HISTORY: FICTION OR SCIENCE?

THE GREAT WALL OF CHINA HOAX

ANATOLY FOMENKO
GLEB NOSOVSKYI
THE GREAT WALL OF CHINA
HOAX

ANATOLY FOMENKO
GLEB NOSOVSKIY
Overview of the e-Series

About the authors

From the publisher

1. A general characteristic of Chinese history
   1.1. The reason why Chinese history is so complex
   1.2. Chinese names of persons and places
       1.2.1. What we come up with when we read Chinese texts and translate Chinese names
       1.2.2. European nations on the Chinese arena
   2. The landmarks of the parallelism between the Chinese and the phantom European history before the X century A.D.
   3. The landmarks of the parallelism between the Chinese and the Roman-Byzantine history of the X-XIV century A.D.
       3.1. The parallel between the Macedonian conquest in Europe and the Khitan conquest in China
       3.2. Baptism in China in the X century. The same happened in the X century Russia
       3.3. The Son of Heaven in the XI century China (Jesus Christ?)
       3.4. The First Crusade of 1099 as reflected in “Chinese history”
       3.5. A hundred-year shift in the “Chinese history” of the XI century
       3.6. Kaifeng as the capital of the Chinese “R” Empire
       3.7. The reflection of the Fourth Crusade in the “Chinese history”
   4. The Chinese history of the Khitans, the Kingdom of Prester John, and the rise of the “Mongolian” Empire
       4.1. The bifurcation on paper of the prehistory of the “Mongolian” Empire: it splits into European and allegedly Oriental, “Chinese” history
       4.2. The history of the emergence of the “Mongolian” Empire according to
“Chinese” chronicles
4.2.1. The Latin and the Nicaean Empires in the “Chinese” chronicles
4.2.2. Ilya Dashi
4.2.3. Gürkhan
4.2.4. The “Chinese” Emil River and the ancient Russian Ilmer
4.2.5. The “Chinese” Balasagun city and the old Russian city of Balakhna
4.2.6. The “Chinese” Zhetysu region
4.2.7. Yelü Dashi founds himself at the head a huge army in the Semirechye
4.2.8. Why China is called “Kitai” in Russia
4.2.9. An grand “ancient Chinese” battle of the XIII century A.D.
4.2.10. Christianity of the Kara-Khitans (Royal Scythians?)
4.2.11. The “Chinese” chronicles describing one and the same period had later been stretched to cover a hundred years
4.2.12. When had the European chronicles been brought to China?

5. The history of China after the XV century A.D.
5.1. The age and purpose of the Great Wall of China
5.2. How long is the way from China to Kitai?
5.2.1. Where was China at the time of Afanasy Nikitin
5.2.2. Bilingualism in the XV century Russia
5.3. Why Beijing is called Peking
5.4. China or Bogdoy?
5.5. Who are the Buddhists?
5.6. Three “Mongolian” dynasties in the history of China
5.7. In European chronicles, China is referred to as the Land of the Seres. Who were the Seres?
5.8. The Manchurian epoch as the beginning of trustworthy history of China

What mainstream historians say about the New Chronology?
Overview of the seven-volume print edition
Bibliography
Overview of the e-Series

History: Fiction or Science?

by Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb Nosovskiy

Book 1:
The Issue with Chronology

Book 2:
Astronomy vs. History
Book 3:
The Apocalypse Seen by Astronomy

Book 4:
The Issue with Dark Ages

Book 5:
The Issue with Antiquity
Book 6:
The Issue with Troy

Book 7:
The Issue with Russian History

Book 8:
The Horde From Pacific to Atlantic
Book 9:
The Issue with Mongols

Book 10:
The Issue with Ivan the Terrible

Book 11:
The Issue with Tamerlane
Book 12:
USA Has Issues with Maps of 18th Century

Book 13:
The Issue with Czar’s Helmet

Book 14:
The Issue with Russian Tartary
Book 15:
The Issue with British History

Book 16:
Crusades and Exoduses

Book 17:
Maps and Coins vs. History
Book 18:
Swords and Mantles Tell History

Book 19:
The Testament of Peter the Great

Book 20:
The Issue with Baptism of Russia
Book 21:
The Issue with Chinese Astronomy
About the authors

- **Fomenko, Anatoly Timofeevich** (b. 1945). Full Member (Academician) of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Full Member of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences, Full Member of the International Higher Education Academy of Sciences, Doctor of Physics and Mathematics, Professor, Head of the Moscow State University Section of Mathematics of the Department of Mathematics and Mechanics. Solved Plateau’s Problem from the theory of minimal spectral surfaces. Author of the theory of invariants and topological classification of integrable Hamiltonian dynamic systems. Laureate of the 1996 National Premium of the Russian Federation (in Mathematics) for a cycle of works on the Hamiltonian dynamical systems and manifolds’ invariants theory. Author of 200 scientific publications, 28 monographs and textbooks on mathematics, a specialist in geometry and topology, calculus of variations, symplectic topology, Hamiltonian geometry and mechanics, computer geometry. Author of a number of books on the development of new empirico-statistical methods and their application to the analysis of historical chronicles as well as the chronology of antiquity and the Middle Ages.

- **Nosovskiy, Gleb Vladimirovich** (b. 1958). Candidate of Physics and Mathematics (MSU, Moscow, 1988), specialist in theory of probability, mathematical statistics, theory of probabilistic processes, theory of optimization, stochastic differential equations, computer modelling of stochastic processes, computer simulation. Worked as researcher of computer geometry in Moscow Space Research Institute, in Moscow Machine Tools and Instruments Institute, in Aizu University in Japan. Faculty member of the Department of Mathematics and Mechanics MSU.
The general hypothesis related in this book can be formulated as follows. Early history of China up until the XV century A.D. is in fact the history of Europe and the Mediterranean region, Byzantium in particular. Historical chronicles telling us about Europe were transplanted to China in the XIV-XV century A.D. the earliest.

Today it is considered that the construction of the Great Wall of China began in the III century B.C., allegedly as a protection against northern nomads. The argument that the wall had been repaired during those two thousand years is dubious. Only a rather recent construction is worth being repaired, otherwise it will become obsolete and just wreck. This is what we observe in Europe, by the way. Old defensive walls had been demolished, and new, more solid walls built in their place. For instance, many fortifications in Russia had been rebuilt in the XVI century.

And yet we are told that the Wall of China, once built, remained unchanged for two thousand years. We are not told that this is a “modern wall recently built in the site of the old one,” but that this is exactly the wall that had been built two thousand years ago. This is extremely strange, not to say more.

When and against whom had the wall been built? According to the new chronology, the “Chinese” history before the XV century had in reality been unfolding in Europe; therefore, the Wall of China could not be built before XV century A.D. And, naturally, it wasn’t built against spears and arrows, even copper- or stone-tipped, of the III century B.C. Such walls are needed against firearms. The construction of such fortifications began in approximately the XV century, with the invention of cannons and siege weapons...
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
1. A general characteristic of Chinese history

1.1. The reason why Chinese history is so complex

Let us begin with two general observations.

Firstly, Chinese historical sources are extremely chaotic, contrary to the popular opinion.

Secondly, the modern Chinese pronunciation of historical names, personal as well as geographical, is drastically different from the ancient, and once we turn to the older versions of the names, we instantly begin to recognize names and terms familiar from European history.

According to J. K. Wright, “many of these Asian Christians bore Christian names, which have reached us in Chinese transcription; for instance, Yao-Su-Mu (Joseph) or Ko-Li-Chi-Sy (George; see [722], page 254). We can clearly see how Christian names transform in Chinese pronunciation and become distorted to a large extent.

It turns out that Yaosumu stands for Joseph, and Kolichisy for George. If one isn’t aware of this fact beforehand, one is unlikely to ever figure it out on one’s own.

However, many of the modern ruminations about the uniqueness and the antiquity of Chinese history are largely based on this strong distortion of European and Christian names as pronounced in Chinese. It suffices to rewrite the European annals transcribing all the names in the Chinese fashion in order to make the well-familiar European texts impossible to recognize.

The general hypothesis related in this book can be formulated as follows.

Early history of China up until the XV century A.D. is in fact the history of Europe and the Mediterranean region, Byzantium in
particular. Historical chronicles telling us about Europe were transplanted to China by the Great = “Mongolian” conquerors in the XIV-XV century A.D. the earliest.

Later on, already after the XVII century, these chronicles were discovered in China and erroneously assumed to report the “ancient history of China.” The mistake was easy to make, since the Chinese had used hieroglyphs, or simply drawings.

This method of writing must have come to China from Egypt, possibly as early as in the XII-XIII century. The interpretation of hieroglyphs is largely dependent on the language. The same hieroglyphs are read in completely different manners depending on whether the reader is Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese, etc.

Names of people and places are transcribed hieroglyphically by means of finding similarly sounding hieroglyphs in the language in question. Therefore, the transcription and, consequently, the modern pronunciation of the old Chinese names is initially dependent on the nationality of the author who had set them in hieroglyphs. One must estimate whether the author in question had originally been Chinese, Japanese, Korean, or Vietnamese.

Furthermore, human language keeps on changing. The names that had once been transcribed in one manner change into something completely different, even if the hieroglyphs transcribing it remain the same. Thus, the interpretation of hieroglyphs is time-related.

Apart from that, hieroglyphs have undergone a variety of reforms. The last large-scale reform of hieroglyphs in China and Japan took place in our epoch, the XX century. Many of the old hieroglyphs are already impossible to read for someone accustomed to the modern hieroglyphic writing, which has undergone a multitude of changes. Fig. 6.1 demonstrates a comparison of the ancient Chinese writing and its modern equivalent.
The chaotic nature of Chinese historical sources is mentioned by specialists in a variety of respects. This is what V. L. Vassilyev, a famous historian, tells us:

“The first impression one gets after familiarizing oneself with the complete collection of Chinese annals is a feeling of its completeness; it is easy enough to believe that anyone who knows the Chinese language can read the numerous volumes of historical works and mechanically extract data from them. However, the real picture is thoroughly different. Apart from the strange order of volumes that makes one go through the entire collection of chronicles in order to obtain information about a single event, tiresome labour and constant critical strain (which can nonetheless reveal the truth only after a study of the subject in its entirety), historians are constantly confronted with questions that keep them searching for answers in vain, running into lacunae and distortions all the time” (quoted by [215], page 21).

The historian L. N. Gumilev adds the following:

“The initial data come from the translations of Chinese chronicles, but despite the fact that said translations were done very diligently, the actual chronicles are a source of the greatest complexity” ([215], page 20).

Further also:
“Difficulties related to historical geography, ethnography, palaeography and social history are much greater than the ones listed [by Vassilyev – Auth.]” ([215], page 21).

Thus, we see that the Chinese chronicles are in a state of chaos and lack any sort of system whatsoever. It is easy to understand why. When old records transcribed in half-forgotten hieroglyphs were converted into a newer hieroglyphic system in the XVII-XVIII century, the translators were hardly capable of understanding the meaning of what they were translating. They were therefore forced to add much of their own commentary, which has led to a substantial growth of the source volume. This must have happened several times. Obviously, the chronicles turned out chaotic, confusing, and vague. Their vagueness results from the poor understanding of the old texts by the translators.

We have seen that European history was similarly afflicted, albeit to a lesser extent. European chroniclers would confuse personal and geographical names as well as certain terms; however, the phonetics of individual letters remained more or less the same. The situation in China was different, hence a much greater degree of entropy. This is why historians accustomed to European materials become confounded when they begin to study Chinese history, presumably related with great diligence by the “ancient Chinese chroniclers.”

1.2. Chinese names of persons and places

1.2.1. What we come up with when we read Chinese texts and translate Chinese names

Chinese history appears to refer to a great variety of names and places familiar to us by the European history of the Mediterranean region. However, modern publications hardly give us an opportunity to see this. The matter is that we read old names using modern Chinese pronunciation, as it has been mentioned already, and without any
translation to boot. However, N. A. Morozov was perfectly right to note that if one were to translate every single name that one finds in Chinese chronicles, the latter lose their distinct “Chinese” look as well as the ties with the territory of the modern China. Leaving Chinese names without any translation whatsoever is incorrect, since they all have meaningful translations in reality.

N. A. Morozov wrote:

“The readers have seen how the Highest Emperor, or simply His Highness, ordered his astronomers, two ‘Plans’ and a ‘Draft’, to wander the world in order to make astronomical and calendar observations [we have already quoted this ancient Chinese text after Morozov, q.v. in Book 21 of the present e-series – Auth.].

Quite naturally, the readers themselves … decided that this wasn’t a chronicle … but rather a myth of a later origin… However, I have first read this myth in English … wherein ‘Draft’ and ‘Plan’ retained their Shang-Dung names of He and Ho, and the name of the Highest Ruler was left half-translated as Emperor Yao… This gave me the impression of a dry chronicle record whose every word is a historical fact” ([544], p. 61).

One needn’t wonder about the mysterious reasons why one cannot make heads or tails of the Chinese chronicles translated quite as “meticulously.” Another example:

“In every Chinese story we read: ‘In the third century between 221 and 264 there were three emperors regnant in China simultaneously: Chao-Le-Di, Ven-Di, and Da-Di… In the early IV century there was the dynasty of Shi-Chin, whose most spectacular ruler was known as U-Di… The dynasty regnant between 317 and 419 was that of Dung-Ching, whose kings were called Yuan-Di, Ming-Di, Chen-Di, Kung-Di, etc.”

N. A. Morozov writes:

“Isn’t this account historical, documental and nationally Chinese? However, it is enough to recollect the fact that these names are transcribed as drawings and not
sounds for this pseudo-documental rendition to cease being authentically Chinese, let alone historical. We shall come up with the following:

‘In the third century between 221 and 264 the Mediterranean Empire was ruled by three emperors at the same time; their names were Clear and Passionate, Literary and The Great… The dynasty of Occidental Prosperity reigned in the beginning of the fourth century; its most spectacular ruler was known as the Military Emperor… After that, between the years of 317 and 419, there was the dynasty of Oriental Prosperity, whose rulers were known as the First Main King, the Fairest King, King of the Ending, King of Prosperity, etc.”

Further on, Morozov asks the reader:

“Do you think that a complete translation, and not a partial one, which is the custom of every historian, as it was mentioned above, leaves anything of dry documental data, history or even distinctive national characteristics pertaining to China? The ‘Mediterranean Empire’ strongly resembles the empire of Diocletian in the Mediterranean region with its first triumvirate, only moved backwards by a few decades” ([544], page 62).

The pronunciation of names in Chinese has changed greatly over the course of time as well. L. N. Gumilev wrote the following in this respect:

“Unfortunately, consensual pronunciations of Chinese names are based on the phonetics of the language that is contemporary to us, and not the events in question. This circumstance complicates the linguistic analysis of ethnicons” ([215], p. 151).

1.2.2. European nations on the Chinese arena

1) The “ancient” Chinese Hungarians

The nation of the Huns was quite prominent in the “ancient” history of China. L. N. Gumilev even wrote the famous book entitled Huns in China. However, Scaligerian history reports that the very same Huns were active in Europe and the Mediterranean region in the beginning of the new era.
Modern historians are forced to assume (and actually assume) that the *Huns separated into two tribes*, one of which ended up in the *Mediterranean* region, and the other in *China*.

This is what L. N. Gumilev writes on this subject:

“In the first century A.D. the *kingdom of the Huns was split in two* as a result of certain internal processes. One part submitted to the *Chinese* rule, and the other fought its way back to the *West*, having become mixed with the *Ugrians* and the *Sarmatians*” ([215], page 5).

It is easy enough to understand why the Huns have “become mixed with the Ugrians” when they arrived in Europe. This only happened on paper, in the reports of historians. As we mentioned in *Chron4*, referring to Sigismund von Herberstein, mediaeval *Hungarians* (or *Ugrians*) were known as the *Huns*. Hungarians also manifest in Chinese history under their European name, as *Ugrians*, or *Ouigurs*, which is virtually the same name ([212], p. 165).

The progeny of the European Huns (in particular, their alleged Chinese roots) keeps the learned historians on edge. The Huns have recently become known as the Sunnians, in accordance with the modern Chinese pronunciation ([319], p. 113).

For instance, S. S. Minyaev reports the following:

“Finally, let us mention the historical destiny of the *Sunnians* [the Huns – Auth.] and the possibility of their advent to Europe… The primary reason that could have led to the *possible migration of the Sunnians* [the Huns – Auth.] and their *transformation into the European Huns* is usually named as…” ([339], pp. 123-124).

S. S. Minyaev suggests a version that doesn’t even seem satisfactory to himself:

“It is obvious that the suggested model *doesn’t solve the problem of the Huns’ origins; au contraire, it emphasises its complexity*” ([339], p. 125).
We can therefore see that the “ancient” China was inhabited by Hungarians, but not just them; after all, a great many nations inhabited Europe in the Middle Ages, which is known to the readers perfectly well.

2) Serbs in “ancient” China

L. N. Gumilev reports:

“In Asia, the Huns weren’t defeated by the Chinese; their conquerors belonged to a nation that doesn’t exist today, known as Sianbi in Chinese. In the old days, this nation was known as Särbi, Sirbi, or Sirvi” ([215], p. 6).

We categorically disagree with Gumilev about the nonexistence of this nation. We all know the famous Serbs (also known as Särbi, Sirbi, and Sirvi) – good warriors who still live in the Balkans and don’t intend to vanish at all.

3) Goths in “ancient” China

L. N. Gumilev tells us further:

“Tribes of Zhundian origin [whose name is derived from the word ‘Zhun’, according to Gumilev, which is basically the same as ‘Huns’ – Auth.] united, forming the mediaeval Tangut nation... The Chinese sometimes called them ‘Dinlins’ figuratively; however, this name isn’t an ethnicon, but rather a metaphor that emphasises their Caucasian appearance as a distinctive trait. Real Dinlins were an altogether different nation and resided in Siberia, not China” ([215], page 30).

We are of the opinion that the name “Tangut” is easily recognizable as a version of the well-familiar “Tan-Goth,” or simply “Don-Goth” (“Tanais-Goth”), which is the name of the Goths that lived in the area of the Don, or Tanais (the old name of the Don), or, alternatively, near the Danube.

Thus, the Goths from the region of Don (or the Danube) lived in China, which is why the Chinese chronicles emphasise the Caucasian features of this nation. Another interesting detail is the claim that the
Chinese Dinlins really lived in Siberia.

4) The Don Cossacks in “ancient” China

In *Chron4*, we have already said more than once that “Goths” is just another term for “Cossacks” and “Tartars.” Thus, the “Tan-Goths,” i.e., the Don Cossacks, had lived in China. Therefore, it can be expected that, if we continue the passionate reading of the Chinese chronicles, we will sooner or later stumble upon the “Tartars.” It goes without saying that our prediction immediately comes true. Indeed.

5) The Tartars and the Turks in “ancient” China

Apparently, Chinese historians were convinced that the Tartars and the Turks were living in China since times immemorial ([212], pages 164-167).

> “Wan Ho Wei is of the opinion that *Chubu* is the Qi Dang name of the Tartars… Their Turkic neighbours (the Blue Turks and the Ouigurs) called them Tartars, whereas the Muslim authors called them *Chinese Turks*” ([212], p. 165).

There were three primary kinds of the Chinese Tartars.

> “Mediaeval Chinese historians divided the nomadic Oriental nations into three groups: *White*, *Black*, and *Wild Tartars*” (ibid., p. 167).

This division of the Tartars into three groups is already known to us quite well, q.v. in *Chron4*. Namely, we are referring to the Great Horde, or Greater Russia, the Blue Horde, or Lesser Russia, and the White Horde, or White Russia.

As for the Chinese “Black Tartars,” one has to point out that there had also been *Black Russia*, which was indicated on the maps up until the XVIII century.

One must point out the confusion that accompanies every mention of the *Tartars*, be it Europe or China. As we wrote in *Chron4*, the word “Tartar” was a collective term in Russian history, which had applied to the Russians, the Turks and the actual Tartars in the modern sense of the
We see the same in Chinese history. L. N. Gumilev makes the following irritated comment in this respect:

“What mystery does the ethnicon ‘Tartar’ conceal? … In the XII century, the term was applied to the entire populace of the steppes, from the Great Wall of China to the Siberian taiga” (ibid., page 166).

The collective nature of the term “Tartar” was already pointed out by Rashed ad-Din:

“Many clans sought greatness and dignity, calling themselves Tartars and becoming known under this name, just like … other tribes, who had possessed names of their own previously, but started calling themselves Mongols, attempting to cover themselves in the glory of the latter” (ibid.).

Further on, the Chinese Tartars appear to have undergone a series of fantastical metamorphoses. L. N. Gumilev reports that, apparently, “in the XIII century, the Tartars became regarded as part of the Mongols… The name of their nation ceased to exist in Asia and became used for referring to the Turkic tribes inhabiting the Volga region, subordinate to the Golden Horde, transforming into an ethnicon over the course of time” (ibid.). “The Tartar multitudes (in a narrow sense of the word) were the avant-garde of the Mongolian army” (ibid.).

All of this is already familiar to us. All the inhabitants of Russia were referred to as “Tartars” in a broader sense of the word; however, Russia was also inhabited by the “real” Tartars, or the Turkic tribes living in the region of the Volga, or Tartars in the narrow sense of the word. Nowadays the term applies to them exclusively.

As we can see, the same was the case in China. The Chinese, just like the Western Europeans of the XIII-XVI century, confused the “Mongols,” or the Russians, with the Tartars, or the Turkic tribes inhabiting the area of the Volga.
We believe all the “Chinese reports” of the nations mentioned above, including the Tartars and the Mongols, to be European in origin. They were brought to China (on the pages of the chronicles) as recently as in the XVI-XVIII century, and then adapted so as to fit the vicarious version of the local history. This is how the Tartars appeared on the pages of Chinese chronicles, to vanish and miraculously reappear in the vicinity of the Volga later on.

6) Swedes in “ancient” China

Apparently, the North of China was inhabited by the numerous representatives of the Shi Wei nation, whose name can also be read as Svei ([212], p. 132). Apparently, it is a reflection of the Swedes, who were formerly known as “Svei” in Russian.

The Chinese Swedes are said to have been a Northern nation, just like their European counterparts. Once again we see a name of a nation that still lives in Europe manifest in Chinese history as yet another phantom tribe that vanished mysteriously and without a trace a long time ago.

7) Macedonians in “ancient” China

The so-called “ancient Chinese history” contains many references to the Khitan (or Kidan) people, the alleged descendants of the Syanbi, or the Serbs, q.v. above ([212], p. 131). Furthermore, the Khitans are said to have been a South-Eastern Serbian tribe.

One can hardly get rid of the thought that the nation in question might identify as the Macedonians, the southern neighbours of the Serbs. The languages of the two nations are extremely similar, and the Macedonians were occasionally referred to as the Southern Serbs. We see complete correspondence with the “ancient Chinese geography.” The Khitans are said to have founded a state in China in the X century A.D. ([212], page 145).

By the way, what is the toponymy of the actual name China (“Kitai” in Russian)? According to L. N. Gumilev’s book, Kitai is basically the same
word as Khitan and must be derived from the same root ([215], p. 405). Also, as we shall soon see from mediaeval sources, the name China (or “Kitai”) is most likely to be another version of the name Kitia (Skitia, or Scythia).

As we shall see below, the history of the Khitans is closely tied to the history of the “Mongolian” (Great) Empire. Historians also associate the Western European legends of the Empire of Presbyter Johannes, or the same Great Horde (Russia), with the state of the Chinese Khitans. All of it happens after the Khitans leave China for good. The nation famous in Chinese history strangely disappeared from the map of modern China ([215]).

We shall return to the history of the Macedonians, or the Khitans, somewhat later. For the meantime, let us just point out that the language of the Macedonians is believed to be the prototype of Church Slavonic, which had been used in Russia as the official language for a long enough time. Also, the actual creators of the Church Slavonic Cyrillic alphabet, the “Solun Brothers” Cyril and Methodius, are believed to hail from the city of Solun located on the territory of Macedonia, and are most likely to have been Macedonian. Thus, there are parallels between the ancient Russian culture and the Slavic culture of Macedonia.

It is interesting to compare this important circumstance to the fact that, according to the Chinese chronicles, the state of the “Khitans who had fled China” became the progenitor of the future “Mongolian” Empire, or the Horde (Russia), which we can identify as the Great Russian Empire of the Horde, whose centre was in the Volga region.

According to Orbini, a mediaeval author of the XVI century, “Jeremy the Russian, the learned historian, states it explicitly in the Muscovite annals that the Russians and the ancient Macedonians shared a single language between them” ([617], p. 149).

Orbini refers to some “Muscovite Annals.” Did anyone see them? There must have been a great number of interesting materials written about the Russian history in the pre-Romanovian epoch. However, the Romanovian
historians were laborious enough… Even the name of “Jeremy the Russian, the learned historian” disappeared from Russian history forever, as though he never existed. Old books burn well.

8) Czechs in “ancient” China

“In 67 A.D. the Huns and the Chinese were engaged in a hard battle for the so-called Western Territories. The Chinese and their allies laid the state of the Cheshi, neighbours of the Huns, waste… The chieftain of the Huns gathered the Cheshi survivors and transplanted them to the eastern fringe of his land… The Cheshi belonged to the Eastern branch of the Indo-Europeans” ([212], page 163).

Not only do we see a reference to the European Czechs, but also a perfectly correct mention that they were neighbours of the Hungarians, or the Huns.

9) The identity of the “ancient” Chinese Mongols

References to the Mongol inhabitants of the Ancient China are unlikely to surprise anyone; the modern Mongols still live there, and the modern Mongolia borders with China. These Mongols belong to the Mongoloid race, as the name duly suggests. However, the “ancient Mongol” inhabitants of the ancient China were Caucasian, no less. We learn of the following:

“According to the evidence of their contemporaries, the Mongols, unlike the Tartars, were tall, blue-eyed and fair-haired, and wore beards” ([212], page 162).

Incredible. What became of them? The modern ethnic groups referred to as Mongols are completely different. L. N. Gumilev obviously wondered about this as well. He came up with a rather arbitrary theory aimed at providing the bewildered reader with an explanation of how the tall, bearded and blue-eyed “ancient” Mongols could have undergone a complete change of their racial type. We shall refrain from delving deep
into his speculative constructions for a simple reason: we deem it unnecessary to explain it to the readers why the “Mongols,” or the Russians as mentioned in the “ancient Chinese” history, were tall, fair-haired, bearded, and, occasionally, even blue-eyed.

All of this leads one to the thought that the “Chinese history” before the XV century A.D. must reflect European events; to some extent, at the very least. Later on, the European chronicles ended up in China and became included into local history as its initial part.

We already know of many such examples; this is how English history was created, for instance, q.v. in Chron4. Chronicles of Byzantium and the Horde, relating the history of Europe and the Mediterranean region, were taken to the British Isles by the descendants of the crusaders who fled Byzantium after its fall in 1453, and then erroneously served as the foundation of the history of the British Isles.
2. The landmarks of the parallelism between the Chinese and the phantom European history before the X century A.D.

We haven’t analysed the Chinese history before the X century A.D. in detail. However, even a very perfunctory study of the chronological table of Chinese history between the beginning of the new era and the X century A.D. (as cited in [215], for instance) leads one to the assumption that there might be a parallelism between Chinese and phantom Roman history of the epoch in question.

N. A. Morozov may have been correct when he wrote:

“I would like to give a well-wishing recommendation to all those who use the Shang Dung or Beijing pronunciation when they interpret the Chinese hieroglyphs referring to the names of people and places, thus making the narration void of all obvious meaning… In your attempt to make the ancient documents found in Eastern Asia, which may have come there from Europe in many cases, look pseudo-scientific and authentically Chinese, you involuntarily deceive yourselves as well as others” ([544], page 63).

Pay close attention to the fact that the superimposition of Chinese and European history as discussed below does not contain any chronological shifts. Basically, European history simply became transplanted to the Chinese soil without any alterations of dates; the distortions only affected the names and the geography.

Furthermore, it is extremely important that the parallelism in question identifies Chinese history as the history of Rome in its Scaligerian version, or the very version of European history that already became extended due to the errors made in the XIV-XVII century by M. Vlastar, J. Scaliger and
This instantly implies that the foundation of the “ancient Chinese” history was already based on the distorted version of chronology, which couldn’t have been created earlier than the XVI-XVII century; therefore, history of China as known to us today cannot predate this epoch.

Incidentally, this is in good correspondence with N. A. Morozov’s hypothesis, which suggests that the European chronicles that served as the foundation of the “ancient Chinese history” were brought to China by Catholic missionaries in the XVII century.

\[ a. \] The phantom Roman Empire. In the I century B.C., the “ancient” Roman Empire was founded in Europe by Sulla; its foundation is usually dated to the alleged year 83 B.C. ([327], page 197). We are told that from the very moment of its foundation, the Empire had been claiming its rights for world domination, which it strived to achieve via the conquest of neighbouring nations, which were correspondingly acculturated, q.v. in Chron2, Chapter 6.

\[ b. \] China. In the I century B.C., the famous “ancient” Han Empire was founded in China, “one of the four global empires of the antiquity” ([212], page 106). Its first emperor by the name of U reigned in the alleged years 140-87 B.C. ([212], page 105). The Han dynasty “strived to create a global empire via the conquests of the neighbouring nations with the subsequent cultural inculcation”([212], page 106). One’s attention invariably lingers on the comprehensive name of the first emperor, the simple and modest “U.” Also, the “Chinese Han Empire” is most likely to identify as the Scythian Empire of the Khans, or the Russian Empire, also known as the Horde, governed by Khans.

\[ a. \] The phantom Roman Empire. The “ancient” Roman Empire of Sulla, Caesar and Augustus had initially been very successful in its conquest of the neighbouring nations. However, Rome eventually
started to suffer defeats. During the reign of Marcus Aurelius, Roman Empire encountered powerful adversaries in the North; in particular, the nomadic tribes that had inhabited the region of the Danube, who managed to break through the border fortifications of the Roman Empire ([327], page 280). The reign of Marcus Aurelius, which falls on the alleged years 161-180, became “the epoch of fierce wars and economical depletion” ([327], p. 326).

■ b. China. Around the same time, the Chinese Empire of Han was implementing its plan of military expansion, unifying the adjacent territories under its rule. However, it soon ran into difficulties. “The war in the North didn’t merely turn out a failure, it had instigated a complete economical decline in China” ([212], p. 106). In 184, the “Yellow Turban Rebellion” flares up in China, undermining the power of the Han dynasty ([212], p. 106).

---

a. The phantom Roman Empire. In the beginning of the alleged III century A.D., the “ancient” Roman Empire ceases to exist, swept over by waves of internal feuds and anarchy. The period of the alleged years 217-270 is know in Roman history as “the political anarchy of the middle of the III century. The time of the ‘Soldier Emperors’” ([327], p. 406).

■ b. China. The Han Empire, presumably reigning in faraway China, ceases its existence around the same time ([212], p. 106). The picture of its decline reflects the decline of the “ancient” Roman Empire, which is said to have taken place on the other end of the gigantic Eurasian continent, to the detail. “The initiative was taken over by the aristocrats, who divided into parties, and engaged into struggle against each other; most of them perished in fratricidal feuds” (ibid.). “Illiterate and morally decayed soldiers seized the reins of power” (ibid.). The decline of the Han Empire is dated by historians to the alleged year 220 A.D. (ibid.), which postdates the decline of the Roman Empire by a mere 3
years. We see the emergence of “soldier emperors” in both cases.

**a. The phantom Roman Empire.** In the middle of the alleged III century A.D., the “ancient” Roman Empire founded by Sulla and Julius Caesar collapses, and the power in Rome passes to the famous woman, Julia Maesa, a relative of the emperor Caracalla ([212], p. 404-406). She becomes the actual ruler, appoints her proteges to the throne. Finally, she is killed in the internecine struggle, allegedly in 234 A.D. The epoch of her rule is characterised as exceptionally sanguinary. This is one of the phantom duplicates of the Gothic = Trojan War of the III century A.D., q.v. in *Chron1* and *Chron2*.

**b. China.** After the collapse of the Han Empire in the alleged III century A.D., one of the emperor’s *wifes* comes to power in the country. She “was vigorous and furious. She ordered to execute the head of the government, father of the empress-mother and his three brothers, thus marking the beginning of the new sanguinary epoch. Some time later she was killed. This “ancient Chinese empress” and “ancient Roman Julia Maesa” are probably two different phantom reflections of one and the same mediaeval queen.

**a. The phantom Roman Empire.** In the end of the alleged III century A.D. – beginning of the IV century, after the period of heavy strife, the new stage in the history of the Roman Empire begins. In *Chron1* and *Chron2* this period is referred to as the Third Roman Empire. This “ancient” Roman Empire begins in the alleged year 270 A.D., q.v. in *Chron6*.

**b. China.** In the alleged year 265 A.D., after the fall of the Han dynasty, the *new Jin dynasty* arises in China. As we can see, the “Roman original” is reproduced rather accurately: the alleged year 270 A.D. there, the alleged year 265 A.D. here. Both phantom dates virtually coincide. The new epoch in the history of China begins, as well as in the
history of “ancient” Rome ([215], p. 239).

a. The phantom Roman Empire. In the beginning of the alleged IV century A.D., Constantine moves the capital to New Rome, thus actually founding the Eastern Roman Empire, future Byzantium. This is the known division of the “ancient” Roman Empire into the Western, with the capital in the Italian Rome, and the Eastern, with the capital in New Rome, future Constantinople, q.v. in Chron6.

■ b. China. Simultaneously with phantom Roman history, in the beginning of the alleged IV century A.D., or more precisely, in the alleged year 318, arises the new dynasty called Eastern Jin ([215], p. 242). Thus, the Chinese Jin Empire splits into two: Western Jin and Eastern Jin. Exactly as in phantom Italian Rome, and at the same time.

a. The phantom Roman Empire. For “ancient” Rome, this is the period of permanent wars against “barbarians” – Goths, Huns, etc.; q.v. in Chron2, Chapter 6.

■ b. China. Exactly at the same time, China is fighting against “barbarians,” namely the Huns. What we see is that the same Huns simultaneously attack phantom Rome and phantom China allegedly situated in the opposite ends of the Eurasian continent.

a. The phantom Roman Empire. Under Theodosius I, in the alleged IV century A.D., around 380 A.D., the phantom Third Roman Empire had to start a hard war against the Goths. The rebellion of the Goths begins on the Balkan Peninsula. The Goths inflicted a heavy defeat on the troops of Theodosius, q.v. in Chron2, Chapter 6.

■ b. China. At around the same time, in the alleged IV century A.D., China begins a hard war with the Tanguts (that is, with the Goths, as we have already found out above). The Tangut rebellion allegedly began around 350 A.D. ([215], p. 108). In 376, the Tanguts occupy the Liang
Empire. It should be noted that there is no difference between sounds R and L in Chinese and Japanese. Also, as we have already mentioned many times before, sounds M and N are very close and easily interchanged. Accordingly, “Liang” could mean “Ram,” or “Rom,” or “Rome.” And then it becomes obvious that “Liang Empire” in the Chinese chronicles is nothing else but “Roman Empire.” Following these events, the Chinese “steppe was administratively divided into Western and Eastern” ([215], p. 119). Don’t we recognize in this division the famous split of the “ancient” Roman Empire to Eastern and Western? And it’s happening exactly in the alleged IV century A.D., right when the phantom Roman Empire broke in two, according to Scaligerian chronology. Aren’t there too many mind-boggling coincidences between the history of “ancient” China and that of “ancient” Rome?

---

\(a\). The phantom Roman Empire. The “purely Roman” Western Roman Empire ends up around the alleged year 476 A.D. with the taking of Rome by Germans and Goths under the leadership of Odoacer. This moment is considered to be the end of Western Rome. The last “purely Roman” emperor was adolescent Romulus Augustulus, q.v. in Chron2, Chapter 6.

\(b\). China. In the alleged 420 A.D., Western Liang, or, as we have already noted, Western Rome, was taken by Huns ([215], p. 162). “The Chinese historiography considers 420 as the pivotal and epoch-dividing year ([215], p. 164). It is remarkable that the last emperor of Western Liang (Western Rome?) was very young yet ([215], p. 162). But “ancient” Roman Emperor Romulus Augustulus was also almost a child when his empire broke down under the hits of “barbarians.”

---

Huns in the Roman Empire and Huns in China

In the alleged 460 A.D., the Huns had been annihilated in China ([215], p.
This event strikingly identifies with the similar fact in the phantom Roman history. The parallelism is so evident that even L. N. Gumilev couldn’t pass over it. He wrote:

“Isn’t it strange that exactly on the same years [years of annihilation of the Chinese Huns – Auth.] falls the equally tragic end of the Western branch of the Huns… It is difficult to assert that the chronologically simultaneous destruction of the Asian and the European Huns was a random coincidence” ([215], p. 200).

It goes without saying that Gumilev tried to somehow explain this really striking coincidence. He referred to his ethnogenesis theory. However, in our opinion, ethnogenesis has nothing to do here. The phantom European chronicles had simply been laid into the foundation of the “ancient Chinese history,” without any shift in time, making the same European Huns divide into two so that they simultaneously appeared both in Rome and China and had simultaneously been annihilated – the ones in European reality, and the others on the Chinese paper.

**Summary.** Having acquainted with the Chinese chronicles, we have understood that this rough parallelism could be significantly deepen and the tables of parallel events could be compiled similar to those given in *Chron1* and *Chron2* to demonstrate the identity of the Third and the Second Roman Empires. However, we leave this work to the future researchers of the authentic Chinese history.

The presented data testify that the “ancient” Chinese history before the X century A.D. is probably the duplicate of the phantom “ancient” European history up to the X century A.D., moreover, in its erroneous Scaligerian version. Therefore, it could not be written before the XVI-XVIII century A.D.
3. The landmarks of the parallelism between the Chinese and the Roman-Byzantine history of the X-XIV century A.D.

3.1. The parallel between the Macedonian conquest in Europe and the Khitan conquest in China

Earlier we have examined the phantom VI century A.D. Let us omit the dim period until the IX century A.D. Thereafter begins the *lacuna in the Chinese history*, allegedly from 860 to 960 A.D.; a hundred years of darkness, that is. L. N. Gumilev calls it just so, the “dark age,” and builds sort of a geophysical theory, which would explain the absence of records. The steppe had dried out, the hurricanes befell on the unfortunate country… However, in our opinion, the point is not in the hurricanes, but the incorrect datings.

L. N. Gumilev continues:

> “Widened the great silence of the desert swallowing up the steppe grasses and filling the brooks up with sand. This is the reason why the chroniclers of the X century were silent about the events in the center of the continent. *No events happened there for a long time*” ([212], p. 152).

This is the last lacuna in the history of China. The following epochs are allegedly better documented ([212], p. 176).

As we have already seen, “dark ages” in the Scaligerian history are usually the artificial joints between neighbouring epochs resulting their incorrect positioning on the time axis. The chronologically last “dark ages” usually mark the beginning of the real, written history, which is not yet sufficiently covered in the survived documents. We have repeatedly
stumbled upon such examples when analysing European history, q.v. in *Chron1, Chron2* and *Chron4*.

Therefore, we will object to L. N. Gumilev: events did happen. Maybe just not quite then, and surely quite elsewhere. Let us consider those few legends that nevertheless reached us from the darkness of Chinese history of the alleged IX-XI century A.D.

*Firstly,* it is the legend of the Khitan conquest of China. Due to the superimposition of the Khitans over the Macedonians, it would be natural to compare this story with the legend of the conquests of Alexander the Great.

*Secondly,* it is the legend of the Son of Heaven. The latter keeps obvious traces of the narrative of Jesus Christ; incidentally, the Chinese version dates it correctly, to the XI century A.D.

---

*a. The Mediterranean.* Alexander the Great, the founder of the gigantic empire, has conquered a great many of European and Asian countries and created the Macedonian Empire. This is the famous Macedonian conquest. It is considered that, having become an all-powerful ruler, he adopted the customs of conquered Persia, changed his clothes to Persian, took over distinguished Persian manners instead of the unaffected Macedonian ones, etc. Following his death, his gigantic empire collapsed at a glance (q.v. in *Chron2*, Chapters 8 and 9). Scaligerian history relates Alexander the Great to the IV century A.D. But as we already understand, these events most likely didn’t take place before XI century A.D., and for the most part relate to the XIV-XVI century A.D.

*b. China.* In the middle of the alleged X century A.D., namely in 946, the Khitans under the leadership of Deguang had conquered all China, and the Khitan monarch founded the “Liao dynasty, which was truly Chinese” ([212], p. 145). Just like Alexander the Great, Deguang “changed his dress to Chinese ceremonial vestments, surrounded
himself by Chinese functionaries, established in the country the order, which resembled more the early feudalism than old tribal customs” ([212], p. 145). However, soon after the victory, Deguang died. “As soon as the body of the conqueror was taken off to Manchuria, China revolted” ([212], p. 145). The empire collapsed. All in all, rather similar to the story of “ancient” Alexander the Great.

3.2. Baptism in China in the X century. The same happened in the X century Russia

According to the new chronology (q.v. in Chron2, Chapter 7), the activity of John the Baptist, as well as of Jesus Christ thereafter, took place in the X-XI century A.D. One should expect to find the traces of those famous events in the “ancient” Chinese chronicles brought to China from Europe. The expectation proves justified. Such traces exist, and they are striking.

In the X century, a great many nations in China had been baptised according to Christian ritual. Just like in Russia at the very same time, by the way.

“In 1009, the Khereids had been baptised… At around the same time, the Turkic-speaking Onguts (Goths? – Auth.) accepted Christianity... At the same time, the Oguzes, and partially the Chigils, had been baptised…” Even among the Khitans themselves and their subordinate tribes of Western Manchuria occurred “some Christian element,” the fact that served as a foundation for the mediaeval European legend of Prester John ([212], pp. 168-169).

As regards Prester John (or John the Presbyter), he most probably appears here as a reflection of John the Baptist and a link to the baptism itself. And it happens right when it “should” – in the beginning of the XI century, that is. Let us reiterate (q.v. in Chron2, Chapter 7) that at the same time in Roman history appears another reflection of John the Baptist – John Crescentius.

If we have met John the Baptist, Jesus shouldn’t be far away. This
expectation also proves justified.

3.3. The Son of Heaven in the XI century China (Jesus Christ?)

Indeed, in the mid-XI century A.D., there appears in China prince Yuanhao who in 1038 A.D. declares himself the Son of Heaven ([212], p. 156). His name is associated with the change of the chronological system, exactly as it was at the time of Jesus Christ, according to our reconstruction (q.v. in Chron2, Chapter 7). Prince Yuanhao had replaced the existed chronology with his own, just invented ([212], p. 156).

Further on, the “Chinese” Son of Heaven created the new written language, which was “hieroglyphic, but different from Chinese” ([212], p. 156).

The Son of Heaven was murdered in 1048. But Jesus Christ too was crucified, and, according to our reconstruction, at around the same time, the second half of the XI century, q.v. in Chron2, Chapter 7.

The “Chinese” date of 1048 A.D. virtually coincides with 1053 or 1054 A.D., when the new chronological system had started in Europe. See Chron1, Chapter 6 for our discussion of the chronological shift of 1053 years. Let us reiterate that it is at exactly the same epoch that acted “Gregory Hildebrand,” whose “biography” contains obvious parallels with the evangelical biography of Jesus Christ who, according to our reconstruction, also lived in the XI century.

All this is reflected in the “ancient” Chinese history, which, in our opinion, is nothing more than a “Chinese version” of European history of the same epoch.

3.4. The First Crusade of 1099 as reflected in “Chinese history”

According to Chinese sources, the Son of Heaven was killed in the Tangut kingdom, which identifies with the Gothic one in our reconstruction. This
perfectly corresponds to the new chronology, according to which Jesus Christ was most probably crucified in New Rome = Jerusalem = Troy in the XI century A.D. New Rome was situated in Asia Minor, in the ancient land of the Hittites = Goths (q.v. in *Chron1*, Chapter 7:7).

We are already accustomed to identify the *Trojans* and the *Turks* as the *Goths*, q.v. in *Chron2*, Chapter 8. The Balkans in general is a Slavic region with Turkish presence, which only adds to its identification as *Gothic* kingdom.

In Europe, right after the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, in 1096 A.D., begins the *First Crusade to the Balkans*. The crusaders take New Rome – Constantinople – Jerusalem and advance further to the south.

At the same time in China, after the death of the Son of Heaven, “the gloomy time of the noble Liang family rule had begun… In 1082, the Chinese took away from the Tanguts the fortress Lianzhou and enthroned the old dynasty” ([212], p. 157).

In our opinion, the latter description refers to the First Crusade of 1096-1099, with virtually no chronological shift. The Chinese dated it to 1082, which make the difference of only 15 years.

We have already explained above that “Liang” is the Chinese phonation of “Rome.” Therefore, the “Chinese sources” are talking here about the rule of a “noble Roman family,” which is absolutely correct.

Let us reiterate that all these “Chinese events” relate to the epoch, which is very poorly covered in the “Chinese history.” L. N. Gumilev qualified the time between 961 and 1100 A.D. as “dark and empty period in the history of the great steppe” ([212], p. 176). However, right after that begins the period “full of events, names of heroes and cowards, places and peoples, and even moral and ethical judgements… Sources on that epoch are multifarious and characteristic” ([212], p. 176).

3.5. A hundred-year shift in the “Chinese history” of the XI century
After the “dark period” begins the perfect parallelism between the “Chinese” and European history, albeit with a *hundred*-year shift. The Chinese datings are about a hundred years “older” than the European ones. See more about it below.

3.6. Kaifeng as the capital of the Chinese “R” Empire

In the beginning of the XII century, we find in China the Liao Empire. Without vocalisation, and knowing that L in Chinese can stand for R, we get simply the “R” Empire. Isn’t it *Rome* once again?

The capital of the “R” Empire is considered to be the city of Kaifeng. However, in the Chinese chronicles the capital is called Pian, and not Kaifeng. Identification of the ancient Chinese capital with the modern city of Kaifeng is a rather recent idea, most probably erroneous.

3.7. The reflection of the Fourth Crusade in the “Chinese history”

---

*a. Byzantium.* In 1203-1204, the Crusaders attack Byzantium and besiege Constantinople. The aggressors are *foreigners*.

■ *b. China.* In 1125, *foreign* invaders, the Jurchens, assault the Chinese capital, Kaifeng. The difference between the European and the Chinese dates is about a hundred years.

---

*a. Byzantium.* In the beleaguered Constantinople, *two parties* are set up: partisans of war and “peace-fighters,” supporters of Alexios Angelos who arrived with the crusaders. The party of Alexios wins and promises to pay a big tribute to Crusaders (Franks). The Crusaders retire from the city, q.v. in *Chron4*.

■ *b. China.* The same way, in the beleaguered Kaifeng, “two parties are formed: the partisans of war and the ‘peace-fighters.’ The latter prevailed and came to terms with the Jurchens by *rendering tribute* and
making territorial concessions” ([212], pp. 182).

---

**a. Byzantium.** In 1204, the situation had changed and Franks besieged Constantinople again; having taken it, they captured the Emperor Alexios Doukas (Mourtzouphlos). The new Greek Emperor, Theodore Laskaris, moved south, to Nicaea, leaving Constantinople to the Franks to plunder.

■ **b. China.** The Jurchens come back and besiege Kaifeng again. “In 1127, Kaifeng fell, the Chinese emperor was captured. His brother moved the capital to the south, leaving the north of the country to the enemy to plunder” ([212], p. 183).

---


■ **b. China.** Jurchens enthrone their own king, *Altan* (Altan Khan), in Kaifeng ([212], p. 208). The linguistic similarity of the words “Altan” and “*Latin*” is obvious: both result in “*LTN*” without vocalisation.
4.

The Chinese history of the Khitans, the Kingdom of Prester John, and the rise of the “Mongolian” Empire

4.1. The bifurcation on paper of the prehistory of the “Mongolian” Empire: it splits into European and allegedly Oriental, “Chinese” history

Above we have tried to demonstrate that the “Chinese history” before the XIV century A.D. is actually a description of European history brought to China and mistaken there for “local, Chinese history.”

Moving on up the “Chinese history,” we finally reach the moment, in the XIII century A.D., when, even in the opinion of historians themselves, the “Chinese history” interlocks with the European. This is where the Scaligerian history connects the history of China to that of Europe. Here we witness the appearance of the gigantic “Mongolian” – Great Empire, which includes China as well as a part of Europe (Russia, the Balkans, Eastern Europe, etc.).

If we move through the Scaligerian history textbook from the XIII century A.D. back to the past, we will be witnessing the “bifurcation of nations.” On paper only, of course. For instance, the “Mongols” will appear in China as well as in Russia. But we have already explained that “Mongols” simply means the “great ones,” that’s how the populace of ancient Russia-the-Horde called themselves. Therefore, the Scaligerian history actually bifurcates the ancestors of the “Mongols”/Russians, placing them both in “ancient” China, as “Mongols,” and in Russia, as Russians.

The same has been done to Hungarians, who were placed both in China, as the Huns, or the Xiongnu, and in Europe, as the Huns. And so forth.
According to mainstream historians, the ancestors of all these peoples initially lived in China and only then spread over all Asia and Europe. Roughly speaking, “we are all Chinese,” descendants of either the Mongols, or the Xiongnu, etc.

Our idea is quite different. According to our reconstruction, the history of China, up to the XIV century A.D. at least, is but a version of European history moved to the East. This version can contain some precious details that had later been lost in Europe. By putting them back “in their place,” it would be possible to better restore the mediaeval history of Europe with the help of “Chinese chronicles.”

This is why we consider Chinese history extremely valuable. The only problem is its correct interpretation. The events described in it did happen in reality, albeit not necessarily in China, but mostly in Europe.

From this new point of view, it would be interesting to take a look at the emergence of the “Mongolian” = Great Empire. Now we can just drop preposterous theories about the wild nomads moving through the entire continent from China to Europe. The new regard will help to better understand many phenomena in the history of the “Mongolian” conquest, which were unclear in their former presentation.

4.2. The history of the emergence of the “Mongolian” Empire according to “Chinese” chronicles

4.2.1. The Latin and the Nicaean Empires in the “Chinese” chronicles

Let us continue our move up the “Chinese chronicles.” We shall use their brief exhibition made by L. N. Gumilev ([212]), immediately commenting it with our version of reading them and identifying the described events with European ones. As we shall see, such “European reading” turns out quite natural in view of our previously made identifications.

After the capture of the Chinese capital by the Jurchens headed by Altan
Khan, two empires had emerged. Our interpretation: after the Fourth Crusade, when Constantinople had been captured by the Franks = \textit{Latins}, hence the name Altan = Latin.

The first empire is founded by foreign invaders, the Jurchens. This is a \textit{Latin} empire in the territory of Byzantium. The other empire is Chinese, founded by the new emperor from a former Chinese, that is Byzantine, or Romean, dynasty. The real Chinese emperor had to establish a new capital in the South ([212], p. 177).

In our opinion, this second, Chinese empire identifies with the famous \textit{Nicaean} Empire, situated in the territory of Byzantium as well. The establishment of a new, “southern” capital is the establishment of a new capital in Nicaea.

\textbf{4.2.2. Ilya Dashi}

A new enemy of the Jurchens (that is, apparently, of the Latin Crusaders) emerges in the North – a Khitan, or simply Macedonian prince Yelü Dashi. More probably, his first name was \textit{Ilya}. The following is reported: “Yelü (Ilya – Auth.) was born in 1087 A.D. in the royal Liao family. He was the eighth generation descendent of \textit{Yelü} Ambagyan (Abaoji), the founder of the dynasty ([212], page 177).

The Khitan = Macedonian prince Yelü attempts to resist the invaders, but finally has to flee the country. Together with his loyal troops, he goes to the north. Three days after, having crossed the “Black River,” he founds himself in the land of the Onguts ([212], page 180). Most probably, the reference here is made to the \textit{Black Sea}. And the \textit{Onguts} are the \textit{Goths}, as we have already wrote. Naturally, they lived in Europe, particularly in the Balkans.

Some more days after, Yelü reached a fortress named \textit{Khotun}. There are still the traces of this ancient name in today’s Europe, particularly in Byelorussia; for instance, modern Khatyn or Katyn. Apparently, such names originate from the words “Goth” or “Hittite.”
4.2.3. Gürkhan

“Yelü Dashi took the title of ‘Gürkhan’” ([212], page 180) and founded the “Kara-Khitan” Empire. That is to say, adds L. N. Gumilev, Yelü (Ilya) Dashi became a Khan. Hence the title of his next paragraph: “The fate of a Khan.”

The “Chinese” title “Gürkhan” is clearly composed of two syllables: “Gür” and “Khan” – “Khan George,” that is. Let us remind the reader that “Gurgiy” and “Gürgiy” are ancient forms of the Russian names “Georgiy” and “Yuri” (we have discussed it in details in *Chron4*). Why did Yelü-Ilya take this particular title?

It turns out that one of Yelü Dashi’s descendants, according to L. N. Gumilev, was “Zhilugu, who ruled until 1213 A.D., … and had to pursue a policy related to the wars of Genghis Khan” ([212], page 191).

The names “Georgiy” and “Yuri” are very frequent in the chronicles, q.v. in *Chron4*. As we have already demonstrated in *Chron4*, “Khan George” could most probably also be prince Georgiy Danilovich, or Yuri the Muscovite, or Genghis Khan, or Rurik of the Russian chronicles.

The most important result of Yelü Dashi’s activity was the creation of a gigantic empire, which became known as “Mongolian” Empire (founded by Genghis Khan) or Ancient Russia (founded by Rurik). In reality, as we have demonstrated in *Chron4*, these are but two names of one and the same state. It has bifurcated on paper only, as a result of chronological mistakes made by the authors of Russian and world history.

Ergo, here we see a slight confusion in the “Chinese” chronicle: the name of Khan George (“Gür”) is merged with his title (“Khan”) into a single word, which apparently resulted in the invention of a new “Chinese” royal title, “Gürkhan.” In the later versions of the chronicles, this “title” is attributed not only to Yelü Dashi himself, but to his predecessors as well.

But let us return to the story of Yelü-Ilya Dashi according to L. N. Gumilev. After the flight from “China” – or from Byzantium, or Russia-
the-Horde, that is, – Yelü Dashi “summoned his commanders and addressed them with a speech. He acknowledged defeat of his people, catastrophic collapse of the Liao Empire (the Byzantine, or Eastern Roman Empire, that is – Auth.), and told about the flight of the last emperor… Then he announced his intention to *unite the nomad tribes of the great steppe* in order to reconquer the native land” ([212], p. 185).

What we see here is a political program that we know very well from the ancient Russian history – a program of building a united world-wide empire by military means (q.v. in *Chron4*). The program of Yelü Dashi was implemented by the “*Mongols*” (the “great ones”) about a hundred years later, in the XIV century. It was started by Genghis Khan (aka Georgiy Danilovish, aka Rurik) and finished by his brother (not nephew, as it is considered to be), Batu Khan, aka Ivan Danilovich Kalita (Kalif).

The Danilovich brothers could have been direct descendants of the Macedonian = “Khitan” prince Ilya (“Yelü Dashi”) who had fled the East Roman Empire, or Byzantium.

4.2.4. *The “Chinese” Emil River and the ancient Russian Ilmer*

Yelü Dashi had started with founding a rather small state in the valley of the Emil River ([212], p. 185). The “Kara-Khitan” history reports the following about it:

> “The Khitans resisted only in the *Emil River* valley and the *Zhetsu* region, where they took part in the strife of the Kangals and Karluks against the khan of Balasagun city” ([212], p. 185).

We couldn’t find the “Emil River” anywhere in China on the ancient maps. But we have easily found a river with a consonant name in the ancient Russia: the Ilmer (or Ilmen) River. Apparently, this is the famous Ilmer River that Rurik had come to when, according to the forged page of the *Radzivilovskaya Chronicle*, he had been “called to Russia.” Ilmer might
also be “Itil” – the mediaeval name of the great Volga River.

4.2.5. *The “Chinese” Balasagun city and the old Russian city of Balakhna*

The “Chinese” chronicles also mention a “Balasagun” city. We couldn’t find a city of such name in the modern *Small World Atlas* (1979), searching anywhere in the East, in China or Mongolia. However, a city with a consonant name can easily be found in Russia. Everybody knows the big city of Balakhna on the Volga River, to the north of Nizhny Novgorod. Moreover, some scientists, such as P. P. Smirnov, considered Balakhna as *one of the capitals of ancient Russia*.

In the name “Balakhna,” one can recognize the conjunction of two roots: “bala” (“biely”, meaning “white” in Russian) and “khna” (“khan”). The same roots are heard in the name of the “Chinese” Balasagun, which thus means the “White Hun,” or the “White Khan.”

It turns out that the name “Balasagun” is featured in the Russian history in virtually the same form – as “Balgasun.” According to legend, this was the name given by Batu Khan to the city of Kozelsk after its capture. As wrote Tatishchev, “Mau Balgasun” meant “wicked city” in Kalmyk ([832], Part 2, p. 237). Thus, Balgasun in the “Chinese” chronicles is a Russian city under a Turkic name. It could be Balakhna as well.

4.2.6. *The “Chinese” Zhetysu region*

In *Chron4*, we have already conjectured that the famous “Chinese” region of Zhetysu, which translates as “The Seven Rivers” (“Semirechye” in Russian), is the area of “seven rivers,” where settled the Cossacks. Those rivers were: Volga, Don, Yaik, Dniepr, Dniestr, Terek, and Irtysh. Let un remind the reader, that there were *Semirechye Cossacks* in Russia. In the “Chinese” story of Yelü Dashi, this region appears once again.

4.2.7. *Yelü Dashi founds himself at the head a huge army in*
Having settled down in the Semirechye, Yelü-Ilya Dashi suddenly founds himself at the head of a huge army. L. N. Gumilev amazedly wrote: “In the period of 1130-1135, the troops of Yelü Dashi reached a tremendous size, but due to what and whom?” ([212], p. 187).

According to Ibn al-Athir, “in 1130, the Karluk and Ghuzz mercenaries fell out with the Samarkand ruler, Arslan Khan, and … defected to Gürkhan ([212], p. 187).

We understand it as follows. The Karluk mercenaries are none other than royal mercenaries (“Karl” is consonant with the word “korol,” which is “king” in Russian). Earlier we have already identified the Ghuzzes (or Oguzes) as the Cossacks, based on other data, q.v. in Chron4.

Samarkand is probably a slightly distorted name of the Russian city of Samara on the Volga (“Samara-Khan”), or of Sarmatia (Scythia).

Arslan Khan apparently means Ruslan Khan, or Russian Khan. Ruslan is still a popular given name among Volga Turks, and Ruslanov is a widespread family name in Russia.

Thus, all names featured in the “Chinese” chronicles can noncontradictorily be found in the ancient Russian history.

In our opinion, these texts are referring to the early stage of unification of Russia under the rule of the future Russian-Hordean dynasty. We are at the very beginning of creation of the “Mongolian” = Great Empire.

4.2.8. Why China is called “Kitai” in Russia

Scaligerian chronology dates the abovementioned events to about 1130 A.D. Taking into account the 100-year shift, they fall in the mid-XIII century A.D., which is probably their correct dating.

At that time, Byzantium split into the Latin and the Nicaean Empires, and the process of unification started in Russia. The Russian word “Kitai” (“China”) is probably a variant pronunciation of the word “Skythia.” It is possible that Russia-the-Horde was also known as the state of Kara-
Khitans. In Moscow there is still a quarter called “Kitai-gorod” (“China Town”), which was the name of the second belt of fortifications around Moscow Kremlin. The walls of Kitai-gorod existed in Moscow until the XX century and had only been disassembled after the revolution of 1917.

Yet N. A. Morozov justly noted that nowadays the word “Kitai” is preserved only in Russia. Nobody else, including the Chinese themselves, calls the modern China “Kitai.” Moreover, even in Russia the name “Kitai” appeared only after the XVII century. A state of such name is completely absent in the Dictionary of Russian Language of the XI-XVII Century (Moscow: Nauka). In the XVII century Russia, contemporary China was also referred to as the “Bogdoy” Kingdom. See below for more details about it.

On the other hand, in the ancient documents we sometimes stumble upon the Kara-Khitan state, also known as the Kingdom of Prester John. Where was it situated? Our idea is as follows. That was the ancient Russia, starting from the XIII-XIV century. After the liberation wars of Ivan Kalita, the ancient Russia had expanded and been referred to by the foreigners, particularly Western Europeans, as the “Mongolian” = Great Empire.

However, one of the internally used names of that state, or of some of its part, was Kitai = Scythia. This is why Russian language still keeps traces of ancient names such as “Kitai-gorod,” “kitaika” (simple cotton fabric, as well as variety of apples). Let us also recall the old word “kita,” meaning something twined, wicker, etc. Generally speaking, “Kitai” is the old Russian word. It is not in use any more, but was commonly used in Russia before the XVII century. For instance, according to the Dictionary of Russian Language of the XI-XVII Century, the word “kita” means something wicker, woven in a bundle, a braid ([787], p. 141). In particular, “kita” meant a braid, a wisp, a sultan of feathers. A XVII century author wrote: “Janissaries wore caps with kitas” ([787], p. 141). Thus, “kita” meant a part of military equipment. The word “kita” also exists, and has the same meaning, in other Slavic languages, including
Caps topped with *kitas* – long sultans – were, in particular, parts of the *hussar* uniform. What we call “*sultan*” today was called “*kita*” in the XVII century. It can be seen from the following quote taken from a source of the late XVII century, which describes military equipment of the epoch: “A rideable horse with a *hussar* saddle, a gold-embroidered *chaprák*, a *kita* of feathers…” ([787], p. 141).

Even on the modern statue of Bohdan Khmelnytsky in Kiev you can see a *kita* – a sultan of feathers upon the *turban*. Turbans with long sultans- kitas distinguished the Turkish warriors, *janissaris*, q.v. above.

It is possible that the word “*kita*,” meaning a part of military uniform, is also reflected in the name of “*Khitans*” – *Macedonians* who one came to the Balkans from Russia-the-Horde. At the same time, in “European reading,” the story of Khitan prince Yelü Dashi from the “Chinese” chronicles that we are discussing here turns into a story of how a Macedonian military unit headed by prince Ilya (“*Yelü*”) came from Byzantium to Russia in the XIII century and founded there a state that subsequently grew into the “*Mongolian*” = Great Empire, the mediaeval Russia…

**4.2.9. An grand “ancient Chinese” battle of the XIII century A.D.**

Let us return to the story of Ilya = Yelü Dashi according to Chinese sources. “In 1141, a new conflict arose, this time of immense size. To fight the infidels (Yelü Dashi, that is – Auth.) came Sultan Sanjar… Those were the best warriors of the Muslim world, hardened in the battles with the Greek and the Crusaders, they had also best arms of the epoch. The army of Sanjar numbered one hundred horsemen. Such a force had not been sent even against the Crusaders… The Sultan and his entourage took the operation extremely seriously, not as a repulse of just another raid of nomads” ([212], pp. 187-188).
As for Yelü Dashi, he put forward, according to Ibn al-Athir, three hundred thousand warriors, “of the Khitans, the Turks, and the Chinese” ([212], p. 188).

The battle took place in 1141, that is, after correction for a hundred-year shift, in 1241. The battle was joined on the Qatwan steppe, between Khujand and Samarkand. “Ilya-Yelü Dashi divided his army into three groups and completely defeated the united army of his adversaries, as neither Charles Martel, nor Leo the Isaurian, nor Godfrey of Bouillon could… Thirty thousand best Seljuk warriors died a heroic death. It is a fact. There is no doubt about what happened, but why it could happen stays unclear and unexplained… After such a bright victory, Yelü Dashi contented himself with taking Samarkand and Bukhara and letting some Khitan unit pillage the Khwarazm oasis. However, the Khwarezm-Shah had quickly come to terms with the Gürkhan having promised to pay taxes… In all captured cities the Khitans left local lords in their place, just obliging them to pay taxes to the Gürkhan” ([212], p. 188).

From the above we have learned the following:

a. The year of 1241 virtually coincides with the Millerian-Scaligerian year of the conquest of Russia by the “Mongols.”
b. With a correction for a hundred-year shift, the great battle corresponds to either the famous battle of the Kalka River of 1223, or the battle of the Sit River of 1238, when the “Mongols” (the “great ones”) defeated the united armies of the princes. Both adversaries were Russian.
c. The “Mongol” custom to leave the rulers of captured cities in their place, just obliging them to pay taxes, is well-known. This is exactly what we see in the case of the “Kara-Khitan” conquest of Yelü Dashi.

By the way, the primary unit of Ilya-Yelü Dashi’s army was “sotnia” (“company”), each numbered a hundred soldiers. “The ‘sotniks’ [company commanders – Trans.] subordinated directly to the Gürkhan” ([212], p. 189). This is exactly the structure of Cossack armies either.
4.2.10. Christianity of the Kara-Khitans (Royal Scythians?)

The state founded by Ilya = Yelü Dashi turned out to be Christian. Very strange from the point of view of Scaligerite historians. Why would the Far-Eastern nomads suddenly become Christian, and not Muslim, or adepts of other Eastern religion? Moreover, the Kara-Khitans (Royal Scythians) behave themselves, on the one hand, as if they were Christian, and on the other hand, as if they were Muslim. Complete confusion.

L. N. Gumilev writes the following: “Despite the fact that his (Yelü Dashi’s – Auth.) letter to the ruler of Buhkara begins with a formula acceptable for Muslims, his heir had been given a Christian name Ilya, and the Crusaders in Palestine and Syria sincerely believed in the existence of a Christian state to the east from Persia [or from France? – Auth.]” ([212], p. 190).

So, the son of Yelü Dashi was called Ilya. And as we have just seen, he was Christian. It turns out, however, that “Chinese” chronicles made no difference between the successors of Yelü Dashi and Yelü Dashi himself ([212], p. 191). In other words, Yelü Dashi and his son are one and the same person. But, if so, then Yelü Dashi himself is a Christian called Ilya either.

All is correct. He couldn’t be someone else. Because what we are talking about here is the history of the Orthodox ancient Russia, also known as the Christian Kingdom of Prester John. We will discuss it in detail in the next book of the e-series.

4.2.11. The “Chinese” chronicles describing one and the same period had later been stretched to cover a hundred years

Yelü Dashi died in 1143. For some reasons, “Chinese” sources continued to refer to his successors as to Yelü Dashi himself ([212], p. 191).

“In 1178, the son of Ilya, Zhilugu (George, Yuri – Auth.), came to the
throne, who ruled until 1213 A.D., ... and had to pursue a policy related to the wars of Genghis Khan” ([212], page 191). Then the Kara-Khitan (Royal) state became part of the “Mongolian” Empire.

Our explanation is as follows. The chronologists had stretched the period of the reign of one and the same Yelü-Ilya Dashi for more decades than was needed. And here is the reason why: they couldn’t join ends in their chronology due to a hundred-year shift. Chronicles talked about one and only Yelü, so the chroniclers had to make several copies of Ilya (on paper only, of course) to fill the gap. Then appeared the son of Ilya – George, or Yuri. With a correction for a hundred-year shift, he happened to lay exactly upon Georgiy Danilovich, aka Genghis Khan.

With the epoch of Genghis Khan begins the epoch of the “Mongolian” Empire, the ancient Russia, that is. And starting from the same time, all main events take place on the Volga River, in the Golden Horde. However, they move from the borders of modern China to Volga only in the Scaligerian version of history. In our reconstruction, they keep on happening in China, albeit not in the modern sense of the name, but the ancient one, that is in the ancient Russia, which in that epoch was called Kitai, or Scythia, q.v. in Part 6.

4.2.12. When had the European chronicles been brought to China?

It turns out that not before the XIV century, because, as we see, they describe the European events of the XIII-XIV century. Here we agree with N. A. Morozov, who wrote, albeit based upon quite different considerations, that the Chinese chronicles had been written in the XV century the earliest, and brought to China by Europeans, most probably Catholic missionaries.
5.
The history of China after the XV century A.D.

5.1. The age and purpose of the Great Wall of China

Today it is considered that the construction of the Great Wall of China began in the III century B.C., allegedly as a protection against northern nomads. Its modern condition can be seen in figs. 6.2 and 6.3.

Fig. 6.2. The Great Wall of China. Taken from [544], Volume 6, page 121.
Fig. 6.3. The Great Wall of China in its modern condition. Taken from [85], Volume 21.

N. A. Morozov wrote on this occasion:

“Well a thought that the construction of the famous Wall of China – 6 to 7 meters high, up to three meters thick, and stretching for over *three thousand kilometers* – had started in the year 246 before current era by the emperor Shi Huangdi and *finished only 1866 years after*, by 1620 A.D., is so absurd that can only vex a serious historian and thinker. Because any significant construction project has a premeditated purpose. Who would have an idea to start an enormous construction that could only be finished in 2000 years, and meanwhile would stay but a useless burden for the people? Anyway, to remain as preserved as it is today, the Wall of China should not have been built more than some hundred years ago” ([544], Vol. 6, pages 121-122).

The argument that the wall had been *repaired* during those two thousand years is dubious. Only a rather recent construction is worth being repaired, otherwise it will become obsolete and just wreck. This is what we observe in Europe, by the way. Old defensive walls had been demolished, and new, more solid walls built in their place. For instance, many fortifications in Russia had been rebuilt in the XVI century.

And yet we are told that the Wall of China, once built, remained unchanged *for two thousand years*. We are not told that this is a “modern wall recently built in the site of the old one,” but that this is exactly the
wall that had been built two thousand years ago. In our opinion, this is extremely strange, not to say more.

When and against whom had the wall been built? As we already wrote, the “Chinese” history before the XV century had in reality been unfolding in Europe; therefore, the Wall of China could not be built before XV century A.D. And, naturally, it wasn’t built against spears and arrows, even copper- or stone-tipped, of the III century B.C. Such walls are needed against firearms. The construction of such fortifications began in approximately the XV century, with the invention of cannons and siege weapons. For instance, the Ottomans (Atamans) took Constantinople using heavy artillery. In fig. 6.4, we see another depiction of the Wall of China. It is very curious that ancient authors, such as Abu’l-Fida, also called it the wall of Gog and Magog ([1078], Vol. 1, p. 294).

![Fig. 6.4. The Great Wall of China. Apparently, it was also known as “The Wall of Gog and Magog” ([1078], Vol. 1, pp. 293-294. Taken from [1078], Volume 1, page 293.](image)

So, who had the wall been built against? We cannot answer unequivocally. A further research would be needed for that. However, we will express the following idea.

The Great Wall of China had been built above all as a borderline between two countries: China and Russia. Although designed as a military fortification, it is unlikely that it has ever been used in this quality.
Defending a 4000 kilometer-long wall ([213], p. 44) is nonsense. L. N. Gumilev quite justly wrote:

“The wall stretched for 4 thousand kilometers. Its height attained 10 meters, and every 60-100 meters there was a watchtower. However, when the works had been finished, it turned out that all Chinese army would not be enough to assure the efficient defence of the wall (as if it wasn’t clear in advance, before the beginning of the construction – Auth.). Indeed, if you assign a small unit to every tower, the enemy will annihilate it before the units from other towers can come to help. And if you place bigger units at longer intervals, there will be gaps where enemy can easily and imperceptibly enter the country. A fortress without defenders is not a fortress” ([213], p. 44).

What is the difference between our point of view and the consensual one? We are told that the Wall separated China from nomads in order to secure the country from their forays. However, as L. N. Gumilev rightly noticed, such an explanation doesn’t hold water. If the nomads wanted to cross the Wall, they could easily do it anytime and in any place.

We have a quite different explanation, which is as follows. In our opinion, the Wall had been built above all as a borderline between two countries. And it had only been built when a border agreement was reached. Apparently, in order to exclude further border disputes, which had probably been to expect. Nowadays the countries just draw on a map (on paper, that is) the borders they have agreed upon and consider it sufficient. In the case of Russia and China, the Chinese apparently didn’t trust the paper agreement and decided to also perpetuate it “in stone,” by building a wall along the borderline. It looked safer and, as they thought, would exclude border disputes for a long time. This assumption is corroborated by the very length of the wall. Four thousand kilometers (or two, or one) is in the order of things for a border between two countries, but nonsense as a military fortification.

However, the political border of China changed many times in the course of its history of allegedly over two thousand years. Historians
themselves tell us so. China unified, then broke apart to separate principalities, lost and acquired various territories, etc.

On the one side, it makes the verification of our hypothesis more difficult. But on the other side, we are offered the opportunity to not only verify it, but also date the construction of the wall. If we succeed to find a political and geographical map where the border of China runs exactly along the Great Wall of China, it will mean that the wall had been built exactly at that period.

Today the Wall of China is situated inside China. Was there a time when it marked the country’s border? And when was it? Obviously, if it was built as a border wall, then it had to run perfectly along the political border of China. This would let us date its construction.

Let us try to find a geographical map where the Wall of China runs perfectly along the political border of China. It turns out that such maps exist, and they are many. Those are the maps of the XVII-XVIII century. We have already used them previously, while discussing geographical views of the XVIII century.

On the map, let us find two states: Tartarie and China, q.v. in figs. 6.6 and 6.7. The northern border of China runs approximately along the 40th parallel. And this is exactly where we see the Wall of China. Moreover, on the map it is drawn as a thick line with the legend in French: “Muraille de la Chine.”
Fig. 6.6. Fragment of a map of Asia taken from an XVIII century atlas ([1019]). It is very obvious that the Great Wall follows the border of China. The wall isn’t merely drawn on the map, there’s also the corresponding indication (“Muraille de la Chine”).

Taken from [1019].
Fig. 6.7. Our drawn copy of a fragment of a map of Asia dating from the XVIII century that depicts the Great Wall of China. Map taken from [1019].

The same way and with the same legend the Wall of China is indicated on another map, this one of 1754, entitled “Carte de l’Asie” and taken from another rare atlas of the XVIII century ([1018]), q.v. in fig. 6.8. Here, the Wall of China also runs approximately along the border between China and the Great Tartary, aka “Mongolian Tartary,” aka Russia (q.v. in figs 6.9 and 6.10).

Fig. 6.8. Eastern part of the map of Asia from an XVIII century atlas. Taken from
Fig. 6.9. Fragment of a map of Asia from an XVIII century atlas. The Great Wall follows the border of China. We also see a corresponding indication ("Muraille de la Chine"). Taken from [1018].
Fig. 6.10. Our drawn copy of a map fragment dating from 1754 ("Carte de l’Asie. 1754"). We see the Great Wall of China. Map taken from [1018].

Exactly the same we see on the XVII century map of Asia in the famous Blaeu Atlas ([1035]), q.v. in fig. 6.11. The Wall of China runs exactly along the Chinese border, with only a small western part inside China.
Fig. 6.11. Fragment of a map of Asia from the Atlas of Blaeu dating from 1655. The Great Wall of China follows the Chinese border exactly, with only a small part of it located within China. Taken from [1035].

Our idea is corroborated by the very fact that the XVIII century cartographers have depicted the Wall of China on a political map. Therefore, it had the meaning of political border. They didn’t depict other “wonders of the world,” such as Egyptian pyramids, but made an exception for the Wall of China.

The wall is also indicated on the colour map of the Qing Empire of the XVII-XVIII century in the 10-volume Academic edition of the History of the World ([151], pp. 300-301.) On that map, the Great Wall is depicted meticulously, down to the smallest bends. Almost for all its length, it runs exactly along the border of the Chinese Empire, except for the short western part of about 200 kms.

On the map of the alleged year 1617 from the Blaeu Atlas ([1036]), we see the Wall of China running exactly along the border between China and Tartaria, q.v. in figs. 6.12 and 6.13. The same goes for the map of the alleged year 1635 from the Blaeu Atlas ([1036], pp. 198-199), q.v. in figs.
6.14 and 6.15.
Fig. 6.12. The Great Wall of China on the map that allegedly dates from 1617, which follows the border between China and Tartary exactly. Taken from [1036], pages 190-191.

Fig. 6.13. A close-in of the Great Wall, which serves as the borderline between China and Tartary. Fragment of a map presumed to date from 1617. Taken from [1036], pages 190-191.
Fig. 6.14. The Great Wall of China follows the border between China and Tartary on the map allegedly dating from 1635. Taken from the Atlas of Blau ([1036], pages 198-199).
In our opinion, it means the following. *The Great wall of China had been built in the XVI-XVII century as a political borderline between China and Russia = “Mongol Tartary.”*

To those having seen these maps and still repeating that the Great Wall was built in the III century B.C., we will answer the following. Okay, you may be right, we won’t argue. But it would mean that the ancient Chinese had such staggering prophetic talents that could predict where exactly the border between China and Russia would run in the XVII-XVIII century A.D. – *two thousand years ahead*, that is.

Our opponents may also argue that it’s not the wall that runs along the border between Russia and China, but the border had been agreed upon in the XVII century to run along the ancient wall. However, is this case, the
Wall of China should have been mentioned in the written Russian-Chinese agreement. We haven’t found any such mention.

To all appearances, the Great Wall was built exactly in the XVII century. It is justly considered that it was only finished in 1620 ([544], Vol. 6, p. 121), if not even later, q.v. below.

Let us recall in this connection that at exactly the same period Russia and China fought border wars (q.v. in: S. M. Solovyov, History of Russia from the Earliest Times, Vol. 12, Chapter 5; [800]). Probably, they had only agreed upon the border in the late XVII century, and secured the agreement with a wall.

Was there a wall before the XVII century? Apparently, no. Scaligerian history tells us that in the XIII century (or, more precisely, in 1279) China had been conquered by the “Mongols” and became part of the gigantic “Mongolian” = Great Empire. According to new chronology, the correct dating of this conquest is the end of the XIV century, that is a hundred years later, q.v. in Chron4. In the Scaligerian history of China this event is associated with the accession to power in 1368 of the Ming dynasty (the same Mongols, that is).

As we understand now, in the XIV-XVI century, Russia and China still formed one and the same empire. Therefore, there was no need to build a border wall. Most probably such a necessity arose after the strife in Russia, the defeat of the old Hordean dynasty and seizure of power by the Romanovs. It is known that the Romanovs had dramatically changed the Russian policy, trying to subordinate it to Western influence. Such a pro-Western orientation of the new dynasty resulted in the collapse of the Empire. Turkey broke away, and heavy wars began with it.

China broke away either. De facto was lost control over significant part of America. Finally, even the small Alaska was lost, the last surviving sliver of the Horde in America. The relations of China with the Romanovs became tense; border conflicts began, and a wall seemed to be a solution.

The Great Wall is mentioned in many “ancient Chinese” chronicles. But when were they written? Obviously, after the wall had been built, which
means not before the XVII century A.D.

Here is another interesting question. Is there in China other preserved solid stone structures (stone temples, stone city walls, solid stone fortresses, etc.) built before the XVII century, that is before the Manchurian dynasty? Or was the Great Wall all alone waiting for the Manchurians to come? The latter would be very strange. Is it possible that in two thousand years the Chinese, already having the experience of building the Great Wall, didn’t build a single structure even remotely comparable to it? We are told that the long Chinese history is chock-full of internecine wars. Why didn’t they wall off from each other?

In Europe and Russia, there is a great many preserved ancient fortresses. If two thousand years ago the Chinese had built a giant stone fortification, albeit useless from military point of view, then why didn’t they direct their remarkable talents at building really useful stone citadels in their cities, which waged permanent wars with each other? Having such an experience of “building walls,” they could cover all China with powerful stone fortifications long before the XVII century and the arrival of the Manchurians.

However, if the Great Wall was, as we suppose, one of the first grand stone structures in China, then everything becomes clear. After the XVII century, there were no internecine wars in Chine, it was always ruled by the same Manchurian dynasty. So it continued until the XX century. And in the XX century, the time of stone walls and fortifications was already over for obvious reasons.

Apparently, it is possible to date the building of the Great Wall even more precisely.

As we already said, the wall was apparently erected as a borderline between Russia and China in the time of border disputes of the XVII century. Armed conflicts kindled in the mid-XVII century. The sides fought with alternating success ([800], p. 572-575). Description of the wars can be found in the memoirs of Khabarov.

The treaty which fixed the northern border of China with Russia was
signed in 1689 in Nerchinsk. Attempts to sign the Russian-Chinese treaty could also be made earlier. It should be expected that the Wall of China was built between 1650 and 1689. This expectation is justified. It is known that Emperor (Bogd Khan) Kangxi “began the realization of his plan of wiping the Russians out of the Amour River region. Having built in Manchuria a chain of fortifications (! – Auth.), Bogd Khan, in 1684, sent to Amour the Manchurian army ([151], Vol. 5, p. 312).

What chain of fortifications had Bogd Khan built by 1684? In our opinion, it is the Great Wall of China, a chain of fortified towers connected by walls.

In fig. 6.16, we see an engraving of the early XVII century depicting a Russian embassy passing through the Great Wall of China.

Fig. 6.16. Ancient engraving from a book by I. Ides dating from the early XVIII century entitled “Russian Envoys Passing the Gates of the Great Wall of China”. This wall has got nothing in common with the one that we know under this name today. In the XVIII century it looked like a tall and relatively thin masonry fence, without any passageways on top, unlike the modern “ancient” Wall of China. Taken from [550], page 143.
It is worth to point out that the wall as it is depicted here doesn’t look like a military fortification at all. For instance, neither of passageways leading through the towers from Russia to China has closing gates or obstructing bars of any sort, q.v. in fig. 6.17.

Both reach-through arcuate passages are tall and wide, and there is nothing to close them up. Their large dimensions make them very hard to bar. Moreover, the entire brick wall is rather thin. There is no protected corridor at the top of it for defenders to move along from one tower to another in case of a siege. What we see is merely a stone fence. It is unclear how defenders could scramble such a thin wall from inside. It is obvious that there is no stairs anywhere that would lead to the top of the wall from the yard enclosed by it. All this makes the wall depicted in fig. 6.16 rather useless as a military fortification.

It is perfectly clear that the function of the Wall of China was merely decorative and symbolic – to point out the political border between two
states; just as it should, according to our reconstruction.

On the other hand, the Great Wall of China in its modern condition has substantially different design. It is much thicker and, more importantly, has a wide passageway at the top, q.v. in fig. 6.18.

![Fig. 6.18. The Great Wall of China in its modern state. It is rather thick, and has a wide passageway at the top, as though it were designed for tourists. Taken from [930], page 362.](image)

At both sides it has protective rails. When was it rebuilt to the modern look? Wasn’t it in the XX century? The passageway at the top of the Great Wall looks as though it was expressly designed for strolling tourists. It is a wide alley wherefrom opens a beautiful panoramic view of surrounding area. In fig. 6.19 we reproduce the photo of the Grand Wall taken in 1907.
It is possible that significant input into reconstruction of the “most ancient” Wall of China was made during the relatively recent epoch of Chairman Mao, when the nation was urged to create an exceptionally outstanding symbol of greatness of the modern China. The wall was repaired, widened, extended, here and there built anew… And then it was said that it always looked like this.

5.2. How long is the way from China to Kitai?

5.2.1. Where was China at the time of Afanasy Nikitin

Two names of China are in use today: “Kitai” and “China.” It is considered that both are correct and mean the same country. We have got used to it. But was it always so? No, it wasn’t. Let us take the famous Journey Beyond Three Seas by Afanasy Nikitin ([41]). To our surprise, we shall read the following: “The way from China to Kitai takes six months of walk by land and four days by sea” ([41], p. 460). Afanasy Nikitin reports it after the words, “And it’s Russia that I’m going to” ([41], p. 460).
Thus, it is clearly said that China and Kitai are two different countries, and it takes six months to walk from one to the other. Modern China is referred to as “China” in virtually all modern languages, so there is no doubt about what country is meant under this name. But in Russia, China is called “Kitai,” and Afanasy Nikitin is Russian. So, what country did he call “Kitai” all while stressing that it isn’t China?

Our answer is simple: he meant Russia. Or, possibly, its Eastern part. He pointed it out saying, “… it’s Russia that I’m going to” ([41], p. 460). And everything falls in its place. Indeed, taking into account means of travel of the epoch, it would take about six months to arrive by land from China to Muscovy, or, say, the Ural Mountains.

One could say against it that Afanasy Nikitin simply walked too slowly and therefore needed six months to toddle from Northern to Southern China. It’s because modern translators of Afanasy Nikitin for unknown reasons translate his “China” as Southern China, and “Kitai” as Northern China ([41], p. 460-461).

To this argument we will answer the following. Afanasy Nikitin didn’t travel too slowly. He begins his travel notes from the modern Strait of Hormuz in Persia and goes along the coast of India to Southern China by sea. It takes him about five months. Take a look at the map, you will see that the speed is quite normal for such a long distance. Then he writes that going by land from China to Kitai takes six months. In so much time he would easily reach Russia. As for Northern China, Afanasy Nikitin, at his travel speed, would reach it from Southern China in less than two months, not six.

By the way, if it were the travel by land from Southern to Northern China that took him six months, then where did he find en route a sea that took him four days to cross? There are no inland seas in China. As for going to Russia, he could have to cross Caspian or Aral Sea, or Lake Balkhash. It’s one of them that he most probably talked about.

Even if he meant “six months by land” or “four days by sea,” it wouldn’t change anything: there are no two such points in modern China a
travel between which would require either four days by sea or six months by land.

Among other things, Afanasy Nikitin mentions a certain state of “Kayaks” on the coast of Caspian Sea ([41], p. 446-449). Isn’t it this “Kitai” that Afanasy Nikitin was going to cross on the way home? Curiously, detailed travel notes of Afanasy Nikitin on his way back to Russia end with Kitai, which probably means that, in his opinion, the road from Kitai to Middle Russia is known to the reader, so he doesn’t want to waist his time describing it. Therefore, Kitai was either a part of Russia or a neighbouring region; in any case, not a mysterious country thousands kilometers away.

In this connection, let us return to the map of the alleged year 1635 from the Blaeu Atlas ([1036], p. 198-199), q.v. in fig. 6.14. There the name “Cathaya” (“Kitai”) is attributed to the region situated in the Far Eastern part of Russia, not in the territory of modern China (q.v. in fig. 6.20). Moreover, on the map of 1635, we see the word “Kithaisko” (“Chinese” in Russian) written near the city of Tumen, in the middle of Siberia and even farther from modern China (q.v. in figs. 6.21 and 6.22). It is noteworthy that under the word “Kithaisko” we see the words “Kasakki Tartari” (“Tartarian Cossacks”), q.v. in fig. 6.22.

Let us also point out, on the map of 1635, the area called “Belgian Desert” (“Desertum de Belgian”). Today the name Belgium exists only in Western Europe.

5.2.2. Bilingualism in the XV century Russia

Reading the books of Afanasy Nikitin draws many interesting questions. We have already talked about it in Chron4. For the most part he is writing in Russian, but occasionally switches to Turkic, and then back to Russian. These transitions are smooth and natural, often in the middle of a phrase. It leaves the impression that the author is perfectly bilingual and fluent both in Russian and Turkic. Read more about it in Chron4, Chapter 13.
For us, however, it is small wonder. That’s how it should have been in the “Mongolian” = Great Empire, where the official language was Russian, so the book is written mostly in Russian, but Turkic was also extensively used and spoken by everybody, or almost. This is why there are many phrases in Turkic in the book.

In this connection, the interesting book, *Az-i-Ya* ([823]) by Olzhas Suleimenov, comes to mind, where the author points at many Turkisms in the famous Russian *Tale of Igor’s Campaign*. And again, Turkisms appear in *The Tale* smoothly and naturally, indicating that both the author and his readers were bilingual. As a matter of fact, that’s exactly what Olzhas Suleimenov asserts: “Bilingual reader of the XII century didn’t apprehend Sviatoslav’s dream the same way as monolingual reader of the XVIII century and on” ([823], p. 65).

Suleimenov’s dating of the end of bilingualism in Russia seems to be correct: the XVII century. Having come to power, the Romanovs probably tried to extirpate bilingualism, which didn’t tie up with their theory of “confrontation between Russia and the Horde.” So, naturally, they declared Turkic “evil,” the “language of aggressors” and “aliens,” etc. Their Tatar subjects had been declared “descendants of wicked conquerors,” and their language was ordered to be forgotten.

The contraposition of two peoples living in the same country and previously acting together on historical scene resulted in depriving Russians of their history, blackening it, and passing it over to “evil Tatars” as the “history of the Horde.” The authentic history of the Tatars was taken away from them and “pushed” to the Far East.

Russians had been injected with feeling of defectiveness and inferiority, told that they had been conquered by savage nomads and for many years stayed under their terrible yoke; as a result, they had been left hopelessly far behind in their cultural development by enlightened, well-educated, economically advanced and democratic Western European countries.

**Summary.** The Russian part of one and the same real history of the
Horde, that was the history of the mediaeval Great Russian Empire, was taken away from Russians, and its Turkic and Tatar part was distorted and blackened.

5.3. Why Beijing is called Peking

Let us begin with the assertion that the modern Russian word “Peking” rather inaccurately reflects the real name of this city. This can be seen, for instance, from the report of the Russian embassy of N. G. Spafariy who had been sent to China by the Czar Alexis Mikhailovich (q.v. in: S. M. Solovyov, [800], p. 576-577).

“On the 5th of May, 1676, [Spafariy] reached the royal city of Pejing (Peking)” ([800], p. 577).

So, in the XVII century, Peking was called Pejing. In the connection with the name Pejing, we have got to say the following. We have already seen that Russia = “Mongolian” Empire was divided into regions, or “Hordes.” There were the White Horde, the Blue Horde, etc.

But there also was one more Horde, in the farthermost East. It was called the Pegaya Horde. We find this name in the Dictionary of Russian Language of the XI-XVII Century ([790]), searching on the word “Horde” (p. 64). The expression “Pegaya Horde” had been used in Russia in the XVII century: “Draft … from the Muscovite state … going up the Ob River, through the Obdor land, the Yugor and Siberian lands to Narym, to the Pegaya Horde” ([790], p. 64).

S. M. Solovyov also says that Pegaya Horde “was the name of the Trans-Amur countries” ([800], Book 6, Vol. 12, p. 570).

It is hard to get rid of thinking that the name Pejing, or Peging, or Peking, originates from the Russian word “pegiy” (“piebold”); the interchange of letters G and J is current and in full accordance with the rules of the Russian language. It is possible that Pejing (Beijing, Beijing) was the capital of the Russian (“Mongolian”) Pegaya Horde.
One can argue that Beijing was founded in very ancient times, long before the “Mongols,” it is mentioned in Chinese chronicles, etc. In our turn, we will ask our opponents to answer a simple question: what was the name of the Chinese capital in those “Chinese” chronicles? Was it Peking, or was it Beijing, as the modern Chinese call it?

No, it wasn’t. According to historians, it was called humbly and simply Ji ([212], p. 142.). But why should we consider Ji and modern Beijing to be the same city? Incidentally, in the reports of Feodor Baykov, sent to China from Russia in 1654, the Chinese capital (considered to be Peking) was referred to as “Kanbalyk.” The “White Khan,” that is.

5.4. China or Bogdoy?

By the way, in Russian diplomatic correspondence, until the end of the XVII century at least, neither China nor any Chinese are mentioned in that region. The state was called the Bogdoi (Bogda) Khanate, and its populace the Bogdans. The Chinese emperor was called Bogda-Khan or Bogd Khan ([815], p. 47); “Khan of the Bodgans,” that is (q.v. in: S. M. Solovyov, [800], p. 576-577).

The suspicion arises that Bogda-Khan simply stands for the Russian term “God-Given Khan,” at least that’s how it literally translates to Russian.

On the XVIII century map published in Amsterdam (see above in fig. 6.6), the Bogdoi region is depicted outside China, to the north from the Great Wall. This points out that there still was a great confusion around China by the XVII century. For instance, it is unclear whether it’s China that the abovementioned embassies had been sent to. And what was the meaning of the name “China” at the epoch?

5.5. Who are the Buddhists?

Today it is considered that for many centuries the official religion of China was Buddhism, which appeared long before the current era. It turns out,
however, that the famous mediaeval scientist Al-Biruni, who lived in the alleged X century A.D. (XV century in our reconstruction), didn’t make difference between Buddhists and Manichaeans ([212], p. 117). Let us remind the reader that the Manichaeans were a Christian sect founded in Byzantium.

Thus, it turns out that the Buddhism appeared in Byzantium either. Just as some of the “ancient Chinese” chronicles. Later both Buddhism and those chronicles had been taken to modern China. Other “ancient Chinese” chronicles came from Russia.

It is just natural that historians don’t like the abovementioned identification of Buddhists and Manichaeans by Al-Biruni. For instance, here is how skilfully and carefully brings L. N. Gumilev an inexperienced reader to the “dangerous quotation” from Al-Biruni:

“Manichaeism was not completely suppressed [in China – Auth.], although to hold out they had to resort to trickery. Manichaeans started to pretend to be Buddhists. In the beginning that was a conscious mimicry… Pretending they were Buddhists and observing the corresponding decorum, Chinese Manichaeans gradually merged with Buddhists, so that even such scientists as Al-Biruni couldn’t tell them from each other any more” ([212], p. 117).

“Manichaean gods of the luminaries in Buddhist clothes have been found on the icons in Khara-Khoto” ([212], p. 117). Fortunately, some survived documents make it possible to establish when and how the expulsion of Christianity from China had begun.

“The fate of the Catholic episcopate in China was not bright. In 1304, following the complaint of a Taoist church, the Khan outlawed the baptism of the Chinese and ordered that public prayers in his honour could only be served after Taoist and Buddhist services. In 1311, Buddhists took away from Christians the temples at the bank of the Yangtze River and painted Bodhisattvas and Dharmapalas over the frescoes that depicted scenes from the Gospels” ([212], p. 281).

However, one shouldn’t think that all this really happened in the XIV
century A.D. It happened much later. See for yourself.

“Manchurians ... favoured Christians until 1722, when hostility against Europeans and those Chinese who adopted their religion started to rise, but it’s only in 1815, upon arrival of Protestants and under their influence, that Catholics had been expelled from China” ([544], Vol. 6, p. 127).

Hence, Christianity was spread in China up until the XVIII century, and only then started to get ousted and replaced by Buddhism. The overpainted Christian frescoes discovered in China in the second half of the XIX century were perceived as very ancient. There is a special book, *Ancient Traces of Christianity in China According to Chinese Sources* by Palladius (Pyotr Kafarov), dedicated to this subject (*Oriental Digest*, I, Saint-Petersburg, 1872).

In conclusion, we cannot pass by the remarkable scientist of the alleged X century A.D., *Al-Biruni*. What do we know about him? We are told that “Abu al-Rayhan Muhammad al-Biruni (973-1048) was a Persian scholar and polymath from the Khwarezm region who wrote in Arabic. In his extensive work, *Chronology of Ancient Nations*, he gave descriptions of Persian, Arabic, Jewish, Hindu, and Greek calendar systems” ([212], p. 462).

Let us ask ourselves: when did the first serious and extensive works on chronology start to appear? This is well-known today in the commonly accepted version of history: at the times of Matthew Blastares, Scaliger and Petavius, that is in the XV-XVII century. In the works of Blastares, in the XIV century, for instance, chronology is presented in a fragmented, uncoordinated manner. It’s only in the mid-XVI – XVII century that really “extensive works” on chronology started to appear.

One of the first sizeable tractates on chronology was the famous mediaeval oeuvre of Caesar Baronius (Cesare Baronio) entitled *Annales ecclesiastici a Christo nato ad annum 1198* (“Ecclesiastical annals from Christ’s nativity to 1198”). Consisting of twelve folio volumes, it was first published in Rome between 1588 and 1607.
Isn’t the outstanding scientist of the X century A.D., al-Biruni, just an alias of the European Baronius of the XVI century?

5.6. Three “Mongolian” dynasties in the history of China

The three last ruling dynasties in the history of China had virtually the same name.

1. In 1279, the Mongols conquered China and made Beijing their residence ([544], Vol. 6, p. 127).
2. In 1368, the Ming dynasty came to power in China; the same Mongols, that is.
3. In 1644, power in China was taken by Manchurians ([544], Vol. 6, p. 127), i.e., Mangurs, or Manguls, since R in Chinese is often transmitted as L. Apparently, it’s the same Mongols again…

The first of the listed dynasties is a duplicate of a later epoch, because the correct dating of the “Mongolian” conquest is the XIV century, q.v. in Chron4.

The time of appearance of the Ming dynasty doesn’t contradict our newly obtained data in re chronology of China. However, we don’t know whether the Chinese chronicles are talking about the territory of modern China or keep on describing European events. This issue requires a special research.

5.7. In European chronicles, China is referred to as the Land of the Seres. Who were the Seres?

It turns out that, “in antiquity, inhabitants of China were referred to as the Seres.” ([722], p. 243).

Mediaeval European authors considered that “Seres is the city in the East, as well as the name of a land, a people, and a kind of fabric” ([722], p. 243).

So, in many mediaeval chronicles China is referred to as the Land of the
Seres. Who are the Seres? Without vocalisation, we get SR, or RS, since names have often been read from right to left. But RS means Russes, or Russians. Hence a natural hypothesis that Seres meant Russians.

And it’s obvious. China, or its significant region, made part of the “Mongolian” Empire – the Great Russian Hordean Empire, that is. Moreover, as we have discovered, the word “China” in Western chronicles initially, in the XIV-XVI century, referred to Russia – the Horde, or Scythia.

J. K. Wright writes: “Only in the XVI century it became known that the Land of Seres and China are one and the same thing” ([722], p. 243).

5.8. The Manchurian epoch as the beginning of trustworthy history of China

Apparently, the history of China (in its modern territory) becomes trustworthy only starting from the epoch of the Manchurian (Mongolian) dynasty, that is the dynasty originating from Russia (“Mongolia”). The dynasty was most probably Russian or Tartar.

Let us reiterate that even as recently as in the XVIII century “Manchurian,” “Mangur,” “Mangul,” and “Mongol” meant the same; therefore, the name “Manchurian” definitely indicates the Mongolian origin of the dynasty.

The XVII century is the border that separates the epoch of Manchurian reign in China from the preceding “purely Chinese” period. This coincides with the dating of the most ancient Chinese manuscripts that survived to our time. Let us remind the reader that none of such manuscripts antedate the XVII century A.D. ([544], Vol. 6, p. 119).

Do the ancient documents confirm our hypothesis? They do, really.
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 Hardouinthen 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.
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
zero). The function of the two texts are then compared. (*Chron1*, pp. 187–194.)

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. (*Chron1*, pp. 194–196.) He also compares modern texts, which describe different periods, and calculates low correlation, as expected. (*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.

**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. (*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 Zodiaccs—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.
Overview of the seven-volume print edition

History: Fiction or Science?

Chronology 1
A. T. Fomenko
Introducing the problem.
A criticism of the Scaligerian chronology.
Dating methods as offered by mathematical statistics.
Eclipses and zodiacs.

Chronology 2
A. T. Fomenko
The dynastic parallelism method.
Chronological shifts.

Chronology 3
A. T. Fomenko, T. N. Fomenko, V. V. Kalashnikov, G. V. Nosovskiy
Astronomical methods as applied to chronology.
Ptolemy’s Almagest. Tycho Brahe. Copernicus.
The Egyptian zodiacs.
Chronology 4
A. T. Fomenko, G. V. Nosovskiy

Chronology 5
A. T. Fomenko, G. V. Nosovskiy
Russia = Horde. Ottomans = Atamans.
The Etruscans. Egypt. Scandinavia.

Chronology 6
A. T. Fomenko, G. V. Nosovskiy
The Horde-Ataman Empire.
The Bible. The Reformation.
America. Passover and the calendar.

Chronology 7
A. T. Fomenko, G. V. Nosovskiy
A reconstruction of global history.
The Khans of Novgorod = The Habsburgs.
Miscellaneous information.
The legacy of the Great Empire in the history and culture of Eurasia and America.

This seven-volume edition is based on a number of our books that came out over the last couple of years and were concerned with the subject in question. All this gigantic body of material was revised and categorized; finally, its current form does not contain any of the repetitions that are
inevitable in the publication of separate books. All of this resulted in the inclusion of a great number of additional material in the current edition – including previously unpublished data. The reader shall find a systematic rendition of detailed criticisms of the consensual (Scaligerian) chronology, the descriptions of the methods offered by mathematical statistics and natural sciences that the authors have discovered and researched, as well as the new hypothetical reconstruction of global history up until the XVIII century. Our previous books on the subject of chronology were created in the period of naissance and rather turbulent infancy of the new paradigm, full of complications and involved issues, which often resulted in the formulation of multi-optional hypotheses. The present edition pioneers in formulating a consecutive unified concept of the reconstruction of ancient history – one that apparently is supported by a truly immense body of evidence. Nevertheless, it is understandable that its elements may occasionally be in need of revision or elaboration.

A. T. Fomenko
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.*
5. *The Empire.*

*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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