“The Great Principality of Lithuania was formed on the territory of Byelorussia in 1240. Its capital was the city of Novogrudok… The greater part of the modern Lithuania, or its western half, was known as Zhemaytia (Zhmud) or Samogitia (Latin name) and not as Lithuania. It had been an autonomous principality and part of the Great Principality of Lithuania, as one see from many of the ancient maps reproduced in the book. Its citizens were called Zhmudins.

The modern name [“Lithuania” as used for referring to the modern state of Lithuania – Auth.] has only been used starting with the second half of the XIX century. The official language of the Great Principality of Lithuania up until the end of the XVII century had been Old Byelorussian, and it was eventually replaced by Polish. One must note that Lithuanian had never been an official language in the entire history of the principality. The Great Principality of Lithuania wasn’t only considered Slavic in language and culture, but also due to the fact that the majority of the populace had been Slavic” ([977], page 5).

When did the change of historical names occur? Y. Y. Shiryaev gives an
explicit answer to this question: “In the XIX century the course of events has led to a shift of historical conceptions and the names of ethnic groups and territories. Thus, the former ethnic territory of Zhemaytia became known as Lithuania, whereas the traditional toponym ‘Lithuania,’ formerly identified with the North-Western Byelorussia (including the area around Vilna) has completely lost its ethnic and historical content” ([977], page 5).

It would be hard to formulate it more clearly. This is explained perfectly well by our conception, according to which Lithuania is the former name of White Russia, also known as Moscovia.

This fact is confirmed by old maps. On a map dating from the alleged year 1507, which is reproduced in Y. Y. Shiryaev’s book, we see the explicit legend: Russia Alba sive Moscovia (“White Russia, alias Moscovia”), q.v. in fig. 1.34, right part of the map. However, V. Ostrovskiy, a modern commentator, translates this perfectly clear inscription as “Greek Orthodox faith, or Moscovia,” for some bizarre reason. This outrageous translation can be seen in V. Ostrovskiy’s book ([1323]; quoted from [977], page 9). Ah, the things one does to save Scaligerian and Romanovian history!

Fig. 1.34. Fragment of an ancient map allegedly dating from 1507. “Map of Central

---

Fig. 1.34. Fragment of an ancient map allegedly dating from 1507. “Map of Central
Further on, our reconstruction implies that the city of Novogrudok, the capital of the Great Principality of Lithuania, founded in 1240, is most likely to identify as the very Novgorod the Great, or Yaroslavl. After all, 1240 is the actual year when the “Mongolian” conquest began, according to Scaligerian and Romanovian history.

The name Samogitia as used in the old maps is of similar origins – “Samo-Gotia,” or “The Actual Land of the Goths.” Another explanation is possible: Samogitia = Land of the Goths, since, for instance, the Polish word for “land” (“ziemia”) may have easily transformed into “samo.” We have already mentioned that the Goths and the Tartars are the same nation historically, q.v. in the book of Herberstein ([161]).
Today it is commonly assumed that, upon finding an old coin, numismatist historians are usually capable of estimating where, when and by whom it was minted, either right away or after giving it some consideration. Unfortunately, this is very far from being true. A famous Russian historian and numismatist of the XIX century, A. D. Chertkov (1789-1858), wrote the following:

“The appearance of old Russian coins, generally speaking, can usually tell a numismatist nothing about the time of their creation, or their value, or even their names; they are small, and the marks upon them are so poor in quality that, even if we have dozens of identical coins at our disposal, it is sometimes barely possible to read the lettering upon it, making it out from two or three letters that have survived here and there. Our search for explanations shall be fruitless, whether we turn to the Chronicles, the Deeds or even Karamzin’s History – everything is silent…

The few lines found in Herberstein’s work, which is truly the Ariadne’s thread in the labyrinth of Russian numismatic knowledge, refer to the coins of his own epoch (the early XVI century). Any connoisseur of Russian coins, having made the effort of reading a prince’s name upon a coin and without any knowledge of the time, the place and the value thereof, must use his own conclusions to fill the gaps” ([957], pages V-VI).

Further also:

“Let us assume that the entire inscription reads ‘Great Prince Vassily,’ for instance, since the coin reveals no more; who could this Great Prince be, who was his father, when did he reign?… The same happens with other coins and the names we read upon them – Mikhail, Ondrei, Dmitrey, etc. Dozens of princes with such names are known in history. But if the lettering says ‘seal of Great Prince,’
princely seal, pool (such-and-such), what sort of patience will not cave in?” ([957], pages VII-VIII).

“In 1780, Prince Shcherbatov classified Russian coins as follows:
   a) unidentified ones without any lettering,
   b) unidentified ones with Tartar lettering,
   c) unidentified ones with lettering in Tartar and in Russian,
   d) unidentified ones with Russian lettering, and
   e) identified coins” ([957], page VIII).

Needless to say, “identified coins” don’t date any further back than the end of the XVI century A.D. Again and again we run into the same threshold of great importance – the beginning of the XVII century. It separates the more or less known history of the XVII-XIX century from the history of Russia as the Horde, or the XIV-XVI century, which was distorted by the Romanovs.

The coins of the Golden Horde were very common in Russia; one often comes across coins with one of the sides allegedly copying a Horde coin. A. D. Chertkov proceeds to tell us the following:

“Unfortunately, authentic Arabic inscriptions are few and far between; most of them do little but imitate the coins of the Tartars … even the most diligent Orientalist cannot read the lettering upon them” ([957], page 6).

The real picture is as follows. There are lots of Russian coins with Arabic lettering present thereupon; however, historians prefer to believe that most of them are mere “thoughtless copies of Arabic originals,” although numismatists themselves recognize the fact that “authentic Arabic lettering” is also present on a number of Russian coins, q.v. below. In fig. 2.1 we see one of the “Arabic coins” that were circulating in Russia. Nowadays we are told that the Russians used to use foreign coins in that epoch, Arabic for the most part, due to the alleged lack of domestic coinage. In fig. 2.2 we see a typical “Arabic dirham” of the type frequently found in Russian hoardings of coins ([578], Book 1, page 86). It turns out that
nearly the entire territory of Russia and the Eastern Europe yields findings of such “Arabic coins.” In fig. 2.3 we see a map compiled by numismatists, with black dots marking the “hoardings of Kufic coins” ([233], page 89). As a matter of fact, the word “kufic” may be derived from the Russian verb “kupit” (“to buy”), bearing the mind the frequent flexion of the sounds P and F. People use coins to buy and sell. The Russian word “kupets” (“merchant”) might also be a version of the word “kufic.”

Fig. 2.1. Mediaeval Russian coinage. These coins bore Arabic lettering. It is assumed that the Russians used foreign coins of Arabic origin since they had no coinage of their own. Many hoardings of such coins were found in the area of Vladimir and Suzdal. According to our reconstruction, the coinage in question is authentic Russian coinage of the XIV-XVI century. Historians fail to realize that Arabic was one of the official languages spoken in the Russian Empire, or the Horde, up to the very end of the XVI century. Taken from [331], Volume 1, page 12.

Fig. 2.2. “Arabic dirgham. Found in a Russian hoarding” ([578], Volume 1, page 86). Taken from [578], Volume 1, page 86, illustration 70.
The lettering on the coins minted by Dmitriy Donskoi is also extremely interesting. It implies that Dmitriy Donskoi, and even his son, Vassily Dmitrievich, were called “Sultan Tokhtamysh-Khan” in Arabic, no less!

A. D. Chertkov has got the following to say in this respect: “G. Fren has read the following on the coins of Great Prince Vassily Dimitrievich and his father, Dmitriy Donskoi: ‘Sultan Tokhtamysh-Khan, may his years be long’” ([957], page 6). Readers familiar with Chapter 6 of Chron4 can appreciate just how much it corresponds to our reconstruction of Russian history.

A. D. Chertkov points out that on many Russian coins one often encounters the famous “Tartar seal.” In figs. 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7 we see old Russian coins with “Arabic and Tartar” tamgas and “Arabic” lettering. According to A. D. Chertkov, this symbol, “which was very common on
the coins minted by the khans of the Golden Horde, *can often be seen on Russian coinage* of the XIV century, especially that which was minted by Great Prince Vassily Dmitrievich and his brothers” ([957], pages 4-5).

Fig. 2.4. Russian coins bearing the image of a Tartar tamga. See the right side of the print. Taken from [957], table XVII.

Fig. 2.5. Russian coin with the image of a Tartar tamga and an inscription in Arabic. Taken from [870].

Fig. 2.6. Russian coin with the image of a Tartar tamga and an inscription in Arabic. Taken from [870].
Our opponents might suggest that there’s nothing strange about this fact. The Tartar invaders demanded their vassals that the latter should put the sigil of their conquerors on their coins. This is possible; however, how is one to interpret the following facts?

“Yedigey [presumably, a Tartar khan – Auth.] wrote thus to Vitovt [the alleged Prince of Lithuania, aka Great Prince Vassily Dmitrievich, according to our reconstruction, q.v. in Chron4 – Auth.]: ‘Pay me tribute and put my crest on Lithuanian money.’ Vitovt himself was demanding the same of Timur Kutluk-Khan” ([957], page 5).

What do we see here? Khans demand of princes that the latter should put the khans’ crests on their money, and vice versa, the princes demand their sigils to be put on the coins minted by the khans.

The tamgas are presumed to be of a Tartar origin due to the fact that they were frequently depicted on the coins of the Golden Horde. The book of K. M. Fren ([921]) reproduces some of these coins. Similar crests on Russian coins should signify the dependence of the Russians from the khans of the Horde, presumably foreign, according to the Romanovian and Millerian theory about the conquest of Russia by the “Mongols.” But how are we to explain the fact that virtually the same tamga can be seen on the columns of the Muscovite Kremlin’s Ouspenskiy Cathedral (figs. 2.8, 2.9 and 2.10), where it is even included in the decorative ornamentation, as well as the galleries of Blagoveshchenskiy Cathedral of
the very same Kremlin?

Fig. 2.8. Various forms of the Horde tamga as found on Russian coins (a, b and c) and ornamental details from the columns of the Ouspenskiy Cathedral in the Muscovite Kremlin (d, e and f). The symbols are obviously related.

Fig. 2.9-2.10. Images of Horde tamgas on the columns of the Ouspenskiy Cathedral in the Muscovite Kremlin. Taken from [96], page 31, ill. 15.

Who was whose vassal, then? Who did the crest belong to? At any rate, was it introduced by the khans, the Princes, or both simultaneously?

This oddity is simply and naturally explained by our reconstruction, q.v. in Chron4, according to which the khans and the Great Princes were but the same characters, demanding the subservient khans and princes to put their lieges’ crest on their coins.
According to the Millerian and Romanovian history of Russia, the mintage of coins in Russia started in the X century A.D. However, it is said to have lasted only for a short while (the X century and some of the XI, ceasing in the early XII century). V. M. Potin, the famous specialist in historical numismatics, writes the following in his book on the history of numismatics in Russia:

“The period between the middle of the XII and the second part of the XIV century is usually referred to as the period of no coinage” ([684], page 186).

Therefore, Russia is said to have minted no coins of its own for some two hundred years. I. G. Spasskiy, another famous specialist in historical numismatics, even mentions a gap of three centuries and a half inherent in the history of Russian coinage ([806], page 93). This amazing picture is represented schematically in fig. 2.11.

Moreover, according to V. M. Potin,

“V. L. Yanin dates the ‘exclusion’ of coins from Russian currency in the south of Russia to the beginning of the XI century” ([684], page 182).
Thus, the epoch of the earliest Russian coinage becomes all but limited to a single century – the tenth, which is followed by a “deathly silence void of coinage” stretched into three centuries, and not two.

It turns out that there’s a “modern theory” meant as an explanation of this fact. Historians descant at length about the presumed “rejection of coins” by the ancient Russians – in other words, we are being told that after some brief experimentation the Russians decided they didn’t like the coins and abandoned them in favour of barter – nails for potatoes, potatoes for fish, and fish for nails. We shall refrain from agreeing with this ridiculous presumption. There is another “theory,” according to which the Russians made the instant transition to gold bullion for large deals and banknotes for everyday use, which were made out of leather, according to the hypothesis of learned historians. However, they are surprised to point out that “hundreds of thousands of excellently preserved leather objects have been found … without anything that would remotely resemble leather money, regardless of type” ([806], page 69). Therefore, no mythical leather banknotes have ever been found.

The mysterious gap of three hundred years in the numismatic history of Russia has been discussed in literature for quite a while. One comes across comments of this kind: “The methods applied to the dating of hoardings are a much more poignant issue in Russia than in any other European country, since none of them has ever had a ‘coinage-deprived’ period of such length (time when no minted coins were used as currency), except for the territory of the ancient Russia. In the north of Russia, this period began in the 1130s – 1140s, and much earlier in the south, stretching up until the restoration of Russian coinage in the second half of the XIV century” ([684], page 182).

Timid attempts to explain the mystical period of “coinage deprivation” in Russian history by references to the Tartar and Mongol invasion are insubstantial due to the very reason that even Millerian and Romanovian chronology dates this “conquest” to the XIII century, circa 1223, which is closer to the end of the period in question than to its beginning.
Therefore, the famous historian I. G. Spasskiy is forced to acknowledge the following in his book *The Russian Monetary System*: “This period is a very odd and uncommon occurrence in the whole history of Russian currency” ([806], page 62).

The feeling of oddness grows after a closer acquaintance with the coinage period of the alleged X-XI century, covered, for instance, in the monograph of M. P. Sotnikova, *The Oldest Russian Coins of the X-XI Century* ([804]). It turns out that there are some 340 Russian coins of the X-XI century known to date, “75 of which remain undiscovered” ([804], page 5). The mintage is believed to have taken place in Kiev during the epoch of Kiev Russia. For the most part, the coins were minted by Princes Vladimir Svyatoslavich, Svyatopolk Yaropolkovich and Yaroslav Vladimirovich.

The following fact is very interesting indeed:

> “Minted 1000 years ago, they [the coins – Auth.] have only been known to scientists for 200 years; only 100 years have passed since they were proven to be Russian, and a mere 30 years since it became finally clear that the first Russian coinage is 1000 years old, and not 900-800. The reason is the relatively small number and poor quality of these coins, as well as the scarcity of such findings” ([804], page 5).

Therefore, the real history of Russia’s oldest coins (namely, the coins of Kiev Russia) *can only be traced as far back as the XVIII century*. Earlier fate of these coins remains unknown; it was relatively recently that historical science “unambiguously dated them to the X-XI century A.D.”

If we are to proceed from the facts that we already know, it is possible to ask the following question loud and clear: *do these coins really date from the X-XI century?* After all, their dating was based on the *pre-existing Scaligerian chronology*, which is most likely to be erroneous, as we already know. Therefore, the datings of these coins need to be revised. Also, what is the exact meaning of the mysterious statement that “only 100 years have passed since they were proven to be Russian”? Were there
other opinions? If so, we would very much like to find out about them.

Further immersion into M. P. Sotnikova’s book, or catalogue, strengthens our suspicions about the veracity of datings ascribed to most Russian coins. If we are to believe that the learned historians were correct, and the mintage barely began before this mysterious cessation, it would be natural to expect that it was primitive, rough and showing little experience in general, eventually ceasing because of the inability of Kiev Russia to use coins as its official currency.

It is with great interest that we turn to the catalogue of coins included in M. P. Sotnikova’s book. We see photographs of the oldest Russian coins dating from the alleged X-XI century. What do we see? We see excellent gold and silver coins of Vladimir. The detail is exquisite, the shape regular, and many of the coins are in good condition. Svyatopolk’s coins have sustained more damage, but the mintage quality is perfect in their case as well. Next we have the beautifully wrought coins with the legend that says “Yaroslavle serebro” (Yaroslav’s silver). I. G. Spasskiy couldn’t hold himself from the emotional remark about “Yaroslav’s silver coins as a phenomenon of mintage quality that makes them quite special in the context of that epoch’s European coinage” ([806], page 53).

In Scaligerian chronology, this level of artwork emerges all of a sudden, as a flash, instantly demonstrating perfection of craftsmanship. Where are the predecessors of these coins, or the first attempts at minting coins, primitive and crude? There are none, for some reason. It is obvious that the high quality of these coins makes it impossible for them to be the first ones minted in a country that has barely become civilized. They represent a well-developed and rich monetary system with much experience behind it, based on silver and gold.

Later on, after the presumably brief and brilliant surge to amazing heights, we see a total collapse. The mintage of coins ceases, and the coins themselves disappear. We are told that the population of Russia was suddenly cast back to the pre-historic barter system of exchanging skins for iron, iron for honey, and honey for skins, entering the “period of no
coinage” that presumably covered some two hundred, or even three hundred years. Historians suggest all sorts of theories in order to explain this strange phenomenon in Russian history to themselves as well as the readers.

Let us briefly pretend to trust them and move forward across the time axis, towards the XIV century, when Russian coinage was “suddenly revived.”

I. G. Spasskiy reports the following:

“In the second half of the XIV century … certain Russian principalities revived the mintage of their own coins, silver coinage of all sorts” ([806], page 78).

In Moscow, the mintage was commenced by Great Prince Dmitriy Ivanovich Donskoi (1389-1425) in the 1360s or the 1370s. The coinage assumed a wider character under his son Vassily Dmitrievich (1389-1425). I. G. Spasskiy’s catalogue ([806]) reproduces the XIV century coins of Dmitriy Donskoi and his descendants. What do we see?

We see primitive and inelegant coins – small, irregular in shape and made of crude cuts of silver, skewed dies, ugly embossing, obvious cases of dies striking the edge of a silver bar, with nothing but a few letters embossed, and so on. This is indeed the very dawn of real mintage.

These coins are the authentic first coins, and therefore naturally very crude and lumpish; the art of mintage took much time to perfect, and the process had been gradual. Let us move onward through I. G. Spasskiy’s catalogue, advancing chronologically, and consider the coins minted by Czar Alexei Mikhailovich Romanov in the XVII century. Some of them already look satisfactory, with fine enough die detail – however, even here we see a large number of crude coins only marginally different from the ones minted under Dmitriy Donskoi in quality – the same unskilful dies, irregular shapes, and diminutive size.

The conclusion we make is that the real origins of Russian coinage can be traced back to the XIV century A.D. – even if Russians did mint coins
prior to that, those were crude and primitive. Russia was therefore little different from all the other countries, since European mintage also doesn’t date any further back than the XI-XII century, q.v. in the review in Chron1, Chapter 1:18. Russian coins of the XIV-XVIII century that have actually reached our age reflect the natural progress of mintage, from the initial crude and primitive coins to the brilliant coinage dating from the epoch of Peter the Great and his successors.

The strange splash of luxurious golden and silver coinage of the alleged X-XI century in Russia receives a simple explanation within the framework of our reconstruction. We are of the opinion that these coins were manufactured on the interval between the XIV and the XVII century. It is clear that they date from the epoch when the craft of Russian mintage had already been well-evolved – gold, silver and excellent dies with fine detail.

These exquisitely wrought coins ended up dated to the X-XI century due to the incorrect chronology of Russian history thought up by court historians of the Romanovian epoch. In other words, the imagination of later historians made the coin travel backwards in time, ending up in the X-XI century due to the chronological shift of 300 or 400 years inherent in Russian history, q.v. in Chron4.

Could it be true, then, that Russia was indeed a particularly barbaric state back in those days, one that had barely managed to emerge from the Stone Age? This would give birth to many strange phenomena that couldn’t have happened in the truly civilised countries of the Western Europe. However, this isn’t the case – history of gold coinage in mediaeval Europe paints the exact same picture.
12.
Strange absence of golden coinage from the Western European currency of the VIII-XIII century

We already mentioned this surprising effect in *Chron1*, Chapter 1:18. We shall now complement those observations of ours with several new considerations. It is generally thought that the “ancient” Rome minted golden coins of outstanding quality. The *mintage of golden coins* had dwindled over the centuries that followed and is reputed to have *completely ceased in the VIII century* A.D. This mysterious “disappearance of gold” had lasted until the XIII century, and even the XV century in some of the European countries.

This is how V. M. Potin comments on *this famous mystery*:

> “Between the V and the middle of the VIII century golden coins prevailed in the currency of many European countries. *Between the middle of the VIII and the XIII century golden coins in European countries were extremely scarce*, with the single exception of Byzantium and certain European regions that were under the influence of Byzantium and the Orient, where gold and copper had still played an important role.”

Potin proceeds to tell us that

> “at the end of the X century, golden coins were *briefly* minted in Russia; they bore the clear marks of Byzantine cultural influence [we have already mentioned this strange surge of masterful Russian coinage in the alleged X-XI century – Auth.];… In the second half of the XV century, the mintage of golden coins was resumed *after a break of five hundred years* by Ivan III, Great Prince of Moscow. *The XV century also begins the epoch of gold and silver currency in Europe*” ([684], page 133).
However, in Italy golden coinage is supposed to have “resumed” somewhat earlier, in the alleged XIII century.

![Diagram showing no golden coinage in Europe from VII to XII century and the resumption in XIII-XVI century.](image)

Fig. 2.12. Mysterious lack of golden mediaeval coinage in Europe in the epoch of the VIII-XII century A.D.

A propos, the quality of the “resurrected” mediaeval coins dating from the XIII-XVI century is just as high as that of the “ancient” gold dated to the epochs preceding the VI-VIII century by learned historians, q.v. in fig. 2.12. Several “theories” were suggested to explain this.

- **Theory #1.** The Dark Ages and the wave of barbarism sweeping over Europe in the VIII-XIII century.
- **Theory #2.** The economical incapacity of Europe.
- **Theory #3.** Shortages of gold, etc.

We believe the explanation to be completely different and a great deal simpler. It is as follows: *the “ancient” golden coins of the alleged I-VIII century were in fact manufactured in the epoch of the XIV-XVII century.* Then they were misdated to deep antiquity by the erroneous chronology of Scaliger and Petavius. New chronology returns them to the due place and makes the picture a great deal more natural, in particular: *first there were the primitive and crude coins of the X-XII century; later on, as experience grew, the mintage of golden coins began in the XIV-XV century.*

It appears as though Russian coinage has been developing more or less simultaneously with the Western European. This is perfectly natural, taking into account the constant trade between the countries, and especially the fact that all of it took place within the boundaries of the united “Mongolian” Empire.

Nations were quick with adopting the *useful ideas* developed by their neighbours and introducing them at home. There were no pronounced
leaders or outsiders – all the nations were developing at a more or less constant rate.

Actually, historians themselves mention this fact: “The technique of manual Russian mintage in the XIV-XVII century didn’t differ much from the techniques of the other European countries” ([684], page 165). Further also: “The naissance of Russian coinage [dated to the X century nowadays – Auth.] coincided with the time that the mintage of coins was introduced in a number of European countries such as Poland, Sweden, and Norway…” ([684], page 231).
13.
The origins of the bicephalous eagle as seen on Russian coins

It is presumed that the bicephalous eagle symbol appeared on Russian coins in 1472 the earliest ([684], page 54). Its history is as follows. This symbol was first introduced by Ivan III in 1497 as the crest on his seal. Some historians explain it by Ivan III marrying the Byzantine princess Sophia Palaiologos in 1472. It is said to have come from Byzantium, which had also given Russia Christianity.

V. M. Potin concludes his analysis of how the bicephalous eagle made its first appearance in Russian heraldry as follows:

“Apart from the rather unconvincing assumption of A. V. Oreshnikov about the symbol of the bicephalous eagle present on several XIV century coins, there is no factual information to confirm that it was introduced before 1472” ([684], page 54).

One may have drawn a line here. The hypothesis about the Byzantine origins of the bicephalous eagle seems perfectly natural and appears to raise no objections from any part. However, in the very next phrase V. M. Potin reports an astonishing fact:

“However, the XIV century inhabitants of the Eastern Europe were already familiar with the symbol, since it had been embossed on the Djuchid coins of Djanibek-Khan (1339-1357) and another anonymous mintage dated to 1358-1380… It is currently impossible to associate the coinage of the Golden Horde [sic! – Auth.] bearing the bicephalous eagle symbol with analogous coins minted in Russia, since they are separated by a centenarian gap… The epoch of Djanibek was the time when the currency of the Golden Horde flourished [sic! – Auth.], which is indirectly confirmed by the popularity of Djanibek-Khan’s coins.
They remained in circulation for a long time after his death… *The symbol was more characteristic for copper coins, with the Djuchids and the Russian Princes alike.* It is most likely that after the marriage of Ivan III the Byzantine emblem found a fertile soil” ([684], page 54).

One cannot fail to notice that V. M. Potin is very cautious when he mentions this “delicate” subject. If we are to formulate the same thought frankly and explicitly, we shall see the following:

1. *The bicephalous eagle first came to Russia with the coins of the Golden Horde in the XIV century.*

2. It can be found on the coins believed to originate from both Russia and the *Golden Horde*. This is in good concurrence with our reconstruction, according to which *the Golden Horde can be identified as the Great Russia*, also known as the *Volga Kingdom* and *Russia of Vladimir and Suzdal*, q.v. in *Chron4*.

3. It is possible that the Horde, or Russia, borrowed the bicephalous eagle symbol from Byzantium. The reverse is also a possibility, namely, that it was brought to Byzantium by the Horde and the Ottomans = Atamans.

4. Apparently, the bicephalous eagle first appeared on the coins of Djanibek-Khan regnant in the middle of the XIV century (1339-1357). Readers familiar with *Chron4* will instantly recognise this character as Ivan Danilovich Kalita (the First, 1328-1340). “Khan” translates as “Czar,” whereas Djanibek simply means John-Bek, or John (Ioann/Ivan).

This corresponds with our reconstruction, according to which Ivan Danilovich Kalita = Caliph was described in various documents as Batu-Khan and Yaroslav the Wise.
The history of Russian coinage is well familiar with the word “altyn,” which is of a Tartar origin. The following is reported about its etymology:

“The word altyn was borrowed from the Tartar language, where it used to stand for a golden dinar. The first mention of altyns known from Russian sources was made in the treaty signed between Dmitriy Ivanovich, Great Prince of Moscow, and Mikhail Alexanrovich, Prince of Tver, simultaneously with the revival of Russian coinage and the introduction of denga as a monetary unit…

The relation between the Old Tartar denke and the Russian denga is obvious (towards the end of the XVIII century the N sound transformed into the softer version more common for the modern Russian)… Thus, altyn (likewise denga) was borrowed from the Tartar financial terminology” ([684], p. 158).

Once again we become convinced about the unity of the Russian and the Tartar monetary system, which is perfectly natural for a single nation, or the “Mongolian” = Great Empire of Russia (the Horde). No terms were borrowed from anywhere, since it would be absurd for any to borrow from itself.

Here’s another curious fact. Let us, for instance, consider the native Russian word kopeika (kopek). V. M. Potin is perfectly right to point out the following:

“There is no doubt about the fact that the name kopek derives from the Russian word for spear, ‘kopyo,’ and had originally been associated with the figure of a horseman armed with a spear found on the Novgorod coins that became the foundation of Russian currency after the reform of the 1530s.”
Yet, further on, Potin tells us the following:

“However, Wilhelm Giese, a researcher from Hamburg, tried to prove this word to be of Oriental Turkic origin, supposedly translating as ‘dog’ (‘kopek’ = ‘dog’). In Timur’s empire [sic! – Auth.] this name was used in a jocular fashion for referring to coins with leonine figures…”

Although the connexions between the Russian state and the nations of Central Asia doubtlessly existed, and certain Russian words derive from Turkic, we consider the transformation of such a term into the name of a Russian coin of the XVI century quite inexplicable” ([684], page 160).

What have we just learnt from V. M. Potin? A most interesting fact indeed. If it is to be formulated briefly and explicitly, the currency used in Timur’s empire was called kopek, just like the Russian currency. This corresponds with our reconstruction, according to which Russia and the Horde (as well as Timur’s empire) can be identified as the same state.

The awkward explanation about the humble citizens of Timur’s great empire were calling their coins kopeks in mockery of the lion depicted upon them, calling it a dog, looks like a fantasy of the modern commentators forced to explain facts that fail to concur with the Scaligerian theory in some way.

Apparently, kopeks, or coins bearing the image of a horseman with a spear (hence the word kopeika, or kopek; the Russian for “spear” is “kopyo”) were circulating in the West as well as in Russia. There were many coins with images of mounted spearmen found during the archaeological excavations in Geneva, for instance ([1043]). We shouldn’t exclude the possibility that this fact can be explained by the “Mongolian” = Great conquest of the XIV century.
15.

Russian and Tartar lettering and the presumably “meaningless inscriptions” on the ancient coins of the Muscovite principality

I. G. Spasskiy reports the following:

“On one side of the first coins issued by the Muscovite principality we see the name of Dmitriy Donskoi in Russian; there is Tartar lettering on the reverse side, which settled on many coins of early emission in Moscow and its environs, as well as the principalities located further East… Tartar lettering as encountered on Russian bilingual coins, oftentimes meaningless or even illegible, were once considered a result of ‘conqueror and tributary’ interaction scheme” ([806], page 96).

An example of such an “illegible Russian coin” is reproduced in fig. 2.13.

Fig. 2.13. “Illegible” inscriptions on Russian coins. The reverse of the top coin bears the legend “Lord of All Russia”. Could it be that the strange script as found on the reverse of the bottom coin means the same thing transcribed in a now-forgotten alphabet? Taken from [957], table VII.
However, as it was already mentioned in *Chron4*, the term “illegible” is often used for referring to coins where the lettering could be read if it hadn’t contradicted Scaligerian chronology.

Further I. G. Spasskiy refutes the version about Russian princes being forced to place the Tartar lettering on their coins as vassals of the Horde. In particular, he points out that

> “even some of Ivan III’s coins minted in that epoch, when any meddling with the Russian currency was already right *out of the question*, we see Tartar phrases such as ‘The present is a Muscovite denga,’ ‘Iban’ (Ivan), etc.” ([806], page 86).

According to A. D. Chertkov,

> “on the coin of Ivan the Terrible we see an *Arabic* inscription that complements the Russian; it transcribes his name as ‘Iban’” ([957], page 59).

Chertkov is therefore of the opinion that the *Tartar* lettering was still present on *Russian* coins under Ivan IV, as well as Ivan III, *at the very end of the XVI century*, that is, which invalidates the theory about Russia being a tributary of the Horde. The latter no longer remained regnant in Russia, even if we’re to believe the Scaligerian and Millerian chronology. A. D. Chertkov believed that such coins were minted by the Russian princes for their Tartar tributaries, which actually makes sense.

The “Tartar” lettering and “Arabic” symbolism as present on Russian coins (see figs. 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.14) are “consensually” (compulsorily, perhaps?) considered vestiges of the “Tartar yoke” in Russia. What one must remember in this respect is that one finds *Arabic lettering* on coins minted in the *West of Europe*, and not just Russia.
For example, “in the coins of Normandy and Sicily we see the word REX in Roman letters on one of the sides and Arabic on the flip side” ([957], page 61). Let us remind the reader that much of the lettering found on Russian coins is also Arabic in origin ([957], q.v. above). Was there a Mongolian yoke in Sicily as well? Historians suggest other explanations; for instance, an abundance of Mohammedans in Sicily ([957], page 61).

We are well familiar with this double standard practice. The same postulations lead to different corollaries in reference to Russia and the West. If we apply the same logic to Russia, we can say that “there were many Mohammedans in Russia, hence the Arabic lettering occasionally found on the Russian coins.” This is the very explanation used for this effect by A. D. Chertkov (in [957], page 61), but only in application to the epochs postdating the end of the XVI century.

Our explanation of the Arabic lettering as present on Western European coins is as follows. The territories in question were part of the “Mongolian” = Great Empire in the epoch of the XIV-XVI century. The lettering was transcribed in the ancient Slavic characters forgotten today and presumed to be Arabian in origin.

Also, if we’re to assume that one side of the “Russo-Arabic” coins was Russian and the other designed to represent vassal dependency, how are we to interpret the coin seen in fig. 2.7, with the legend “The Just Sultan Djanibek” written in the centre, and “Prince Vassily Dm” encircling it? See [870], pages 61-63.

Incidentally, even the Russian letters found on the Russian coins
occasionally strike our contemporaries as extremely odd. Thus, the letter O, for instance, occasionally looked like a human profile facing right, whereas the letter H looked like an animal resembling a do ([957], page 120). See fig. 2.15-2.16.

Fig. 2.15-2.16. Russian coins with Russian letters shaped in an uncommon manner. Taken from [957], table XIII.

According to the evidence of the experts in numismatic history, the overwhelming majority of the “Tartar” legends encountered on Russian coins (apart from the few exceptions as mentioned above) cannot be read ([806] and [957]).

In general, one might come up with the obvious question. How do we
know that the “meaningless and illegible” legends found on Russian coins are indeed of Tartar origin? Could they simply have utilised some ancient Russian alphabet that had drastically differed from the more recent version known to us today? In *Chron4* we already mentioned the mysterious mediaeval Russian stamps covered in “meaningless illegible writing.” This writing turned out Russian – some of it at least.

Therefore, history of the Russian alphabet as reflected in our conception is very incomplete; apparently, up until the rather recent XVII century completely different Russian letters and words had existed, cast into oblivion today. Are any modern researchers working on this problem? We know nothing about any such work.

In general, one finds that the numismatists are rather confused by the Russian coinage of the XIV-XV century ([806], page 97).

> “The Tartar lettering [on these Russian coins – Auth.], being of an imitative nature [? – Auth.], doesn’t offer us much for a precise identification of the coins, since all kinds of Tartar coins were used as prototypes for copies, without much distinction [? – Auth.], oftentimes old ones, bearing names of long deceased khans [sic! – Auth.]” ([806], page 97).

All of this sounds highly suspicious. Could the great Russian princes, who had been free from the yoke of the Horde even in Romanovian history, have based their own currency on the ancient Tartar coins of long dead khans. We believe this hypothesis to be absurd. All the information related by I. G. Spasskiy concurs well with our reconstruction, according to which the Horde and Russia are but the same thing.

It is curious that modern researchers still haven’t managed to attain a full comprehension of the XIV-XV century Russian coinage. I. G. Spasskiy admits that “many Russian coins dating from this epoch remain unidentified; the names found upon them often defy all attempts to be linked to history. Other coins are altogether void of names, with nothing but the title inscribed upon them” ([806], page 97).

There are other examples to demonstrate that there is something wrong
about the modern conception of the Russian language in the XIV-XVI century:

“The lettering upon certain coins are still confusing; on many coins of Vassily Dmitrievich we see a distinct but incomprehensible inscription that reads ‘RARAY’” ([806], page 98).

Further also:

“Many conjectures were voiced (some of them rather amusing) before it became possible to find a satisfactory reading of the unusual warning that we see on a certain type of early Tver coins: ‘Guard against a madman’” ([806], page 98).

However, Spasskiy doesn’t explain this truly odd inscription that one sees upon many Russian coins. Why would that be?

Also:

“We are reminded of just as strange an inscription found on the Muscovite denga of Vassily Tyomniy: ‘Reject the madness, and ye shall live’.”

Actually, there’s nothing too uncommon about it. Apparently, Russians had the custom of putting the first words of ecclesiastical texts on their coins (as it is done on reverse sides of crosses worn as pendants).

Further also:

“A distinctly readable cryptogram [sic! – Auth.] that reads ‘DOKOVONOVOVOZORM’ can be found on the famous type of coin that dates from the epoch of Ivan III or Vassily Ivanovich” ([806], page 98; see fig. 2.17).
M. I. Grinchouk points out the following about this coin:

“The lettering is indeed very distinct, but hardly cryptographic; it can be interpreted as ‘Moskovsko-Novgorodskaya,’ or ‘of Moscow and Novgorod.’ Incidentally, the interpretation suggested by A. D. Chertkov in [957] is much closer to this version than to the ‘cryptographic’ one suggested above.”

All of the above means that these peculiar traits of the Russian alphabet and language in the XIV-XVI century need to be researched actively. Who is conducting this research, and where?

There are many such “cryptographic” coins. There must be something horribly wrong with the modern (Romanovian) version of Russian history, if we fail to understand the lettering on our national currency, which had still been in circulation some 100-200 years before the ascension of the Romanovs, and even during the first years of their reign.

I. G. Spasskiy tells us further:

“One is particularly baffled by certain coins from Tver. They are decorated with figures of unidentifiable bipeds with horns and tails, much like the devils in folk tradition” ([806], page 99).

Could this be the official national currency?

In the reign of Ivan III,

“after the establishment of the 12-grain weight, all the quadrupeds, birds, flowers, griffins, sirens and other fruits of our minters’ imagination disappear from coinage… We are entering the epoch of uniform artwork, weight and general appearance, which shall henceforth characterize the money of the Great Prince of Moscow: a single stamp and the 12-grain weight shall remain in use for the next 150 years. We see a horseman riding to the right, with a sabre over his head, and four lines on reverse… The only difference is in the letters underneath the horse” ([957], page
A. D. Chertkov doesn’t know the meaning of the letters underneath the horse; they could possibly represent the date; we use numeric characters nowadays, whereas our ancestors used the alphabet for the same purpose. It turns out that the life of Russia in the XIV-XVI century, emerging from the signs found on Russian coins, remains a mystery to us, if we cannot so much as make out many of the words used in the Russian language of that epoch.

It is assumed that the ancient Russian monetary unit called *mortka* was made redundant by the introduction of the *denga* as early as in the XIV century.

However, I. G. Spasskiy makes the following unexpected statement:

“The *mortka* is a surprising example of a term’s longevity: it was used in the region of St. Petersburg until the very beginning of the XVIII century, no less!” ([806], page 104).

Our hypothesis is as follows: the Russian monetary units that are dated to deep antiquity nowadays hail from a relatively recent epoch in reality; some of them remained in use until the XIX century.
16. Bilingual lettering on the Russian coins of the XIV century (Russian and Tartar)

According to what A. A. Ilyin, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, reports in the catalogue entitled Classification of Russian Regional Coinage, “all the Russian coins minted at the end of the XIV century were issued on behalf of the Khan of the Golden Horde” ([309], page 33). What makes the historians and the numismatists arrive at this conclusion?

It turns out that “on the front side [of the Russian coins – Auth.] we always have a copy of the Tartar coin… The reverse side always bears the legend saying, ‘Seal of the Great Prince,’ or ‘Seal of the Prince,’ as well as the actual crest. The name of the Great Prince appears to be a later addition… One is therefore brought to the conclusion that all the first Russian coins had two names” ([79], page 33).

Actually, the terms “front” and “reverse” as applied to coins are perfectly arbitrary. On the very same page A. A. Ilyin tells us that “in Russian numismatic terminology of said period the side that bears the seal of the Prince accompanied by Russian lettering is referred to as the front side, whereas the reverse is the copy of a Tartar coin” ([309], page 33).

Specialists in the field of numismatic history usually use the rather evasive term “doubly titled” for referring to these coins. In other words, they bear the name of a Tartar khan on one side and the name of a Russian prince on the other. However, Russian minters in their presumed ignorance would often use the name of the wrong khan. Consider this: “Russian minters, lacking a firm grasp on the Tartar language, appear to have used random Tartar coins as specimens” ([309], page 33). Apparently, this is why they would often mint coins with names and
portraits of the *wrong khans* ([309], page 33).

It turns out that the savage Russian minters were completely unaware of just which Tartar coins were minted in *their* own day and age. Think of a modern Tartar with no knowledge of the Russian language, who is nonetheless perfectly aware of the nature of the Russian currency used for making purchases in shops, despite the numerous recent reforms.

We suggest a simple explanation.

These coins weren’t “doubly titled,” but rather *bilingual*; that is, each coin would bear the name of a single ruler, who was *simultaneously* Khan and Great Prince, *in two languages*, Russian and Tartar.
17.

The locations of the Tartar mints

Let us ponder another noteworthy issue. Where were the *Tartar* mints – the ones that minted *actual Tartar* currency? The Romanovian and Scaligerian version of history keeps silent about their possible locations.

On the other hand, we know the locations of the mints that produced *Russian coinage (presumably copying Tartar specimens)*, or the Russian currency that had “looked Tartar”.

According to A. V. Oreshnikov,

> “due to the recurrent findings of uniform coins in a single region (the area around Suzdal and Nizhniy Novgorod), the question about the place where the *Russian copies of the Tartar coins* were minted is likely to be answered positively – they originate from the Great Principality of *Suzdal and Nizhniy Novgorod*” ([309], page 33).

One gets the impression that the mints of Suzdal and Nizhniy Novgorod made the *Tartar coins of the Russian khans, or Great Princes*. On the other hand, we find *Slavic lettering* on the *Tartar coins* ([309], page 24). This makes the distinction between the “Russian” and “Tartar” coinage even more vague; apparently, it classifies as *nonexistent*. 
18.
Why Great Prince Ivan III put the Hungarian coat of arms on some of his coins

There must be something out of order with the modern Romanovian version of Russian history if it allows for such events as the following.

Apparently, when the Russian Prince Ivan III was minting his own Russian coins,

“he faithfully reproduced a common type of Hungarian coinage, complete with the Hungarian coat of arms on one of the sides and the figures of St. Laszlo on the other (mistaken for the Prince in Moscow). However, the Russian subscription contains the names and the titles of Great Prince Ivan, and his son and co-ruler, Ivan Ivanovich” ([806], page 109).

Let us reflect for a moment. It is very hard to imagine that a mighty ruler of the great Empire would for some reason put the coat of arms of a foreign country on his coins. One might well enquire whether this should imply that Hungary was part of the “Mongolian” = Great Empire of the Horde in the XIV-XVI century. At any rate, this hypothesis is more plausible than, say, the national Mexican coat of arms embossed on US dollar coins, with the profile of a Mexican hero placed on the reverse.

Furthermore, any textbook on mediaeval history states that the Mongols did in fact invade Hungary in the XIII century, at the very beginning of the “Mongol and Tartar invasion.” Scaligerian chronology dates this event to 1241, when the mighty army of Batu-Khan, or the Cossack Batka, laid waste the domain of Bela IV, King of Hungary ([677], page 8). The West was immersed in a state of panic upon learning of this.

In reality, it appears to have happened about a hundred years later, under Batu-Khan, also known as Ivan Danilovich Kalita, who reigned in
the XIV century. Therefore, Hungary had been a colony of the “Mongolian” = Great Empire for some time. However, as it is known to us even from recent history, in such cases imperial authorities usually minted special coins for their colonies.

In our case, the Hungarian coins must have copied the Horde prototypes, using Hungarian symbols, but indicating the title of the Russian Czar, or the leader of the “Mongolian” = Great Empire, in Russian, “colonial coinage,” as it were. After the fragmentation of the Empire, Hungary had separated from the Horde (Russia), which naturally resulted in the cessation of such mintage.
19. Some general considerations in re numismatic history

19.1. The similarity or dissimilarity of portraits on various coins

One occasionally comes across the opinion that the portraits of the same king as found on the coins pertaining to different mintage and type are “similar as a rule,” whereas the coin portraits of different monarchs usually “differ.”

However, if this is indeed the case, the consideration is only applicable to modern coins, with high enough quality of representation. Mediaeval coins demonstrate no such traits; there is a multitude of cases when a single king’s portraits on different coins look completely different. On the contrary, coin portraits of different kings often look amazingly similar. The readers can observe this to be the case if they turn to any comprehensive catalogue of ancient coins.

There is nothing odd about it; the primitive nature of mediaeval dies, as well as the crudeness of artwork and embossment, give us no opportunity of identifying monetary portraits or distinguishing between them. It is absurd to refer to the extremely approximate “royal portraits” found on mediaeval coins as “similar” or “dissimilar.”

19.2. The bizarre hoardings of “long-term accumulation”

Some of the coin hoardings discovered by archaeologists are characterised as “long-term accumulation hoardings”. This term is used for the findings where “the same pot” contains coins dating from epochs considered distant in Scaligerian chronology.

For instance, a single hoarding can contain coins whose datings are centuries apart ([684], page 8). Such cases are usually explained by
theories about “ancient collections accumulated by several or even many generations” ([684], page 8).

We are supposed to believe that some ancient numismatist clan had been collecting coins from different historical epochs for centuries on end – “ancient” Roman coins, mediaeval European coins, etc., and then buried the collection in the ground for future archaeologists to find. We shall not deny the theoretical possibility of this explanation.

However, we can suggest another point of view, which strikes us as more natural. The overwhelming majority of hoardings should be constituted from coins of more or less the same epoch, whose dating scatter range does not exceed several decades or the period of real coinage circulation within the lifespan of a single generation. If we find a strange hoarding where “ancient” coins are mixed with mediaeval ones, it can only mean that the so-called “ancient” coins were misdated and should really be dated to the same mediaeval epoch. The only reason why they ended up in the same hoarding as the coins believed to be mediaeval nowadays is that all of them had been in circulation around the same time.

It is most likely that the mysterious “long-term accumulation” hoardings that make the “antiquity” intertwine with the Middle Ages in a peculiar manner result from the fallacies of Scaligerian chronology. New Chronology transforms all of them into typically mediaeval hoardings.

19.3. Strange destructions of “ancient” coin hoardings in the Middle Ages

Here we have another bizarre fact. It turns out that, according to V. M. Potin,

“the ‘pagan’ coins of the antiquity were treated with suspicion as a rule; the interpretations of the artwork and the lettering were often preposterous [from the Scaligerian viewpoint? – Auth.], and hoardings of coins were often destroyed” ([684], page 8).
Let us cite a characteristic example. An iron chest with gemstones and “ancient” Roman coins was discovered in the alleged IX century. Abbot Konrad von Halden “gave orders for the immediate meltdown of the coins, believing the finding to be the devil’s work” ([684], pages 8-9). By the way, did this really happen in the IX century? According to our reconstruction, the order for the destruction of the old coins was most likely given in the epoch of the Reformation, or the XVI-XVII century, when the history of the “Mongolian” Empire was being obliterated and distorted.

As it is widely known from recent history, many books were destroyed in the Western Europe during the late Middle Ages for some strange reason; for instance, they were burnt publicly, in plain sight of the crowds gathered to witness the incineration. Nowadays we are told that the books in question were considered heretical and contradicting the established ecclesiastical tradition. This might indeed be the case. However, as we are beginning to understand, the primary reason was the destruction of written documents associated with the “Mongolian” = Great Empire. There was even a special index of forbidden books subject to mandatory destruction.

Apparently, a similar fate befell the imperial coinage of the Horde in the XVI-XVII century. They weren’t burnt, obviously enough, but rather re-melted. Wherefore? Could it be that many authentic coins started to contradict certain nascent pseudo-historical conceptions – the Scaligerian version of history, for instance? The ancient symbols of the Horde that they had borne upon them were the very reason for their destruction. The problem would thus be effectively and promptly “solved,” leaving no space for explanations, disputes, etc.

19.4. Petrarch (aka the “ancient” Plutarch?) as the first numismatist

When did the collection and classification of antique coins actually begin?
“Most researchers begin the history of modern collecting from the deeds of Francesco Petrarch, the prominent Italian humanist and poet (1304-1374). His letters reveal that winegrowers often brought him found ancient coins, which the poet would buy” ([684], page 9).

Imagine the glee of the numerous winegrowers at finding such a generous buyer! Their fields must have become bountiful excavation fields.

On the other hand, Petrarch’s involvement in the creation of the “authorised Roman history” is marked by numerous oddities, as covered in detail in Chron1, Chapter 7:4.

19.5. The “ancient” Golden Fleece and its double from the XV century

From our salad days we all know the romantic “ancient” myth of the Golden Fleece, or the legendary treasure sought by the Argonauts. It was glorified and immortalised by Homer, the famed poet.

According to the opinion of the historians, the campaign of the Argonauts dates to deep antiquity, or the epoch of the Trojan War, which is dated to the XIII or the XII century before Christ.

However, it turns out that in 1429, some 2600 years later, Duke Philip of Burgundy founded the Order of the Golden Fleece in Bruges to commemorate his marriage to Isabel of Portugal ([684], page 36).

“The origins of the order’s symbolism is explained in a variety of ways. Some try to associate it with the ancient myth of the Golden Fleece, others with the Flanders felt, which was made of sheep wool… Near the end of the XV century, the crest of the order appears on the silver and golden coinage minted by Philip the Handsome, Count of Franche-Conte (1493-1506) … who had minted coins in Brabant, Flanders, Namur and Holland…”

For about three centuries, the chain of the Golden Fleece with the crest of the order was circumscribing the coats of arms found on most coins minted all across the enormous Habsburg domain by the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire, Kings of Spain and overseas colonies, rulers of the Netherlands and parts of
We shall omit the lengthy list of countries, cities and rulers whose coins had borne the chain of the Golden Fleece in the XV century and later on. Therefore, Scaligerian chronology is of the opinion that it had taken Europe some twenty-five hundred years to recollect the “amazing ancient legend” and found the Order of the Golden Fleece to commemorate it. Our explanation of this “revival” is based on altogether different considerations.

The “ancient” myth of the Golden Fleece does indeed date from the epoch of the Trojan War, but the correct dating of this event is the XIII century A.D. and not the XII century B.C. See more on the subject in Chron1 and Chron2. The voyage of the Argonauts and the “search of the Golden Fleece” is but a legendary reflection of the mediaeval crusades, whose primary participants were the Franks and the subjects of the Holy Roman Empire. Hence the foundation of the Order of Golden Fleece in the XV century – immediately after the Trojan War and the voyages of the Argonauts, which identify as the crusaders. The foundation of the Order of the Golden Fleece in Europe obviously didn’t postdate the Argonauts by 2500 years.

19.6. Mediaeval geographical names were in a state of constant flux

“Numismatic science … cannot exist without the knowledge of historical geography … since the names of towns, cities and whole areas have undergone many changes since then. The mediaeval names of cities on most European coins are in Latin, and they differ from their modern counterparts considerably, for instance:

Aachen – Aquisgranum, or Aquensis urbs;
Milan – Mediolanum;
Liège – Leodium;
The same book lists a large number of other interesting examples. Let us cite a few more (see [684], pages 287-288).

Argentoratum, Argentina or Argentaria – Strasbourg in France;
Augusta Treverorum – Trier in Germany;
Augusta Vindelicorum – Augsburg in Germany;
Batavia or Pattavia – Passau in Germany;
*Borussia* – Prussia;
Dorobernia – Canterbury in archaic literature, or – Dover in Great Britain;
Eboracum or Eoferic – York in Great Britain;
Grantebrycg – Cambridge in Great Britain;
Hybernia – Ireland;
Holsatia – Holstein in Germany;
Ianva – Genoa in Italy;
Lugdunum – Lyon in France;
Mediolanum – Milan in Italy;
Mimigardeforum – Munster in Germany;
Moguntia – Mainz in Germany;
Monacum or Monachum – Munich in Germany;
Mons, Montium or Montanus ducatus –
Berg in Germany;
Nicopia – Nucoping in Sweden;
Palatinus ad Rhenum or Palatinus Rheni – Rhineland-Westphalia in
Germany;
Papia or Ticinum – Pavia in Italy;
Revalia – Tallinn in Estonia;
Ruscia or *Ruthenia* – Russia;
Sabaudia – Savoy in France;
Scotia – Scotland;
Urbs clavorum – Verdun in France; and Vindobona – Vienna in Austria.

These facts once again confirm our general thought that in many cases the names of mediaeval cities and areas had been in a constant state of flux before they rigidified in the epoch of the printing press, when the multiple copies of printed geographical maps put an end to the process.

Therefore, whenever one comes across the name of a town or a region in an ancient document, one must first of all estimate the actual country in question, otherwise it is very easy to make a mistake and transplant the events that occurred in the city of Paris, France, to the soil of the “ancient” Asian Persia, or P-Russia, known as White Russia. Let us reiterate that Russia was sometimes referred to as Ruthenia in the Middle Ages (q.v. in the list above).

19.7. Dates as indicated on antique coins

“Minting dates on ancient coins are rare exceptions. Some of them can only be dated (and to wide time intervals, at that) by secondary indications. However, in the Hellenistic epoch the coins often bore the reign years of the kings who minted them, or the date of minting in local chronology” ([684], page 125).

However, this can only provide us with tiny shreds of relative chronological data. The estimation of a coin’s true chronology is a difficult task.

“The first dated Russian coins appear in 1596 transcribed as letters of the Slavonic alphabet. Although the so-called yefîmki talers, as well as the coins awarded as decorations under Alexei Mikhailovich, had the dates inscribed upon them as numerals (all of the yefîmki are known to date from 1655), virtually every coin up until 1722 bears a dating transcribed in Slavonic numerals” ([684], page 128).

19.8. Is it possible to date sepulchres by the coins found
therein?

According to V. I. Ravdonikas, “it is dangerous to base the chronology of sepulchres upon findings of the monetary nature” (quoted by [684], page 183). We are beginning to understand the reason why; apparently, the coins discovered in hoardings and in actual soil often contradict the Scaligerian chronology.

For example, in the course of the Novgorod excavations, a coin minted between 990 and 1040 was discovered in the layer dated to 1197-1212 by the archaeologists. V. M. Potin makes the following restrained comment:

“The time interval between the dates of the mintage and the loss is thus equal to two centuries… Occidental denarii of the X-XI century can be found in graves that predate 1200” ([684], page 183).

The gap is two or even three centuries long. And so on, and so forth.
What mainstream historians say about the New Chronology?

The **New Chronology** is a fringe theory regarded by the academic community as pseudohistory, which argues that the conventional chronology of Middle Eastern and European history is fundamentally flawed, and that events attributed to the civilizations of the Roman Empire, Ancient Greece and Ancient Egypt actually occurred during the Middle Ages, more than a thousand years later. The central concepts of the New Chronology are derived from the ideas of Russian scholar Nikolai Morozov (1854-1946), although work by French scholar Jean Hardouin (1646-1729) can be viewed as an earlier predecessor. However, the New Chronology is most commonly associated with Russian mathematician Anatoly Fomenko (b. 1945), although published works on the subject are actually a collaboration between Fomenko and several other mathematicians. The concept is most fully explained in *History: Fiction or Science?* book series, originally published in Russian.

The New Chronology also contains a *reconstruction*, an alternative chronology, radically shorter than the standard historical timeline, because all ancient history is “folded” onto the Middle Ages. According to Fomenko’s claims, the written history of humankind goes only as far back as AD 800, there is almost no information about events between AD 800–1000, and most known historical events took place in AD 1000–1500.

The New Chronology is rejected by mainstream historians and is inconsistent with absolute and relative dating techniques used in the wider scholarly community. The majority of scientific commentators consider the New Chronology to be pseudoscientific.
History of New Chronology

The idea of chronologies that differ from the conventional chronology can be traced back to at least the early XVII century. Jean Hardouin then suggested that many ancient historical documents were much younger than commonly believed to be. In 1685 he published a version of Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History* in which he claimed that most Greek and Roman texts had been forged by Benedictine monks. When later questioned on these results, Hardouin stated that he would reveal the monks’ reasons in a letter to be revealed only after his death. The executors of his estate were unable to find such a document among his posthumous papers. In the XVII century, Sir Isaac Newton, examining the current chronology of Ancient Greece, Ancient Egypt and the Ancient Near East, expressed discontent with prevailing theories and proposed one of his own, which, basing its study on Apollonius of Rhodes’s *Argonautica*, changed the traditional dating of the Argonautic Expedition, the Trojan War, and the Founding of Rome.

In 1887, Edwin Johnson expressed the opinion that early Christian history was largely invented or corrupted in the II and III centuries.

In 1909, Otto Rank made note of duplications in literary history of a variety of cultures:

“... almost all important civilized peoples have early woven myths around and glorified in poetry their heroes, mythical kings and princes, founders of religions, of dynasties, empires and cities—in short, their national heroes. Especially the history of their birth and of their early years is furnished with phantastic [sic] traits; the amazing similarity, nay literal identity, of those tales, even if they refer to different, completely independent peoples, sometimes geographically far removed from one another, is well known and has struck many an investigator.” (Rank, Otto. *Der Mythos von der Geburt des Helden*.)

Fomenko became interested in Morozov’s theories in 1973. In 1980, together with a few colleagues from the mathematics department of
Moscow State University, he published several articles on “new mathematical methods in history” in peer-reviewed journals. The articles stirred a lot of controversy, but ultimately Fomenko failed to win any respected historians to his side. By the early 1990s, Fomenko shifted his focus from trying to convince the scientific community via peer-reviewed publications to publishing books. Beam writes that Fomenko and his colleagues were discovered by the Soviet scientific press in the early 1980s, leading to “a brief period of renown”; a contemporary review from the journal *Questions of History* complained, “Their constructions have nothing in common with Marxist historical science.” (Alex Beam. “A shorter history of civilization.” *Boston Globe*, 16 September 1991.)

By 1996, his theory had grown to cover Russia, Turkey, China, Europe, and Egypt [Emp:1].

**Fomenko’s claims**

According to New Chronology, the traditional chronology consists of four overlapping copies of the “true” chronology shifted back in time by significant intervals with some further revisions. Fomenko claims all events and characters conventionally dated earlier than XI century are fictional, and represent “phantom reflections” of actual Middle Ages events and characters, brought about by intentional or accidental misdatings of historical documents. Before the invention of printing, accounts of the same events by different eyewitnesses were sometimes retold several times before being written down, then often went through multiple rounds of translating and copyediting. Names were translated, mispronounced and misspelled to the point where they bore little resemblance to originals. According to Fomenko, this led early chronologists to believe or choose to believe that those accounts described different events and even different countries and time periods. Fomenko justifies this approach by the fact that, in many cases, the original documents are simply not available. Fomenko claims that all the history of the ancient world is known to us...
from manuscripts that date from the XV century to the XVIII century, but describe events that allegedly happened thousands of years before, the originals regrettably and conveniently lost.

For example, the oldest extant manuscripts of monumental treatises on Ancient Roman and Greek history, such as *Annals* and *Histories*, are conventionally dated c. AD 1100, more than a full millennium after the events they describe, and they did not come to scholars’ attention until the XV century. According to Fomenko, the XV century is probably when these documents were first written.

Central to Fomenko’s New Chronology is his claim of the existence of a vast Slav-Turk empire, which he called the “Russian Horde”, which he says played the dominant role in Eurasian history before the XVII century. The various peoples identified in ancient and medieval history, from the Scythians, Huns, Goths and Bulgars, through the Polyane, Duleby, Drevliane, Pechenegs, to in more recent times, the Cossacks, Ukrainians, and Belarusians, are nothing but elements of the single Russian Horde. For the New Chronologists, peoples such as the Ukrainians, Belarusians, Mongols, and others who assert their national independence from Russia, are suffering from a historical delusion.

Fomenko claims that the most probable prototype of the historical Jesus was Andronikos I Komnenos (allegedly AD 1152 to 1185), the emperor of Byzantium, known for his failed reforms; his traits and deeds reflected in ‘biographies’ of many real and imaginary persons (A. T. Fomenko, G. V. Nosovskiy. *Czar of the Slavs* (in Russian). St. Petersburg: Neva, 2004.). The historical Jesus is a composite figure and reflection of the Old Testament prophet Elisha (850-800 BC?), Pope Gregory VII (1020?-1085), Saint Basil of Caesarea (330-379), and even Li Yuanhao (also known as Emperor Jingzong, or “Son of Heaven”, emperor of Western Xia, who reigned in 1032-1048), Euclides, Bacchus and Dionysius. Fomenko explains the seemingly vast differences in the biographies of these figures as resulting from difference in languages, points of view and time frame of the authors of said accounts and biographies.

Fomenko claims the Hagia Sophia is actually the biblical Temple of Solomon. He identifies Solomon as sultan Suleiman the Magnificent (1494–1566). He claims that historical Jesus may have been born in 1152 and was crucified around AD 1185 on the hill overlooking the Bosphorus.

On the other hand, according to Fomenko the word “Rome” is a placeholder and can signify any one of several different cities and kingdoms. He claims the “First Rome”, or “Ancient Rome”, or “Mizraim”, is an ancient Egyptian kingdom in the delta of the Nile with its capital in Alexandria. The second and most famous “New Rome” is Constantinople. The third “Rome” is constituted by three different cities: Constantinople (again), Rome in Italy, and Moscow. According to his claims, Rome in Italy was founded around AD 1380 by Aeneas, and Moscow as the third Rome was the capital of the great “Russian Horde.” Similarly, the word “Jerusalem” is actually a placeholder rather than a physical location and can refer to different cities at different times and the word “Israel” did not define a state, even not a territory, but people fighting for God, for example, French St. Louis and English Elizabeth called themselves the King/Queen of Israel.

He claims that parallelism between John the Baptist, Jesus, and Old Testament prophets implies that the New Testament was written before the Old Testament. Fomenko claims that the Bible was being written until the Council of Trent (1545–1563), when the list of canonical books was established, and all apocryphal books were ordered to be destroyed. Fomenko also claims that Plato, Plotinus and Gemistus Pletho are one and the same person; according to him, some texts by or about Pletho were misdated and today believed to be texts by or about Plotinus or Plato. He
claims similar duplicates Dionysius the Areopagite, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, and Dionysius Petavius. He claims Florence and the House of Medici bankrolled and played an important role in creation of the magnificent ‘Roman’ and ‘Greek’ past.

**Specific claims**

In volumes 1, 2, 3 and 4 of *History: Fiction or Science?*, Fomenko and his colleagues make numerous claims:

- Historians and translators often “assign” different dates and locations to different accounts of the same historical events, creating multiple “phantom copies” of these events. These “phantom copies” are often misdated by centuries or even millennia and end up incorporated into conventional chronology.
- This chronology was largely manufactured by Joseph Justus Scaliger in *Opus Novum de emendatione temporum* (1583) and *Thesaurum temporum* (1606), and represents a vast array of dates produced without any justification whatsoever, containing the repeating sequences of dates with shifts equal to multiples of the major cabbalistic numbers 333 and 360. The Jesuit Dionysius Petavius completed this chronology in *De Doctrina Temporum*, 1627 (v.1) and 1632 (v.2).
- Archaeological dating, dendrochronological dating, paleographical dating, numismatic dating, carbon dating, and other methods of dating of ancient sources and artifacts known today are erroneous, non-exact or dependent on traditional chronology.
- No single document in existence can be reliably dated earlier than the XI century. Most “ancient” artifacts may find other than consensual explanation.
- Histories of Ancient Rome, Greece and Egypt were crafted during the Renaissance by humanists and clergy - mostly on the basis of documents of their own making.
- The Old Testament represents a rendition of events of the XIV to XVI centuries AD in Europe and Byzantium, containing “prophecies” about “future” events related in the New Testament, a rendition of events of AD 1152 to 1185.

- The history of religions runs as follows: the pre-Christian period (before the XI century and the birth of Jesus), Bacchic Christianity (XI and XII centuries, before and after the life of Jesus), Christianity (XII to XVI centuries) and its subsequent mutations into Orthodox Christianity, Catholicism, Judaism, and Islam.

- The *Almagest* of Claudius Ptolemy, traditionally dated to around AD 150 and considered the cornerstone of classical history, was compiled in XVI and XVII centuries from astronomical data of the IX to XVI centuries.

- 37 complete Egyptian horoscopes found in Denderah, Esna, and other temples have unique valid astronomical solutions with dates ranging from AD 1000 and up to as late as AD 1700.

- The Book of Revelation, as we know it, contains a horoscope, dated to 25 September - 10 October 1486, compiled by cabbalist Johannes Reuchlin.

- The horoscopes found in Sumerian/Babylonian tablets do not contain sufficient astronomical data; consequently, they have solutions every 30–50 years on the time axis and are therefore useless for purposes of dating.

- The Chinese tables of eclipses are useless for dating, as they contain too many eclipses that did not take place astronomically. Chinese tables of comets, even if true, cannot be used for dating.

- All major inventions like powder and guns, paper and print occurred in Europe in the period between the X and the XVI centuries.

- Ancient Roman and Greek statues, showing perfect command of the human anatomy, are fakes crafted in the Renaissance, when artists attained such command for the first time.

- There was no such thing as the Tartar and Mongol invasion followed
by over two centuries of yoke and slavery, because the so-called “Tartars and Mongols” were the actual ancestors of the modern Russians, living in a bilingual state with Turkic spoken as freely as Russian. So, Russia and Turkey once formed parts of the same empire. This ancient Russian state was governed by a double structure of civil and military authorities and the hordes were actually professional armies with a tradition of lifelong conscription (the recruitment being the so-called “blood tax”). The Mongol “invasions” were punitive operations against the regions of the empire that attempted tax evasion. Tamerlane was probably a Russian warlord.

- Official Russian history is a blatant forgery concocted by a host of German scholars brought to Russia to legitimize the usurping Romanov dynasty (1613-1917).
- Moscow was founded as late as the mid-XIV century. The battle of Kulikovo took place in Moscow.
- The tsar Ivan the Terrible represents a collation of no fewer than four rulers, representing two rival dynasties: the legitimate Godunov rulers and the ambitious Romanov upstarts.
- English history of AD 640–1040 and Byzantine history of AD 378–830 are reflections of the same late-medieval original.

**Fomenko’s methods**

**Statistical correlation of texts**

One of Fomenko’s simplest methods is statistical correlation of texts. His basic assumption is that a text which describes a sequence of events will devote more space to more important events (for example, a period of war or an unrest will have much more space devoted to than a period of peaceful, non-eventful years), and that this irregularity will remain visible in other descriptions of the period. For each analysed text, a function is devised which maps each year mentioned in the text with the number of pages (lines, letters) devoted in the text to its description (which could be
For example, Fomenko compares the contemporary history of Rome written by Titus Livius with a modern history of Rome written by Russian historian V. S. Sergeev, calculating that the two have high correlation, and thus that they describe the same period of history, which is undisputed. \textit{(Chron1, pp. 194–196.)} He also compares modern texts, which describe different periods, and calculates low correlation, as expected. \textit{(Chron1, pp. 194–196.)} However, when he compares, for example, the ancient history of Rome and the medieval history of Rome, he calculates a high correlation, and concludes that ancient history of Rome is a copy of medieval history of Rome, thus clashing with mainstream accounts.

\textit{Statistical correlation of dynasties}

In a somewhat similar manner, Fomenko compares two dynasties of rulers using statistical methods. First, he creates a database of rulers, containing relevant information on each of them. Then, he creates “survey codes” for each pair of the rulers, which contain a number which describes degree of the match of each considered property of two rulers. For example, one of the properties is the way of death: if two rulers were both poisoned, they get value of +1 in their property of the way of death; if one ruler was poisoned and another killed in combat, they get -1; and if one was poisoned, and another died of illness, they get 0 (Fomenko claims there is possibility that chroniclers were not impartial and that different descriptions nonetheless describe the same person). An important property is the length of the rule. \textit{(Chron1, pp. 215–223.)}
Fomenko lists a number of pairs of unrelated dynasties – for example, dynasties of kings of Israel and emperors of late Western Roman Empire (AD 300-476) – and claims that this method demonstrates correlations between their reigns. (Graphs which show just the length of the rule in the two dynasties are the most widely known; however, Fomenko’s conclusions are also based on other parameters, as described above.) He also claims that the regnal history from the XVII to XX centuries never shows correlation of “dynastic flows” with each other, therefore Fomenko
insists history was multiplied and outstretched into imaginary antiquity to justify this or other “royal” pretensions.

Fomenko uses for the demonstration of correlation between the reigns exclusively the data from the *Chronological Tables* of J. Blair (Moscow, 1808-1809). Fomenko says that Blair’s tables are all the more valuable to us since they were compiled in an epoch adjacent to the time of Scaligerian chronology. According to Fomenko these tables contain clearer signs of “Scaligerite activity” which were subsequently buried under layers of paint and plaster by historians of the XIX and XX centuries.

**Astronomical evidence**

Fomenko examines astronomical events described in ancient texts and claims that the chronology is actually medieval. For example:

- He says the mysterious drop in the value of the lunar acceleration parameter D” (“a linear combination of the [angular] accelerations of the Earth and Moon”) between the years AD 700–1300, which the American astronomer Robert Newton had explained in terms of “non-gravitational” (i.e., tidal) forces. By eliminating those anomalous early eclipses the New Chronology produces a constant value of D” beginning around AD 1000. (*Chron1*, pp. pp.93-94, 105-6.)
- He associates initially the Star of Bethlehem with the AD 1140 (±20) supernova (now Crab Nebula) and the Crucifixion Eclipse with the total solar eclipse of AD 1170 (±20). He also believes that Crab Nebula supernova could not have exploded in AD 1054, but probably in AD 1153. He connects it with total eclipse of AD 1186. Moreover he holds in strong doubt the veracity of ancient Chinese astronomical data.
- He argues that the star catalog in the *Almagest*, ascribed to the Hellenistic astronomer Claudius Ptolemy, was compiled in the XV to XVI centuries AD. With this objective in sight he develops new methods of dating old stellar catalogues and claims that the *Almagest* is based on data collected between AD 600 and 1300, whereby the
telluric obliquity is well taken into account.

- He refines and completes Morozov’s analysis of some ancient horoscopes, most notably, the so-called Dendera Zodiacs—two horoscopes drawn on the ceiling of the temple of Hathor—and comes to the conclusion that they correspond to either the XI or the XIII century AD. Moreover, in his *History: Fiction or Science?* series finale, he makes computer-aided dating of all 37 Egyptian horoscopes that contain sufficient astronomical data, and claims they all fit into XI to XIX century timeframe. Traditional history usually either interprets these horoscopes as belonging to the I century BC or suggests that they weren’t meant to match any date at all.

- In his final analysis of an eclipse triad described by the ancient Greek Thucydides in *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Fomenko dates the eclipses to AD 1039, 1046 and 1057. Because of the layered structure of the manuscript, he claims that Thucydides actually lived in medieval times and in describing the Peloponnesian War between the Spartans and Athenians he was actually describing the conflict between the medieval Navarrans and Catalans in Spain from AD 1374 to 1387.

- Fomenko claims that the abundance of dated astronomical records in cuneiform texts from Mesopotamia is of little use for dating of events, as the astronomical phenomena they describe recur cyclically every 30–40 years.

**Rejection of common dating methods**

On archaeological dating methods, Fomenko claims:

> “Archaeological, dendrochronological, paleographical and carbon methods of dating of ancient sources and artifacts are both non-exact and contradictory, therefore there is not a single piece of firm written evidence or artifact that could be reliably and independently dated earlier than the XI century.” ([Chron1](#))
Dendrochronology is rejected with a claim that, for dating of objects much older than the oldest still living trees, it isn’t an absolute, but a relative dating method, and thus dependent on traditional chronology. Fomenko specifically points to a break of dendrochronological scales around AD 1000.

Fomenko also cites a number of cases where carbon dating of a series of objects of known age gave significantly different dates. He also alleges undue cooperation between physicists and archaeologists in obtaining the dates, since most radiocarbon dating labs only accept samples with an age estimate suggested by historians or archaeologists. Fomenko also claims that carbon dating over the range of AD 1 to 2000 is inaccurate because it has too many sources of error that are either guessed at or completely ignored, and that calibration is done with a statistically meaningless number of samples. Consequently, Fomenko concludes that carbon dating is not accurate enough to be used on historical scale.

Fomenko rejects numismatic dating as circular, being based on the traditional chronology, and points to cases of similar coins being minted in distant periods, unexplained long periods with no coins minted and cases of mismatch of numismatic dating with historical accounts. (Chron1, pp. 90-92.)

He fully agrees with absolute dating methods for clay tablets or coins like thermoluminescence dating, optically stimulated luminescence dating, archaeomagnetic, metallographic dating, but claims that their precision does not allow for comprehensive pinpointing on the time axis either.

Fomenko also condemns the common archaeological practice of submitting samples for dating accompanied with an estimate of the expected age. He claims that convergence of uncertainty in archaeological dating methods proves strictly nothing per se. Even if the sum S of probabilities of the veracity of event produced by N dating methods exceeds 1.00 it does not mean that the event has taken place with 100% probability.
Reception

Fomenko’s historical ideas have been universally rejected by mainstream scholars, who brand them as pseudoscience, but were popularized by former world chess champion Garry Kasparov. Billington writes that the theory “might have quietly blown away in the wind tunnels of academia” if not for Kasparov’s writing in support of it in the magazine Ogoniok. Kasparov met Fomenko during the 1990s, and found that Fomenko’s conclusions concerning certain subjects were identical to his own regarding the popular view (which is not the view of academics) that art and culture died during the Dark Ages and were not revived until the Renaissance. Kasparov also felt it illogical that the Romans and the Greeks living under the banner of Byzantium could fail to use the mounds of scientific knowledge left them by Ancient Greece and Rome, especially when it was of urgent military use. However, Kasparov does not support the reconstruction part of the New Chronology. Russian critics tended to see Fomenko’s New Chronology as “an embarrassment and a potent symbol of the depths to which the Russian academy and society have generally sunk … since the fall of Communism.” Western critics see his views as part of a renewed Russian imperial ideology, “keeping alive an imperial consciousness and secular messianism in Russia.”

In 2004 Anatoly Fomenko with his coauthor Gleb Nosovsky were awarded for their books on “New Chronology” the anti-prize of the Moscow International Book Fair called “Abzatz” (literally ‘paragraph’, a euphemism for a vulgar Russian word meaning disaster or fiasco) in the category “Esteemed nonsense” (“Pochotnaya bezgramota”) awarded for the worst book published in Russia.

Critics have accused Fomenko of altering the data to improve the fit with his ideas and have noted that he violates a key rule of statistics by selecting matches from the historical record which support his chronology, while ignoring those which do not, creating artificial, better-than-chance correlations, and that these practices undermine Fomenko’s statistical
arguments. The new chronology was given a comprehensive critical analysis in a round table on “The ‘Myths’ of New Chronology” chaired by the dean of the department of history of Moscow State University in December 1999. One of the participants in that round table, the distinguished Russian archaeologist, Valentin Yanin, compared Fomenko’s work to “the sleight of hand trickery of a David Copperfield.” Linguist Andrey Zaliznyak argued that by using the Fomenko’s approaches one can “prove” any historical correspondence, for example, between Ancient Egyptian pharaohs and French kings.

James Billington, formerly professor of Russian history at Harvard and Princeton and currently the Librarian of Congress placed Fomenko’s work within the context of the political movement of Eurasianism, which sought to tie Russian history closely to that of its Asian neighbors. Billington describes Fomenko as ascribing the belief in past hostility between Russia and the Mongols to the influence of Western historians. Thus, by Fomenko’s chronology, “Russia and Turkey are parts of a previously single empire.” A French reviewer of Billington’s book noted approvingly his concern with the phantasmagorical conceptions of Fomenko about the global “new chronology.”

H.G. van Bueren, professor emeritus of astronomy at the University of Utrecht, concluded his scathing review of Fomenko’s work on the application of mathematics and astronomy to historical data as follows:

“It is surprising, to say the least, that a well-known (Dutch) publisher could produce an expensive book of such doubtful intellectual value, of which the only good word that can be said is that it contains an enormous amount of factual historical material, untidily ordered, true; badly written, yes; mixed-up with conjectural nonsense, sure; but still, much useful stuff. For the rest of the book is absolutely worthless. It reminds one of the early Soviet attempts to produce tendentious science (Lysenko!), of polywater, of cold fusion, and of modern creationism. In brief: a useless and misleading book.” (H. G. van Bueren, *Mathematics and Logic.*)
Convergence of methods in archaeological dating

While Fomenko rejects commonly accepted dating methods, archaeologists, conservators and other scientists make extensive use of such techniques which have been rigorously examined and refined during decades of use.

In the specific case of dendrochronology, Fomenko claims that this fails as an absolute dating method because of gaps in the record. However, independent dendrochronological sequences beginning with living trees from various parts of North America and Europe extend back 12,400 years into the past. Furthermore, the mutual consistency of these independent dendrochronological sequences has been confirmed by comparing their radiocarbon and dendrochronological ages. These and other data have provided a calibration curve for radiocarbon dating whose internal error does not exceed ±163 years over the entire 26,000 years of the curve.

In fact, archaeologists have developed a fully anchored dendrochronology series going back past 10,000 BCE. “The absolutely dated tree-ring chronology now extends back to 12,410 cal BP (10,461 BC).”

Misuse of historical sources and forced pattern matching

Critics of Fomenko’s theory claim that his use of historical sources is highly selective and ignores the basic principles of sound historical scholarship.

“Fomenko … provides no fair-minded review of the historical literature about a topic with which he deals, quotes only those sources that serve his purposes, uses evidence in ways that seem strange to professionally-trained historians and asserts the wildest speculation as if it has the same status as the information common to the conventional historical literature.”

They also note that his method of statistically correlating of texts is very rough, because it does not take into account the many possible sources of
variation in length outside of “importance.” They maintain that differences in language, style, and scope, as well as the frequently differing views and focuses of historians, which are manifested in a different notion of “important events”, make quantifying historical writings a dubious proposition at best. What’s more, Fomenko’s critics allege that the parallelisms he reports are often derived by alleged forcing by Fomenko of the data – rearranging, merging, and removing monarchs as needed to fit the pattern.

For example, on the one hand Fomenko asserts that the vast majority of ancient sources are either irreparably distorted duplicate accounts of the same events or later forgeries. In his identification of Jesus with Pope Gregory VII (Chron2, p. 51) he ignores the otherwise vast dissimilarities between their reported lives and focuses on the similarity of their appointment to religious office by baptism. (The evangelical Jesus is traditionally believed to have lived for 33 years, and he was an adult at the time of his encounter with John the Baptist. In contrast, according to the available primary sources, Pope Gregory VII lived for at least 60 years and was born 8 years after the death of Fomenko’s John-the-Baptist equivalent John Crescentius.)

Critics allege that many of the supposed correlations of regnal durations are the product of the selective parsing and blending of the dates, events, and individuals mentioned in the original text. Another point raised by critics is that Fomenko does not explain his altering the data (changing the order of rulers, dropping rulers, combining rulers, treating interregna as rulers, switching between theologians and emperors, etc.) preventing a duplication of the effort and effectively making this whole theory an ad hoc hypothesis.

Selectivity in reference to astronomical phenomena

Critics point out that Fomenko’s discussion of astronomical phenomena tends to be selective, choosing isolated examples that support the New
Chronology and ignoring the large bodies of data that provide statistically supported evidence for the conventional dating. For his dating of the Almagest star catalog, Fomenko arbitrarily selected eight stars from the more than 1000 stars in the catalog, one of which (Arcturus) has a large systematic error. This star has a dominant effect on Fomenko’s dating. Statistical analysis using the same method for all “fast” stars points to the antiquity of the Almagest star catalog. Rawlins points out further that Fomenko’s statistical analysis got the wrong date for the Almagest because he took as constant Earth’s obliquity when it is a variable that changes at a very slow, but known, rate.

Fomenko’s studies ignore the abundance of dated astronomical records in cuneiform texts from Mesopotamia. Among these texts is a series of Babylonian astronomical diaries, which records precise astronomical observations of the Moon and planets, often dated in terms of the reigns of known historical figures extending back to the VI century BCE. Astronomical retrocalculations for all these moving objects allow us to date these observations, and consequently the rulers’ reigns, to within a single day. The observations are sufficiently redundant that only a small portion of them are sufficient to date a text to a unique year in the period 750 BCE to 100 CE. The dates obtained agree with the accepted chronology. In addition, F. R. Stephenson has demonstrated through a systematic study of a large number of Babylonian, Ancient and Medieval European, and Chinese records of eclipse observations that they can be dated consistently with conventional chronology at least as far back as 600 BCE. In contrast to Fomenko’s missing centuries, Stephenson’s studies of eclipse observations find an accumulated uncertainty in the timing of the rotation of the earth of 420 seconds at 400 BCE, and only 80 seconds at 1000 CE.

Magnitude and consistency of conspiracy theory

Fomenko claims that world history prior to 1600 was deliberately falsified
for political reasons. The consequences of this conspiracy theory are twofold. Documents that conflict with New Chronology are said to have been edited or fabricated by conspirators (mostly Western European historians and humanists of late XVI to XVII centuries). The lack of documents directly supporting New Chronology and conflicting traditional history is said to be thanks to the majority of such documents being destroyed by the same conspirators.

Consequently, there are many thousands of documents that are considered authentic in traditional history, but not in New Chronology. Fomenko often uses “falsified” documents, which he dismisses in other contexts, to prove a point. For example, he analyzes the Tartar Relation and arrives at the conclusion that Mongolian capital of Karakorum was located in Central Russia (equated with present-day Yaroslavl). However, the Tartar Relation makes several statements that are at odds with New Chronology (such as that Batu Khan and Russian duke Yaroslav are two distinct people). Those are said by Fomenko to have been introduced into the original text by later editors.

Many of the rulers that Fomenko claims are medieval doppelgangers moved in the imaginary past have left behind vast numbers of coins. Numismatists have made innumerable identifications of coins to rulers known from ancient sources. For instance, several Roman emperors issued coinage featuring at least three of their names, consistent with those found in written sources, and there are frequent examples of joint coinage between known royal family members, as well as overstrikes by kings who were known enemies.

Ancient coins in Greek and Latin are unearthed to this day in vast quantities from Britain to India. For Fomenko’s theories to be correct, this could only be explained by counterfeit on a very grand and consistent scale, as well as a complete dismissal of all numismatic analyses of hoard findings, coin styles etc.

*Popularity in forums and amongst Russian imperialists*
Despite criticism, Fomenko has published and sold over one million copies of his books in his native Russia. Many internet forums have appeared which aim to supplement his work with additional amateur research. His critics have suggested that Fomenko’s version of history appealed to the Russian reading public by keeping alive an imperial consciousness to replace their disillusionment with the failures of Communism and post-Communist corporate oligarchies.

Alexander Zinoviev called the New Chronology “one of the major scientific breakthroughs of the XX century.”

(Wikipedia text retrieved on 2nd August, 2015)

Afterword from the publisher

Dr. Fomenko et al as scientists are ready to recognize their mistakes, to repent and to retract on the condition that:

- radiocarbon dating methods pass the black box tests, or
- astronomy refutes their results on ancient eclipses, or
- US astrophysicist Robert Newton was proved wrong to accuse Ptolemy of his crime.

At present, historians do not, can not, and will not comply. The radiocarbon dating labs run their very costly tests only if the sample to be dated is accompanied with an idea of age pronounced by historians on basis of … subjective … mmm … gutfeeling … and the history books they have been writing for the last 400 years. Radiocarbon labs politely bill for their fiddling and finetuning to get the dates “to order” of historians. Circulus vitiosus is perfect.
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Separate books on the New Chronology

Prior to the publication of the seven-volume *Chronology*, we published a number of books on the same topic. If we are to disregard the paperbacks and the concise versions, as well as new re-editions, there are seven such books. Shortened versions of their names appear below:

1. Introduction.
4. The New Chronology of Russia, Britain and Rome.
5. The Empire.
6. The Biblical Russia.
7. Reconstruction.

**Book One. Introduction.**


**Book Two, Part One:** *Methods-1.*


[Meth1]:7. A revised version of the book was published as two volumes (the first two in a series of three) in 1999 in the USA (in Russian) by the Edwin Mellen Press. Fomenko, A. T. *New Methods of Statistical Analysis of Historical Texts. Applications to Chronology,* Vols. 1 and 2. The publication is part of the series titled *Scholarly Monographs in the Russian Language,* Vols. 6-7. Lewiston,

- **Book Two, Part Two: Methods-2.**


  [Meth2]:3. A revised version of the book was published as the last volume in a series of three in the USA (in Russian) under the title: Fomenko A. T. *Antiquity in the Middle Ages (Greek and Bible History)*, the trilogy bearing the general name: Fomenko A. T. *New Methods of the Statistical Analysis of Historical Texts and their Chronological Application*. The publication is part of the series titled *Scholarly Monographs in the Russian Language*. Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter, The Edwin Mellen Press, 1999. 578 p.

- **Book Three: Methods-3.**


• **Book Four: Russia, Britain and Rome.**


• **Book Five: The Empire.**


• **Book Six: The Biblical Russia.**


- **Book Seven: Reconstruction.**


We have to point out that the publication of our books on the New Chronology has influenced a number of authors and their works where the new chronological concepts are discussed or developed. Some of these are: L. I. Bocharov, N. N. Yefimov, I. M. Chachukh, and I. Y. Chernyshov ([93]), Jordan Tabov ([827], [828]), A. Goutz ([220]), M. M. Postnikov ([680]), V. A. Nikerov ([579:1]), Heribert Illig ([1208]), Christian Blöss
and Hans-Ulrich Niemitz ([1038], [1039]), Gunnar Heinsohn ([1185]),
Gunnar Heinsohn and Heribert Illig ([1186]), Uwe Topper ([1462],
[1463]).

Our research attracted sufficient attention to chronological issues for the
Muscovite publishing house Kraft to print a new edition of the
fundamental work of N. A. Morozov titled Christ, first published in 1924-
1932.
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