



## **Investigation of English History**

A.T.Fomenko, G.V.Nosovskij

NEW HYPOTHETICAL CHRONOLOGY AND CONCEPT OF THE ENGLISH HISTORY.  
BRITISH EMPIRE AS A DIRECT SUCCESSOR OF BYZANTINE-ROMAN EMPIRE.  
(SHORT SCHEME)

### **ABSTRACT**

This article is devoted to the investigation of traditional version of English chronology and English history. It should be mentioned that this tradition was established only in 15-17th cc. (and especially by Scaliger and Petavius) as a result of attempts to construct the global chronology of Europe and Asia at that time.

The results of our investigation show that modern version of English history (which is in fact a slightly modernized version of 15-16th cc.), was artificially prolonged backward and became much more long as it was in reality. The real history of England, as it was reflected in written documents, was much more short. The same is true for other countries.

In correct version, ancient and medieval English events are to be transferred to the epoch which begins from 9-10th cc. Moreover, many of these events prove to be the reflections of certain events from real Byzantine-Roman history of 9-15th cc. Consequently, the Great Britain Empire is a direct successor of medieval Byzantine Empire.

This effect for English history corresponds to the similar "shortening effects" for traditional histories of other countries (Italy, Greece, Egypt, Russia etc.). Such effects were discovered earlier by the authors (see our previous publications). A discussion of the whole problem of global chronology and a history of this problem one can find in [1],[24]. English history is not an exemption from the "rule".

We do not think that all speculations which are suggested here are final ones. Surely, they are subject to further corrections and clarification. Nevertheless, the general concept is quite clear and seems to be a final one. The aim of present work is only to present main points of our new version of reconstruction of the real English history.

### **CONTENTS**

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

## 2. BRIEF REVIEW OF TRADITIONAL ENGLISH HISTORY

- 2.1. The most old English chronicles
  - 2.1.1. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.
  - 2.1.2. Nennius' "Historia Brittonum"
  - 2.1.3. Galfridus Monemutensis' "Historia Brittonum". "Histoires of the kings of Britain by Geoffrey of Monmouth"
  - 2.1.4. Some other old English chronicles
- 2.2. What were the medieval names for modern cities, nations and countries according to ancient English chronicles?
- 2.3. An overview of traditional concept of English history
  - 2.3.1. Scotland and England: two parallel "dynastic streams"
  - 2.3.2. English history. Epoch from 1st to 445 A.D. England as the Roman colony
  - 2.3.3. Epoch from 445 to 830. Six kingdoms and their union
  - 2.3.4. Epoch from 830 to 1040. The epoch is finished by Danish conquest and then by disintegration of Dutch kingdom in England
  - 2.3.5. Epoch from 1040 to 1066. Epoch of the Old Anglo-Saxon dynasty and it's fall
  - 2.3.6. Epoch from 1066 to 1327. Norman dynasty and after it - Anjou dynasty. Two Edwards
  - 2.3.7. Epoch from 1327 to 1602.

## 3. PARALLELS BETWEEN ENGLISH AND BYZANTINE-ROMAN HISTORY. GREAT BRITAIN EMPIRE AS THE DIRECT SUCCESSOR OF MEDIEVAL BYZANTINE-ROMAN EMPIRE

- 3.1. Rough comparison of dynastic streams of England and Byzantine-Roman empire
- 3.2. Dynasty parallelism between ancient and medieval England from one side and medieval Byzantine empire from another side. General concept of correspondence between English and Byzantine histories
- 3.3. Some details of dynastic parallelism ("parallelism table")
  - 3.3.1. English history of 640-830 A.D. and Byzantine history 378-553 A.D. 275-year shift
  - 3.3.2. English history of 800-1040 and Byzantine history of 553-830. Rigid 275-year shift
  - 3.3.3. English history of 1040-1327 and Byzantine history of 1143-1453. Rigid 120-year shift

## 4. CORRECT ENGLISH HISTORY IS MORE SHORT IN TIME BUT MUCH MORE DENSE IN EVENTS THAN IT IS SUGGESTED BY TEXTBOOKS

- 4.1. Our new concept of English history
- 4.2. In which way the Byzantine chronicles were inserted into the medieval English history (of the island Anglia)?

## 5. OLD ENGLISH CHRONICLES AS ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS WHICH SPEAK ABOUT REAL EVENTS OF 10-13th CENTURIES

- 5.1. Roman consul Brutus - the first who conquered Britain (and the first king of britts)
- 5.2. Consul Brutus of English chronicles - was he a contemporary of Julius Caesar?
- 5.3. Biblical events in English chronicles
- 5.4. Do we interpret ancient texts in a proper way? Problem of vowels restoration
- 5.5. Geography and chronology of biblical events
  - 5.5.1. Problems with traditional geographical localizations
  - 5.5.2. Where ancient Troy was located?
  - 5.5.3. Where Moses traveled in reality?
- 5.6. Why English chronicles suggested that both Russia and England were located on islands?
- 5.7. Where was the land Britain which was conquered by Brutus located? In what direction his fleet cruised?
- 5.8. With whom Brutus fights while conquering of Britain = Albania?
- 5.9. With whom Julius Caesar fights while conquering of Britain = Albania?
- 5.10. Where was London located in 10-11th cc.A.D.?
- 5.11. Who were scots in 10-12th cc.A.D. and where did they live? Where was Scotland located in 10-12th cc.A.D.?
- 5.12. Five original languages of ancient Britain. Which nations used these languages and where did they live in 10-12th cc.A.D.?
- 5.13. Where were located six original English kingdoms Britain, Kent, Sussex, Wessex, Essex and Mercia in 10-12th cc.A.D.?
- 5.14. A shift of originally Byzantine map to the land of modern Great Britain resulted in duplicating of many geographical terms
- 5.15. William I the Conqueror and Hastings battle in 1066 A.D. The fourth crusade in 1204 A.D.
  - 5.15.1. Two well-known wars in England and Byzantine empire have the same origin
  - 5.15.2. English version of William the Conqueror story
  - 5.15.3. Byzantine version of the Constantinople's conqueror
  - 5.15.4. A list of correspondences between events from Byzantine and English chronicles
- 5.16. Medieval Russia from the point of view of English chronicles. When did apostle Paul write his message to galats and who they were?

## REFERENCES

### 1. INTRODUCTION

This work belongs to the scope of investigations carried out by authors in order to give a critical analysis of ancient and medieval chronology, and also - to try a reconstruction of real ancient chronology. The whole history of the problem one can find in A.T.Fomenko's books [1],[24]. In these books some new statistical methods of obtaining true dates for ancient events recorded in old chronicles were suggested. As a result, a new chronology of Europe, Asia, Egypt and Northern Africa based on a statistical investigation of ancient texts, was suggested in [1],[24]. One also can find there a list of all publications by A.T. Fomenko and his colleagues devoted to chronological problems.

This new concept of global history and chronology confirms some ideas which were expressed by different scientists in 16-20th cc. The most important were ideas of famous Russian scientist N.A.Morozov (1854-1946) who had an extremely wide range of scientific interests in many different branches of natural science and history. Very interesting works devoted to the problems of traditional chronology were written by Isaac Newton, J.Gardouin, R.Baldauf, E.Johnson and others.

As a result of application of statistical methods to historical science, A.T.Fomenko discovered a "fiber structure" of our modern "textbook in ancient and medieval history". In such a way we will call a modern chronological tradition in history which is expressed in all our textbooks. It was proved that this "textbook" consist of four more short "textbooks" which speak about the same events, the same historical epochs. These short "textbooks" were then shifted one with respect to other on the time axis and then glued together preserving these shifts. The result is our modern "textbook" which shows the history much longer than it was in reality. To be more precise, we speak here only about a "written" history, i.e., such history which left it's traces in written documents which finally, after their certain evolution, we possess today. Of course before it, there was a long "pre-written" history, but information about it is lost.

Resume is as follows. History which we in principle could learn about today, starts only in 9-10th cc. "A.D." (i.e., 1100-1200 years ago). And the very name "A.D." attached to the era which we use now, is not correct. New results concerning the problem of reconstruction of real ancient chronology one can find in two last Fomenko's books [4,5] devoted to history and chronology.

An important step to the reconstruction of real ancient chronology was made by publication of a book [3] written by A.T.Fomenko, V.V.Kalashnikov and G.V.Nosovskij. In this book the true date of compilation of a famous ancient scientific manuscript, the Ptolemy's "Almagest", was (approximately) determined as a result of statistical analysis of numerical astronomical data in the "Almagest". Traditionally it is assumed that the "Almagest" was compiled not later than in 2nd c. A.D. In [3] it is proved that the real date of it's compilation belongs to the time interval from 7th century to 13th century A.D.

Later, in 1992-1993, A.T.Fomenko and G.V. Nosovskij applied new statistical methods to Russian history. In Russian history there also were discovered chronological shifts and duplicates. It proves to be very much different from well-known version of Russian history which was suggested in epoch of Romanov dynasty reign in Russia. The book "Chronology and General Concept of Russian History" by A.T.Fomenko and G.V. Nosovskij is being printed (in Russian).

In 1992-1993 authors recognized that the history of development of English chronology and English history itself is a very interesting and important point in the whole scope of global chronology reconstruction. In our analysis of Russian old documents it was necessary to use also some English documents. And immediately we came upon several such amazing facts that, it become quite clear to us that English history (which is rather "spoiled" in modern "textbook") gives new and important information to the reconstruction of real chronology of Europe and Asia.

We tried our best to make this work independent from our previous works. Nevertheless, such dependence exists. That is why we recommend to anyone who really wants to understand the whole problem of reconstruction the English history as it as in reality, to look through mentioned above books and scientific publications by authors. We believe

that this work is good for the beginning and it could serve as a starting point to the reader. We tried to avoid citation from other our works here (as far as it was possible).

It is pleasure for us to thank Mrs. Laura Alexander (USA) for her excellent assistance in arranging materials concerning English history. Her energy very much inspired our work on English history.

We thank T.N.Fomenko for several good ideas which improved some of our results concerning parallels between English and Byzantine history and also for valuable remarks which made this text better.

## **2. BRIEF REVIEW OF TRADITIONAL CONCEPT OF ENGLISH HISTORY**

### **2.1. The most old English chronicles**

#### **2.1.1. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.**

To understand a material we are going to present here, it would be better if a reader knows main things from English, Roman and Byzantine history. As to Roman and Byzantine history, we assume that it is more or less the case. But old English history is not so generally well-known. That is why we are going to present here a brief review of "English history textbook".

Surely, we could simply suggest that a reader looks through one of modern books concerned with English history before he reads this paper. But all such books are necessarily the secondary texts which, in fact, copy an information from more old texts and documents devoted to English history. The problem is that this coping proves to be not so good (part of information is lost). That is why we prefer to analyse medieval historical texts themselves rather than modern textbooks, which are based on them. An important advantage of these medieval texts is that they were written more close to the time of creation of now traditional global chronological version (it was I.Scaliger's one). Our experience says that an information about old history was been lost while publishing new and new textbooks from that time up to now. Medieval texts are more valuable for reconstruction of real history.

Our analysis was based mostly on three famous medieval English chronicles: Anglo-Saxon Chronicle [2], Nennius' "Historia Brittonum" [8] and Galfridus Monemutensis' "Historia Brittonum" [9]. In fact, these texts form a basis for modern concept of old and medieval English history.

Also we used well-known "Chronological Tables" which were compiled by J.Blair [6] in 18th c. - beginning of 19th c. These fundamental tables cover all historical epochs which seemed important to experts in the end of 19th century.

Now it is assumed that so-called "legendary" English history started from the time of Trojan war, i.e., in 12-13th cc. B.C. Nevertheless a 1000-year period from Trojan war to the epoch of Julius Caesar (1st c. B.C.) is considered usually as a "dark time".

From the time of creation and establishment of modern chronological concept (by I. Scaliger and D.Petavius in 16-17th cc.) it was assumed that "written" English history

starts from 60 B.C. when Julius Caesar conquered the British islands. But it is known today that documents speak about English history only from approximately 1 A.D., i.e. from the reign of Octavian Augustus. It was the 1 A.D. when Anglo-Saxon Chronicle began its records ([2], p.4).

### **The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle consists of several separate manuscripts:**

Manuscript A: The Parker Chronicle (60 B.C. - A.D. 1070),

Manuscript B: The Abigdon Chronicle I (A.D. 1 - A.D. 977),

Manuscript C: The Abigdon Chronicle II (60 B.C. - A.D. 1066),

Manuscript D: The Worcester Chronicle (A.D. 1 - A.D. 1079), (with twelfth-century addition 1080 - 1130 A.D.),

Manuscript E: The Laud (Petersburg) Chronicle (A.D. 1 - A.D. 1153),

Manuscript F: The Bilingual Canterbury Epitome (A.D. 1 - A.D. 1058).

It is well-known that all these manuscripts duplicate each other in the sense that they all speak about the same events, but in more or less details. That is why all they are placed in the publication [2] parallel to each other in a very convenient manner, which makes it easy to compare different records concerning the same year. Maybe, all these manuscripts have the same written original and in fact represent different scripts of one old chronicle.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle covers an epoch from 1 A.D. to 11th century (except manuscript E which stops in 1153).

It is traditionally assumed that all these manuscripts were written approximately in 11-12th cc., just in the form which we have today. But it is only a hypothesis which is strongly based on the Scaliger's chronology. And it sounds not very natural. For example, manuscript A exists now only in two "copies" and both of them were made only in 16th c. (see [2], p.xxxiii). The original version (from which these two copies were made) was practically burned out in a fire. As to other manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, their history is not clear from [2]. For example, it is not pointed out what were the methods of determining of dates when existing copies were made. One could have an idea that the dating was as follows: if last records of these manuscripts refer to 11-12th cc., then the copies we now possess are necessarily written just in that form in 11-12th cc. Leaving aside other objections, we must say that this speculation is fully based on Scaliger's chronology. If real dates of last mentioned events change, then such dating of a manuscript would also change.

Difficulties with reconstruction of a true story for origin of these manuscripts are well-known among experts. For example David Knowles had to claim that: "The question of provenance and interdependence of the various versions [of the Chronicle] are so complicated that any discussion soon assumes the appearance of an essay in higher mathematics" ([2],p.xxxi).

Moreover, G.N.Garmonsway says that any modern analysis of Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is based on the Charles Plummer's revision (1892-1899) of its original edition published by John Earle in 1865. It should be mentioned that manuscripts A and E are again "associated" (G.N.Garmonsway's expression) with certain persons from 16th century - Archbishop Parker (1504-1575) and Archbishop Laud (1573-1645). Here is his text: "Any account of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is necessary based on Charles Plummer's revision of the edition of John Earle (1865) which was published in two volumes by the Oxford

University Press in 1892-9... Plummer's edition... gives prominence on opposite pages to manuscripts A and E, associated respectively with the names of Archbishop Parker (1504-75) and Archbishop Laud (1573-1645);...The other manuscripts were once in the possession of Sir Robert Cotton (1571-1631), and are to be found in the Cottonian collection of manuscripts in the British Museum"([2],p.xxxi).

It seems that all the manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Chronicle which are available today were actually written (or revised) not earlier than in 15-16th centuries. However, they are considered to be written in this form in 11-12th cc. Probably the only reason for such point of view is that traditional dates of the last events from Anglo-Saxon Chronicle belong to this epoch: 11-12th cc. But such reason is not enough. It is possible that events from 11-12th cc. were described by somebody in 15-16th cc. and we actually possess his secondary text which could be very far from an original version. And also, the dates of events from Anglo-Saxon Chronicle strongly depend on a used chronological concept. If it changes then the dating of Anglo-Saxon Chronicle would change automatically.

There is a strong argument which suggests that manuscripts of Anglo-Saxon Chronicle are actually of a rather late origin. The problem is that all these manuscripts use modern "A.D." era which came into regular practical use only in 15th century. It is a known fact in traditional history. Later we will also present some facts which suggest that the authors of Anglo-Saxon Chronicle were already familiar with J.Scaliger's chronological concept (16th c.), and by no means - with a chronological concept of Matthew Vlastar (16th c.). It means that Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was written much later than it is usually accepted.

The reason for Anglo-Saxon Chronicle to be paid such great attention in our reconstruction of English history is very simple. It turns out that "Thanks to the example of Bede, the Chronicle is the first history written in English to use his mastery innovation of reckoning years as from the Incarnation of Our Lord - "Years of Grace" as they were called in England."([2],p.xxiv).

Concerning the way of presenting dates in Anglo-Saxon Chronicle we should make a remark. It is accepted that in medieval England they used for "A.D." era the following formula: "Years from the Incarnation of Our Lord". It is accepted today that this formula was equivalent to the formula "Years of Grace". But this equivalence is not so evident and requires a special investigation. (We will return to this subject later and discuss it in more details). Note that there is a strange similarity between two well-known names-terms Grace - Greece.

Maybe the original (and forgotten today) meaning of a formula "Years of Grace" differs from one which is accepted today. Maybe it was "years in Greece", "Greek years" or something like this. It is possible also that there is a relation between terms Grace, Greece and Christ. Was the name of Christ associated in some sense with a name of country "Greece"? For example Christ religion = "Greece religion"? It might be because in medieval epoch Greece was a name of Byzantine empire, and another it's name was Romea, Rome. So Christian, "Roman" religion could be called also as "Greek religion"; but if so then there might be a confusion between "A.D.", "Christ" era and old "Greek", Byzantine era which was used sometimes, as well as "A.D.", with it's thousands omitted. It could be not obvious which era was actually used in an old documents which indicate "Years of Grace". Of course, such kind of similarity between different terms could not be considered as very strong arguments supporting any point of view. It play a role of preliminary speculations and should be considered as a serious argument only in the case when it appears (repeats) constantly in a long historical parallelism, when similar

names arise simultaneously for hundreds of years in two different epochs after one of them is shifted in time as a whole and then compared with another one.

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was written in a very laconic manner, it was divided into chapters (fragments) each of them devoted to a certain year. Many years are not described at all (there are some lacunas in the text). It is considered today that Anglo-Saxon Chronicle speaks about events from the beginning of A.D. to 11-12th centuries. See Fig.1. The text of Anglo-Saxon Chronicle seem to be really very old. Absence of long and "beautifully designed" periods in the text (typical for historical literature of 15-16th cc.) suggests that Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is an important historical document which was based on some really ancient records. Surely, it was edited in 16-17th cc. and a main question is: what credit should we give to chronologists of 15-17 centuries who actually dated events in Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as we have it now?

### 2.1.2. Nennius' "Historia Brittonum".

Nennius' "Historia Brittonum" is a rather short text, only about 24 pages in [8].

There exist more than 30 manuscripts of Nennius' book which are known today (see [8]).

"The earliest manuscripts are dated today by 9th or 10th centuries, and the latest - by 13th or even 14th centuries. In some of the manuscripts are indications that the author was Gildas. Nennius is called as the author sufficiently rare. Thus, this manuscript is possibly - compilation... The original text was lost, we do not have it today. But there exists its Irish translation of 11th century" ([8],p.269).

Translation was made from the publication: "Nennius et l'Historia brittonum", P.,1934.

Some manuscripts are ended with pages from "Annals Cambriae", which is considered to be compiled approximately in 954 A.D.

Nennius' "Historia Brittonum" does not have nor chronological subdivision neither any chronological notes except the following two ones:

- 1) A table titled "About six ages of the world" is placed at the beginning of the "Historia". It presents time distances in years between some biblical events - and already according to Scaliger's calculations, which were carried out only in 16th c.
- 2) Chapter XVI of the "Historia" has a section titled "The ground of the dating", which speaks about the relative distances (in years) between a few events from English history. In both cases chronological notes are very brief.

Resume is that it is unclear, who and when actually wrote the "Historia". It's original text does not exist today, a translation which is considered to be carried out in 11th c. The text does not have it's own chronological scale. Surely, all questions which arise with Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, refer to "Historia" also. Moreover, Nennius' text is written in a free artistic manner with many stylistic accessories. It suggests that this manuscript is of rather late origin. Such text could be written only in an atmosphere of a deep and well developed literary tradition when many people use writing and reading books and paper is not a treasure.



It is accepted today that Nennius describes certain events in a time interval from the epoch of Trojan war to 10-11th cc. A.D. In fact it is a result of only a traditional chronological concept (which suggests that short Nennius' text covers an extremely large 2000-year historical period) that one could find today giant lacunas in chronology of "Historia". Fig. 1 shows by a dotted line the epoch which is considered to be covered by "Historia". According to traditional chronological concept Nennius easily omits whole centuries in his story, makes giant chronological jumps without any explanations. He seems not to notice it at all and continues his story after such jumps as if nothing was missed.

### **2.1.3. Galfridus Monemutensis' "Historia Brittonum". "Histories of the kings of Britain by Geoffrey of Monmouth".**

It is generally accepted today that this chronicle was written in 30th or 40th of 12th century ([8], p.196) by Galfridus Monemutensis who based it on Nennius' text, sometimes even copying Nennius "errors" ([8], p.231, comments to chap. 17; see also [8], p.244). Galfridus Monemutensis' book is rather big one - about 130 pages in [8]. In opposition to Anglo-Saxon Chronicle his text has no chronological subdivision (no indication about years). His writing style was rather complicated, with many accessories, moralities, philosophical excursions et cetera. Galfridus is even considered to be not a historian only but also a poet. Surely, the traditional point of view that Galfridus wrote his book after Nennius, is correct. It is known also that Galfridus made an extensive use of "Ecclesiastic History of the English Nation" (in Latin) by Bede Venerable ([9], p.244). It is assumed that Bede's "History" covers 597-731 A.D.

It is remarkable that modern commentators point out "the extremely clear and evident Galfridus' orientation of the antique tradition" ([9], p.207). For example, Galfridus not only used ancient plots, but also copied a stylistic manner of ancient authors ([9], p.207). It seems that Galfridus writes his book being fully influenced by the atmosphere of antiquity. It was pointed out that Galfridus copies some of his topics directly from ancient authors (for example, from Stacius), but does not give any references ([9], p.236).

Galfridus Monemutensis' "Historia Brittonum" was extremely popular in medieval times. "Today we have about two hundreds (! - Auth.) copies of his "History",... which were written in different places starting from 12th century and until 15th century, i.e., up to appearance of the first printed edition" ([9],p.228). At first time "Historia" was printed in Paris in 1508.

Fig. 1 shows a historical epoch which is assumed to be covered by Galfridus' text (according to traditional chronology). Notice that it is approximately the same time interval as for Nennius' case: namely, from Trojan war up to 8th century A.D. Of course, Galfridus' book is much bigger than Nennius' one, but being referred again to the giant 2000-year time interval, it could not cover it all without huge lacunas. And really, traditional chronology states that Galfridus "omit" large historical epochs. But it is strange, that Galfridus himself does not mind it at all. He calmly continues his story without notifying a reader that he sometimes actually misses whole historical epochs in his chronology.

### **2.1.4. Some other old English chronicles**

In our work we use also some other English chronicles of 9-13th centuries, particularly those represented in a book by V.I.Matuzova "English medieval documents" [10]. Here

we would like to present a very interesting list which was compiled by V.I. Matuzova as a result of her investigation of these chronicles rather than to characterize them in details. We will discuss this subject in the next section.

## 2.2. What were the medieval names for modern cities, nations and countries according to ancient English chronicles?

Many people use to think that medieval chronicles refer to such well-known areas (regions) as England, London, Russia, Kiev etc. with just the same names as today, and so in general there is no problem to recognize what place old documents are speaking about. Sometimes, in more new documents, it is actually the case. But in more old, original documents such situation seems to be rather an exception than a rule. Old chronicles very often use absolutely different geographical names and it is a nontrivial task to understand what regions (areas, towns et cetera) they are really speaking about.

It is also a problem that old documents in general use many different names for each country, land, nation etc. Very often these names have nothing to do with those we use today. The names of ancient nations, countries and cities which are known today, were fixed only in 18-20th centuries. But before that time there were various opinions concerning what names to use. These opinions were often quite different from each other. It is a very interesting question to analyse the names which were used in medieval English documents for cities, nations and countries which are so well-known today with their modern names. It turns out after such analysis, that medieval authors seem to have quite different views on old and ancient history. That is why modern specialists in history usually claim that almost all medieval people were "extremely wrong" in history, that they had "fantastic concepts" about it, "confused and mixed historical epochs", "did not distinguish antiquity and medieval epoch" and so on.

In a following list some medieval "synonyms" of modern accepted names and terms are presented. Each entry of the list shows a modern term and is followed by it's medieval synonyms.

<b>AZOV SEA</b>	= Meotidisc lakes, Meotidisc fen, Maeotidi lacus, Maeotidi paludes, palus Maeotis, paludes Maeotis, paludes Maeotidae, Paluz Meotidienes.
<b>ALANIA</b>	= Valana, Alania, Valana, Valvy, Polovtzy ?! - see below.
<b>ALBANIANS</b>	= Liubene, Albani.
<b>AMAZONS LAND</b>	= Maegda land, Maegda londe, Amazonia.
<b>ALBANIANS</b>	= Maegda land, Maegda londe, Amazonia.
<b>BULGARIANS</b>	= Wlgari, Bulgari, Bougreis.
<b>BUG RIVER</b>	= Armilla.
<b>VANDALS</b>	= Wandali, Sea-cost Slavs.
<b>HUNGARY</b>	= Hungaria, Hunia, Ungaria, Minor Ungaria.
<b>BYZANTINE EMPIRE</b>	= Graecia, Constantinopolis,
<b>VALACHIANS</b>	= Coralli, Blachi, Ilac, Blac, Turks ! (see below).
<b>VALACHIA</b>	= Balchia.
<b>VOLGA RIVER</b>	= Ethilia.

<b>GALITZK-VOLYNSK RUSSIA</b>	= Galacia, Gallacia.
<b>GERMANY</b>	= Gothia, Mesia, Theutonia, Germania, Allemania, Jermaine.
<b>HIBERNIC OCEAN</b>	= The English Channel, Hibernicum oceanum.
<b>HIBERNIA</b>	= Ireland (!)
<b>GOTHIA</b>	= Germany, Island Gotland, Scandinavia, Tavrida (=old name of Crimea).
<b>GUNNS</b>	= Hunni, Huni, Hun.
<b>DACKS</b>	= Dani, Daneis.
<b>DENMARK</b>	= Denemearc, Dacia, Dania, Desemone.
<b>DUTCH</b>	= Daci, Dani, Norddene, Denen.
<b>DARDANELLES (the strait)</b>	= St. Georg strait = branchium Sancti Georgii.
<b>DERBENT (passage)</b>	= Alexander gates = Alexandres herga, Porta ferrea Alexandri, claustra Alexandri.
<b>DNEPR RIVER</b>	= Aper.
<b>DOGI</b>	= Russians (see below).
<b>DON RIVER</b>	= Danai, Thanais, Tanais.
<b>MEDIEVAL RUSSIA</b>	= Susie, Russie, Russie, Rusia, Russia, Ruthenia, Rutenia, Ruthia, Ruthena, Ruscia, Russcia, Russya, Rosie.
<b>DANUBE RIVER</b>	= Danubius, Hister, Danuvius, Damaius, Deinphirus, Danube.
<b>IRON GATES</b>	= see "Derbent".
<b>IRELAND</b>	= Hybernia.
<b>ICELAND</b>	= Ysolandia.
<b>CAUCASUS</b>	= beorg Taurus, Caucasus.
<b>CASPIAN SEA</b>	= Caspia garsecge, mare Caspium.
<b>CASSARIA</b>	= Chasaria (! (see below)
<b>KIEV</b>	= Chyo (!), Cleva (!), Riona (!),
<b>CHINESE</b>	= Cathaii.
<b>CORALLS</b>	= Wlaches (see above), Turks (see above),
<b>RED SEA</b>	= mare Rubrum.
<b>ENGLISH CHANNEL</b>	= Hibernic ocean , Hibernicum oceanum.
<b>MARBURG</b>	= Merseburg.
<b>MESIA</b>	= Moesia, Germany (see above),
<b>MONGOLIANS</b>	= Moal, Tatars (see above),
<b>NARVA</b>	= Armilla.
<b>GERMANS</b>	= Germanici, Germani, Teutonici, Theutonici, Allemanni.
<b>NETHERLANDS</b>	= Frisia, Arise.
<b>NORMANS</b>	= Nordmenn.
<b>OCEAN</b>	= Garsecg, Oceano, Oceanus, Occeanus, Ocean.
<b>PECHENEKS (medieval neighbours of Russians)</b>	= Getae.

<b>POLOVTZY (medieval neighbours of Russians)</b>	= Planeti, Captac, Cumani, Comanii, Alani, Values, Valani. (See Comment 1.)
<b>PRUSSIA</b>	= Prutenia (!). (P-Rutenia = P-Russia).
<b>PRUSSES</b>	= Prateni, Pruteni, Pructeni, Prusceni, Praceni, Pruceni.
<b>RIONA</b>	= Kiev (see above)
<b>RUGS</b>	= Russians, , Sea-cost, Slavs (see below)
<b>RUSSIANS</b>	= Russii, Dogi (!), Rugi (!), Rutheni (!), Rusceni.
<b>RUTHENS</b>	= Russians (see above)
<b>THE ARCTIC OCEAN</b>	= Sciffia garsecg, Oceanus Septentrionalis, mare Scythicum.
<b>SITHIA</b>	= Scithia (see above)
<b>SCANDINAVIANS</b>	= Gothi.
<b>SCYTHS</b>	= Scithes, Scythae, Cit (!).
<b>SCITHIA</b>	= Sithia, Barbaria, Scithia, Scythia, Sice (!).
<b>SEA-SIDE SCLAVI</b>	= Winedas, Wandali, Roge.
<b>TAVR</b>	= Caucasus (see above)
<b>TAVRIDA (CRIMEA)</b>	= Gothia (!!!)
<b>TANAIS</b>	= Don (see above)
<b>TYRRHENIAN SEA</b>	= mare Tyrene.
<b>TATARS (MONGOLS)</b>	= Tartareori, gens Tartarins, Tartari, Tartariti, Tartarii, Tattari, Tatari, Tartarii, Thartarei.
<b>TURKS</b>	= Coralli, Thurki, Turci, Blachi, Ilac, Blac (!!!).
<b>URAL MOUNTAINS</b>	= Riffeng beorgum, Hyberborei montes, montes Riph(a) eis, Hyperborei montes.
<b>FRANCE</b>	= Gallia, Francia.
<b>FRISIA</b>	= The Netherlands (see above.)
<b>CHASARIA</b>	= Cassaria, Cessaria (!!!).
<b>CHASARS</b>	= Chazari.
<b>CHIO</b>	= Kiev (see above)
<b>SCOTLAND</b>	= Scotia, Gutlonde.
<b>BLACK SEA</b>	= Euxinus, Pontius, mare Ponticum, mare Majus.
<b>CHINGIS-CHAN</b>	= Cingis, Churchitan, Zingiton, Chircam, Cliyrcam, Gurgatan, Gurgatan, Cekarcarus, Ingischam, Tharsis (!), DAVID (!), PRESBYTER IOHANNES (!!).
<b>JAROSLAV THE WISE (Kiev Princeps Magnus)</b>	= Malesclodus, Malescoldus. Juriscloth (= Julius-Georgius), Juliusclodius (= Julius-Clodius). Julius Claudius.

One remark about Jaroslav the Wise. He was known in medieval England as "Malescoldus". According to M.N.Alexeev [12] there were also some other names which were applied to Jaroslav the Wise in Western historical tradition: Juriscloht (from Julius-Georgius), Juliusclodius (!), (the last form of Jaroslav's name was used by Norman historian of 12th century - Gijom), Julius Claudius, (this form used by Orderic Vitali).

Let us present a typical example of old English historical text: "He escaped to the

kingdom of Dogs, which we prefer to call RUSSIA. When the king of [this] land - MALESCLODUS - learned about him, he was given a great honor" ([13],[14]).

Here is a Latin original text: "Aufugit ad regnum Dogorum, quod nos melius vocamus Russiam. Quem rex terrae Malescoldus nomine, ut cognovit quis esset, honeste retinuit" [13].

Imagine please reading this old text without looking at the modern comments which suggest that Dogs Kingdom means the same as Russia. The text would look like this: "He escaped to the Kingdom of Dogs. When the king of that land learned about him, he was given a great honor."

Most probably such text would be understood as a story treating some medieval events in England or Scotland. The word "Dogs" seems to designate a population in some part of England or Scotland and the name "Malescoldus" very much looks like a name of medieval English or Scottish king. Such an interpretation looks rather natural. One knows from Scottish history, for example, that there were several kings with a name "Malcolm", close to "Malescoldus": Malcolm I (943-958), Malcolm II (1004-1034), Malcolm III (1057-1093) etc.

But such interpretation of this text would definitely transform some of ancient Russian events into English ones, i.e., into ones which are thought to happen on the land of modern England. This example suggests that even a direct understanding, not to say about an interpretation, of an old historical text could be rather ambiguous.

Differences between medieval English writer's opinion and modern way of understanding and interpretation of medieval terms occur for texts written in 9-15th centuries (not so old texts, from the point of view of modern tradition). It means that there exist several possibilities to interpret medieval documents. The way of such interpretation which is in general use now, proves to be not unique. It is only one of possible ways, maybe not the best one. We are going to show here that this standard way is really not enough supported by original documents. The above vocabulary of synonyms (medieval terms-duplicates) is very useful for our analysis of English history.

### **2.3. An overview of traditional concept of English history**

#### **2.3.1. Scotland and England: two parallel "dynastic streams"**

Fig. 1 shows a rough scheme of the English history as it is considered today. The beginning of English history is placed in the 1st century B.C. (Julius Caesar's conquest of England). Starting at this moment and going up to 400 A.D., English chronicles talk in fact about Roman history. Sometimes they only mention that certain Roman emperor visit England. According to English chronicles there were no independent kings in England before 400 A.D.

We will take J.Blair's "Chronological tables" as a source of information about general structure of English chronology. These tables were compiled in the end of 18th c., but the new information which became available after that time, have not changed the whole picture of English history and so this information is not very important for us now. In 5th century A.D. the Roman power in England came to the end and in that time the first English kings appeared. It was a moment when English history divided into:  
a) history of England and

b) history of Scotland.

In other words, two dynastic streams began in 5th c.:

- a) English stream and
- b) Scottish stream.

These two dynastic streams develop in parallel up to 1603 when they transformed into a single dynastic stream of the Great Britain.

In 404 A.D. the long dynasty of Scottish kings began with the king Fergus I. It ends in 1603 when a united kingdom of Great Britain appeared with its first king Jacob I (1603-1625). Scottish dynasty looks "very good organized": it practically does not have simultaneous reigns of different kings, it does not have breaks and epochs of anarchy also. Being represented graphically on a time axis, this dynasty covers a 1200-year time interval from 404 to 1603 A.D. in a very nice, extremely "regular" manner: reigns of Scottish kings cover one by one without intersections all this time interval. It is a fine example of "carefully written history". See dotted line in the Fig.1. The absence of simultaneous reigns suggests that Scotland was a "geographically homogeneous" kingdom: it never was divided into several independent parts.

English history shows a strong contrast to Scottish one in its structure.

### **2.3.2. English history. Epoch from 1st to 445 A.D. England as the Roman colony.**

Time period from 60 B.C. to the beginning of the era A.D. is considered today as an epoch of conquest of England by Roman army under the command of Julius Caesar.

Period from 1st century A.D. to 445 A.D. is considered to be an epoch of Roman occupation of England. England was a Roman colony at that epoch, and there were no English kings, because England was ruled formally by Roman emperors themselves. The description of this period in Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is in fact a compilation from Roman history of 1st - 5th (middle) centuries A.D. as it appears in Scaliger's version of chronology.

It was 409 A.D. when, according to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Romans were defeated by Goths, leave England and their power was never restored after that date: "In this year the city of Romans was taken by assault by the Goths, eleven hundred and ten years after it was built. Afterwards, beyond that, the kings of the Romans ruled no longer in Britain; in all they had reigned there four hundred and seventy years since Julius Caesar first came to the country" ([2],p.11).

### **2.3.3. Epoch from 445 to 830. Six kingdoms and their union.**

From 445 A.D. we see six kingdoms on the English land. Each of these kingdoms has its own dynastic stream of rulers. Namely they are

Brittany = Britain,  
Saxons = Kent,  
Sussex = South Saxons,

These six kingdoms exist up to 828 A.D. when they all are destroyed in a war and instead of them one kingdom is established - the kingdom of England. It is the time of Egbert, who becomes the first king of united England. The time of about 830 A.D. could be called, following [6],[7], as the end of Six Kingdoms. "It was 829 A.D., the time of Wessex king Egbert, when all Anglo-Saxon kingdoms united into one feudal kingdom" [11, p. 172]. See Commentary 2 which speaks about the term "Saxon".

#### **2.3.4. Epoch from 830 to 1040. This epoch is finished by Danish conquest and then by disintegration of Dutch kingdom in England. Beginning from 830 A.D. English chronicles speak about only one dynastic stream of kings (in united kingdom of England).**

In the period 1016-1040 A.D. there was a crucial point in English history. In 1016 Danish king Cnut Danish the Great occupied England. He became the king of England, Denmark and Norway simultaneously. But his state proved to be not stable and after his death in 1035 it was divided. A representative of old English dynasty Edward "The Confessor" (1042-1066) became a king in England after that division. The year 1040 is represented in the Fig.1 as one of the most important break points in English history.

#### **2.3.5. Epoch from 1040 to 1066. Epoch of the Old Anglo-Saxon dynasty and its fall**

The reign of Edward "The Confessor" finished in 1066 A.D., which is a well-known date in English history. In that year Edward died and after that England was occupied by Normans with their leader William I Conqueror the Bastard. In 1066 William the Conqueror defeated English-Saxon king Harold in Hastings battle and as a result became an English king himself. Period of his reign was 1066-1087. This well-known date (1066 A.D.) is also represented in the Fig.1.

#### **2.3.6. Epoch from 1066 to 1327. Norman dynasty and after it - Anjou dynasty. Two Edwards.**

This epoch starts with the beginning of Norman dynasty which ruled England up to 1153 or 1154 ([7], p. 327). Just after it the next, Anjou dynasty started in England. It existed from 1154 to 1272 ([7], p. 327).

In 1263-1267 a civil war broke out in England ([11], p.260). After that, in the end of 13th c.- beginning of 14th c., the new monarchy was established in England. First kings in this new dynasty were Edward I (1272-1307) and Edward II (1307-1327). In the end of the considered time period there was a war between England from one side and Wales, Scotland and Ireland from another side. England tried to occupy these regions but its attempt was not successful. In 1314 Scots won.

#### **2.3.6. Epoch from 1327 to 1602.**

This period is started with the reign of Edward III (1327-1377) and is finished with the establishment of Great Britain as a union of England and Scotland.

The last period from 1600 to the present time is a well-known history, which we do not doubt and do not analyse here.

Resume.

We see that English history could be divided into several periods which are separated by well-known "break point" dates. We argue that these division is not occasional one. It reflects the existence of duplicates and chronological shifts in English history.

### **3. PARALLELS BETWEEN ENGLISH AND BYZANTINE-ROMAN HISTORY. GREAT BRITAIN EMPIRE AS THE DIRECT SUCCESSOR OF MEDIEVAL BYZANTINE-ROMAN EMPIRE.**

#### **3.1. Rough comparison of dynastic streams of England and Byzantine-Roman Empire.**

We saw that old English chronicles claim that England was a Roman colony for the first 400 years of it's history. Moreover, when they speak about England at that times, they speak more about Rome and Byzantine empire then about England itself. That is why an idea of comparison of English and Roman-Byzantine dynastic streams seems quite natural. For this purpose we used the Global Chronological Map, which was already made by A.T.Fomenko including dynastic streams of Rome, Byzantine empire and England.

Even first glance on this map shows a surprising statistical similarity of general structure for density of reigns in Roman-Byzantine empire and in English dynastic streams. Such specific "density picture" exists only for these two dynastic streams - Roman-Byzantine and English ones. Now we are going to describe this picture.

Consider a partition of time interval from 1st to 1700 A.D. by decades. Let us calculate the number of kings in England whose reigns intersect with a certain decade. For example if some decade is covered by a reign of only one king then let us assign number 1 to this decade. If it is covered by two reigns then we assign number 2 to it, and so on. As a result of this procedure we obtain a graph which shows us how many kings ruled inside each decade. We call this graph as "density graph" for a given dynastic stream.

Because of absence of kings in England before 400 A.D. the values of density graph in that time interval are zero. Approximately in 440 A.D. there were established 6 dynasties in England (six kingdoms, see above) which existed up to (approximately) 830 A.D. when English kingdoms were united. After that union there was only one English dynasty up to present time [2].

Similar procedure was applied to the dynastic stream of Roman-Byzantine empire from 1st to 1500 A.D. Information about all Roman and Byzantine emperors of 1st-15th centuries was used. >From 1st c. to 4th c. all Roman emperors are supposed to stay in Italian Rome (and in it's colonies), and after 330 A.D. another Roman dynasty in New Rome = Constantinople appeared. So, up to 6th c. there were two parallel Roman dynastic streams (sometimes they had intensive intersections). In 6th c. after a known Gothic war western Rome lost it's status as emperor's residence. From that time only one Roman dynasty stream in Constantinople = New Rome was existing constantly up to 1453. In 1453 after siege of Constantinople by Turks this stream was finished.



The result of our calculations is shown in the Fig.2. There are two curves in the Fig.2. At the bottom one can see a density graph for Roman-Byzantine empire, and on the top - for England. Note that English chronology is shifted down as the whole block by approximately 275-year shift.

Both graphs look very similar. Both of them start with a period of low density and then, at the same moment the density increases very sharply. Periods of such high density have approximately the same length and the same amplitude in both cases. Then the sharp fall of density occurs simultaneously in these graphs. After that both of them are approximately constant. Their value changes mostly in a range of 1-2 reigns per decade for remaining several hundreds years.

High density zone in English chronology is located approximately in 445-830 A.D., and for Roman-Byzantine empire this zone constitutes 170-550 A.D. The length is approximately 380 years in both cases. The duration of the historical periods in England and in Roman-Byzantine empire being compared constitutes about one and a half thousand years.

We should say once more that such specific density graphs could not be find in other dynastic streams. It is a feature of English and Roman-Byzantine history only.

Fig.3 compares density graphs for England and Roman-Byzantine empire in a very rough way: only high density zones are represented from the graphs. Fig.3 clearly shows that the chronological shift between English and Roman-Byzantine history is equal to approximately 275 years.

Of course, above method of comparison for two different histories is very rough and could not be considered as a basis for any statements. But such similarity for density graphs is probably a reflection of the same origin of these two dynastic streams (on a long time period). It is also possible that one of them is a reflection of another one. Moreover, some well-known facts from old English history could support this possibility.

For example, it is well-known that the old name of England and English people was not "England" but "Anglia", "Angles" (from "Angel"), maybe "Angeln" ([2], p.12-13,289). Term "Angles" as a name of population appears in Anglo-Saxon Chronicle at a date 443 A.D. After that this term is used constantly. The first king which was called as "king of Anglia (England)" was Athelstan (925-940) ([7],p.340).

Note that "Angels" was also a famous noble feudal family in Byzantine which includes Byzantine emperor dynasty of Angels (1185-1204) ([15], p.166).

The natural question arises: may be the name "England" - "Angles" - "Anglia" is the reflection of the name of Byzantine dynasty Angels of 11-12th cc.?

It was only some preliminary remarks. They could only to suggest that some connection between English and Byzantine ancient history seem to exist. More careful analysis says that these histories on a long time period are the same.

Remark. When we speak about a "dynasty stream" we mean simply a sequence of kings in a certain kingdom which is ordered in time. We do not care about family relations

between these kings (which is usually included in term "dynasty").

### **3.2. Dynasty parallelism between ancient and medieval England from one side and medieval Byzantine Empire from another side. General concept of correspondence between English and Byzantine histories.**

We have discovered that there exists a strong parallelism between durations of reigns for English history of 640-1327 A.D. from one side and Byzantine history of 378-830 A.D. continued by Byzantine history of 1143-1453 A.D. from another side. This parallelism is represented in a visual form at the bottom of Fig.1.

More precisely, we discovered that:

1) Dynastic stream of English kings from 640 to 1040 A.D. (400-year period) is a duplicate (reflection) of Byzantine dynastic stream from 378 to 830 A.D. (452-year period). These two dynastic streams coincide after 210-year chronological shift.

It means that there exists a subsequence ("dynastic stream") of English kings whose reigns cover time interval 640-1040 and a subsequence of Byzantine emperors whose reigns cover time interval 378-830, such that they duplicate each other. Note that not all kings or emperors from these epochs are included in those dynastic streams. It is possible because often there were several corulers (i.e., kings or emperors which ruled simultaneously).

2) The next period of English kingdom history: from 1040 to 1327 (287-year period) duplicates Byzantine dynasty history from 1143 to 1453 A.D. (310-year period). These two dynastic streams coincide after 120-year chronological shift.

3) Dynastic stream of Byzantine emperors from 830 to 1143 also duplicates the same English dynastic history of 1040-1327. It is quite natural because Byzantine history has its own duplicates inside it. In particular, Byzantine history of 830-1143 duplicates Byzantine history of 1143-1453. For details see [1],[24].

4) The ends of time intervals from English history duplicating Byzantine history coincide with the break points in English history which we pointed out earlier.

5) The ends of time intervals from Byzantine history duplicating English history also prove to be certain natural break points in Byzantine history. They generate a partition of the whole Byzantine history into 4 parts which we will denote by Byzantine empire-0, Byzantine empire-1, Byzantine empire-2 and Byzantine empire-3.

### **3.3. Some details of dynastic parallelism ("parallelism table")**

#### **3.3.1. English history of 640-830 A.D. and Byzantine history of 378-553 A.D. 275-year shift.**

We used J.Blair's Tables [2] as the first main source of chronological information and Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as the second one. Below we use an abbreviation ASC for Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Note that sometimes different chronological tables contain a slightly different data, but these differences do not influence the parallelism which we are going

to present here.

## English history

English history of 640-830. Wessex kings - one of the six kingdoms in England of 400-830. This dynastic stream is a part of the dense sequence of kings whose reigns cover the time axis with high multiplicity. See Figs.2,3.

## Byzantine history

Byzantine history of 378-553. Byzantine emperors dynasty starting from the foundation of New Rome = Constantinople. This dynastic stream is a part of the dense sequence of kings whose reigns cover the time axis with high multiplicity. This period of Byzantine history is denoted as Byzantine-0 on Fig.1. See Figs.2,3.

Commentary. Durations of reigns are shown in brackets (rounded off to whole years). In the left column the whole list of English kings is presented. In the right column almost all Byzantine emperors appear. Only absent are names of some emperors with very short reign and co-emperors of those ones who are presented here. Note that all English kings (with only few exceptions of very short reigns) are included in this parallelism.

1. Cenwalch 643-672 king of Wessex and 643-647 as the king of Sussex. He ruled 29 or 25 years, if we consider only his rule in Wessex (after 647 A. D.)

Queen Seaxburh 672-674 (2), wife of K.Cenwel. Short rule

2. Cens 674-686 (12) according to Blair. In Anglo-Saxon Chronicle we see here two kings: Escwine + Centwine (9 years in total)

Caedwalla 686-688 (2). Short rule

3. Ine 686-727 (39) according to Blair and (37) according to Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (= ASC)

4. Aethelheard 727-740 (13), and (14) according to ASC

5. Cuthread 740-754 (14) according to Blair and (17) in ASC

5. Zeno 474-491 (17) (he ruled two times)

1. Theodosius I The Great 378 or 379 - 395 (16)

?

2. Arcadius 395-408 (13)

?

3. Theodosius II 408-450 (42)

4. Leo I 457-474 (17)

Sigeberht 754 (1). Short rule

?

6. Cynwulf 754-784 (30) according to Blair and (31) in ASC]

7. Beorhtric 784-800 (16)

8. Egbert 800-838 (38). In 828 A.D.(i.e., at the 28th year of his rule) he consolidated all six kingdoms into one - Anglia. The last 10 years he ruled as the king of Anglia. He is considered as distinguished king in English history

6. Anastasius 491-518 (27)

7. Justin I 518-527 (9)

8. Justinian I The Great. In 553 A.D.(i.e. at the 26th year of his rule) he defeated the Goths (this is well-known Gothic war) and became unique emperor in Roman-Byzantine empire. He ruled during his last 12 years without any corulers. Well-known emperor in Byzantine history

### 3.3.2. English history of 830-1040 and yzantine history of 553-830. Rigid 275-year shift.

English epoch of 830-1040. Anglia after consolidation into one kingdom (see Blair [6]).

9. Aethelberht 860-866 (6)

10. Aethelbald 857-860 (3)

11. Aethelwulf 838-857 (19)

12. Aethelred 866-872 (6)

Byzantine epoch of 553-830. Is denoted as "Byzantine empire-1" in the Fig.1.

9. Justin II 565-578 (13)

10. Tiberius Constantinus 578-582 (4)

11. Maurice 582-602 (20)

12. Phocas 602-610 (8)

Here the old English chroniclers transposed two kings, namely - the kings Aethelwulf (see No.11) and Aethelberht (see No.9) were placed in another order (their Byzantine originals are Justin II and Maurice). This confusion has a simple explanation: all four English kings of this period have very similar names beginning from "Aethel".

13. Alfred The Great 872-900 (28) according to Blair and 871-901 (30) according to Bemont and Monod ([7],p.340)

14. Edward the Elder 900-925 (25)

15. Athelstan 925-941 (16). It is supposed today that he was the first who took the name king of Anglia ([7],p.340)

13. Heraclius 610-641 (31)

14. Constans II Pogonatus 641-668 (26)

15. Constantine IV 668-685 (17)

16. Confusion: the war with Northumbria. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle mentions about three main kings of this period: Edmund I 941-948 (7), Eadred 948-955 (7), Eadwig 955-959 (4). All these kings ruled relatively short period

16. Well-known confusion in Byzantine history in the end of 7th century - beginning of 8th century. Here there are several emperors with a short rules: Leontius II 695-698 or 694-697, Tiberius III 697-704 or 698-705, Justinian II 705-711, Philippicus Bardanes 711-713, Anastasius II 713-715 or 716, Theodosius III 715 or 716-717

Thus, both confusion epochs (English and Byzantine) are matched under the rigid chronological shift. We did not discuss here the details because of mess structure of the chronicles of this time period

17. Edgar 959-975 (16)+ Edward "The Martyr" 975-978 (3), and totally (after summation) they give 19 years. Their names are similar and consequently their union is natural

17. Leo III Isaurian or the Syrian 717-741 (24)

18. Aethelred II "The Unready" 978-1013 (35)

18. Constantine V Copronimus 741-775 (34)

19. Cnut The Great Danish 1017-1036 (19). His death indicates the disintegration of Danish empire. Thus, this epoch is finished by the well-known event in the history of Anglia. Let us note that this fragment of English history is matched with Byzantine epoch under 210 (or 275)-year shift (approximately)

19. Constantine VI Porphyrogenitus 780-797 (17). Let us note that now we are in the end of historical epoch which was marked out in [1] and [24] as Byzantine empire-1 (527-840). Thus, in this column of our table we came to some important turning-point in Byzantine history

The old English chronicles placed in the end of this epoch (in history of Anglia) two "short" kings: Harold I Danish (1036-1039, ruled 3 years) and Harthacnut (1039-1041, ruled 2 years). We did not find the Byzantine duplicate-original for Harthacnut, but the original-duplicate for Harold I will be demonstrated below

We continue the motion along English history in the left column of the table. The parallel with Byzantine history will continue (in the right column). But this parallel becomes more clear and evident if we take the next epoch "Byzantine empire-3" (1143-1453) instead of the epoch "Byzantine empire-2" (Fig.1). As we explained before, these two epochs of Byzantine history are parallel, i.e. they are duplicates (of course, not identical). Consequently, we will list in the right column of the table the emperors from "Byzantine empire-3" and also will indicate here their duplicates from "Byzantine empire-2". And we will see that the parallelism between English and Byzantine history will continue until the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

### 3.3.3. English history of 1040-1327 and Byzantine history of 1143-1453. Rigid 120-year shift.

English epoch of 1040-1327

Byzantine epoch of 1143-1453. Is marked as "Byzantine empire-3" in the Fig.1. It is the original for "Byzantine empire-2"

20. Edward "The Confessor" 1041-1066 (25)

20. Manuel I Comnenus 1143-1180 (37)

The death of Edward "The Confessor" indicates the beginning of Norman invasion. It is possible, that English chronicles mean here in reality "Roman invasion" because there is the parallel between some periods of Roman history and Norman history (see [1], [24])

After the death of Manuel I the hard time for Byzantine empire began and the turning-point is the well-known crusade and the conquest of Constantinople in 1204. It is supposed today that Italian Rome organized the invasion in Byzantine empire

The commentary to the dynastic stream of English history. After the death of Edward "The Confessor" a new king Harold II "Godwinson" took the throne. He ruled only 1 year and was killed in 1066 in the battle near Hastings. From the other hand it is known ([7],p.343) that in reality he got a great political power in 1054 when Edward was alive. But the English chronicles placed just before the rule of Edward "The Confessor" one more "short" (i.e. with a short rule) Harold, namely Harold I "Harefoot" (1036-1039) who ruled only 3 years. It is possible that this Harold I is simply the reflection of Harold II

21. "Doubled Harold", i.e. Harold I Danish (1036-1039) and then Harold II (1066 year). Harold II ruled only 9 months. It is clear that this "doubled Harold" is the reflection of Byzantine "doubled Isaac Angelus", who ruled two times. His second rule was short: less than 1 year

Norman conquest of Anglia. The famous battle near Hastings in 1066

We will speak later and more detailed about the parallel between these events

22. William I of Normandy (Bastard) The Conqueror 1066- -1087 (21). His rule starts the new Norman dynasty in Anglia

23. William II "Rufus" 1087-1101 (14). Thus, here we have 14 years and in the right column we have 11 or 12 years. We see here some confusion in the chronicles because in the right column Isaac II Angelus ruled twice

24. Henry I 1101-1135 (34 or 35 years)

25. Stephen of Blois 1135-1154 (19). King Stephen finishes the Norman dynasty in Anglia ([7],p. 357). The next king Henry II starts a new Anjou dynasty in Anglia

21. Isaac II Angelus 1185-1195, then he lost the power and appeared on Byzantine throne again in 1203 (second time). He ruled no more than 1 year and finally lost the power in 1204, after the conquest of Constantinople by crusaders. Thus, his second rule was no more than 1 year

The conquest of Byzantine empire by crusaders. Famous fourth crusade 1199-1204

22. Theodore I Lascaris 1204-1222 (18). In 1204 a new Nicaean empire starts on the territory of Byzantine empire. The reflection of Theodore in Byzantine empire-2 is Basil I the Macedonian 867-887 (19)

23. Possibly, there is some mess in the chronicles when they describe the Norman dynasty and Nicaean empire. The first conjecture: the original preimage for William II is lost. Second conjecture: this is again Isaac II Angelus. But in this case the chronicle took the whole his rule: 1185-1195 and then 1203- -1204, i.e. totally 11 or 12 years.

24. John III Vatatzes 1222-1254 or 1256 (32). His reflection in Byzantine empire-2 is Leo VI "The Philosopher" 886-912 (26)

25. Michael VIII 1259 or 1260 until 1282 or 1283 (23). His reflection in Byzantine empire-2 is Romanus I 919-945 (26). Michael VIII starts a new Palaeologus dynasty which lasts from 1261 until 1453

Thus the rigid chronological shift matches English Norman dynasty with Byzantine dynasty of Angelus and then matches the next Anjou dynasty with Byzantine dynasty of Palaeologus

26. Henry II Plantagenet 1154-1189 (35). Note that both terms Plantagenet and Porphyrogenetus have the same meaning: "one who was born in a shirt". This term has well-known meaning - see commentary below

26. Andronicus II Palaeologus 1282 or 1283 - 1328 (46). If calculated from 1283 to 1320 - the moment when his co-ruler Andronicus III began to reign then duration of Andronicus II reign is 37 years. He was reflected as Constantine VII 910 or 912 - 959 (47),(49) in Byzantine empire-2.

Commentary. Term (name) "Porphyrogenetus" = "Porphyro" + "Genitus" could be interpreted as "one, who was born in porphyry". It says about birth in a "royal attributes", maybe "royal clothes", "royal shirt". It suggests a rare case from medical practice when a baby is born "in a shirt", i.e. still in placenta (placenta sounds similar to "planta" - part of "Plantagenet"). In old times such cases were considered as a sign of outstanding future for the baby (good or bad one). We see in English version (left column) a name Plantagenet, i.e. Planta + Genet. It means exactly "birth in a planta, in a cover" - the same as "birth in a shirt"

27. Henry II established a known dynasty of Plantagenets (House of Plantagenet) in English history. This dynasty was finished in 1329 with Richard II. So, this dynasty covers time interval 1154-1399 ([27], p.346).

27. Michael VIII. He was just before Andronicus II. He established a known dynasty of Palaeologus in the history of Byzantine. This dynasty covers time interval 1261-1453 (up to the siege of Constantinople) ([27], p.636).

So, the chronological shift which we discovered puts together two dynasties: Palaeologus' and Plantagenets. Dynasty of Palaeologus' is finished in 1453 and reflecting them Plantagenets continue up to 1399.

28. Richard I Coeur de Lion 1189-1199 (10). Duration of his reign is 10 years which is close to 13 years - duration of reign of his analog (original) in Byzantine empire

28. Andronicus III Palaeologus 1320-1328-1341. Formally his reign lasts 21 years (1320-1341), but his reign as unique emperor (without corulers) was only for 13 years (1328-1341). In 1328 finished the reign of his coruler - emperor Andronicus II.

29. John Santer 1199-1216 (17)

29. John VI Cantacuzenus 1341 or 1347 - 1355 (15)



30. Henry III 1216-1272 (56). Henry III was the last king in Anjou dynasty in England. Dynasty of Palaeologus in Byzantine empire (right column) is not finished at this point but it is near to the end

30. John V Palaeologus 1341-1391 (50). His has a reflection in Byzantine empire-2: Basil II Bulgaroktonos (975 or 976 - 1025). Basil II Bulgaroktonos' reign was for 49 or 50 years.

31. Edward I 1272-1307 (35)

31. Manuel II Palaeologus 1391-1425 (33 or 34).

32. Edward II Caervarven 1307-1327 (20)

32. John VIII Palaeologus 1424-1448 (23 or 24).

End of parallelism.

In 1453 Constantinople was seized by Turks and Byzantine Empire changed to Turkey.

Fig.4 illustrates this parallelism. It is important that durations of reign fit each other so well in the case when the same chronological shift was applied to all reigns. All dynasty was shifted as a whole, it's internal time was unchanged.

Fig.5 shows the same parallelism in a different form which is designed for visual comparison of durations of reign in both dynasties. For quantitative comparison we used numerical characteristic of a distance between two arbitrary dynasties, which was introduced in [1],[24]. It appears that this "distance" drops into a range of values which are normal only for strongly dependent dynasties (details about this numerical characteristic one can find in [1],[24]). Recall that two dynasties are called as dependent ones if they both reflect the same real dynasty.

Dependence of these two dynasties (we mean statistical dependence of reign durations) is the main result of this paper. It is in fact a formal result and we might finish on it. But many not formal questions follow after this result is claimed. Main of them is: what real events lay under both of these two dynasties? What was the real history?

#### 4. CORRECT ENGLISH HISTORY IS MORE SHORT IN TIME BUT MUCH MORE DENSE IN EVENTS THAN IT IS SUGGESTED BY TEXTBOOKS

##### 4.1. Our new concept of English history

The answer follows definitely from the above parallelism and from the Fig.1. Naturally, the more new dynasty (one which was later in time) is to be supposed as original one. This is a Byzantine dynasty 1143-1453 A.D. It was denoted above as Byzantine empire-3. In [1],[24] it was discovered that Byzantine empire-3 is a source of information for it's reflections Byzantine empire-0, Byzantine empire-1 and Byzantine empire-2. Roughly speaking the whole Byzantine history is constructed from several blocks - duplicates of the same epoch: 1143-1453 A.D. As we discovered, English history being stringed to the English kings dynasty is a duplicate of Byzantine history up to 1327 A.D. (in English chronology) = 1450 A.D. (in Byzantine chronology). Middle of 15th century was a time from which we have enough information, so Byzantine dynasty of that time was surely a real one. It suggests that Byzantine is an original in above parallelism, and England before 1327 A.D. - a reflection. It could be seen from the Fig.1 how English history before

1327 A.D. was constructed from several reflections of Byzantine Empire of 1143-1453 A. D.

As a resume we present the follows hypothesis.

- 1) According to English history of 1-400 A.D. England at that time was a Roman province. English history of that period speaks more about events in Rome itself than in England. It was proved in [1],[24] that Roman history of that time reflects real events from 9-13th cc. A.D.
- 2) That chronicles which are supposed now to speak about English history of 400-830 A. D. appear to describe Rome and Byzantine empire-0. Therefore these chronicles reflect some real events of 9-15th cc. which took place in Byzantine empire.
- 3) That chronicles which are supposed now to speak about English history of 830-1040 A. D. appear to describe Byzantine empire-1. These chronicles also reflect real history of 9-15th cc. in Byzantine empire.
- 4) That chronicles which are supposed now to speak about English history of 1040-1327 A.D. appear to describe Byzantine empire-3 and therefore they reflect real history of 9-15th cc. in Byzantine empire. The name "Anglia" (England) came from the name of well-known Byzantine dynasty of Angels (1185-1204 A.D.)
- 5) Thus, in this hypothesis we suggest that those ancient and medieval English chronicles which are now available and which are thought by historians to speak about some events from the epoch before the beginning of 14th century, are in fact devoted to certain periods of Byzantine history of 9-15th cc. Roughly speaking, ancient English chronicles are in fact Byzantine chronicles which were taken from Byzantine to England and then modified in a such way that they seem to speak about events in England.
- 6) The time when written history of the island which is today called as England really begins is most probably the epoch of 9-10th centuries. Now we have only very few information about that early period of English history on the island. So the description of English history of 9-13 cc. is in fact rather fragmentary. But this information about real island events was then "covered" by chronicles brought from Byzantine empire. The resulting sum of two fibers: "island fiber" and "Byzantine fiber" we can see now as the English history of 9-13th cc.
- 7) Starting from 14th century English history speaks about real events in England only. Roughly speaking, traditional version of English history becomes correct from 14th c.
- 8) One might ask: "If you are right, how to explain the fact that in ancient English chronicles there are chronological details about, for example, how many years there were between the Flood and a certain event of English history? These chronological details often agree with Scaliger's (modern) chronological concept." The answer is follows.

At first, note that chronological and astronomical data from ancient chronicles in many cases strongly contradict with modern historical version. See [1],[24].

In the second, even if we see that a direct chronological statement from ancient text agrees well with modern tradition, it says really nothing, because all ancient chronicles which we have today, were finally edited only in 15-17th cc. And it was exactly the time when modern chronological concept was worked out (in general). Such direct chronological statements are simply the traces of chronological computations of 15-17th cc. At that time historians "calculated" the dates of ancient events and then placed (for reader's convenience) the results of their (medieval!) calculations inside ancient historical texts. The fact that chronological statements in different ancient texts often agree means that today we have mostly the results of work of only one medieval chronological school. It was the chronological school which work was supervised in 15-17th cc. by Roman-Catholic church.

Often, astronomical calculations were used for chronological purposes. In this case there could be certain astrological motivations in medieval astronomical calculations for chronology. Medieval scientists, and historians among them, often trusted astrology and could use it in their considerations. Maybe medieval astrologers tried to solve problems like these: what was the planetary configuration at the moment of coronation of Justinian I (or when ancient lunar eclipses occurred etc.)? Results of such astronomical calculations of 15-16th cc. could be placed in ancient texts to make their chronology more clear. It was large work and it might be very useful if the calculations were correct. Unfortunately, medieval astronomers and historians made a lot of mistakes. These mistakes are discussed in [1],[24]. As a result of such mistakes, ancient chronicles got an incorrect chronological skeleton. This incorrect chronology was then supported by church authorities and by medieval scientific schools. It was the chronology which we have now in our textbooks. And today, our contemporaries - the historians and chronologists - take the ancient chronicles (from archives) and with pleasure discover in them the "astronomical and chronological information". Then, basing on the modern theory, they date the described eclipses, horoscopes (i.e., the configuration of the planets along the zodiacal constellations). After this, historians discover (with great pleasure) that sometimes these records from "ancient chronicles" satisfy to the Scaliger's chronology (and, consequently, are correct). Of course, sometimes there are some contradictions. And sometimes - very serious. The real explanation is as follows: the medieval methods for calculations were more rough than modern ones. Then in each such case the modern chronologists "correct" these "records of ancient chronicler". As a result, they form the illusion of the correctness of traditional Scaliger's version of ancient chronology. But what the modern historians really do when the results of modern astronomical calculations sharply disagree with Scaliger's chronology? As we know today (see, for example, [1], [24]) the list of such contradictions is very long. This fact shows that Scaliger's chronological version is wrong. But in all such cases the modern historians start to speak (with a great irritation and displeasure) about "ignorance of ancient observers and chroniclers", about "impossibility to apply the modern scientific methods to the analysis an ancient texts" etc.

The visual picture of our chronological conjecture you can see in the Fig.6.

4.2. In which way the Byzantine chronicles were inserted into medieval English history (of the island Anglia)?

The answer will be extremely simple if we will erase from our minds the picture which is imposed by traditional Scaliger's chronology.

Starting from 11th century, several crusades storm the Byzantine empire. Several feudal

crusaders' states were founded on the territory of Byzantine empire in 11-14th cc. In these states many nations were mixed: local population, the crusaders from England, France, Germany, Italy etc. In these crusaders' regions and in Byzantine empire the new culture was created, in particular, were written a historical chronicles. Among Byzantine inhabitants were a lot of people from Europe, in particular, from some island, which later will be called England.

In 1453 A.D. Turks conquered Constantinople. Byzantine empire was ruined and the crowds of its inhabitants leaved the country. Many of them returned in the Europe, in their old homeland. In particular, - in the island Anglia. These descendants of crusaders took with them their Byzantine historical chronicle, because these texts describe their own real history in Byzantine empire (during many years - one or two hundreds years). Several decades passed. On the island Anglia starts the writing its history (i.e., the history of the people living on the island). In 16-17th centuries some qualified historians appear and start to create the general history of the whole land Anglia ("from the beginning"). They search for ancient documents. Suddenly they find several old trunks with "very old" documents. The documents are dusty, the paper is very fragile, and the old books fall to pieces. These chronicles were transported from Byzantine empire. But now (in 16-17th cc.) nobody knew this. Unfortunately, the prehistory of these trunks is forgotten. And, unfortunately, is forgotten that these chronicles describe the history of ANOTHER LAND. The English historians of 16-17th centuries carefully analyse these texts as the history "of island England" and put them into the basis of "old British-island history, which started many centuries ago". In some strong sense they were right because really the authors of the chronicles were closely connected with island Anglia (but, let us repeat, described ANOTHER LAND - Byzantine empire).

This process is quite natural and does not suggest any special falsification of the history. Such natural errors were inevitable at the first steps of creating of the general history.

As a result, appeared such chronicles as Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, the Nennius' chronicle etc. After some time this wrong version of an old English history stand stockstill, becomes a "monument". Further historians simply modify (only a little) the initial scheme of the history, add some new documents. And only today, using some statistical and other methods we start to discover some strange regularities inside the "history textbook" and start to realize that the real history was possibly sufficiently shorter and that today we need to remove from the "old English history" its "Byzantine part" and return this piece to its right place (in time and in the geographical sense)

This procedure is very painful. We realize this because we discovered the same problem in the old Russian history, when we also found several chronological duplicates.

General remark. It is possible, that this process of "insertion of an old Byzantine chronicles" in the beginning of a "local history" is presented for several different regions which were closely connected with Byzantine empire. In particular, it is true for Russia, for England, for Rome, for Greece.

## 5. OLD ENGLISH CHRONICLES AS ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS WHICH SPEAK ABOUT REAL EVENTS OF 10-13th CENTURIES

### 5.1. Roman consul Brutus - the first who conquered Britain (and the first king of Britts)

We have analyzed above the durations of rules and suggested the conjecture that old English history is "a chronological reflection" of one period of real Byzantine history. The following question immediately arises: what about old English chronicles - do they confirm this conjecture? - or there are some contradictions? Let us take these chronicles and let us read them once more by "fresh sight", without a priori "school" hypothesis about "great antiquity" of these sources.

Now we recall to the reader well-known facts from traditional history of England (Anglia in old texts). Let us take, for example "Historia Brittonum" of Nennius, "Historia Britonum" of Galfridus Monemutensis and Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

Galfridus calls Brutus as FIRST king of Britts ([9],p.5). In brief, the story of conquest of Britain is as follows. After the end of the Trojan War and after the fall of Troy, the Trojan hero Aeneas arrived on the ship in Italy. After two or three generation his great-grandson Brutus was born ([9],p.6-7). By the way, Nennius thinks that "time distance" between Aeneas and Brutus is sufficiently more ([8],p.173). He states that "the distance" between Trojan war and Brutus is about several hundreds years. However, this difference is not so important for us.

Then Brutus leaved Italy and arrived it Greece, where becomes the leader of Trojans survived after war. Brutus collects the large fleet and then his army (on the fleet) leaves Greece. After some time they landed on some "island", began the battle with local people, won the war and founded the new kingdom.

This is Britain.

Brutus is the first in the row of rulers in ancient Britain. Today they are considered as legendary heroes, because, according to traditional chronology, these events were "in a deep past" (before Jesus Christ).

Nennius tells the analogous story of Brutus (but more short). Nennius definitely states that Brutus "arrived on the island, which was called by HIS NAME, i.e., on the island Britain, then populated the island by his posterity and lived there. From this day and before now the Britain is populated" ([8],p.173). Thus, the Britain was called by the name of Brutus.

Then Nennius informs us about opinion of some other authors, that "island Britain was called by the name of Britt, son of Isicion, who was the son of Alan" ([8],p.172). But according to the most widespread and authoritative version (which is quoted by Nennius) Britain was called "by the name of Brutus, who was ROMAN CONSUL (! - Auth.)" ([8], p.172). Thus, Brutus - the first king of Britain was Roman consul.

This statement is extremely strange and impossible from the point of view traditional Scaliger's chronology, because Rome was founded only about 753 B.C. and consequently in the epoch of this Brutus there are no "Roman consuls" and even no Rome! Anglo-Saxon Chronicle states that: "The first inhabitants of this land were the Britons, who came from ARMENIA (!-Authors)..." ([2],p.3).

It is quite clear that here the name Armenia points out on the Romania, i.e. on the Roman-Byzantine empire, which was called Romai-Romania. Thus, as we see, the English chronicle again connects Britain and Roman-Byzantine empire.

Of course, today this statement of old chronicle is declared by historians as erroneous. The modern commentary is as follows: "instead of erroneous name Armenia one should read Armorica = Brittany" ([2],p.3). However, the replacement of Armenia by Armorica does not help to traditional history: the name Armorica also can be connected with the name of Roman-Byzantine empire. Our conclusion does not change.

Thus, old English chronicles state that Britain was at first conquered by Roman consul Brutus, who arrived there with a military fleet and founded the British kingdom. He became the first king of an island Britain.

## 5.2. Consul Brutus of English chronicles - was he a contemporary of Julius Caesar?

It seems that the answer is quite clear. We need only to understand - when lived this remarkable Roman consul (according to traditional chronology)? It is very simple. The qualified reader already prompts to us the right answer: it was 1st century B.C. In this century we see (in modern textbook in ancient history) the well-known Roman consul Brutus - the friend and brother-in-arms of Julius Caesar. Brutus took part in many campaigns of Julius Caesar. Then Brutus betrayed Caesar - his patron and protector. We remember from our "scholar childhood" the bitter words of Caesar: "And you, Brutus", which Caesar said when Brutus struck him by the sword.

As we also known, the traitorous murder of Caesar - one of the most important episode in "biography" of ancient Roman consul Brutus. It is remarkable, but the old English chronicles also speak about this episode but in a slightly different words. They state that Brutus (the first Britts' king) killed his farther. This murder is considered by chronicles as accidental, unintentional. Allegedly, Brutus shot an arrow and accidentally killed "his farther" ([8],p.173). In our opinion, this is slightly distorted Roman story about murder of Julius Caesar by Brutus. Here "farther" is Caesar - former friend and protector of Brutus.

Because of this terrible murder, the people expel Brutus from his native land. It was done in both stories: in Roman and in English. Brutus started on a journey.

Our simple and natural conjecture is as follows: in the old English story about conquest of Britain acts Brutus - the contemporary of Julius Caesar. As we saw, this conjecture is supported by ancient documents, although they do not call directly Brutus as friend or enemy of Caesar. Indeed, all chronicles state that AT FIRST Britain was conquered by Julius Caesar. Some interesting details are reported. Namely, Caesar arrived in Britain with Roman military fleet which consisted of about 80 ships ([2],p.5). But the conquest of the land became a complicated problem and soon Caesar returned in Britain with the fleet consisting of 600 (!) ships. After the battle the local army of natives were defeated and Romans founded the new kingdom. Moreover, Nennius claims that Julius Caesar WAS THE FIRST ROMAN who arrived on the island Britain and conquered the kingdom and Britts ([8],p.176).

Thus, if Brutus WAS THE FIRST ROMAN arrived in Britain, and if Julius Caesar also WAS THE FIRST ROMAN arrived in Britain, then BRUTUS and JULIUS CAESAR are simply CONTEMPORARIES and brothers-in-arms. This conclusion evidently follows from old English chronicles.

Let us resume these corollaries in the form of some table.

## **Brutus - the first king of Britts**

1. The first Roman arrived on the island, conquered the land and founded the kingdom
2. Arrived in Britain with great military fleet
3. "Accidentally" killed his father by arrow
4. The murder of Brutus' father by his son was predicted in advance by prophet (see Nennius, [8],p.173)
5. Afterwards Brutus was expelled from his native land (as the men who committed the murder)
6. Roman consul Brutus starts the history of Britain

## **Julius Caesar**

1. The first Roman arrived on the island, conquered the country and also founded the kingdom
2. Was the head of great military fleet which invaded into the land
3. His contemporary - Roman Brutus, Caesar's friend, traitorously killed Caesar (= "his father-protector")
4. Well-known story: the murder of Julius Caesar was predicted by Roman prophet (see, for example, Plutarch)
5. Romans expelled Brutus as great traitor, because he killed Julius Caesar
6. Julius Caesar lived (according traditional chronology) in 1st c. B.C.

Thus, from the position of common sense we immediately date the epoch of the first Brutus' conquest of Britain (with his contemporary Julius Caesar) by 1st century A.D. Let us note, that this our statement is not new in reality. All experts know that Caesar conquered the Britain in 1st century A.D. All experts know that Brutus was the first who conquered Britain. We simply combine these two facts and formulate the evident conclusion:

"Ancient" Roman consul Brutus - the "father" of all Britts, the first king of Britain, the "starting person" of the whole English history - is a contemporary on Julius Caesar, i.e., well-known in classical Roman history consul Brutus.

The reader qualified in ancient history can, of course recall here also the second known Brutus in Roman history, who acted allegedly about 6th c.B.C. in Rome. He expelled the Roman kings from the capital and founded the Roman republic. But this historical epoch is in reality another chronological duplicate (copy), reflection of the epoch of Julius Caesar. It was discovered in [1],[24]. Consequently, the attempt to identify the Brutus = the first king of Britts - with "another Brutus" - fails. We again come to the epoch of Julius Caesar (1st century A.D. according to traditional chronology). Let us recall here, that according to chronological results, obtained in [1],[24], the epoch of Julius Caesar is in reality the duplicate (reflection) of the epoch of 10-11th cc.A.D.

The reader can ask us: why we discuss in such details such evident question (the

identification of Brutus - the first king of Britts - with Brutus of Caesar's epoch)?

Our answer is as follows. This our statement is mortally dangerous to the traditional chronology of England (and not only England). This is the explanation why the traditional historians try to avoid any serious discussion about the assertion of English chronicles, that Brutus was Roman consul and that Britts are the descendants of Romans. In particular, the modern commentators of Nennius and Galfridus (A.S. Bobovich and M.A. Bobovich) irritatedly write: "The (medieval - Auth.) idea to deduce the origin of Britts from Romans and Trojans is not so original: already in 6th century A.D. the Frank's rulers deduced their origin from Trojans (and, in our opinion, they were right, see the discussion about this subject in [1],[24] - Auth.)" ([9],p.270). And then commentators add carefully: "There are several Brutus in Roman history". They do not continue and do not discuss this remark, and now we realize - why. If you start to analyse the "Brutus' problem", you (as we demonstrated above) will make the inevitable (and catastrophic for traditional chronology) conclusion that "English Brutus" was the contemporary of Julius Caesar.

**BUT WHY THIS CONCLUSION IS SO DANGEROUS?**

At first, because in this case the so called "ancient legendary British history" is immediately moved upwards by approximately 1000-year shift in the epoch of 1-13th A. D. and moreover, in 10-15th cc.A.D.

Such corollary, of course, is completely unacceptable (and totally fantastic) to any modern traditional historian. But there are some another, sufficiently more dangerous corollaries. About this - our next section

### **5.3. Biblical events in English chronicles**

The "Historia Britonum" of Galfridus Monemutensis is strung on the pivot of biblical history. This means that sometimes, when speaking about the events of British history, Galfridus inserts the phrases similar to this: In Judea the prophet Samuel ruled at this time ([9],p.20). These rare phrases are scattered along the chronicle and form the rough (and very brief) skeleton of biblical history of prophets and biblical kings, which is closely interwoven with the stream of British history. But, by the way, Galfridus does not give any absolute dates. His chronology is completely relative, i.e., he tells only - in the time of which biblical kings (or prophets) were occurred some of British events. Thus, when analyzing the English chronology in a unprejudiced way, we meet the necessity to start the analysis of biblical chronology also. Let us do it and we will see what we will obtain.

The evident identification of "English Brutus" with well-known Brutus from the epoch of Julius Caesar, is impossible for traditional historian because in this case the whole biblical chronology is automatically moved from its traditional place (in time) upwards by about at least 1000-year shift ! In reality this shift will be sufficiently more: about 1800 years! See [1],[24].

Indeed, if "English Brutus" (the forefather of Britts) is placed in 1st century B.C., then, according to the "Historia Britonum" of Galfridus Monemutensis, ALL BASIC EVENTS OF BIBLICAL HISTORY should be distributed on time axis from 1st century A.D. until 13th century A.D. Here we mean: the history of all biblical prophets, the history of the kingdom of Judah and the kingdom of Israel et cetera. On the face of it, such conclusion is completely impossible! Traditionally, biblical history is dated from 11th century B.C.



until 1st century A.D.

But if we will wait a little and will try nevertheless to place ancient biblical history on the interval from 1st century A.D. until 13th century A.D. - what we obtain?

It turns out that this procedure does not lead to the contradiction with ancient evidences of ancient texts. We suggest to the reader to take the books of Fomenko [1],[24], where you can find the details. Here we demonstrate only one, but remarkable example.

#### **5.4. Do we interpret ancient texts in a proper way? Problem of vowels restoration.**

In the attempt to read and date the most of the ancient manuscripts (ancient Egyptian, ancient Slavonic, biblical et cetera) certain basic problems are frequently encountered.]

As soon as J.Sunderland started investigating the original language of the Old Testament, he, in his words, "...faced the fact of enormous and even startling importance. The thing is that the Jewish written language originally had neither vowels nor signs replacing them. The books of the Old Testament were written only with consonants" ([16], p. 155).

This is also typical for other languages. For example, an ancient Slavonic text was a chain of only consonants, too; sometimes even without signs replacing the vowels, or without division into words. Old Egyptian texts were also written in consonants only.

According to well-known chronologist E.Bickerman, "...the names of Egyptian kings are given in contemporary literature schematically, in a quite arbitrary, so-called scholastic manner adopted in school textbooks. These forms are often greatly different from each other; it is impossible to order them somehow, due to their arbitrary reading (! - Authors.) which became traditional" ([17], p.176).

Probably, the rarity and high cost of writing materials in ancient times made the scribes save them, and omit the vowels, thereby essentially shortening the text.

J.Sunderland continues:

"However, if we take the Jewish Bible or a manuscript today, we shall find in them the skeleton of vowels filled with dots and other signs denoting the missing vowels. These signs did not belong to the old Jewish Bible. The books were read by consonants, and the intervals were filled with vowels according to one's skill and the apparent requirements of the context and oral legends" ([16], p. 155).

Imagine how exact the meaning of a word written in consonants can be if, for example, CLN can mean clean, clan, colon, and so forth.

According to T.Curtis, even for the priests, the content of manuscripts remained extremely doubtful and could be understood only by means of the authority of the legend ([16], p. 155).

It is assumed that this serious short-coming of the Jewish Bible had been eliminated not earlier than the 7th or 8th century A.D., when the Massorettes revised the Bible and added

signs replacing the vowels; but they had no manuals, except their own reason, and a very imperfect legendary tradition ([16], p. 156-157).

Well-known expert S.Driver adds that, since the times of the Massorettes in the 7th-8th century A.D., the Jews have taken to keeping their sacred books with extraordinary care, but then it was too late to repair the damage already done. The result of such attentiveness was just the immortalization of the distortions, which were then placed on exactly the same level of authority with the original text ([16], p.157).

J.Sunderland: "The opinion reigning earlier was that the vowels had been introduced into the Jewish text by Ezra in the 5th century A.D. But in the 16th and 17th century, E.Levita and J.Capellus in France refuted this opinion and proved that th vowels had been introduced only by the Massorettes. The discovery created a sensation in the whole of Protestant Europe. Many people believed that the new theory would lead to disproving the religion completely. If the vowels were not a matter of Divine Revelation, but only a human invention, besides, a much later one, then how could we rely on the text of the Scripture? This discussion was one of the hottest in the history of the new biblical criticism and proceeded for more than a century, stopping only when the validity of the new point of view was acknowledged by everyone" ([16], p. 157-158).

## **5.5. Geography and chronology of biblical events.**

### **5.5.1. Problems with traditional geographical localizations.**

Even if the vowels of common words are not that important (you can easily reconstruct a well-known word from the context), the situation changes completely when combination of consonants meaning a city, country, the name of a king, etc., appears in an ancient text. Tens and hundreds of different variants of vowels for one term (word) may be found, stating the "identifications" of the biblical vowel-free names of cities, countries, and others, made by traditional historians proceeding from the chronological (and geographical) version of J.Scaliger and the localization referring the biblical events to the Near East.

As the archaeologist M.Burrows notes, the archaeological job generally leads to the undoubtedly strongest creed in the reliability of biblical information (cit.from [18], p. 16).

F.Kenyon of the British Museum insists as much categorically on archaeology refuting the "destructive skepticism of the second half of the 19th century" [18].

But here is unexpected information reported by the well-known archaeologist G.Wright, who, by the way, is a staunch partisan of the correctness of orthodox localization and of traditional dating biblical events. He wrote, "A great many findings do not prove or disprove anything; they fill the background and only serve as historical artifacts. Unfortunately, the desire "to prove" the Bible permeates many works available to the average reader. Historical evidences may be used in an incorrect manner, whereas the conclusions dawn are often erroneous and only half correct" ([18], p. 17).

If we attentively examine the fundamental facts about the Bible discovered by N.A. Morozov [19], then we shall see that none of the books of the Old Testament contain any solid archaeological confirmation of their traditional geographical and time localization. As I.A.Kryvelev noted, the whole "Mesopotamian" biblical theory will be questioned.

The traditional localization of the events described in the New Testament is no better.

I.A.Kryvelev many years studied the biblical geography and chronology. He wrote, "The reader interested in biblical archaeology may be bewildered by the hundreds of pages speaking of excavations, landscapes, or artifacts, historical and biblical background. And, in the conclusion, when it comes to the results of the whole job, there are only a number of indistinct and imprecise statements about the problem not having been completely solved, but that there is still hope for the future, and so forth. We may be absolutely sure that none of the stories of the New Testament contains any somewhat convincing archaeological confirmation (in terms of the traditional localizations - Authors). This is perfectly true, in particular, if applied to the figure and biography of Jesus Christ. Not a single spot traditionally regarded as the arena of a particular event occurring in the New Testament can be indicated with the slightest degree of confidence" ([18], p. 200-201).

The natural question arises: where the events of Old and New Testaments were geographically located in reality?

### **5.5.2. Where ancient Troy was located?**

In reality, considerable difficulties accompany the attempts of geographical localization of many of the ancient events and cities (not only from the Bible).

For example, one of the accepted today traditional localizations of the famous city of Troy is near the Hellespont (= the sea of Helen). It is for this particular reason that Schliemann ascribed the famous name of Troy (described by Homer) to the rests of a small ancient village he excavated near the Hellespont. It is well known that today we have not any proofs of this "identification".

It is assumed today, that according to traditional chronology, Troy was completely destroyed in the 12-13th century B.C. and after this was never reconstructed [17]. But, it turns out, that in the Middle Ages, Italian city Troy, which still exists today [1],[24], enjoyed widespread fame. This is celebrated medieval city which played an important role in many medieval wars; especially, in the well-known war of the 13th century.

Many Byzantine historians also speak of Homer's Troy as of an existing medieval city, namely, Choniates Nicetas and Gregoras Nicephoras ([20], v. 6, p. 126).

T.Livy indicates the spot named Troy and the Trojan region in Italy (Book.1). Certain medieval historians identified Troy with Jerusalem (see, for example, [21], p.88,235,162,207), which embarrasses the modern commentators: "The book of Homer somewhat suddenly turned (in the medieval chronicle, while describing Alexander's expedition to Troy - Authors)... into the book on the destruction of Jerusalem" ([21], p. 162). Let us recall that the second (well-known) name of Troy is Ilion, whereas the second name of Jerusalem is Aelia Capitolina ([19], v. 7). It is absolutely clear that in the names of these cities there is a similarity: Aelia = Ilion.

The books [1] and [2] contains the data and arguments which allow to assume that Homer's Troy is the Constantinople (= New Rome), and that the Trojan War is the reflection of crusades which started from 11th c.A.D. The Constantinople was captured during crusades. Besides this, some part of the legend on Trojan War is the reflection of

a real medieval war from the middle of 13th c.A.D. in Italy. The Italian city Troy was involved in this war (see [1]).

The identification of the Great Troy with Constantinople follows also from the texts of crusades epoch. The chronicler Rober de Clari told that the Great Troy was located near the entrance into the "branchium Sancti Georgii" ([25],p.210). It is supposed today that this is the Dardanelles. From the other hand it is also known that another famous chronicler of the 4th crusade - Villehardouin - calls as "branchium Sancti Georgii" not only the Dardanelles but also the Bosporus! M.A.Zaborov (modern historian) notes: "Villehardouin applies the name "branchium Sancti Georgii" to the Dardanelles and to the Bosporus" ([25],p.238).

Thus, the Great Troy can be located also near the entrance into the Bosporus. But here we see the Constantinople!

Consequently, it was completely unnecessary to search the "rests" of the Troy on a desert hills as Schliemann done. Our conjecture: the Trojan War is the reflection of the one or several crusades on the Constantinople or on Italian Troy.

The well-known medieval "Novel on the Troy" of Benoit de Sainte-Maure ("Roman de Troie") was finished allegedly between 1155 and 1160 A.D. "The source of this novel is the "History of Troy destruction" written by some Dares, who was allegedly the eyewitness of Trojan War (possibly, he was one of the crusaders - Auth.). Benoit looks in the antiquity through the prism of his epoch and his reality... In his basis is the ancient Greek epos, but its personages and heroes are transformed into noble knights and beautiful ladies, and the Trojan War itself is transformed into the sequence of knight's duels... Ancient Medea is represented in his chronicle as courtier lady, whose clothing is exactly the same as the clothing of the lady of her social level in medieval France of the middle of 12th century"([10],p.235).

We suggest to read the old chronicles "in direct way", without some special complex interpretations; we need to read "what is written" and not "what should be written". In this case we are forced to agree that Benoit de Sainte-Maure describes the Trojan War as the event from medieval epoch.

### **5.5.3. Where Moses traveled in reality?**

Let us return to the Bible. Many strange phenomena occur in an unprejudiced analysis of biblical geography (see detailed Morozov's analysis in [19]).

That many biblical texts describe volcanic activity has been stressed in history long ago. Let us take the Bible.

The Lord said to Moses, "I am now coming to you in a thick cloud... But when the ram's horn sounds (when the cloud leaves Mount Sinai - Authors), they may go up the mountain'... there were peals of thunder and flashes of lightning, a dense cloud on the mountain and a loud trumpet blast... Mount Sinai was all smoking because the Lord had come down upon it in fire; the smoke went up like the smoke of a kiln... and the sound of the trumpet grew ever louder" (Ex. 19:9, 13, 16, 18).

And then: All the people saw how it thundered and the lightning flashed, when they heard

the trumpet sound and saw the mountain smoking..." (Ex.20:18).

"You stood... at Horeb... The mountain was ablaze with fire to the very skies: there was darkness, cloud, and thick mist. And the Lord spoke unto you out of the midst of the fire" (Dt. 4:10-12).

The destruction of biblical cities Sodom and Gomorrah has long been regarded in history to have been due to a volcanic eruption. For example:

"And then the Lord rained down fire and brimstone from the skies on Sodom and Gomorrah... He saw thick smoke rising high from the earth like the smoke of a like-kiln" (Gn.19:24,28). And so on.

The complete list of all apparent volcanic eruptions mentioned in the Bible was compiled by V.P.Fomenko and T.G.Fomenko (see [1],[24]).

To associate (as is done traditionally) all these descriptions with Mn. Sinai = Mn. Horeb (and Jerusalem in traditional Palestine) seems doubtful; it is generally known that it has never been a volcano.

Where did the events occur then?

It suffices to study the geological map of the Mediterranean area to obtain immediately the unique answer. There are no acting volcanoes in the Sinai peninsula, Syria, or Palestine; there are only zones of tertiary and quaternary volcanism, as, for example, near Paris. In the above-mentioned regions, where the biblical events are traditionally located, no volcanic activity has been discovered in historical epoch since the birth of Christ. Besides, Egypt and North Africa have no volcanoes. The only powerful, and by the way, acting volcanic zone, is Italy together with Sicily.

Thus, according to the Bible, we have to find

- 1) a powerful volcano active in the historical era;
- 2) a destroyed capital (see the book of the Prophet Jeremiah) near the volcano;
- 3) two other cities destroyed by the volcano, namely, Sodom and Gomorrah.

There exists such a volcano in the Mediterranean, and it is unique, namely the famous Vesuvius, one of the most powerful volcanoes in history.

Famed Pompeii (biblical "capital"?) and two destroyed cities Stabiae (Sodom?) and Herculaneum (Gomorrah?) are located nearby. We cannot but mention a certain similarity in the names of these Italian and biblical towns. It is possible that the name of Sinai for Vesuvius originates from the Latin Sino (sinus), and biblical Horeb from the Latin horribilis (horrible).

The following analytic study worth mentioning, which permits to read the vowel-free text of the Bible, was performed by Morozov in [19]. It took into account placing Mt. Sinai=Horeb=Sion in Italy.

We illustrate by several examples.

The Bible speaks: "The Lord our God spoke to us at Horeb and said, "You have stayed on this mountain long enough; go now, make for all KNN (Canaan)..." (Dt. 1:6-7).

The theologians supply the Hebrew KNN with vowels Canaan and place it in the desert on the Dead Sea coast, but another solution is also possible, namely, KNN = GENUA (Italian Genoa).

The Bible continues: "All KNN (Canaan) and the LBN (Lebanon)..." (Dt. 1:7). The theologians restore the Hebrew LBN with vowels as Lebanon; however lebanon means "white", i.e., the same as Mont Blanc, or White Mountain. Famous mountain in Europe. "As far as the great river, the PRT" (Dt. 1:7). The theologians restore PRT with vowels and decipher it as Euphrates; but, there is the large tributary of the Danube, the Prut, located in central Europe, as beyond Mont Blanc. "Then we set out from Horeb... and marched through that vast and terrible wilderness" (Dt. 1:19).

In fact, the famous Phlegraei, vast and burnt-out spaces filled with small volcanoes, fumaroles, and solidified lava streams are located near Vesuvius=Horeb. "And so we came to KDS-BRN" (Dt. 1:19).

KDS-BRN is traditionally supplied with vowels as Kadesh-Barnea, which is, from the other hand, possibly, a town on the Rhone ([19], v. 2, p. 166). It is also possible that modern Geneva was meant as "town on the Rhone". "And we spent many days marching round the hill-country of Seir" (Dt. 2:1).

Mount Seir was left here without translation; however, if it is translated, we obtain Devil's Mountain(s). And there is such a mountain near Lake Geneva, namely Le Diableret ("Devil's Mountain").

Then, the "Children of Lot" (Dt. 2:9) met on the way can be evidently identified with the Latins (= LT).

"And cross the gorge of the Arnon" (Dt. 2:24). In the canonical translation we see Arnon (RNN). But, this is the Italian river Arno existing up to now!

"Next we... advances... to Bashan" (Dt. 3:1). The town Bashan (Bassan) is often mentioned in the Bible. It is surprising that town Bassano still exists in Lombardy.

"King of Bashan... came out against us at Edrei" (Dt. 3:1). Adria is still here, on the Po delta; the Po, by the way, has often been mentioned by ancient Latin authors (e.g., Procopius) and called the Jordan (in Procopius' Eridanus), which is very consistent with the biblical spelling of the Jordan, namely hay-yarden (JRDN) ([19], v. 2, p. 167).

"And we captured all his cities... sixty cities..." (Dt. 3:3-4).

Indeed, in the Middle Ages, there were many big cities in the region: Verona, Padua, Ferrara, Bologna, and others.

"From the gorge of the Arnon to Mount Hermon (HRMN)" (Dt. 3:8).

But it is obvious that MNT HRMN can be supplied with vowels to be translated as the "German mountains". "Only the Og king of Bashan remained... His sarcophagus of iron may still be seen in the... city of Rabbah" (Dt. 3:11).

Here is mentioned not only Ravenna (=Rabbah), but also the famous tomb of Theodoric (493-526 A.D.) of the Ostrogoths (Og = Goths?). It is clear that biblical OG means possible GOTH.

There follows TBRN (Taberiah in traditional biblical translation), which is naturally identified with the Tiber in Italy; ZN is Siena, southeast of Livorno. The slopes of Monte Viso are called Jebus (Jgs. 19:10-11) in the Bible, and Rome is called Ramah (Jgs. 19:14).

And so on. As we see, the shift of some biblical events from "the deep antiquity" in the medieval epoch does not contradict with the ancient text of the Bible (without vowels). Thus, now we can continue our analysis of English history.

### **5.6. Why English chronicles suggested that both Russia and England were located on islands?**

The fact that modern England is located on the island, does not surprise us. But Russia!? There are no geographical reasons to think that Russia is the island! But nevertheless, for example the well-known chronicler Benoit de Sainte-Maure in his "Chronicle of the dukes of Normandy" [22] speaks, that

There exists an ISLAND called Cansie (or Canzie), and I think that this is Rosie (in another copy of the manuscript - Russie - Auth.), which is surrounded by the great salty sea. And they (the people of Russie - Auth.) fly out as great swarm of bees, and their number is thousands; and they... can attack the great kingdoms and take the great procurement and they can win and conquer.

Here the original text: "Une isle i a par non Cancie (Canzie in manuscript B - see [10], p.240), e si crei bien que c'est Rosie (Russie in manuscript B, see [10],p.240), qui est de la grant mer salee de totes parz avironnee. Dunc autresi com les euetes de lor diverses maisonnetes gitent essains granz e pleners, ou moct a nombres e millers, ou com de ceus qui sunt irie' sunt en estor glaive sachie', tost e isnel d'ire esbrasez, trestot eissi e plus assez seuct icil poples fors eissir por les granz rennes envair e por faire les granz ocises, les granz gaaz e les conquises."

Russia is called here Rosie or Russie. If we look in the table of medieval names, titles and their duplicates (see above), we will see that here the chronicler really speaks about Russia. V.I.Matuzova (who included this text in her book "English Medieval Texts") comments this fragment as follows:

"Rosie is Russia. The report that Russia is an ISLAND is similar to another such reports..."([10],p.244). And then Matuzova quotes another medieval authors who were confident that Russia is an ISLAND (in particular, some Arabian and Persian chroniclers; but, by the way, it is not so clear - where they lived in reality, may be in Spain?).

It is supposed sometimes today that Cancie is Scandinavia. But Scandinavia also is not an island! By the way, the "Chronicle of Monastery of Saint Edmund" (13th c. A.D.) is

also convinced that Russia is located on an island, because reports that Tartars rushed on Hungary FROM ISLANDS ([30], and also [10],p.100-101).

How we can explain it? The simplest way - to accuse the authors of 12th century that they were completely ignorant (this is the standard explanation in modern historical textbooks and this idea allows to the modern historians simply to "close the problem").

But another explanation is also possible. English word island means today the piece of land surrounded by a sea. But may be in the medieval epoch this word had also another meaning? Our conjecture: it was Asia-Land, i.e., the Land located in Asia. Without vowels we have: asialand = SLND, and island = SLND. This is the same word!

Then all things immediately fit in their "correct places". Russia really can be considered (from the Western point of view) as far Asian Land = island. Large part of Russia belongs to the Asia. Consequently, medieval chroniclers were quite right when we talked about Island Russia. They were not so ignorant as it is supposed today.

Let us repeat once more our conjecture: the word island had two meanings in the past: piece of land surrounded by a sea, and Asia-Land.

But in this case the natural question arises (as the flash). If the ancient English authors speaking about island Russia, assumed that they speak about Asia-Land Russia, then we do not see any obstacles to assume that when they told bout island Anglia, they also speak about Asia-Land Anglia. And only after this, in a new epoch, the word island Anglia become to be considered only as island Anglia in a modern sense (piece of land surrounded by sea).

We saw the remarkable parallel between English history and Byzantine history. But Byzantine Empire really was Asia-Land for Western chroniclers. And only in the next epoch (when Byzantine chronicles were transported in England and were inserted into English history) the Asia-Land Anglia was transformed into Island Anglia.

Thus, were was located the land Anglia-Britain in 10-12th cc. A.D.? This is a complicated question. To get the answer we have unique way - to take the old English chronicles. Our answer will be as follows:

Anglia-Britain of 10-12th cc.A.D. was Byzantine Empire.

### **5.7. Where was the land Britain which was conquered by Brutus located? In what direction his fleet cruised?**

On the face of it, the answer on this absurd question is completely evident: on the same place where England-Britain is located today. But let us not hurry.

Let us recall after "accidental murder of his father", Brutus was expelled from Italy. He went to the Greece ([9],p.7). Here Brutus fixed the ancient relationship and he was staying among Trojans ([9],p.7). The period of wars in Greece started at this time. These wars are described by Galfridus in many details. Then Brutus organized the army and fleet and after this started the campaign-cruise. It is supposed today that his fleet went in Atlantic ocean and then arrived in modern England. Is it true? Maybe the chronicles



describe in reality the military operations inside Mediterranean sea and on the territory of Greece and Byzantine Empire?

For example, Brutus' army arrived in Sparatin. Modern commentary: "Location is unknown" ([9],p.230). Of course, you cannot find Sparatin if you assume that Brutus travel far from Mediterranean sea. But if these events occurred in Greece, then you do not need to search Sparatin, because this is well-known Sparta.

Then Galfridus describes the path of Brutus' fleet which is considered today as a "proof" that Brutus really went in Atlantic and then arrived in modern England. But we see suddenly from modern comments that it turns out that Galfridus "repeat the mistake containing in his source - namely, in "Historia Brittonum" of Nennius, who made the mistake because of erroneous reading of Orosius' chronicle..."([9],p.231). Moreover, then it turns out that "following to Nennius, Galfridus ERRONEOUSLY placed Tyrrhenian Sea BEHIND Gibraltar. We recall that Tyrrhenian Sea is BEFORE Gibraltar because is a part of Mediterranean Sea near Western coast of Italy" ([9],p.231).

But we are sure that here - no mistake! Galfridus was right because he describes in reality some complicated military movements INSIDE Mediterranean Sea, in particular, near Italy, where you can see Tyrrhenian Sea. Brutus' fleet did not pass in the Atlantic Ocean! Modern historians try to accuse Galfridus (and other chroniclers) in some "mistakes" only because historians try to adjust their modern "traditional" chronological and geographical concepts with real evidences of real medieval texts. Of course, a lot of contradictions appear. All these contradictions are considered today as "the fault of medieval authors".

Then Galfridus describes the battle between Brutus' army and Greeks on the Akalon (Acalon) river ([9],p.8). The modern commentary is as follows: "This name is, possibly, the fantasy of Galfridus... E.Phalar is his book formulated the idea that this description of Greek's defeat during the battle with Trojans near Acalon river, was taken by Galfridus from the story of Etien de Blua about the defeat of TURKS during the battle with CRUSADERS near "Moscolo" river at March 1098 A.D." ([9],p.230).

Consequently, here we can penetrate through the thick cover of traditional plaster into the real contents of the Galfridus chronicle. He describes in reality (following to some old documents) the epoch of the First Crusade in the end of 11th c.A.D. in Byzantine Empire.

Thus, we can assume that Brutus' campaign = Julius Caesar's campaign is the reflection of well-known crusade in the end of 11th c.A.D. The conquest of Britain is shifted from the 1st c.B.C. into the 11th c.A.D. (about 1000-year shift !). This fact confirms the discovered parallel ("identification") between Roman-Byzantine history of 10-15th cc.A.D. and old English history starting, allegedly, in 1st c.B.C. See above.

After some time they (Brutus' fleet) arrived to "the island which was called Albion" ([9], p.17). Modern commentary: Albion = Al'bania - one of the early (old) names of Britain or the part of it, which was appeared in ancient sources" ([9],p.232).

When speaking about Britain, Galfridus very often uses its second equivalent name: Al'bania ([9],p.19).

Thus, Britain = Al'bania.

Let us refuse now to follow the traditional historical version which identifies persistently the Anglia of 10-12th cc. A.D. with the modern island. Then we immediately recognize the modern name Albania (located on the territory of medieval Byzantine Empire) in this Galfridus' term Al'bania.

Thus, Galfridus places the medieval Britain on the territory of medieval Byzantine Empire.

The name Albania or Al'bania was slightly transformed into Albion later (occasionally or, possible, deliberately), when somebody decided to erase the evident traces of Byzantine origin of the old English chronicles.

### **5.8. With whom Brutus fights while conquering of Britain = Albania?**

After landing on the coast of Albania (later Albion), "Brutus named the island Britain using his own name, and named his fellows Britts" ([9],p.17). By the way, transformation of the Asia-Land Albania into island Albion (as a piece of land surrounded by sea) can be supported and partially explained because of the reason that Brutus arrived into Albania with his fleet, i.e., after sea expedition. And in some texts the landing on the coast of Byzantine Empire was transformed into the landing on the coast of some island.

With whom meets Brutus after landing?

With giants. We think that here chronicle means different great nations which lived in Byzantine Empire and possibly formed some individual dependent or independent states.]

"Among these giants was one especially disgusting, abominable, who was called Goemagog" ([9],p.17-18). This "giant" was (according to Galfridus) extremely powerful and terrible. Brutus' army meets in battle with 12 giants (among them - Goemagog). Initially, Britts were defeated. But then they "won and killed all the giants except of Goemagog" ([9],p.18). The battle with Goemagog continues and in the end Britts won.

Let us stop for a moment and think a little. What tells us Galfridus in his poetic chronicle (of course, he was based on some old real documents).

1) About the victory of Britts. In other words, as we think, - about the victory of crusaders who conquered Byzantine Empire.

2) About one of the most dangerous their enemies - some Goemagog.

The modern commentary:

"Galfridus combined in one name two ones: Gog and Magog" ([9],p.232). The modern historian, the commentator of Galfridus chronicle, noted that the nations Gog and Magog are frequently mentioned in the Bible (in Revelation, in Ezekiel). For example, in the biblical book Ezekiel we can see the following text about these terrible and powerful nations:

"Set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal...Gog shall come against the land of Israel..." (Ezekiel, 38:2-3,18). According to the

Bible, death and destruction carry these nations.

Remark. In some English publications of the Bible the word "Rosh" is omitted! Why?

About the hordes of Gog and Magog with fear speaks the biblical book of Revelation: "Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations... Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea" (Revelation, 20:7-8).

The modern historian tells us: "Late the people fantasy transformed Gog and Magog into spiteful, malicious giants. In London starting from the Middle Ages there are two monuments - the figures of Gog and Magog (near entrance to the City, today near town hall" ([9],p.232).

These two medieval nations are well-known and are identified according to some medieval chroniclers with Goths and Mongols. In 13th c.A.D. Hungarians considered Gog and Magog as Tartars ([9],p.174). All these facts forced us to move the events described by Galfridus into Byzantine Empire (or in neighboring countries).

From the other hand it is impossible do not mention about the following important remark.

The Moscow kingdom, according to the old Russian legend, which can be found in Russian textbooks until 19th century, "was founded by biblical patriarch Mosoh". This legend explains why Moscow is called in Greek as Mosha (Moska). When the Moscow kingdom was founded? The reader gives the answer immediately: the first note in chronicles about Moscow is dated by 1147 A.D.

Because the Bible speaks about Gog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal, N.A. Morozov formulated an interesting question:

"Is it true that the Russian MUZHNIK (man, fellow) = Rosh-Meshech was reflected in this famous biblical fragment, as the founder of Russia-Muzhikovii ? Then, after the filtration of the sound ZH through the Greek language, where this sound is transformed into S, this word was returned again into Russia as "Russia-Moscow".' ([19],vol.2,p.579).

Morozov wrote: "Any kind of interpretation for these fragment from the Bible leads you to the historical epoch of Mongolian period in Russian history, i.e., to the epoch starting from 1227, when Mongol Batu (Baty) becomes the ruler (king) of Moscow. When we agree with this point of view, then all things become very natural..." ([19],vol.2,p.615).

We realize that for the reader who is not acquainted with the history of chronological problems and with the books of Morozov [19], Fomenko [1],[24] and Fomenko, Kalashnikov, Nosovskij [3], some of our ideas sound sometimes strange. Nevertheless, from the other hand, as can see the reader, all these ideas are produces by the formal logical analysis of the old English chronicles.

Thus, if we return to the Galfridus chronicle, we are forced to formulate the corollary: during the landing on the coast of Byzantine Empire in 11th c.A.D. the Brutus' army meets with several large nations, and among them are Goths, Mongols and Russians. It is quite natural for 11th c.A.D. because of an important role which play these nations at

this time in medieval Europe and Asia.

### 5.9. With whom Julius Caesar fights while conquering of Britain = Albania?

Let us remind that the Brutus' epoch is simultaneously the Julius Caesar's epoch. If so, the military operations of Brutus should be reflected in the texts speaking about the same operations but from the Caesar's camp.

Galfridus, when finishing the Brutus' story, and passing several centuries along time-axis, comes finally to Caesar's epoch. Then he started to repeat the same "Brutus' story", but, of course, from different point of view.

Galfridus: "As it was mentioned in Roman history, Julius Caesar (after victory in Gallia) appeared on the coast of Rutheni. Looking from there on the island Britain, he asked his fellows, - what about this country and which nation lives here" ([9],p.37).

It is quite clear to the trained reader that, according to the opinion of modern historians, Galfridus again demonstrates here his medieval ignorance. The modern commentary to this fragment of Galfridus' text is as follows: "Rutheni are the Gall nation lived in Aquitaine (southern-western Gallia). It is impossible "to view" Britain from there, and consequently, Rutheni appeared in Galfridus text erroneously" ([9],p.238).

Who are Rutheni? The reader can take again the dictionary of medieval names and their duplicates (see Matuzova [10]) and he will obtain the answer immediately:

Rutheni are Russians.

Really:

ANCIENT RUSSIAN STATE: Susie, Russie, Ruissie, Rusia, Russia, RUTHENIA, RUTENEA, Ruthia, RUTHENA, Ruscia, Russcia, Russya, Rosie.

RISSIANS: Russii, Dogi (!), Rugi (!), RUTHENI (!), Rusceni.

It is well-known that Russian army several times took part in the military operations on Byzantine territory, in particular, they attacked the Constantinople. Thus, in the Middle Ages Russian forces really occupied some Byzantine regions. And it was quite possible "to view" the Albania = Britain = Byzantine Empire from there.

Thus, our conjecture is as follows. Rutheni mentioned in old English chronicles during the Julius Caesar's conquest of Albania = Britain - are the Russians of 10-12th cc.A.D.

Later these Rutheni were shifted along the geographical map in Western direction, when the old English chronicles were taken from Byzantine Empire into modern island England. As a result of such artificial displacement (shift) the name Rutheni appeared on the map of Gallia (in France). Consequently, real Rutheni were "doubled, duplicated". Then the initial, original location of real Rutheni was forgotten among the English chroniclers. Let us note the important idea.

When the Byzantine chronicles were transported from the East to the West (and were inserted in the history of modern island Britain), this shift also generated the "geographical shift" of many names and titles which were initially located in Byzantine Empire and around it. Rutheni (= Russians) are only one of these examples. We will demonstrate below some another examples.

Let us return to Julius Caesar in Galfridus' description. The fleet of Caesar invades into Albania = Britain. Here he starts the battle with Britts ([9],p.38), then defeats them and conquest the country. Let us stop for a moment and ask the question: who are Britts in 10-12th cc.A.D.? Traditional explanation is as follows: Britts are the descendants of Brutus. This "explanation" explains nothing. Basing on our experience, we can suspect that "Britts" of 10-12th cc.A.D. is some real nation of Middle Ages living in some part of Byzantine Empire. We do not need to search too long. The answer is on the surface.

An important part of Roman-Byzantine Empire is Romania = Rumania, and also Bulgaria. Here you can see the well-known river Danube with large afflux Prut = PRT (without vowels) or = BRT. In the epoch of crusades the Byzantine Empire was the collection of several feudal states. One of the important nations, which were represented here (as crusaders), were Germans and Prussians. Let us put the question: which name was used by medieval English chroniclers for Prussians? The immediate answer is given by the same dictionary by Matuzova [10]:

PRUSSIA: Prurenia (!), (P-Rutenia = P-Russia),

PRUSSI (Prussians): Prateni, Pruteni, Pructeni, Prusceni, Praceni, Pruceni.

Thus, the medieval sources call the Prussians as Pruteni = PRTN. It is possible that here we see the medieval BRT = Britts = Brits, described by Galfridus. Thus, it is possible that Julius Caesar was at war with medieval Prussians = Pruteni. In particular, Britain = BRTN (in 10-12th cc.A.D.) coincides with RRTN = Pruneti = Prussia ! Thus, one of the large regions in Byzantine Empire, namely, - occupied by Prussians = Pruteni, - gave the name for Britain = Prutenia.

But another answer is also possible.

According to the Abglo-Saxon Chronicle, the British language is the language Welsh ([2], p.3). But Welsh is evidently Vlachi = Blachi and, according to the Matuzova's dictionary, denotes the Thurki = Turci = Turks. If so, in some cases the Britts can be identified with Turks (at least in some medieval chronicles). But this identification again leads us to the Byzantine Empire as the location of early English history.

We hope that we gave the reasonable answer of the natural question:

With whom Julius Caesar fights while conquering of Britain = Albania?

### **5.10. Where was London located in 10-11th cc. A.D.?**

Trained reader waits with answer because suspects (and it is reasonable) that correct answer can be completely unexpected.

And we continue to read the old English chronicles which give us the correct answers on the all such questions. But we need to read "what is written" and not "what should be written". The second formula is sometimes the point of view of modern historical Scaliger's tradition which is in the basis of a modern textbook on ancient history.

Galfridus:

"When finishing with the division of the kingdom, Brutus decided to built a new town-capital... He founded the town and called it NEW TROY (! - Auth.). The town preserved this name during many years and then, because of distortion the initial title, the name was transformed into TRINOVANT. After this, Lud... who fought with Julius Caesar,... ordered to call the town CAERLUD which means "Town of Lud" (the word Caer = Cair means simply "town", see details below - Auth.). It was the cause of a great conflict between Lud and his brother Nennius, because Nennius was not agree with Lud who wanted to forget the initial name TROY" ([9],p.18).

And then: "The title was distorted and was transformed into Caerludein, then into Lundene and finally, into Lundres" ([9],p.37).

The modern commentary: "Trinovant is today the city London" ([9],p.232). Thus, the old English chronicles states that:

New Troy = Trinovant = Lud = Lundene = London.

Here we recall that according to the analysis in [1],[24], the NEW TROY of 10-11th cc.A. D. is New Rome = Constantinople. As we have mentioned above, the most known historical version states that "the Troy of Homer" is "somewhere near" the Constantinople = Istanbul. Schliemann wrongly spent a lot of his time for senseless "excavations of the Troy" (he discovered not the Troy). It was sufficient simply to point out on the Constantinople = future Istanbul.

This idea is in a nice correspondence with all previous results which give the Byzantine location for initial old events of English history.

Thus, Galfridus possibly tells us about the 1st crusade of 1099 A.D. As the result of crusade, the new capital was founded - NEW TROY = future Constantinople.

Let us attract the attention of the reader to the following remarkable fact. There exists a well-known town TYRNOVO in Bulgaria. But this name is similar to the name TRINOVANT and means simply TROY NEW, i.e., TROY NEW = TyrNovo. It becomes clear that the name Trinovant was initially appeared in Byzantine Empire, on the Balkan Peninsula, in the Slavonic region and its initial meaning was NEW TROY. In English the word new means the same as Slavonic nova or new. Thus, one the initial names of LONDON was TROY NEW (its trace is Tyrnovo in Bulgaria). It is interesting that Galfridus states the same, when he tells us about transformation of the name NEW TROY into TRINOVANT. In reality, this is not a transformation, but simply the transposition of two words: Troy and New inside the joint title.

It is clear also, that "town Lud" means simply "town LD" or "town LT", i.e. = "town of Latins" = "Latin town". The appearance of the name LT in old English chronicles is quite natural: in the epoch of crusades in 1204 A.D. the new LATIN EMPIRE was appeared on

the territory of Byzantine Empire. Latin Empire gave its name to the capital: LATIN TOWN, i.e. Caer-Lud (Cair-Lud). Nennius tells us that word "Cair" means in old Britts' language "Town" ([8],p.190).

Identification of New Troy = London with Constantinople follows also from the following fact. As we saw, New Troy was called later Cair-Lud or Caer-Lud. But Caer or CR (without vowels) sounds also, for example in Slav languages, as ZR because of often oscillation between C and Z. Thus, CR or ZR is evidently ZAR (czar = zar which means "king", "ruler"). Slavonic name for Constantinople was ZAR-GRAD, which means "king-town". Thus, CAER-LUD = ZAR-LUD, i.e. "king-town of Latins" (Latin king town). This is exactly Constantinople = ZAR-GRAD in Slav language.

Trained reader expects that the whole this story of Galfridus (about origin of London's name) the modern historical science claims as wrong and erroneous:

The Galfridus' information about the history and origin of the name London (from the name of Lud) is wrong. The antique authors (Tacitus, Ammian Marcellinus) call this town Londinium or Lundinium. The real history of the name of London is disputable" ([9],p.237).

Thus, after the 1st crusade in 1099 A.D. some chronicles called the New Rome as NEW TROY. Then, after the foundation in 1204 A.D. the Latin Empire the capital was called also (or was renamed?) LATIN TOWN, i.e., Caer-Lud and finally, LONDON. This name was then transported into island England when some of Byzantine chronicles were moved in this direction (after the fall of Constantinople in 1204 A.D. or 1453 A.D.).

Nennius listed in his chronicle "the names of all towns which exist in Britain, and their number is 28" ([8],p.190). The modern commentary: "Cair means Town in Britts' language" ([8],p.283). We can note here that the capital of Egypt is Cairo. Consequently, we see again, that in Britts' language the clear "Eastern trace" was remained. May be, this fact indicates the Eastern origin of initial old English history.

Galfridus tells us that New Troy (= London) was founded on the Thames river ([9],p.18). We think that initially "Thames river" was one of the name for the Bosphorus, where Constantinople is located. The Bosphorus sound (strait) is really very long, sufficiently thin, and was represented on the old geographical maps as large river. Schliemann, by the way, decided to place "his Troy" also in this region, namely - in the end of another long and thin strait (sound) - the Dardanelles, which is close to the Bosphorus.

Today the name of the "London river" is Thames. But because all these events are happened in the East, we need to remember that here some people read the text in opposite direction: from the right to the left (in Europe: from the left to the right). The word SOUND (= strait) without vowels is SND and after opposite reading is DNS. Because D and T were sometimes equivalent, and the same is valid to M and N, we see that the following conjecture (equivalence) is possible: DNS = TMS, i.e. "sound" = "Thames".

From the other hand, Thames is practically identical with Themis. But Themis is the name of well-known GREEK goddess of justice.

5.11. Who were scots in 10-12 cc.A.D. and were did they live? Where was Scotland located in 10-12 cc.A.D.?

Scotland = Scot + Land = the Land of Scots. Scots live in Scotland - this is well-known fact.

But sufficiently less is known that in old English chronicles the Scots sometimes are called Scithi, i.e., Scyths ! See, for example the manuscript F of Anglo-Saxon Chronicle ([2],p.3, comment 4). Thus, one of possible answers on the question in the title of present section is as follows:

Scots = Scyths.

In other words, Scotland = the Land of Scyths = Scithi-Land.

Scyths lived in Scythia, which is partially identified with some regions in modern Russia. Old English chronicles call Scythia also as Scithia, Sice, Sithia, Barbaria (see [10]). Are there some "traces" of medieval name Scots (for Scyths) in modern Russia? Yes! It is known that Scyths are considered partially as the nation which cultivated the cattle. But before now the Russian term for "cattle" is SCOT. Our conjecture: the Scots mentioned in old English chronicles of 10-12th cc.A.D. are Scyths = Scithi which lived near Byzantine Empire on the territory (partially) of modern Russia.

It was in 10-12th cc.A.D. Then, after transport of Byzantine chronicles into modern island Britain, the name of Scyths was also automatically shifted in modern England. And today we see in the modern England the Scyth-Land as Scot-Land.

And we see again that the old English chronicle tell us about the real Byzantine history, because really Scyths of 10-12th cc.A.D. lived near Byzantine Empire. Nennius, in the section with title "About Scots when they captured Hybernia", informs us:

"If somebody wants to know when... Hybernia was uninhabited, desert, then the most informed among SCOTS told me the following. When the people of Israel went from Egypt, the Egyptians who haunted Israelits (according to the Bible), were sank in the Sea. Among the Egyptians was one noble man from SCYTHIA (! - Auth.) with many relatives and with many servants. He was expelled (banished) from his native kingdom and we was in Egypt when Egyptian army was sank in the Sea... Then the survived Egyptians decided to expel him from the Egypt because they afraid that he can captures their country and to establish his power in Egypt" ([8],p.174).

Then, as a result, these Scyths were expelled from Egypt, and then their fleet conquered the Hybernia. This event is considered (in Nennius' opinion) as conquest of Hybernia by Scots ([8],p.175). Thus, here we see that Nennius was sure that Scots were descended from Scyths.



It is possible that here the name Hybernia was in reality applied to the Hyberia = old name of modern Georgia (or, may be to the medieval Spain). It is supposed today in historical science that medieval Hybernia = Ireland.

As we expect (and this is really true), the modern historical commentary to this fragment from Nennius' chronicle is very angry:

"Which Scythia is mentioned here? Bede Venerable calls the Scandinavia as Scythia. The version about "Scyths" origin of Scots was appeared because of some similarity between words "Scithia" and "Scottia" ([8],p.272). The commentator here passed over in silence that sometimes "Scots" were written in old English chronicles as "Scithi", i.e., "Scyths" and this fact is well-known to the real experts in the ancient English history. See [2]. By the way, the replacement of Scythia by Scandinavia does not help, because (as we have demonstrated above), the old English chronicles sometimes identified Cansie = Scandinavia and Russia (Rossie) (see [10]): "Cansie (or Canzie), and I think that this is Rosie (in another copy of the manuscript - Russie - Auth.)" (see the discussion above).

If it was really true that in some medieval historical period the Scithia was called as Scotland (in some historical chronicles), then the great interest will obtain the following fact. As we saw, the English chronicles called Russian king (ruler) Jaroslav the Sage (Wise) as Malescold (Malescoldus) ([10],p.58). Thus, his whole title (if Scythia was Scotland) should be Scottish (or Scoth) king Malescold (or Malcolm?). But we know several medieval Scottish kings Malcolms in traditional Scotland history. May be one of them is Russian king Jaroslav the Sage who was "transported" into "island Scottish history" as a result of chronological and geographical shift?

5.12. Five original languages of ancient Britain. Which nations used these languages and where did they live in 10-12th cc.A.D.?

On the first page of Anglo-Saxon Chronicle the following important information is presented: "Here in this island (i.e. in Britain - Auth.) are five languages:

English, British or Welsh, Irish, Pictish, and Latin...

Picts came from the south from Scythia with warships, not many, and landed at first in northern Ireland, and there asked the Scots if they might dwell there... And the Picts asked the Scots for wives... A part of Scots went from Ireland into Britain" ([2],p.3).

Is there any contradiction between these facts and our identification of old English events with events of crusades epoch of 10-12th cc. A.D. in Byzantine empire? No contradiction! Moreover, here we see certain confirmation of our

conjecture.

1) Appearance of the name Anglia (English) in the old English history is quite natural - this is the evident reflection of well-known dynasty of Byzantine emperors: Angels = Angelus (1185-1204).

2) The name Latin is the reflection of Latin Empire in Constantinople (13th c. A.D.), and a little earlier - the reflection of a group of Latins who came in Byzantine Empire during crusades epoch. Then they settled here and founded several feudal states.

3-a) The name British = BRT (and its duplicate=equivalent Welsh, see [2]) also is presented in the medieval Byzantine history. This is the name of Prussians=Pruteni = PRT (see above).

3-b) The English term Welsh is also well-known in medieval Byzantine empire. It is sufficient to look in the table of Matuzova [10] to get an immediate answer:

Vlach (or Blachi) = Welsh - this is Turci = Thurki = Turks.

Really:

Turks = Coralli, Thurki, Turci, Vlachi = Blachi, Ilac, Blac (!).

The name Vlachi=Blachi or Volochi is well-known in the medieval Europe. Starting from 9th c. A.D., they lived on the territory of modern Romania = Rumania ([11],p.352) and they formed the state Valachia. It is remarkable that the another, second name for Valachia was Zara Rumanska, i.e. the Kingdom of Romania (or Rumania). The most serious influence (on the fate of the whole region) Valachia had in 14th c.A.D.

The history of Valachia is closely connected with the history of Turkey. The medieval Valachia several times was in a heavy war with Turkey (with Osman Empire). In the end of 14th century and in the beginning of 15th century the rulers of Valachia became the vassals of Turkey ([11],p.356). Consequently, the names of Valachia (Welsh) and Turkey are closely connected in the whole medieval history of Byzantine Empire.

Moreover, the name Vlachi is well-known in the history of Constantinople. One of the main residences of Byzantine emperors was in Vlachern Palace ([25],p.226-229). This "Palace was the favorite residence of Comnenus" ([15],p.137). Greeks called it Vlacherni.

"Valachia (in the form Blakie) - is geographical name which is often used by Robert de Clari (and also by Geoffrey de Villehardouin) for the territory of Eastern Balkan" ([15],p.135). This region was called by Byzantine authors as Great Vlachia. In other words, the Great Vlachia is the part of the modern Bulgaria.

Thus, the old English name Welsh points out on Balkan's Valachia of 9-15 cc. A.D., or on the Turkey, or on the whole Byzantine Empire.

4) The original (preimage) of Pictish (Picts, Pict = PCT) in Byzantine Empire is quite clear. It is well-known that the ancient name of Egypt was Copt (= CPT) or Gipt. Thus, we obtain the immediate answer: Picts - are Copts or Gipts (i.e., Egyptians).

By the way, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is quite right when speaking that Picts came (in Britain - Auth.) from the country which is in the South with respect to Scythia. Really, Egypt is in the South with respect to the Scythia.

5) And finally, what about the language IRISH ? Anglo-Saxon Chronicle states that some part of Scots came from Ireland ([2],p.3). Besides this, at least in some historical epochs we have:"Down to the time of Alfred this term Scottas refers either to the Scots of Ireland or of the Irish kingdom of Argyll" ([2],p.3, comm.5).

But this means that Ireland is the part of Scot-Land. Because we have possible identification of Scots of 10-12th cc. with Scyths, then we obtain the following conjecture: language Irish is Russian (RSH = Russia),

because without vowels we have RSH - RSS, "irish" and "russian" sound very closely. Consequently, in this historical epoch we have:

Ireland = Ire + Land is the Russia.

We realize that this possible identification of Ireland (in some historical epoch) with Russia (and consequently, identification of Scotland with Scythia), can generate a certain irritation and even indignation of some scientists. Nevertheless, we are forced to repeat once more that all these conclusions follow from the text of old English chronicles, when we read them without the restrictions generated by traditional Scaliger's chronology. By the way, may be not all readers know that the legendary English (British) king Arthur (who is one of the most famous rulers of ancient England and is placed traditionally approximately in the 5th c.A.D.) was in direct contact with the king of Russia ("and the king of Russia, the most severe of the knights"). This is the report of Layamon (the beginning of 13th century) - the author of the poem "Brut, or the Chronicle of Britain" ([23], see also [10],pp.247-248). By the way, in the time of the king Arthur the princess (or queen) of Russia was kidnaped (see [23]).

When speaking about nations populated the old England, Galfridus tells us ([9],p.6): Normans, Britts, Saxs, Picts, Scots.

We spoke about Britts, Picts and Scots. Now - about Normans.

6) Normans play an important role in Byzantine Empire of 10-15 cc. They took part in crusades. However, it is possible, that Normans are simply one more variant for the name Romans. If so, they are Romans - Romei, the people who lived in Roman (Byzantine) empire.

7) Now - about Saxs (Saxons). "Saxs (Saxons) - German nation lived in northern Europe, mostly on the territory near North Sea. In 5-6 centuries Britain was conquered by German tribes... Galfridus usually calls he GERMAN INVADERS by generalized name SAXS (SAXONS), but in some cases speaks about Angls (Angels)" ([9],pp.229-230). Let us compare with Byzantine history. It is well-known that Germans took part in crusades. Consequently, Saxons (Saxs) and Angls (Angels) were among the nations which invaded into Byzantine empire in 10-12 centuries.

Thus, finally we see that the old English chronicles tell here not about some small nations which, as supposed today, lived many years ago on the modern island England, but about real great nations, states and empires. These great medieval nations were well-known in medieval Byzantine empire and Mediterranean region. If so, the old English chronicles describe important events in medieval world (crusades et cetera). (From traditional point of view they speak about "local events" on isolated island).

And only later, after the artificial transport of some Byzantine chronicles into modern island England, this remarkable history of great events was artificially compressed, "decreased in the size" and was transformed into "small" local history on sufficiently "small area" - on the one island.

5.13. Where were located six original English kingdoms Britain, Kent, Sussex, Wessex, Essex and Mercia in 10-12 centuries.?

The answer is given in the previous section.

All these states (and nations) are real states (and nations) of medieval Europe in 10-12th cc. They took part in the conquest of Byzantine empire and then they created several feudal crusaders states.

1) Britain - is, most likely, Prussia = Prutenia or Turkey (= Vlachia).

2) Kent is, according to J.Blaire [6], the Saxons region = Saxonia. Let us recall that in 10-12th cc. on the German territory there exists Saxons area = Saxonia.

3) Sussex = South Saxons.

4) Wessex = West Saxons.

5) Essex = East Saxons.

6) Mercia. Possible this is again Germany or some of its

part, because in the Middle Ages Germany was called Moesia and, for example, town Marburg was called Merseburg, i.e. Merse + Burg ([10],p.263). It is also possible that chronicles mean Turkey when speaking about Mercia (Mersia). See, for example, large town Mersin in Turkey on the coast of Mediterranean sea.

Anyway, we see that all six old-English kingdoms of 10-12th cc. can be located in Europe around the Byzantine Empire and all of them took part in its "feudal-state organization" during crusades. And only later all these states and nations were "transported" into island England, were artificially "decreased in size" and were inserted in a modern textbooks, where they are considered today as the initial English kingdoms of 5-8th cc.A.D.

## REFERENCES

- A.T.Fomenko. Methods for Statistical Analysis of Narrative Texts and Applications to Chronology. (Recognition and Dating of Dependent Texts, Statistical Ancient Chronology, Statistics of Ancient Astronomical Records). - Moscow, Moscow Univ. Press, 1990.
- The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Translated and edited by G.N. Garmonsway. 1990, Everyman's library, J.M.Dent & Sons Ltd: London.
- A.T.Fomenko, V.V.Kalashnikov, G.V.Nosovskij. Geometrical and Statistical Methods of Analysis of Star Configurations. Dating Ptolemy's Almagest. - CRC Press, 1993.
- A.T.Fomenko. Investigations in the History of Ancient World and Middle Ages. Mathematical Methods for Analysis of Sources. Global Chronology. - Moscow, 1994 (in print).
- A.T.Fomenko. Criticism of Traditional Chronology of Antiquity and Middle Ages. In which Century We Live ? - Moscow, 1994 (in print). 6\*. J.Blair, Blair's Chronological and Historical Tables from the Creation to the Present Time etc., G.Bell & Sons, London, 1882.
- J.Blair. Chronological Tables. Russian translation: Moscow, Moscow University, vols.1,2. 1808-1809. 7\*. C.Bemont and G.Monod, Histoire de l'Europe au Moyen Age. Paris, 1921.
- C.Bemont and G.Monod, Histoire de l'Europe au Moyen Age. Petrograd, 1915.
- Nennius. Historia Brittonum. In the book: Galfridus Monemutensis - "Historia Britonum". - Russian translation. Moscow, Nauka, 1984.
- Galfridus Monemutensis. "Historia Britonum". - Russian translation. Moscow, Nauka, 1984.
- V.I.Matuzova. English Medieval Sources. - Moscow. Nauka, 1979.
- History of the Middle Ages. - Editor: S.D.Skazkin. - Moscow, Vyschaya Schkola. 1977, vol 1.
- M.P.Alexeev. About Anglo-Russian relations in the epoch of Jaroslav the Wise. - Scientific Bulletin. Leningrad Univ.Press, 1945, No.4, p.31.
- Chronica magistri Rogeri de Houedone, ed. W.Stubbs. - RS, N 51, vol.II. London, 1869, p.236. English translation: The Annals of Roger de Hoveden, comprising the history of England and of other countries of Europe from A.D. 732 to A.D. 1201. Tr.H. T.Riley, vol.1-2. London, 1853 (Bohn's Antiquarian Library).
- Ancient Laws and Institutes of England..., ed.B.Thorpe, vol.1. London, 1840, p.198.
- Robert de Clari. The Conquest of Constantinople. - Moscow, Nauka, 1986.

- J.Sunderland. Holy Books in the Light of Science. - Severno- -Zapadnoye izdatelstvo, 1925 (in Russian). 17\*.E.Bickerman. Chronology of the Ancient World. Thames & Hudson, London, 1968.
- E.Bickerman. Chronology of the Ancient World. Russian translation: Moscow, 1975.
- I.A.Kryvelev. Excavations in Biblical Countries. - Sovetskaya Rossiya, Moscow, 1965 (in Russian).
- N.A.Morozov. Christ. (The History of Human Culture from the Standpoint of the Natural Sciences). Moscow and Leningrad. 1926-1932. vols. 1-7. (In Russian). 20\*. Gregoras, Nichephorus. Byzantinae historiae. In J.P.Migne Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca, t.148,149. Paris, 1857-1886.
- Gregoras, Nichephorus. Roman History. Peterburg, 1862. Russian translation.
- Alexandria: Romance of Alexander the Great. Leningrad, 1966. (In Russian). (According to the Russian chronicle of 15th century).
- Benoit de Sainte-Maure. Chronique des ducs de Normandie par Benoit, publee... par C.Fahlin, t.I. - In: Bibliotheca Ekmaniana universitatis regiae Upsaliensis, 55. Uppsala, 1951, p.8-11.
- Layamon. Brut, or the Chronicle of Britain. Ed. F.Madden, vol.II. London, 1847, pp.525-526, vv.22589-22602.
- A.T.Fomenko. Empirico-Statistical Analysis of Narrative Material and its Applications to Historical Dating. Volume 1: The Development of the Statistical Tools. Volume 2: The Analysis of Ancient and Medieval Records. - Kluwer Academic Publishers. 1994. The Netherlands.
- M.A.Zaborov. History of Crusades in Documents and Materials. - Moscow, Vyschaya Schkola. 1977.
- Geoffroy de Villehardouin. La conquete de Constantinople. - Historiens et chroniqueurs du moyen age. Ed. A.Pauphilet. P., 1963.
- The Concise Columbia Encyclopaedia. - Avon Books. 1983. Columbia University Press. USA.
- Bartholomaeus Anglicus. - De proprietatibus rerum. Apud A.Koburger. Nurembergi, 1492, lib.XV, cap.CXXXI.
- Ex Annalibus Melrosensibus Ed.F.Liebermann, R:Pauli. - MGH SS, t.XXVII. Hannoverae, 1885, p.439&
- The Chronicle of Bury St.Edmunds, 1212-1301. Ed. A.Gransden. London-Edinburgh, 1964, p.10.
- Peter Hunter Blair. Roman Britain and Early England, 55 B.C. - - A.D.871. - The Norton Library History of England. W.W.Norton & Company. New York. London. 1963.
- Christopher Brooke. From Alfred to Henry III, 871-1272. - The Norton Library History of England. W.W.Norton & Company. New York. London. 1961.
- A.L.Morton. A People's History of England. Lawrence & Wishart Ltd. London. 1979.