


HISTORY: FICTION OR SCIENCE?

THE ISSUE WITH CHRONOLOGY



ANATOLY FOMENKO

HISTORY: FICTION OR
SCIENCE? ● BOOK 1

**THE ISSUE
WITH
CHRONOLOGY**

ANATOLY
FOMENKO

THE ISSUE WITH CHRONOLOGY

By Anatoly Fomenko

Book 1 of *History: Fiction or Science?* series.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission of the publisher. Critics are welcome, of course, to quote brief passages by way of criticism and review.

Anatoly Fomenko asserts the moral right to be identified as the author of this work.

Translated from Russian by Mikhail Yagupov

Design & layout: Paul Bondarovski


Project management: Franck Tamdhu

Copyright © 2003-2017 Delamere Resources
LLC

Published by Delamere Resources LLC


Publisher's website

2017 print edition



Volume 1:


Dating methods as offered by mathematical statistics, eclipses and zodiacs



Volume 2:

**The dynastic parallelism
method. Rome. Troy.**


Greece. The Bible. Chronological shifts



Volume 3:

**Astronomical methods as
applied to chronology.
Ptolemy's Almagest. Tycho**

Brahe. Copernicus. The Egyptian zodiacs




Volume 4:
**Russia. Britain.
Byzantium. Rome**

Video from Wikipedia

Overview of the e-Series


History: Fiction or Science?

*by Anatoly Fomenko and Gleb
Nosovskiy*




Book 1:

The Issue with Chronology




Book 2:

Astronomy vs. History




Book 3:

The Apocalypse Seen by Astronomy




Book 4:

The Issue with Dark Ages




Book 5:

The Issue with Antiquity




Book 6:

The Issue with Troy




Book 7:

The Issue with Russian History




Book 8:

The Horde From Pacific to Atlantic




Book 9:

The Issue with Mongols




Book 10:

The Issue with Ivan the Terrible




Book 11:

The Issue with Tamerlane




Book 12:

USA Has Issues with Maps of 18th Century




Book 13:

The Issue with Czar's Helmet




Book 14:

The Issue with Russian Tartary




Book 15:

The Issue with British History




Book 16:

Crusades and Exoduses




Book 17:

Maps and Coins vs. History




Book 18:

Swords and Mantles Tell History




Book 19:

The Testament of Peter the Great




Book 20:

The Issue with Baptism of Russia



Book 21:

The Issue with Chinese Astronomy



Book 22:

The Great Wall Of China Hoax



ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Fomenko, Anatoly Timofeevich (b. 1945). Full Member (Academician) of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Full Member of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences, Full Member of the International Higher Education Academy of Sciences, Doctor of Physics and Mathematics, Professor, Head of the Moscow State University Section of Mathematics of the Department of Mathematics and Mechanics. Solved

Plateau's Problem from the theory of minimal spectral surfaces. Author of the theory of invariants and topological classification of integrable Hamiltonian dynamic systems. Laureate of the 1996 National Premium of the Russian Federation (in Mathematics) for a cycle of works on the Hamiltonian dynamical systems and manifolds' invariants theory. Author of 200 scientific publications, 28 monographs and textbooks on mathematics, a specialist in geometry and topology, calculus of variations, symplectic topology, Hamiltonian geometry and mechanics, computer geometry. Author of a number

of books on the development of new empirical-statistical methods and their application to the analysis of historical chronicles as well as the chronology of antiquity and the Middle Ages.

Contents

Overview of the e-Series

About the author

From the publisher

A Global Falsification of History.

Foreword by Alexander Zinoviev

Preface by Anatoly Fomenko

1. Roman chronology as the foundation of European chronology

2. Scaliger, Petavius, and other clerical chronologers. The creation of

contemporary chronology of the ancient times in the XVI-XVII century A.D.

3. The veracity of the Scaliger-Petavius chronology was questioned as early as the XVI century

3.1. Who criticized Scaliger's chronology and where

3.1.1. De Arcilla, Robert Baldauf, Jean Hardouin, Edwin Johnson, Wilhelm Kammeyer

3.1.2. Sir Isaac Newton

3.1.3. Nikolai Alexandrovich Morozov

3.1.4. Recent publications of German scientists containing

criticisms of Scaligerian chronology

3.2. The questionable veracity of
the Roman chronology and history.

The hypercritical school of the XIX
century

4. The problems in establishing a correct
chronology of “ancient” Egypt

5. The problem in dating the “ancient”
sources. Tacitus and Poggio. Cicero and
Barzizza. Vitruvius and Alberti

6. Timekeeping in the Middle Ages.
Historians discuss the “chaos reigning in
the mediaeval datings.” Peculiar
mediaeval anachronisms

7. The chronology and the dating of

Biblical texts

8. Difficulties and contradictions arising from the reading of old texts

8.1. How does one read a text written in consonants exclusively?

The vocalisation problem

8.2. The sounds “R” and “L” were often confused in the Middle Ages

9. Problems in the Scaligerian geography of Biblical events

9.1. Archaeology and the Old Testament

9.2. Archaeology and the New Testament

10. Ancient historical events: geographic localization issues

10.1. The locations of Troy and Babylon

10.2. The geography of Herodotus is at odds with the Scaligerian version

10.3. The inverted maps of the Middle Ages

11. A modern analysis of Biblical geography

12. The mysterious Renaissance epoch as a product of the Scaligerian chronology

13. The foundations of archaeological methods have been based on the Scaligerian chronology from the very beginning

13.1. The ambiguity of archaeological datings and their dependence on the existing chronology

13.2. The excavations of Pompeii. The dating of this town's destruction

13.3. The allegedly accelerated destruction of the “ancient” monuments

13.4. When did the construction of the Cologne Cathedral really begin?

13.5. Archaeological methods are most often based on Scaligerian datings

13.6. One of the numerous problems of the Scaligerian history – the problem of bronze manufacture before the discovery of tin

14. The problems and deficiencies of dendrochronology and several other dating methods

14.1. The consequent scale of dendrochronological datings does not extend further back in time than the X century A.D.

14.2. Sedimentary layer datings. The methods of radium-uranium and radium-actinium analysis

15. Are radiocarbon datings to be

trusted?

15.1. The radiocarbon datings of ancient, mediaeval, and modern specimens are scattered chaotically

15.1.1. Libby's initial idea.

The first failures

15.1.2. A criticism of the application of the radiocarbon method to historical specimens

15.2. The dating of the Shroud of Turin

15.3 Modern radiocarbon analysis of Egyptian artefacts demonstrates serious contradictions

16. Critical analysis of the hypotheses

on which the radiocarbon method is based

16.1. W. F. Libby's initial idea

16.2. Physical basics of the radiocarbon method

16.3 The hypotheses that the radiocarbon method is based upon

16.4. The moment of the object's departure from the exchange reservoir

16.5. Radiocarbon content variations in the exchange reservoir

16.6. Variations in radiocarbon content of living bodies

17. Summary

18. Numismatic dating

*What mainstream historians say about
the New Chronology?*

Bibliography

FROM THE PUBLISHER

NASA research of earth-moon mechanics of late astrophysicist Robert Newton leads mathematicians of MSU Dr. Fomenko et al to a breakthrough in the chronology of the world history that crowns 30 years of meticulous and extensive research.

This research was actually a byproduct of Russian-American competition in Moon exploration when both USA and USSR had to develop new

high-precision computer-assisted methods of calculation of Earth-Moon telluric system.

These methods have, on one hand, allowed for the precise Moon landing operations, but on the other, have proven irrefutably that the solar eclipses of Antiquity referred to in ‘ancient’ Chronicles were actually mediaeval.

The Issue with Chronology is the first volume in ***History: Fiction or Science?*** series, the fundamental oeuvre that exposes and expounds the numerous in-veracities of the traditional version of history.

The data and conclusions therein

contained aren't anything short of revolutionary. The alternatives offered to classical history are stunning, unorthodox to the extent of being labeled heretical by virtually every scholar of history.

Indeed, the book is daring enough to be considered preposterous at first sight, with the timeframe of the civilization compressed to barely 1000 years, although this impression never lasts longer than it takes one to read a few pages attentively.

In *The Issue with Chronology* we are reminded of when the contemporary chronological scale was created and by

whom, with the culprits named as the XVI-XVII century clergy that was in charge of all matters historical in that age.

We also learn that the consensual model of history had prominent critics ever since its creation – among them such names as Sir Isaac Newton and Jean Hardouin, chief librarian of Louis XIV, the Sun King of France, and collector of Louvre museum.

The author dissects every historical age and analyzed the data from every source imaginable – Roman and Egyptian chronology take a good beating, and it goes rapidly downhill

from there. Poggio Bracciolini and Petrarch take the blame for creating the legend of a mythical Classical Age that never was.

The Biblical events are moved a lot closer to us historically, as well as geographically (the Biblical Jerusalem placeholder being identified with the medieval Constantinople, for instance).

The New and the Old Testament swap their positions on the chronological scale, both exposed as referring to mediaeval events. Our perception of history begins to change dramatically even before we're through with *The Issue with Chronology*.

On one hand, Dr. Fomenko et al call everybody, historians including, to apply the Occam's razor to the world history. On the other, the scientists Dr. Fomenko et al are ready to recognize their 'mistakes' of New Chronology theory, to repent and to retract if and only if:

- radiocarbon dating methods or dendrochronology pass a rigorous anonymous non-circular 'black box' tests;
- verifiable astronomic data refutes their results on solar eclipses;
- it is proven irrefutably that Robert Newton (NASA astrophysicist) was wrong calling 'ancient'

Ptolemy the greatest con man in history in his book *Crime of Claudius Ptolemy*.

The radiocarbon dating labs run their very costly tests only if the sample to be dated is accompanied with an idea of age pronounced by historians on basis of ... subjective ... mmm ... gut feeling and the history books they have been writing for the last 400 years.

Radiocarbon labs happily bill for their fiddling and fine tuning with C14 hardware to get the dates 'to order' of historians. The demand to recalculate the calibration curve with an accelerator mass spectrometer is refuted.

The calibration of C14 curve valid now was made initially by the first radiocarbon lab of Arizona University on the basis of samples supplied and dated by the exploration team of Arizona University in Egypt. Circulus Vicious is perfect. Connect the dots ...!

* * *

P.S.: Prescient Saint Augustine warned: *“Be wary of mathematicians, particularly when they speak the truth!”* That’s why Jesuits took over control of Chronology in XVI century, when it was a part of mathematics. Now the mathematicians take it back.

New Chronology theory based on exact sciences says that all events that took place allegedly over 1300 years ago, as well as real persons who took part in them, are simply unknown to us.

Dr. Anatoly Fomenko is a Full Member (Academician) of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Full Member of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences, Full Member of the International Higher Education Academy of Sciences, Doctor of Physics and Mathematics, Professor, Head of the Moscow State University Department of Mathematics and Mechanics.

Franck Tamdhu

August 2017

*History is a pack of lies about
events that never happened
told by people who weren't
there.*

George Santayana,
American philosopher
(1863-1952)

*Be wary of
mathematicians, particularly
when they speak the truth.*

St. Augustine

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

Clarence Darrow

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

George Orwell, 1984

A Global Falsification of History

*Foreword by Alexander
Zinoviev*

I familiarized myself with the works of A. T. Fomenko comparatively recently, and they impressed me greatly. What part of them struck me as the most stunning? First and foremost, it was the intellectual capacity observable behind

them. The authors reveal a way of cogitating that manages to fuse austere logic with dialectic flexibility; this is truly a rare occurrence in the field of social studies. Reading the œuvres of A. T. Fomenko and his co-author G. V. Nosovskiy – occasionally several times over – was a veritable intellectual delight for yours truly. They flabbergasted me with their sheer disquisitive might as well as the research results which, in my opinion, can by rights be called *the greatest discovery in contemporary historical science* – what A. T. Fomenko and his colleagues had learnt over the course of

their research was the fact that the entire history of humanity up until the XVII century is *a forgery of global proportions* (“old history” in their terminology) – a falsification as *deliberate* as it is *universal*. I shall be referring to this falsification as the first one. My sociological research of the great evolutionary breakpoint demonstrated that a new, blatant, global and premeditated falsification was already in full swing.

Prior to becoming familiar with the writings of Fomenko, I had already known that the falsification of the past was a rather common phenomenon

inherent in human existence. However, I was neither aware of the scale of this fraud as described by Fomenko and his fellow scholars, nor of its social type. My assumption had been that the blatant falsification of history *on a planetary scale* that I discovered was the first one in what concerned the proportions and the ulterior motivation, as well as its historical role. Let us call it the second falsification of the same variety. It differs from the first in terms of pertaining to a different epoch. Its main subject is modern history and whatever historical period can be claimed as relevant to, and seen as fitting for, the

purposes of this falsification. The second falsification also differs from the first one in its primary means and methods, which shall be described below.

One has to differentiate between the two kinds of falsification, the first one being the involuntary routine falsification of minor details that results from the mechanisms of gnosis and those of the actual description of historical events, or the entropy inherent in the framework of humanity's historical memory. The second is the extraordinary, premeditated and complex falsification that has distinct

social causes.

Let us consider the former kind first. We shall disregard the period preceding the epoch of literacy and symbolic systems. The mnemonic means available back then were less than meagre, which automatically diminished the arsenal of the hypothetical falsifiers. We shall turn to the era of literacy instead. It is common knowledge that historical events become immanentized in human language – and a statement uttered is a lie, as the old saying goes. We cannot fathom the unfathomable. What we end up doing is raking the vastness of history for tiny morsels of information and

adding some of our own narrative in order to produce wholesome and coherent textual material.

The modern information technology does not affect the principles that the status quo relies upon. Let us introduce the concept of historical “atoms”, or particles that aren’t subject to further division. One may well calculate that the verbal description of a single year of real history the way it really happened, including all manner of events, no matter how minute, would require the processing power of all the computers on the planet, with all people made computer operators. De facto, this

technology serves as a powerful instrument of historical falsification. It allows for the possibility of *drowning a scientific approach to historical events in an ocean of meaningless facts*.

Furthermore, the description of actual historical events is done by humans, and not perfect divine entities. People are brought up and educated in a certain way and have a certain social standing, as well as egotistical goals and aims of their very own. All of this affects the way the information is processed. Over the course of time, the overwhelming majority of events are wiped away into oblivion without leaving the merest

trace. They are frequently not even realized as events. The people's attitude to the past begins to alter as past events gradually drift into an altogether different observational and interpretational context.

Evolutionary process discerns between two kinds of events – preliminal and superliminal. The former kind does not affect the general character of evolution; the latter one does. However, humans, including specialists, fail to recognize the difference between the two. Everyone knows perfectly well how much attention is poured over rather insignificant individuals, such as kings

and presidents, whereas *the really important events often don't even get so much as a passing reference*. This affects the relations between historical events so much that all sense of measure is often lost. Even if we are to suppose that all those who partake in the creation of historical records see veracity as their mission, the result of their collective efforts is often the rendition of their own subjective views on history as opposed to what happened in reality. As centuries pass by, the stream of disinformation is fed by various sources and tributaries, which, in their multitude, produce the effect of impartial

falsification of historical events. This stream also feeds on murky rivulets of countless liars and swindlers.

The false model of history serves its function for a certain while. However, humanity eventually enters a period when this distorted representation loses efficacy and stops serving its ends. This is where people are supposed to start searching for explanations and set out on their quest for a “truth”. However, there is the abstract scientific kind of truth, and the actual historical variety – that is to say, something that people regard, or will at some point start regarding as truth. The very word “truth” is confusing

here. We shall be on safer ground if we are to consider the adequacy of having certain concepts of the past for the new needs that have manifested as a result of the historical process. These concepts stop being valid for satisfying these needs. One becomes aware of the necessity to update our view of the past in accordance with whatever the present stipulates. This awareness is the kind of craving that can only be satisfied by a “bona fide rectification” of history, which has to occur as a grandiose paradigm shift – moreover, it has to be a *large-scale organized operation*; one that shall result in an epochal

falsification of the *entire history of humankind*. The issue at hand is by no means the falsification of individual observations of historical events, but rather the revision of the entirety of historical records describing the events which cannot be observed as a principle since they belong to the past. What we are talking about is not a mere change in the perception and interpretation of the same old existential phenomena – it is the adaptation of the character, which naturally used to refer to certain commonplace realities at some point, to the exigencies of people who have to live in an altogether different

environment. Trained specialists are a sine qua non for this – people whose activity shall have to be organized in such a manner that their collective output will result in the creation of a coordinated historical Gestalt. What they really have to do is create exactly the kind of past that is needed for the present, making use of whatever available material presents itself.

The first global falsification of history as discovered and brilliantly related by Fomenko was based on an erroneous temporal and spatial coordinate system of chronological events (the chronological system and the

localizations of events wedded thereto). The more recent and ongoing second global falsification of history is based on a system of erroneous pseudoscientific sociological concepts based upon ideology and aided greatly by the modern information manipulation technology. This is why I call the second falsification conceptual and informational, or merely “conceptual” for brevity’s sake. Fomenko’s works describe the technology of building a false model of human history which uses the art of manipulating the temporal and spatial coordinates of events. Many thousands of specialists in false

historical models are already working on this second falsification – their forte is the ability to misrepresent historical events while giving correct temporal and spatial coordinates and representing individual facts veraciously and in full detail. The actual falsification is achieved via the selection of facts, their combination and interpretation, as well as the context of ideological conceptions, propagandist texts that they are immersed into, etc. In order to describe the technology behind the second falsification with any degree of clarity at all, exhaustively and convincingly, one needs a well-

developed scientific system of logistics and methodology, as well as sociological theory. I call such a system *logical sociology*; however, it is a thing of the future, which means that the second falsification of history shall continue in its present manner, with as much ease and impunity as the first. Tens and hundreds of years hence, a number of solitary researchers shall “excavate” the so-called “modern history” in very much the same manner as Fomenko (and his predecessors, including N. A. Morozov) have treated “old history”.

I would like to conclude with an observation concerning the exceptional

scientific scrupulousness of the works of A. Fomenko and G. Nosovskiy. I have examined them from exactly this position many a time, and I have neither found a single ipse dixit statement, nor any categorical pontificating of any kind. The general narrative scheme they employ is as follows: the authors relate the consensual (*textbook*) historical concepts and then cite historical facts which either fail to concur to said concepts, or *contradict them explicitly*. Other authors who have noticed these inconsistencies are quoted. Then Fomenko and Nosovskiy put forth hypotheses which allow to find logically

correct solutions for the problems under study. They keep on emphasizing and reiterating that the issue at hand is all about hypotheses and not categorical statements presented as the truth absolute. The readers are invited to take part in the solution of problems that arise as a consequence of the consensual chronological concept of history. I am amazed by the horrendous injustice of the numerous critics of Fomenko and Nosovskiy, who obviously distort their ideas, either failing to understand them completely or being altogether unfamiliar with their content. It is also quite astounding that whenever a

publication occurs that voices ideas that bear semblance to those of Fomenko and Nosovskiy, but are a lot more *tame* and local, providing a lot less factual information, this publication is usually accepted with a great deal more benevolence. I understand the psychological groundwork beneath this – Fomenko and Nosovskiy have performed a *great scientific feat of epochal significance*, one that affects the sentiments and interests of too many people. Acknowledging this feat as such, or at the very least the mere fact of its creative relevance, obligates one to actions that are apparently beyond these

people due to their incapacity and immaturity. The trouble with Fomenko and Nosovskiyy is that they have reached out too far and dealt the dominating historical discourse too heavy a blow.

Alexander Zinoviev

10 October 1999,

19 April 2001.

Alexander Zinoviev (1922–2006), Professor of the Moscow State University, logician, sociologist, writer, member of the Finnish, Bavarian and Italian Academy of Sciences, the Russian Academy of Polite Letters and several others. Laureate of the 1982 Alexis Tocqueville prize for sociology and the “Best

Sociology Essay of 1979” prize, as well as a large number of European and international prizes for literature. Honorary citizen of several French and Italian towns and cities. The works of A. A. Zinoviev are published in more than 20 languages and considered international bestsellers. He read lectures on sociology in many European and American universities.

Preface by Anatoly T. Fomenko

The materials contained in this book correspond to the research that was started in 1973.

One might wonder why we should want to revise the chronology of ancient history today and base our revision on new empirical-statistical methods. It would be worthwhile to remind the reader that *in the XVI-XVII century chronology was considered to be a subdivision of mathematics*, prior to

having gradually transformed into a field of historical studies considered complete in general, and only requiring minor eventual clarifications leaving the actual edifice of chronology intact. And yet we discover that the contemporary official version of the chronology of ancient history is full of prodigious contradictions and inconsistencies that deserve an attempt of partial clarification and rectification based on the methods of modern statistics at the very least.

One often hears the question about what could possibly motivate a mathematician into wanting to study a

seemingly historical problem. The answer is as follows. My primary interests are those of a professional mathematician; they are thus rather distant from historical and chronological issues. However, in the early 70's, namely, in 1972-1973, I had to deal with the dates of ancient eclipses during my studies of one of the key problems in celestial mechanics (see *Chron1*, Chapter2 for more details). It had to do with computing the so-called coefficient D'' in the Theory of Lunar Motion. The parameter characterizes acceleration and is computed as a time function on a large historical interval. The computations

were performed by Robert Newton, a contemporary American astronomer and astrophysicist. Upon their completion, he had made the unexpected discovery of parameter D'' behaving in the most peculiar manner, namely, performing an inexplicable leap on the interval of VIII-X century A.D. This leap cannot be explained by conventional gravitational theory, and is improbable to the extent of making Robert Newton invent mysterious “extra-gravitational forces” in the Earth-Moon system that suspiciously refuse to manifest in any other way.

This inexplicable effect attracted the

professional interest of the mathematician in me. The verification of R. Newton's work showed that his computations conformed to the highest scientific standards and contained no errors. This made the gap in the diagram even more enigmatic. A prolonged pondering of this topic led me to the idea of checking the exactitude of *datings* of the ancient eclipses that the D'' parameter computations were based upon since they implicitly affected the result. This idea turned out to have been unprecedented for the scientists that had dealt with the problem previously. Robert Newton himself, an eminent

expert in the field of astronavigation and theoretical dynamics of natural and artificial celestial bodies, trusted the ancient historical dates completely and attempted to explain the leap in the behaviour of parameter D'' from within his professional paradigm. That is to say, without the merest hint of the very idea of questioning ancient chronology. I was more fortunate in that respect: I found out that N. A. Morozov, a renowned Russian scientist and encyclopaedist, had analyzed the datings of ancient eclipses and claimed most of them to be in need of revision. This happened as early as the beginning of the

XX century. He offered new datings for a large number of eclipses that were considerably more recent. Having obtained his tables, I repeated Newton's calculations using Morozov's dates in lieu of the consensual ones as input data. I was amazed to discover that the D'' graph altered instantly and drastically, transforming into a rather even horizontal line that had concurred with the conventional gravitational theory perfectly. The enigmatic leap disappeared along with the necessity to invent fictitious "extra-gravitational forces".

The satisfaction from having finished

a body of scientific work successfully was accompanied by a sudden awareness of a very knotty point arising in this respect, one of great peculiarity and paramount importance. Namely, that of whether the consensual chronology of ancient history was to be trusted at all.

It was true that the new datings of many ancient eclipses offered by N. A. Morozov led to the equalization of the D'' function diagram, the elimination of a strange contradiction from celestial mechanics, and to the discovery of the conformance of an important parameter in the theory of lunar motion to perfectly normal patterns of behaviour.

It was equally true, however, that fitting something like the idea that the three ancient eclipses described in the *History* of the prominent ancient author Thucydides took place in the XI or even the XII century A.D. and not in the V B.C. as it is believed today into one's perception proved quite impossible. The issue here is that the dating of the "triad of Thucydides" can only correspond to these two astronomically precise solutions (see *Chron1*, Chapter 2). The inevitable question that arose in this respect was that of which discipline had been correct in this case, astronomy or contemporary chronology.

I had to address several distinguished historians with this issue, including the ones from our very own Moscow State University. Their initial reaction was that of polite restraint. According to them, there was no point whatsoever in questioning the consensual chronology of ancient history since all the dates in question can easily be verified by any textbook on the subject and were proved veracious a long time ago. The fact that the diagram of some parameter D'' started to look natural after revised calculations based on some flimsy new chronology was hardly of any relevance. Moreover, it would perhaps be better

for the mathematicians to occupy themselves with mathematics and leave history to historians. The same sentiment was expressed to me by L. N. Gumilyov. I refrained from arguing with him.

The reply offered by the historians failed to satisfy me. Firstly due to the fact that chronology, being a problem of calculating dates, bears immediate relevance to applied mathematics. This includes astronomical calculations, the verification of their precision, calendar problems, the interpretation of old writings based on their frequency characteristics etc, and may present an extensive number of complex issues.

Secondly, becoming familiar with the contemporary chronological tables soon proved that the ancient dates were quoted rather arbitrarily, with hardly any references at all given anywhere. At best, the first chronological tables get a quote – however, those were compiled *relatively recently*, in the XVI-XVII century. Delving deeper into the problem revealed that the version of chronology that we agree upon today wasn't the only one available historically. I found out that eminent scientists from various countries expressed the idea that ancient datings required a radical revision. I realized that the answer was the furthest

thing from simple, and that shedding some light on the issue would require plenty of time and effort. This is how 1973 saw me commencing work in this direction, aided by colleagues – most of them professional mathematicians and physicists.

The research progressed rapidly. Over the years that passed since 1973 many points have been clarified and a great volume of interesting information obtained. A lot of it was published by myself and my colleagues in a number of books and scientific articles quoted in the bibliography. The first related publication saw light in 1980. It has to

be noted that over the course of time our opinions on certain chronological problems have changed. Said alterations never concerned the general picture, but occasionally led to significant shifts in our perception of details. Today we feel that the empirical-statistical methods that our chronological research was based upon need to be formulated and coordinated again. This is how the books *Chron1* and *Chron2* came to existence.

Chron1 is based on the first book I wrote on the subject – *Methods of Statistical Analysis of Narrative Texts and their Application to Chronology*

(Identifying and Dating Dependent Texts, The Statistical Chronology of Ancient History, The Statistics of Ancient Reports of Astronomical Events). It was published by the Moscow State University in 1990; a further revised and extended edition appeared in 1996 under the title *Methods of Mathematical Analysis of Historical Texts and their Applications to Chronology* (Moscow, Nauka Publishing, 1996). *Chron1* contains the entire material in a revised, extended, and coordinated form. It contains an extended version of two of my books: *Global Chronology* (Moscow, MSU,

1993) and *The New Chronology of Greece: The Mediaeval Age of Classics* (Moscow, MSU, 1996).

Certain important results that get briefly mentioned in *Chron1* and *Chron2* were achieved with the aid of outstanding scientists – Professor V. V. Kalashnikov, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences (Moscow State University and the National Research Institute for System Studies, Moscow, Russia), and the Senior Scientific Associate G. V. Nosovski, Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences (the Department of Mathematics and Mechanics, Moscow State University) –

experts in fields of probability theory studies and mathematical statistics. The formation of the author's concept of chronology is largely a result of his having collaborated with V. V.

Kalashnikov and G. V. Nosovskiyy for many years, and I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to both of them.

I would like to state explicitly that over the period of time from 1981 and until presently our collaboration with G. V. Nosovskiyy has been constant and very fruitful, as the two of us have published a number of what we consider to be milestones of the new chronology. The formulation of the main principles of

reconstructing modern chronology and mediaeval history is a direct result of the work we have done together over these years, which adds particular importance to this period.

Let us briefly describe the structure of *Chron1* and *Chron2*. The consensual versions of chronology, as well as those of ancient and mediaeval history, had evolved completely by the XVII century A.D. and appear to contain major flaws. Many prominent scientists are aware of this and have discussed it for quite a while (see *Chron1*, Chapter 1). However, the creation of a new concept of history that would be free from

inconsistencies proved a truly formidable task.

A group of mathematicians, most of them from the Moscow State University, commenced their research of the problem in 1974. The results were most captivating, and got covered in a number of monographs (see bibliography) and several dozens of publications in scientific periodicals. Let us emphasize that the new concept of chronology is based primarily on *applying methods of modern statistics* to the analysis of historical sources and *extensive cybernetic computations*.

The main subject of the books *Chron1*

and Chron2 is the research of new *empirical-statistical methods* of finding dependencies in historical texts and derived procedures of *dating* historical events.

The task of *recognizing the difference between dependent and independent texts* is really one of *identifying images*. One encounters it in various scientific paradigms including applied statistics, linguistics, physics, genetics, historical source studies, etc. Finding *dependent* texts is of great utility as applied to studying historical sources where they may be traced to a *common original* that had been lost

before our time. It is also very useful to be able to tell which texts are *independent*, or derived from non-correlating sources.

The very concept of *text* can be interpreted in a wide variety of ways. Any sequence of symbols, signals, and codes can be referred to as “text” – the sequences of genetic code in DNA chains, for instance. The common problem of finding *dependent texts* is formulated as follows: one has to find “similar fragments” in long signal sequences – that is, fragments of text that duplicate one another.

There is a multitude of methods used

for the recognition of dependencies and the identification of “similar images” available today. We offer several new empirical-statistical methods. They might be of use in analyzing historical chronicles, manuscripts, and archive materials as well as in finding the so-called homologous fragments in texts of a significantly different, more general nature.

This book is divided into several parts or topics for the reader's convenience. This should help us to securely differentiate between proven statistical facts and hypotheses. At the same time, one has to state that such

topical division is rather artificial since the topics really have lots and lots of points in common.

The first topic

Solving the problem of statistical recognition of dependent and independent historical texts. Formulating new statistical models and hypotheses, as well as verifying them with extensive experimental material of actual historical chronicles. It turns out we're able to acquire general verification of the models offered. In other words, we have managed to discover interesting statistical tendencies that define the

evolution of textual information over a period of time, such as what really happens to the data contained in the manuscripts during their duplication, etc.

The discovery of these tendencies is our first result.

The discovered trends are used as basis for the formulation of new methods of dating the events described in the chronicles. This is achieved by statistical comparison of the chronicles and documents pertinent to the research with the ones possessing confirmed datings. The methods are verified by a large body of correctly dated materials. Their application to the chronicles and

documents describing the events of the XVII-XX century appears to confirm the efficacy of these methods. Namely, the statistical datings that we got as a result of our research concur with the ones confirmed by traditional methods. The *a priori dependent* chronicle pairs turn out to be *dependent statistically* with the use of our methods. The ones that are *independent a priori* turn out to be *independent statistically* as well.

Experimental examination of veraciously dated chronicles describing the events of XVII-XX century A.D. led to the discovery of natural numeral coefficients that allow us to differentiate

between *a priori* dependent chronicles and *a priori* independent ones in 1974-1979. Basically, these numbers are rather small for *a priori* dependent pairs and rather large for *a priori* independent ones. This means that nowadays we can compare arbitrary chronicles X and Y and find out whether their proximity coefficients are within the zone that refers to dependent chronicles or the one that refers to independent ones. It is needless to say that the boundaries of these zones were found experimentally.

The discovery of the hidden dependencies that define the evolution of information in rather large historical

chronicles as well as the development and experimental verification of the new dating methods (currently comprising a total of eight) – is the *second principal result of our work*. The datings achieved by our methods cannot be regarded as finite, so we shall refer to them as “statistical datings” and nothing more. We shall occasionally drop the word “statistical” for the sake of brevity. The above is to say that we regard the empirical-statistical dates that we computed to be a result of applying statistical methods to historical materials. Nevertheless, the concurrence of these statistical datings with the ones

verified a priori that we have discovered in the interval of XVII-XX century A.D. implies that our results are of an objective nature.

The second topic

It can also be referred to as *critical*. We analyze the traditional datings of events that occurred in ancient and mediaeval Europe, Asia, the Mediterranean countries, Egypt, and America. Bearing the reader's convenience in mind, we have collected various materials here that can be found scattered across all kinds of scientific literature and are known to specialists of various profiles,

but *often remain beyond the awareness of the general public*. These materials illustrate serious difficulties that are presently inherent in the problem of scientific dating of historical events preceding the XIV century A.D.

We shall inform the reader of the fundamental research conducted by the prominent Russian scientist and encyclopaedist Nikolai Aleksandrovich Morozov (1854-1946), honorary member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, who was the first to have formulated the problem of confirming the ancient and mediaeval chronology with the means offered by natural sciences in

its entirety in addition to having collected a great volume of critical materials and suggested a number of innovative hypotheses.

We shall also report the chronological research conducted by Sir Isaac Newton, who questioned many datings of historical events, and several other representatives of the critical current in history and chronology. We quote from eminent authorities in the fields of archaeology, source studies, and numismatics, and a variety of other well-known scientists, and extensively compare different points of view so that the readers could develop their own

opinions of the problems in question.

The primary application of novel empirical-statistical methods is the analysis of dates of historical occurrences. This is why we were forced to analyze as many *dating versions* of events in question as we could find in this day and age. The issue here is that various ancient and mediaeval chronicles frequently demonstrate *significant discrepancies* in their datings of certain important events. Attempting to navigate in this chaos of mediaeval versions, we devote special attention to those reflected in the chronicles of XV-XVI century A.D. due

to the fact that the chronologists of that epoch were closer in time to the events described than we are. Subsequent chronological versions of XVII-XX century are often revisions of *derivative* material, obscuring and heavily distorting the original mediaeval meaning.

Starting with XVI-XVII century A.D., the version of the chronology of ancient history that was created in the works of prominent mediaeval chronologists J. Scaliger and D. Petavius “rigidifies.” The main points of the official version of contemporary chronology coincide with those of Scaliger and Petavius. Hence

we are to use the term “Scaligerian chronology” and refer to the consensual datings of ancient events as to “Scaligerian datings”.

We presume the reader to be more or less familiar with the traditional – Scaligerian *de facto* – chronology concepts familiar from school and university. We shall thus refrain from quoting the Scaligerian concept in detail, considering this knowledge to be in public domain. On the contrary, we shall be making a special emphasis on its inconsistencies. Further on, we shall give a brief analysis of traditional dating methods: datings based on historical

sources, archaeological datings, radiocarbon datings, dendrochronology, etc. It is expedient to allow the reader the evaluation of the veracity and the precision of these methods as well as their application areas.

The third topic

In 1975-1979 the author compiled a table entitled “*Global Chronological Map*”, which may be referred to as GCM for the sake of brevity. It may be regarded as a rather complete “Scaligerian textbook” of ancient and mediaeval history. All the principal events of ancient history with their dates

according to Scaliger (the ones used today), lists of main historical characters, etc., were placed along the horizontal axis of time. All the key original sources that have survived with descriptions of contemporary life were quoted for each epoch. The resulting chronological map contains tens of thousands of names and dates. The physical space it covers amounts to several dozen square metres. This map proved itself a priceless encyclopedia and a great guide for the edifice of contemporary – Scaligerian *de facto* – ancient and mediaeval chronology. Due to the large volume of the material, it

made its way into Chron1 and Chron2 with many expurgations, as small tables and diagrams.

The fourth topic

In 1974-1979, the entire arsenal of the new empirical-statistical dating methods was applied to the factual material collected on the map of the Scaligerian chronology. This was done by inspecting all manner of pairs of historical epochs and the key original sources pertinent to them. These chronicles were processed statistically and then compared in pairs, and eventually the dependence coefficients of compared historical texts

were computed.

If such coefficients for the two compared chronicles X and Y proved to belong to *the same* numeric order as those of the *a priori dependent* chronicles from the “certainty interval” of XVII-XX century A.D., we called them *statistically dependent*. In this case, both correlating epochs (temporal periods) were marked on the map with *the same* arbitrarily chosen symbol such as the letter R .

If the proximity coefficient (or measure) of the two compared chronicles X and Y proved to belong to *the same* numeric order as those of the *a*

priori independent chronicles from the “certainty interval” of the XVII-XX century A.D., we called them *statistically independent*. In this case, both correlating epochs (temporal periods) were marked on the map with *different* arbitrarily chosen symbols such as the letters *N* and *S*.

As a result of statistical research, pairs of statistically dependent chronicles and epochs pertinent to them were found and exposed in the “Scaligerian history textbook”. We called such chronicles and the sequences of events they described *statistical duplicates*.

We discovered that the results of using different empirical-statistical methods correlate very well. Namely, the chronicle pairs “statistically similar” according to one method turned out to be “statistically similar” according to all the others (if such methods were at all applicable to the chronicles in question). This result correlation is perceived as important.

It is vital that our empirical-statistical methods have found no unforeseen duplicates, or chronicles whose dependent nature we weren't aware of *a priori*, on the interval of XVII-XX century A.D.

At the same time, the same methods found a large number of new statistically similar chronicles (duplicates) that were previously considered underived, independent in every sense of the word and ascribed to various epochs before the XVII century A.D., preceding the XI century in particular. The compilation of the Scaligerian chronological map and the discovery of statistical duplicates therein amount to the third principal result of this book.

The fourth principal result is the division of the Scaligerian chronological map into a sum of the four chronicle layers discovered by the author. These

chronicle layers are nearly identical, but they are shifted in time in relation to each other. These shifts amount to significant amounts of time and their correspondent chronicle layers may be regarded as “short chronicles” of sorts.

A very rough description of “The Contemporary Scaligerian Textbook of Ancient and Mediaeval History” would be calling it a sum, or a collage, of four copies of the same short chronicle, statistically speaking.

A criticism of the Scaligerian chronology and the description of the four statistical results mentioned above comprise the main part of the present

book. Its other parts are of a hypothetical and interpretational nature. They aid the formulation of a possible answer to the naturally occurring question about the meaning of all the discovered empirical-statistical facts, and what the history was “really like”.

The fifth topic

This topic can be called interpretational. This is where we offer the hypotheses that may explain the trends we have discovered and the reasons why the “Scaligerian textbook of history” might contain duplicates. Neither this material, nor the “truncated history textbook” that

we offer are to be considered finite in any way. They may only be regarded as offering a possible version that requires a great body of work to be conducted by experts of various profiles, and maybe even special research facilities.

* * *

The author's position on a significant number of points raised in *Chron1* and *Chron2* has formed as a result of interaction, collective research, and extensive discussions with specialists from a wide variety of fields, most notably, the field of mathematics and fellow mathematicians. Specifically, the

new statistical models and the results we have achieved have all been presented and discussed over the span of the past twenty-plus years:

the Fourth and the Fifth International Probability Theory and Mathematical Statistics Conferences in Vilnius, Lithuania, 1981 and 1985;

the First International Bernoulli Society for Mathematical Statistics and Probability Theory Congress in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, 1986;

the Multidimensional Statistical Analysis and Probabilistic Modelling of Real-Time Processes seminar by Prof. S.A. Aivazyan at the Central Institute of

Economics and Mathematics of the
USSR Academy of Sciences;
several national seminars on
Stochastic Model Continuity and
Stability by Prof. V. M. Zolotaryov (The
V. A. Steklov Mathematics Institute of
the Russian Academy of Sciences) and
Prof. V. V. Kalashnikov (The National
Research Institute for System Studies);
Controllable Processes and
Martingales seminars by Prof. A. N.
Shiryaev (V. A. Steklov Mathematics
Institute of the Russian Academy of
Sciences) and Prof. N. V. Krylov
(Department of Mathematics and
Mechanics, Moscow State University);

Academician V. S. Vladimirov's seminar at the V.A. Steklov Mathematics Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences;

Academician O. A. Oleinik's seminar at the Department of Mathematics and Mechanics, Moscow State University;

Academician A. A. Samarsky's seminar at the USSR National Mathematical Modelling Centre.

The author would like to give thanks to all of the participants of the discussion, and the members of the audience.

The author also expresses his

gratitude to the following members of the Russian Academy of Sciences for their kind support and collaboration: Academician E. P. Velikhov, Academician Y. V. Prokhorov, Academician I. M. Makarov, Academician I. D. Kovalchenko, Academician A. A. Samarsky, and Academician V. V. Kozlov, as well as Corresponding Member S. V. Yablonsky.

Thanks to fellow mathematicians, as well as mechanicians, physicists, chemists, and historians, most of them members of the Moscow State University faculty: Prof. V. V.

Alexandrov, Prof. V. V. Belokourov,
Prof. N.V. Brandt, Prof. Y. V. Chepurin,
Prof. V. G. Dyomin, Cand. Sci. M. I.
Grinchouk, Prof. N. N. Kolesnikov,
Prof. V. V. Kozlov, member of the
Russian Academy of Sciences, Prof. N.
V. Krylov, Prof. A. S. Mishchenko, Prof.
V. V. Moshchalkov, Prof. Y. M.
Nikishin, Prof. V.A. Ouspensky, Prof. V.
I. Piterbarg, Prof. M. M. Postnikov,
Prof. Y. P. Solovyov, Prof. Y. V.
Tatarinov, and Prof. V. I. Trukhin, as
well as Prof. V. M. Zolotaryov and Prof.
A. N. Shiryayev, Corresponding Member
of the Russian Academy of Sciences,
both members of the V. A. Steklov

Mathematics Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences; faculty members of the National Research Institute for System Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Prof. V.V. Kalashnikov and Prof. V. V. Fyodorov; faculty member of the Central Institute Of Economics and Mathematics of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Prof. Y. M. Kabanov; faculty member of the National Institute of Scientific Research in Information Transfer Problems, Prof. A.V. Chernavsky; faculty member of the Moscow Oil and Gas Institute, Prof. I. A. Volodin; Prof. S. V. Matveyev, Chelyabinsk University Corresponding

Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences; faculty member of the Kiev University, M.V. Mikhalevich, and Prof. V. V. Sharko, staff member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences Institute of Mathematics.

The author would like to express his heartfelt gratitude to all of them, along with S. N. Gonshorek for his collaboration and support.

Over various stages the participants of the New Chronology project included the representatives of a variety of scientific paradigms. In their midst: V. V. Bandourkin and Prof. D. Blagojevic (Belgrade University, Belgrade,

Yugoslavia), Cand. Phys. Math. Sci. B. E. Brodsky, T. G. Cherniyenko, Y. S. Chernyshov, Prof. B. S. Darkhovski, Prof. I. V. Davidenko, D. V. Denisenko, Cand. Phys. Math. Sci. T. N. Fomenko, V.P. Fomenko, Cand. Tech. Sci. T. G. Fomenko, I. A. Golubev, N. Gostyev, Cand. Phys. Math. Sci. M. I. Grinchouk, Prof. V. D. Gruba, I. Y. Kalinichenko, Cand. Phys. Math. Sci. N. S. Kellin, G. A. Khroustaliiov, Prof. A. Lipkovsky (Belgrade University, Belgrade, Yugoslavia), Prof. A. S. Mishchenko, N. A. Milyakh, A. V. Nerlinsky, Cand. Phys. Math. Sci. I. N. Nikitin, Prof. E. M. Nikishin, M. G. Nikonova, A. A.

Onishchenko, Dr. Guillermo Peña Feria
(Cuba, Spain), M.E. Polyakov, S. N.
Popov, Prof. M. M. Postnikov, N. Z.
Rakhimov, A. Y. Ryabtsev, D. K.
Salakhutdinov, Prof. Y. N. Sergiyenko,
Prof. Jordan Tabov (The Bulgarian
Academy of Sciences Institute of
Mathematics, Sofia, Bulgaria), Y. N.
Torkhov, and Y. A. Yeliseyev.

The author would also like to thank
Prof. V. K. Abalakin, V. V. Bandourkin,
A. V. Bogdanov, M. A. Bocharov, Prof.
R. L. Dobroushin, Prof. E. Y.
Gabovitsch, Prof. M.I. Grossman, Prof.
A. O. Ivanov, Cand. Phys. Math. Sci. V.
Kossenko, Prof. Y. M. Lotman, Dr.

Christoph Marx (Switzerland), Prof. A. A. Polikarpov, Prof. V. D. Polikarpov, Cand. Hist. Sci. S. A. Poustovoyt, Prof. M.L. Remnyova, Prof. S. N. Sokolov, and Prof. A. A. Touzhilin, for valuable discussions and insights.

Many thanks for the kind assistance of Professor Peter Gruber (The Technical University, Vienna, Austria) who proved to be most valuable indeed.

The author is indebted to all those who helped with statistical work on original sources, namely N.S. Kellin, P. A. Pouchkov, M. Zamaletdinov, A. A. Makarov, N. G. Chebotaryev, E. T. Kouzmenko, V. V. Bashe, B. A.

Silberhof, M. Y. Stein, V. P. Fomenko,
Cand. Tech. Sci. T. G. Fomenko, and
Cand. Phys. Math. Sci. T. N. Fomenko.

Cand. Phys. Math. Sci. N. S. Kellin,
Cand. Phys. Math. Sci. N. Y. Rives,
Cand. Phys. Math. Sci. I. S. Shiganov, P.
A. Pouchkov, M. Zamaletdinov, Cand.
Phys. Math. Sci. S. Y. Zholkov, and A.
V. Kolbasov have all provided much
appreciated help with the creation of
algorithms and programs, as well as
statistical work on the material.

The author would further like to thank
T. G. Zakharova, Director of the N. A.
Morozov Museum at the Inland Water
Biology Institute, RAS, the entire staff of

the museum, as well as V. B. Biryukov for the exceptionally valuable help in archive studies related to N. A. Morozov and his scientific output they provided.

Starting in 1998, the development of the new chronology was aided by a number of specialists from a variety of unrelated fields and adhering to different cognitive paradigms. In 2001 and 2002 G. K. Kasparov voiced his support of the New Chronology in its critical part a couple of times, on the radio and the television; I wish to express my gratitude to him. I am also grateful to Professor A. A. Zinoviev (MSU), the

eminent writer, logician and sociologist, for active support and fruitful discussions. My thanks also go to the IAELPS Academician M. K. Moussin, a merited employee of the oil and gas industry, and all the members of his family who actively took part in the “New Chronology” project. Special thanks to I. R. Moussina for her help in compilation of the Dictionary of Interlingual Parallelisms. The project development was greatly helped by A. V. Podoinitsyn, the economist, and Prof. I. V. Davidenko, the geologist.

Disputes with various historians, philologists, and linguists have been a

significant influence on the development of the new chronology.

The author is immensely grateful to the head of the Philological Department of the Moscow State University, Prof. M. L. Remnyova, for her kind assistance in allowing a reading of a special course in chronological problems and new mathematical methods in history and linguistics, which was read by G. V. Nosovskiyy and the author, at the Philological Department of MSU in 1998. We would like to thank the Professor of the Philological Department, A. A. Polikarpov, who supervises the Laboratory of Computer

Methods in Linguistics for his help in organizing this course and valuable discussions.

Thanks to the Freeborn Russia radio station (Moscow) for the informational support of the New Chronology project in 1998-1999, namely, a large series of special weeklies dedicated to our research. Y.S. Chernyshov brilliantly presented these programs. The second cycle of these programs appeared in 2001.

The author expresses gratitude to the dozens and dozens of people in complex chronological research, for their help and support.

A fond, special thanks to the author's parents, V.P. Fomenko and T. G. Fomenko, and his wife, T. N. Fomenko, Candidate of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, for the great and invaluable help in processing statistical materials and for their steady, unswerving support during all the years of robust and complex development of the new chronology.

I would like to re-emphasize that over the last couple of years our research has been getting active support of A. Zinoviev, the prominent thinker, logician, sociologist and writer. His support is all the more valuable to us

since the period when it is being provided is that of the utmost controversy and difficulty in what concerns the acceptance of the New Chronology by the community of scientists. A. Zinoviev had pointed out the mechanisms used for the falsification of recent history (the XIX-XX century). His concept of “virtual reality” – the one created and deliberately planted for the distortion of one’s perception of reality and the creation of “the official myth of the days of yore” concurs well with the results of our research which have helped to remove the veil obscuring the creation of the Scaligerian version of

history in the XVI-XVIII century. Many of A. Zinoviev's ideas concerning the necessity of introducing the methods of modern constructive logic (including the logical methods created by himself) into sociology and history gain paramount actuality nowadays. The actual idea of translating our seven-volume work into foreign languages in order to increase the involvement of foreign scientists into the discussion of ancient chronology, as well as the organizational initiative, belong to none other but him. We are most grateful to A. Zinoviev for his support and the numerous scientific disputes covering a great scope of issues

including those relevant to chronology. We consider it a great honour and privilege to be able to commune with one of the most eminent thinkers of the XX-XXI century.

The present publication of the seven volumes of *Chronology* only became feasible due to the creation of a special project for the translation and publication of our works on chronology by Youri Filippov. One has to emphasize that the translation of such a great bulk of complex scientific material is a most grandiose endeavour per se. We would like to express our sincere gratitude to Y. N. Filippov for the

gigantic amount of labour invested, and also to the translators and editors for their hard and highly professional work.

* * *

The book is dedicated to the memory of Nikolai Aleksandrovich Morozov, brilliant scientist, encyclopaedist, and author of the most profound œuvres on chemistry, physics, mathematics, astronomy, and history. He was the first to have fully formulated the problem of finding scientific basis for ancient and mediaeval chronology using natural sciences, and obtaining fundamental results in this direction.

The author would like to express the wish for this seven-volume edition to provide an impetus for the development of new empirical-statistical methods of studying historical texts so that the problems of ancient chronology can be solved in their entirety.

*A. T. Fomenko,
March 2002*

1.

Roman chronology as the foundation of European chronology

“One often comes across accounts of a steel chisel found in the external masonry of the Great Pyramid of Cheops (Khufu, the beginning of XXX century B.C.); however, it is indeed most probable that said tool got there in a later age, when the pyramid stones were pillaged for building purposes.” – Michele Giua. *The History of Chemistry*. Moscow, 1975, page 27,

Let us give a concise preliminary account of the current state of ancient and mediaeval chronology. The importance of chronology for historical science is all the greater since this discipline allows for the determination of the time interval between the historical event and the current era (provided it can be adequately translated into terms of contemporary chronology, that is to say, it is given a corresponding B.C./A.D. dating). Nearly all the fundamental historical conclusions depend on the dating of the events described in the source that is being

studied. An altered or imprecise dating of an event defines its entire interpretation and evaluation. The current global chronology model has evolved owing to the labour of several generations of chronologists in the XVII-XIX century and has Julian calendar datings ascribed to all the major events of ancient history.

The datings of events referred to in some freshly discovered document are predominantly based on the Roman chronology, since it is considered that “all the other ancient chronological datings can be linked to our calendar via direct or indirect synchronisms with the

Roman dates” ([72], page 77). In other words, Roman chronology and history are the “spinal column” of the consensual global chronology and history. This is why Roman history shall have to enjoy our very special attention.

2.

Scaliger, Petavius, and
other clerical
chronologers.

The creation of
contemporary
chronology of the
ancient times in the
XVI-XVII century A.D.

The chronology of ancient and mediaeval history in its present form was created and, for the most part, concluded in a series of fundamental works of the XVI-XVII century that begins with the writings of Iosephus Iustus Scaliger (1540-1609), called “the founder of modern chronology as a science” by the modern chronologist E. Bickerman ([72], page 82). The mediaeval portrait of I. Scaliger can be seen on fig. 1.1. This is an etching from *Athena Batavia*, a book by Johannes Mercius ([35], page 25).



Fig. 1.1. Portrait of the chronologist Joseph Scaliger. The caption in [35] reads as follows: ‘Portrait of Iosephus Iustus Scaliger (1540-1609), the famous philologist and critic of the XVI-XVII century. Engraving from the book by


Johannes Mercius titled *Athena Batavia*, page 167.” Taken from [35], ill. 8.

Scaliger’s principal works on chronology are as follows:

1. Scaliger I. *Opus novum de emendatione temporum*. Lutetiac. Paris, 1583 ([1387]).
2. Scaliger I. *Thesaurum temporum*. 1606 ([1387]).

For the most part, the body of Scaliger’s work was concluded by Dionysius Petavius (1583-1652). The best-known book of the latter is titled *De doctrina temporum*, Paris, 1627 ([1337]). Figs. 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4 show the title page of

his *Rationarium Temporum*, published in 1652 ([1338]), and the titles of the first two volumes.



Figs. 1.2, 1.3, 1.4. On the left: the title page of *Rationarium Temporum* by D. Petavius, published in 1652. Mark that the Latin letters *U* and *V* were identical in XVI-XVIII century texts. On the right: the titles of the first and the

second volumes of *Rationarium Temporum*.

Taken from [1338].

Gerhard Friedrich Miller (1705-1783)
“revised” the Russian history and
chronology in the XVIII century in
accordance with Scaliger’s scheme. His
portrait can be seen on fig. 1.5. See
more about the endeavours of Miller and
his German colleagues in *Chron4*.



Fig. 1.5. Portrait of the German historian Gerhard Friedrich Miller (1705-1783). Taken from the *Russian Academy of Sciences Courier* ([129], page 880).

Let us mention the works of the XVIII-

XIX century, which contain a great array of factual chronological data, such as [1155], [1205], [1236] and [1275]. They are of great value to us since they provide a snapshot of the state of chronology during the epoch of a greater proximity to Scaliger and Petavius. This material is thus of a more primordial nature, not “painted over” by latter cosmetic layers. It must be noted that this series remains incomplete as well as several other similar chronological works. To quote the prominent contemporary chronologist E. Bickerman: *“There has been no chronological research ever conducted*

that could be called exhaustive and conforming to modern standards” ([72], page 90, comment 1).

Hence it would be correct to call the modern consensual chronology of the Classical period and the Middle Ages the Scaliger-Petavius version. We shall simply refer to it as “Scaligerian Chronology”. As it will be pointed out, this version wasn’t the only one existing in the XVII-XVIII century. Its veracity has been questioned by eminent scientists.

The ground-laying works of Scaliger and Petavius of the XVI-XVII century present the ancient chronology as a table

of dates given without any reasons whatsoever. It is declared to have be on ecclesiastical tradition. This is hardly surprising, since “history has remained predominantly ecclesial for centuries, and for the most part, was written by the clergy” ([217], page 105).

Today it is believed that the foundations of chronology were laid by Eusebius Pamphilus and Saint Hieronymus, allegedly in the IV century A.D. On fig. 1.6 we have a mediaeval painting of Eusebius Pamphilus of Caesarea dated 1455 ([140], page 80). It is worth noting that Eusebius of Caesarea is painted wearing typically

mediaeval attire of the Renaissance epoch. Most probably because he had lived in that period of time and not any earlier.



Fig. 1.6. “Eusebius of Caesarea, the Chronicler and the Companion of Constantine the Great. A fragment of the mural by Piero della Francesca in the Cathedral of St. Francisco (Frezzo, Italy). 1455” ([140], page 80). One should note that the gap between the Scaligerian dating of the life of Eusebius (the alleged IV century A.D.) and the time of the portrait’s creation exceeds a thousand years. This is most probably a result of a chronological shift by roughly 1053 years that transferred Eusebius of Caesarea, who lived in the XV century, into the phantom IV century. Taken from [140], page 80.

Despite the fact that Scaligerian history ascribes Eusebius to the IV century A.D., during the years 260-340 ([936], vol. 1, page 519), it is interesting to note that his famous work titled *The History*

of Time from the Genesis to the Nicaean Council, the so-called *Chronicle*, as well as the tractate by St. Hieronymus (Jerome) weren't discovered until very late in the Middle Ages. Apart from that, historians say that "the Greek original (of Eusebius – A. F.) is only available in fragmentary form nowadays, and is complemented by the ad libitum translation made by St. Hieronymus" ([267], page VIII, Introduction). Mark the fact that Nicephorus Callistus attempted to write the new history of the first three centuries in the XIV century, or "revise" the *History* of Eusebius, but "he could

not do more than repeat that which was written by Eusebius” ([267], page XI). However, since the work of Eusebius was only published in 1544 (see [267], page XIII), that is, much *later* than the writing of Nicephorus, one has reason to wonder: Could the “ancient” Eusebius have based his work on the mediaeval tractate by Nicephorus Callistus?

On fig. 1.7 we can see a painting by Cesare Nebbia and Giovanni Guerra that was allegedly created in 1585-1590. According to historians, it depicts a scene “of St. Jerome and his pet lion visiting the library of Eusebius (whose

Chronicle was translated by Jerome) in Caesarea” ([1374], page 45). What we see here, however, is a typically mediaeval scene of the Renaissance epoch, or maybe even the epoch of the XVI-XVII century. The library shelves are filled with books that look basically the same as those of the XVIII-XIX century, in hard covers with wide fastening straps. The artists of the XVI-XVII century have most probably painted recent mediaeval events and characters cast into the “dark ages” by later XVII-XVIII century chronologists of the Scaligerian tradition.



Fig. 1.7. Painting by Cesare Nebbia and Giovanni Guerra allegedly dating from 1585-1590. Depicts St. Jerome visiting the library of Eusebius Pamphilus in Caesarea. We see a typically mediaeval scene of the Renaissance epoch or, possibly, of an even later age.

Modern history assures us that all of this happened about a thousand years earlier, in the alleged IV century A.D. Taken from [1374], page 45.

It is assumed that Scaligerian chronology

was based on the interpretations of assorted numeric data collected from the Bible. Certain “basis dates” that were used as reference points originated as results of scholastic exercises with numbers. For instance, according to the eminent chronologist J. Usher (Usserius), the world was created on Sunday, 23 October 4004 B.C., in the small hours of the morning ([76]). Mind-boggling precision. One is to bear in mind that the “secular” chronology of the present days is largely based on the scholastic biblical chronology of the Middle Ages. E. Bickerman, a contemporary historian, is perfectly right

to note that “the Christian historians have made secular chronography serve ecclesial history... The compilation made by Hieronymus is the foundation of the entire edifice of occidental chronological knowledge” ([72], page 82).

Although “I. Scaliger, the founding father of modern chronology as a science, had attempted to reconstruct the entire tractate of Eusebius”, as E. Bickerman tells us, “the datings of Eusebius, that often got transcribed erroneously in manuscripts (! – A. F.), are hardly of any use to us nowadays” ([72], page 82).

Due to the controversy and the dubiety of all these mediaeval computations, the “Genesis dating”, for instance, varies greatly from document to document. Let us quote the main examples:

5969 B.C. – the Antiochian dating according to Theophilus, see other version below;

5508 B.C. – the Byzantine dating, also known as “The Constantinople version”;

5493 B.C. – Alexandrian, the Annian era, also 5472 B.C. or 5624 B.C.;

4004 B.C. – according to Usher, a Hebraic dating;

5872 B.C. – the so-called “dating
of the seventy interpreters”;
4700 B.C. – Samaritan;
3761 B.C. – Judaic;
3491 B.C. – according to
Hieronimus;
5199 B.C. – according to Eusebius
of Caesarea;
5500 B.C. – according to
Hippolytus and Sextus Julius
Africanus;
5515 B.C., also 5507 B.C. –
according to Theophilus;
5551 B.C. – according to Augustine
([72], page 69).

As we can see, this temporal reference

point, considered fundamental for the ancient chronology, fluctuates within the span of 2,100 years. We have only quoted the most famous examples here. It is expedient to know that there are about two hundred various versions of the “Genesis date” in existence. On fig. 1.8 you can see an ancient painting of the seventy Bible translators commonly referred to as “the seventy interpreters” today.



Fig. 1.8. Ancient miniature from the Ostrog Bible, allegedly dated 1581, showing the Bible's translators and interpreters, commonly referred to nowadays as "the 70 interpreters." It is assumed that they were responsible for dating Genesis to 5872 B.C. Taken from [623], page 165. Also see [745], Volume 9, page 17.

The "correct Genesis dating" issue was far from scholastic, and received plenty of attention in the XVII-XVIII century for good reason. The matter here is that many ancient documents date events in years passed "since Adam" or "since the Genesis". This is why the existing millenarian discrepancies between the

possible choices of this reference point substantially affect the datings of many ancient documents.

I. Scaliger together with D. Petavius were the first ones to have used the astronomical method for proving – but not examining critically, the late mediaeval version of the chronology of the preceding centuries. Modern commentators consider Scaliger to have ipso facto transformed this chronology into a “scientific” one. This “scientific” veneer proved sufficient for the chronologists of the XVII-XVIII century to put unquestioning trust in the largely rigidified chronological date grid that

they had inherited.

It is very significant that Scaligerian chronology was initially created within the paradigm of the Western European Catholic Church, which had remained in its firm control for a great amount of time. A. Oleinikov wrote, “The mediaeval theologians often tried to calculate the age of the Earth interpreting assorted data contained in the Holy Writ.” On having studied the text of the Bible, *Archbishop* Hieronymus came to the conclusion that the world was created 3,941 years before the beginning of modern chronology. His colleague Theophilus, the *Bishop of Antiochia*,

had extended this period to 5,515 years. St. Augustine had added another thirty-six years; whilst the Irish *Archbishop* James Usher, who had obviously nurtured a fondness for precise numbers, had made the assumption that the world was created in the early morning hours on 23 October 4004 B.C. ([616], page 8). Many eminent Western European chronologists of the XVI-XVII century were clergymen. I. Scaliger (1540-1609), for instance, was a theologian; Tischendorf (1815-1874), the founding father of paleography, was a Doctor of Divinity; Dionisius Petavius (1583-1652) – a Jesuit and an author of several

theological works ([82], page 320, comment 5).

Their absolute trust in the infallibility of what the ecclesial chronology was telling them determined their entire Weltanschauung. Therefore, their attitude to the data offered by other disciplines was determined by whether or not it could serve the advocacy of this a priori assumption or the other, invariably based on the mediaeval ecclesial chronology that was later baptised “scientific”.

The fact that the clerical chronologists of the Occidental church had deified the endeavours of their predecessors of the

XV-XVI century, excluded the very possibility of criticizing the foundations of chronology in any way at all, even minutely.

I. Scaliger, for instance, could not even conceive of such heresy as running a check on the chronological materials of the holy fathers (Eusebius and others): “Scaliger calls this work by Eusebius (the *Evangelical Preparation* – A. F.), *divine*” ([267], page VIII, Introduction). Trusting the authority of their predecessors unconditionally, the chronologists reacted at external criticisms very bitterly. The same I. Scaliger makes a perfect demonstration

of his attitude toward objective scientific criticisms in the following episode: “The eminent philologist Joseph de Scaliger, the author of the chronology that has received such high scientific acclaim, turned into a keen quadraturist” ([458], page 130). Let us remind that a “quadraturist” was someone who tried to build a square equalling a given circle (disc) in area, using nothing but a pair of compasses and a ruler. This mathematical problem is insoluble as a principle, which is proven by geometry. However, I. Scaliger had published a book where he claims to have proved the “true

quadrature” – which solved the problem, “The best mathematicians of the epoch – Viète, Clavius... have tried their hardest to prove to him that... his reasoning was incorrect – all in vain” ([458], page 130). The point here is that Scaliger’s erroneous “proof” made the easy corollary about the perimeter of an equilateral polygon with 196 angles being greater than that of the circle *circumscribing* it, which is, naturally, quite absurd. Nevertheless, “Scaliger and his supporters, who had a habit of defending their opinions vehemently, didn’t want to acknowledge anything... replying... with maledictions and

scornful epithets, and finally calling all the geometricians complete ignoramuses in what concerned geometry” ([458], page 130).

One might imagine how these people reacted towards attempts of analyzing their version of chronology critically.

Few are aware that Scaliger and Petavius brought chronology to “perfection” and “absolutely precise datings” quoting the year, day, month, and sometimes even the time of day for all the principal events in history of humankind. For whatever reason, modern monographies and textbooks usually only quote the years of events

according to Scaliger-Petavius, coyly omitting the month, day, and hour. It is verily a step backwards that deprives the chronology calculated in the XVII-XVIII century of its former splendour and fundamentality.

By the XIX century, the accumulated volume of chronological material had grown to the extent of inducing respect a priori by its sheer scale, so the chronologists of the XIX century saw their objective in making minor corrections and not much else.

The issue of veracity is hardly raised at all in the XX century, and the ancient chronology solidifies terminally in the

very shape and form given to it by the writings of Eusebius, Hieronymus, Theophilus, Augustine, Hippolytus, St. Clement of Alexandria, Usher, Scaliger, and Petavius. To someone in our day and age, the very thought that historians have followed an erroneous chronology for about three centuries seems preposterous, since it contradicts the existing tradition.

However, as chronology developed, specialists encountered considerable difficulties in trying to correlate the varied chronological data offered by ancient sources with the consensual Scaligerian version. It was discovered,

for instance, that Hieronymus misdates *his own time* by a hundred years ([72], page 83).

The so-called “Sassanide tradition” separated Alexander the Great from the Sassanides by an interval of 226 years, which was extended to 557 by contemporary historians ([72], page 83). In this case, the gap exceeds 300 years.

“The Jews also allocate a mere 52 years for the Persian period of their history, despite the fact that Cyrus II is separated from Alexander the Great by 206 years (according to the Scaligerian chronology – A. F.)” ([72], page 83).

The basic Egyptian chronology has also reached us through the filter of Christian chronologists: “The list of kings compiled by Manethon only survived as quotations made by the Christian authors” ([72], page 77). Some readers might be unaware that “The Oriental Church avoided using the birth of Christ as a chronological point of reference since in Constantinople the debates about the date of his birth had continued well into the XIV century” ([72], page 69).

3.

The veracity of the
Scaliger-Petavius
chronology was
questioned as early as
the XVI century

3.1. Who criticized Scaliger's
chronology and where

3.1.1. De Arcilla, Robert


*Baldauf, Jean Hardouin,
Edwin Johnson, Wilhelm
Kammeyer*

The doubts regarding the correctness of the consensual version aren't a recent phenomenon. They have quite a tradition behind them. N. A. Morozov wrote in particular that "the Salamanca University professor de Arcilla published his works *Programma Historiae Universalis* and *Divinae Florae Historicae* where he had proved that the entire history of the Classical Age was mediaeval in its origin. This is exactly the same point of view that was

shared by the Jesuit historian and archaeologist Jean Hardouin (1646-1724), who considered the Classical literature to have been written in monasteries during the preceding XVI century...

The German Privatdozent Robert Baldauf wrote his *History and its Criticisms* in 1902-1903, proving that not only ancient history, but even that of the early Middle Ages, is a forgery of the Renaissance epoch and the subsequent centuries with the use of nothing but philological arguments” ([544], volume 7, pages VII-VIII, Introduction).

You can see the title page of one of Jean Hardouin's books in fig. 1.9, and that of its translation by Edwin Johnson in fig. 1.10. Fig. 1.11 shows us the title page of one of Robert Baldauf's writings.



Figs. 1.9, 1.10, 1.11. *L-R*: The title page from one of the books by J. Hardouin, 1776. The title page from J. Hardouin's book in Edwin Johnson's English translation, 1909. The title page from one of R. Baldauf's books, 1902.

The eminent English scientist Edwin Johnson (1842-1901), the author of several remarkable critical studies of ancient and mediaeval history, gave some severe and serious criticisms of Scaligerian chronology, fig. 1.12. The main conclusion that Edwin Johnson had arrived to after many years of chronological research, was formulated thusly: “We are a lot closer in time to the Greeks and the Romans than what the chronological tables tell us” ([1214], page XXX). Edwin Johnson called for a revision of the entire edifice of the ancient and mediaeval chronology! His principal works were published in the

late XIX – early XX century ([1214] and [1215]).

THE
RISE OF ENGLISH CULTURE

BY
EDWIN JOHNSON, M.A.

AUTHOR OF
"THE RISE OF CHRISTIANISM," "THE PAULINE EPISTOLAE,"
"ANTIQUA NATIO," ETC.

"I have thought that HISTORY was the most thing lacking to the glory of your
Kingdom of England."

POPESTON VANCE, Archbishop of Wales, to Henry VIII.,
in Preface to "Anglica Historia," London, August, 1533.

"The love of my Country complements all love to it."
WILLIAM CROMWELL, "Britannia."

WITH A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE AUTHOR AND
HIS WRITINGS

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE
14, HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON
NEW YORK: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS

1904

Fig. 1.12. The title page from one of E. Johnson's books, 1904.

See more details concerning the research of Jean Hardouin, Robert Baldauf, and Wilhelm Kammeyer in the work of E. Y. Gabovitsch (Karlsruhe, Germany) quoted in Chron7, Appendix 3.

3.1.2. Sir Isaac Newton

“Isaac Newton (1642-1727), an English mathematician, mechanic, astronomer, and physicist, the creator of classical mechanics, member of the Royal Society of London since 1672 and

its president since 1703 ... developed differential and integral calculus (independently from G. Leibnitz). He discovered light dispersion and chromatic aberration, researched diffraction and interference, worked on the development of the corpuscular theory of light, made a hypothesis that combined the concepts of waves and particles, built the reflecting telescope, formulated the principal laws of classical mechanics, discovered the Gravity Law, formulated the theory of movement of celestial bodies and the founding principles of celestial mechanics” (*The Soviet Encyclopaedic*

Dictionary, Moscow, 1979, page 903). See fig. 1.13 for a portrait of Sir Isaac Newton.



Fig. 1.13. A portrait of Sir Isaac Newton. Taken

from [336], Volume 6, inset between pages 646-647.

Sir Isaac Newton occupies a special place among the critics of the Scaliger-Petavius version. He is the author of a number of profound works on chronology where he relates his conclusions regarding the inaccuracy of Scaliger's version in some of its principal parts. This research remains rather obscure for the contemporary reader despite having provoked major controversy in the past. The main chronological works of Newton's are the following ([1298]):

1. *A short Chronicle from the First Memory of Kings in Europe to the Conquest of Persia by Alexander the Great;*
2. *The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended* (fig. 1.14).

THE
CHRONOLOGY
OF
ANCIENT KINGDOMS
AMENDED.

To which is Prefix'd,
*A SHORT CHRONICLE from the First
Memory of Things in Europe, to the Conquest
of Persia by Alexander the Great.*

By Sir ISAAC NEWTON.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. TONSON in the Strand, and J. OSBORN
and T. LONGMAN in Pater-noster Row.

MDCCXXVIII.

Fig. 1.14. The title page from the book by Sir Isaac Newton called *The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended. To which is Prefix'd, A Short Chronicle from the First Memory of Things in Europe, to the Conquest of Persia by Alexander the Great* (London: J. Tonson, 1728). Taken from [1298].

Newton made a radical revision of the ancient chronology based on natural scientific ideas. Some – very few – events were *added extra age*. This is true of the legendary voyage of the Argonauts, which Newton determined to have occurred in the XIV century B.C. and not in X B.C., as was believed in his time period. However, the dating of this event is rather vague in later

chronological studies of other chronologers as well.

The new chronology offered by Sir Isaac is a lot shorter than the consensual chronology of Scaliger. Newton moved most of the events dated as preceding the epoch of Alexander the Great, forward in time, *closer to us*. The revision isn't as radical as that contained in the writings of N. A. Morozov, who had been of the opinion that the Scaligerian version of ancient chronology was only veracious starting in the IV century A.D. Let us mark that Newton did not go further in time than the B.C./A.D. mark in his research.

Contemporary historians have this to say about these works of Newton's: "They are the fruit of forty years of labour, diligent research and a tremendous erudition. Basically, Sir Isaac Newton studied all of the major literary works on ancient history and all the primary sources beginning with ancient and oriental mythology" ([619], pages 104-105).

Modern commentators invariably come to the conclusion that Sir Isaac was wrong when they compare his conclusions to the consensual Scaligerian chronology. They say that:

"Naturally, without deciphered cuneiform

and hieroglyphic writings, having no archaeological data due to the non-existence of archaeology in that age, bound by the presumed veracity of the Biblical chronology and the belief in the reality of what was told in myths, Newton's errors weren't measured in mere tens of hundreds of years – he was thousands of years off the mark, and his chronology is far from true even in what concerns the very reality of the events described. W. Winston wrote in his memoirs, 'Sir Isaac often saw the truth in mathematics intuitively, without even needing proof... But this very Sir Isaac Newton compiled a chronology... However, this chronology isn't any more convincing than the most ingenious historical novel, as I have finally proved in

my refutation thereof. O, how weak, how utterly weak even the greatest of the mortals can be in some regards' ” ([619], pages 106-107).

What did Sir Isaac suggest exactly? Basically, he had analyzed *the B.C. chronology* of Ancient Egypt and Ancient Greece. He must have lacked the time for the analysis of more recent epochs, since this tractate only got published in the last year of his life.

For instance, the contemporary consensual version of chronology ascribes the first years of reign of the Egyptian Pharaoh Menes to approximately 3000 B.C. ([1298])

Newton suggested that this event could be given a date as recent as 946 B.C. ([1298]) Thus, the shift forward in time comprises about 2000 years.

Nowadays the myth of Theseus is dated to the XV century B.C. However, Sir Isaac claimed that these events took place around 936 B.C. ([1298]) Hence, the shift of dates forward that he suggests amounts to roughly 700 years.

The famous Trojan War is dated to roughly 1225 B.C. today ([72]), but Newton claims this event to have occurred in 904 B.C. ([1298]) The shift forward here is one of approximately 330 years. Et cetera.

Newton's main conclusions may be encapsulated as follows: He moves a part of the history of Ancient Greece about 300 years forward in time, closer to us. The history of Ancient Egypt, covering a span of several hundred years according to Scaliger, that is, 3000 B.C. and on, is moved forward in time by Newton and compressed into a time period as short as 330 years, namely, 946 B.C. – 617 B.C. Newton also moves some fundamental dates of the “ancient” Egyptian history about 1,800 years forward in time ([1298]).

Sir Isaac Newton only managed to revise the dates preceding 200 B.C. His

observations were of a rather eclectic nature, and he could not find any system in these apparently chaotic re-datings.

We shall also briefly relate the publication history of Newton's work as told by the book [1141], which may lead one to certain conclusions. Newton seemed to have been wary of the plethora of complications that the publication of his tractate on chronology could lead him to. This work of his had commenced many years before 1727. The book had been re-written numerous times up until his death in 1727. It is noteworthy that the *Short Chronicle* wasn't intended for publication by its

author; however, the rumours of Newton's chronological research had spread far enough, and the Princess of Wales expressed a wish to familiarize herself with it. Sir Isaac gave her the manuscript on the condition that no third party should learn of it. The same happened with Abbé Conti (Abbot Conti), who started to lend the manuscript to interested scientists upon his return to Paris.

As a result, M. Freret translated the manuscript into French and added his own historical overview to it. This translation eventually reached the Paris bookseller G. Gavellier, who wrote

Newton a letter in May 1724 eager to publish his writing. Having received no answer, he wrote another letter in March 1725, telling Newton that he would consider Sir Isaac's taciturnity as acquiescence for the book's publication, with Freret's comments. No reply was given to that, either. Then Gavelier asked his friend in London to get a reply from Newton personally. Their meeting took place on 27 May 1725, and Sir Isaac answered in the negative. But it was too late. The book had already been published under the following title:

Abrégé de Chronologie de M. Le Chevalier Newton, fait par lui-même, et

traduit sur le manuscrit Angélois
(*With observation by M.Freret*). Edited
by the Abbé Conti, 1725.

Sir Isaac received a copy of the book
on 11 November 1725. He published a
letter in the *Philosophical Transactions*
of the Royal Society (v. 33, 1725, page
315), where he accused the Abbé of
breach of promise and publication
without the author's consent. When
Father Souciet started his attacks in
1726, Sir Isaac had announced the
preparation of a more voluminous and
detailed work on ancient chronology for
publication.

All of these events took place shortly

before Newton's death. He had sadly lacked the time for the publication of a more in-depth book, and none of its traces remain in existence. Sir Isaac died in 1727, leaving his research of ancient history unfinished.

Could all this complicated history of the *Short Chronicle*'s publication be explained by Newton's fear of groundless attacks? What was the reaction to the publication of his book?

The mid-XVIII century press saw a multitude of responses. Most of them were made by historians and philologists, and had voiced such negative opinions as "the blunders of the

honoured dilettante” in regard to Newton’s work. Only very few articles appeared that expressed support of his opinion. After the initial wave of responses subsided, the book was de facto hushed up and withdrawn from scientific circulation.

In the XIX century, François Arago, the author of the revue ([30:1]), presumed Newton’s chronological research unworthy of more than the following rather flippant remark: “By and large, Newton failed to come up with correct judgments in everything excepting mathematics and its applications... Apart from his

theological opuses, the chronology that he compiled is there to confirm our opinion – the very chronology that Freret refuted immediately upon publication.” Most probably, Arago decided not to get involved in the issue, and quoted Freret’s opinion without thinking twice about it.

Cesare Lombroso tries to bring the issue to conclusion in his notorious *Genius and Insanity* in the following manner:

“Newton, whose mind amazed the entire humanity, as his contemporaries rightly state, was yet another one to have gone senile in his old age, although the

symptoms in his case weren't quite as grave as those of the geniuses listed above. That must have been the time when he had written his *Chronology*, *Apocalypse* and *Letter to Bentley*, obscure, involved writings, quite unlike anything that he had written in his youth" ([462:1], page 63).

Similar accusations would later be addressed at N. A. Morozov, another scientist bold enough to revise chronology. They sound most peculiar in a scientific discussion, and, as we think, mask the inability to reply substantially.

3.1.3. Nikolai Alexandrovich Morozov

S. I. Vavilov wrote the following about N. A. Morozov:

“N. A. Morozov managed to combine his selfless revolutionary devotion to his people with a completely amazing dedication to scientific work. This scholarly enthusiasm and this completely unconditional passionate love for scientific research should remain an example to be followed by all scientists, young and old” (Sergei Ivanovich Vavilov, *Essays and memoirs*, Moscow: Nauka, 1981, page 284).

The first researcher of our time who had raised the issue of providing scientific basis for the consensual chronology in its fullness and quite radically was

Nikolai Alexandrovich Morozov, figs. 1.15, 1.16., 1.17. On fig. 1.18 we can see a monument to N. A. Morozov, and on fig. 1.19 – his museum home in the town of Borok in the Yaroslavl region.



Fig. 1.15, 1.16, 1.17, 1.18. *L-R*: Portraits of N. A. Morozov, the first one dated 1878. Monument to N. A. Morozov on his grave in Borok, in the Yaroslavl Region. Taken from [687] and [583].

N. A. Morozov (1854-1946) was an eminent Russian scientist and encyclopaedist whose fortune was far from easy.

Morozov's father, Peter Alexeyevich Shchepochkin, was a rich landowner and belonged to the old aristocratic Shchepochkin family, see fig. 1.20. N. A. Morozov's great-grandfather was a relation of Peter the Great. N. A. Morozov's mother was a simple serf peasant, Anna Vasilievna Morozova, whom P. A. Schepochkin married, after signing her liberty certificate. The church didn't confirm the marriage, and so the children received their mother's

surname.



Figs. 1.19, 1.20, 1.21. *L-R*: The museum home of N. A. Morozov in Borok. Taken from [583], page 223. Peter Alexeyevich Shchepochkin, father of N. A. Morozov. Anna Vasilievna Morozova, mother of N. A. Morozov. Taken from [141], pages 6-7.

At the age of twenty, N. A. Morozov joined the libertarian Narodnaya Volya movement. In 1881 he was sentenced for incarceration in Schliesselburg for life,

where he had studied chemistry, physics, astronomy, mathematics and history, all on his own. In 1905 he was let free, having spent 25 years in gaol. After having received his freedom, he had immersed himself in a vast body of scientific and pedagogical work. His *Memoirs* are of the greatest interest, see fig. 1.22. Many authors wrote about N. A. Morozov – his literary biography, for example, was written by M. A. Popovsky ([675]).



Fig. 1.22. The title page of the *Memoirs* by N. A. Morozov.

After the October revolution, Morozov became Director of the Lesgaft Institute

for Natural Scientific Studies, where he had done the major part of his famous research in ancient chronology with the use of natural scientific methods, supported by enthusiasts and the staff of the Institute.

After N. A. Morozov left his Director's office, the Institute was completely reformed, possibly with the objective of casting the important historical research conducted there by N. A. Morozov and his group into oblivion.


N. A. Morozov was made Honourable Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences (which became the USSR

Academy of Sciences in 1925), decorated with the Order of Lenin and the Red Banner of Labour. More about the body of his prominent work in chemistry and several other natural sciences can be read in such publications as [\[146\]](#), [\[147\]](#), [\[582\]](#), [\[583\]](#) and [\[584\]](#). The official reference book of the USSR Academy of Sciences published in 1945 ([\[811\]](#)) lists the Honourable Members the Academy had in 1945. There were just three – N. F. Gamaleya, N. A. Morozov, and J. V. Stalin ([\[811\]](#), pages 37-38). Nikolai Alexandrovich Morozov is described as follows: “Elected in 1932, known by his

works on a variety of astronomical, meteorological, physical, and chemical problems. Merited Scientist of the Soviet Republic of Russia. Honorary member of the Muscovite Society for Natural Studies. Lifelong member of La Société Astronomique de France. Lifelong member of the British Astronomical Association” ([811], page 37).

In 1907, N. A. Morozov published a book titled *Revelations in Storm and Tempest* ([542]) where he analyzed the dating of the New Testament Apocalypse and came to conclusions that contradicted the Scaligerian

chronology. In 1914, he published *The Prophets* ([543]), which contains a radical revision of the Scaligerian datings of the Biblical prophecies. In 1924-1932, N. A. Morozov published the fundamental work *Christ* in seven volumes ([544] see figs 1.23 and 1.24). The initial name of this opus had been *The History of Human Culture from the Natural Scientific Point of View*. It contains detailed criticisms of the Scaligerian chronology. The important fact discovered by Morozov was that the consensual Scaligerian chronology is based on an unverified concept.



Figs. 1.23, 1.24. The cover and the title page of the first volume of N. A. Morozov's oeuvre titled *Christ*, 1927, Moscow-Leningrad: The State Publishing House.

Having analyzed a great body of material, N. A. Morozov put forth and

partially proved the fundamental hypothesis that Scaliger's chronology had been expanded arbitrarily as compared to reality. This hypothesis was based on the "repetitions" that N. A. Morozov had found, namely, the texts that apparently described the same events, but are dated differently and considered unrelated in our time. The publication of this work caused vivid discussions in the press, and its repercussions can be found in contemporary literature. There had been a number of rational counter-arguments, but the critical part of *Christ* remained undisputable in its entirety.

Apparently, N. A. Morozov had been unaware of the similar works of Sir Isaac Newton and Edwin Johnson that were all but forgotten by his time. This makes the fact that many of Morozov's conclusions coincide with those of Newton and Johnson all the more amazing.

However, N. A. Morozov raised the issue as a much wider and more profound one, having encompassed the entire period up to the VI century in the frame of critical analysis, and found the need for a radical revision of datings. Despite the fact that N. A. Morozov had also failed to discover any sort of

system in the chaos of altered datings that arose, his research was performed on a higher qualitative level than Newton's analysis. N. A. Morozov was the first scientist to have possessed the clear understanding of the necessity of revising the datings of mediaeval events as well as those belonging to "ancient history". Nevertheless, N. A. Morozov did not go further than the VI century A.D. in time, considering the consensual version of the chronology of the VI-XIII century to be basically correct. We shall yet see that this opinion of his turned out to have been gravely erroneous.

Thus, the issues raised in our works

are hardly new. The fact that they recur century after century, and get voiced ever louder, shows that the problem in question does exist. And the fact that the independently suggested alterations of the ancient chronology – those of I. Newton, E. Johnson, and N. A. Morozov – are close to each other in principle is a clear witness that the solution to the problem we're studying lies somewhere in this direction.

It is worthwhile to give a brief account of the creation of Morozov's *Christ*. His ideas met vehement opposition as early as during the publication stage. N. A. Morozov had to

address Lenin as the Head of State personally in 1921 and ask him for support. V. I. Lenin had delegated the study of this issue to A. V. Lunacharsky. Let us quote Lunacharsky's reply dated 13 April 1921:

“From Lunacharsky to Lenin,
13.IV.1921,

Dear Comrade Lenin,

I have received your request in re Morozov's book *Christ* signed by Comrade Gorbunov. It would please me greatly to delegate this matter to the editing board responsible for such matters. I, for one, am familiar with the work in question. It is a perfectly preposterous thing that uses a ridiculous

demonstration to prove the date of the solar and lunar eclipses that the Gospel refers to as having accompanied the Crucifixion and occurred on Friday, that Christ had lived in the fifth century and not in the first, and uses this data to deny the existence of such historical characters as Julius Caesar, who turns out to have really been identified as Julian the Apostate, Augustus, etc., also suspecting the falsification of the writings of Cicero, Horace, etc., as really referring to the Middle Ages, etc., etc.

I like and respect Morozov a lot, but this book is so bizarre that its publication shall definitely bring harm to the name of the author and the State Publishing House.

If serious science treated Morozov's demonstration concerning the Apocalypse

with great suspicion, the book *Christ*, in its turn, can be regarded as completely absurd and based on the same scientific one-sidedness.

If you consider this reply of mine not to be competent enough, I'll be glad to hand the book over to specialists for consideration.

The People's Commissar A. Lunacharsky" ([488], pages 271-272).

Shortly afterwards, having met N. A. Morozov personally and witnessed the detailed scientific report that the scientist had made during their meeting, A. V. Lunacharsky had radically changed his mind about the book and sent the following missive to Lenin as early as

12 August 1921, in complete contradiction of his previous letter:

“From Lunacharsky to Lenin,
12 August 1921.

To the State Publishing House, with a copy to be delivered to the Committee of People’s Commissars.

Although I could not familiarize myself with the actual manuscript of Comrade Morozov’s voluminous opus *Christ and His Time*, an oral report of its contents made by the author and a demonstration of several tables made me consider its publication as a matter of considerable importance, one that is to be addressed as soon as possible.

Since the work is rather large (three volumes, fifty sheets all in all), and seeing

as how we still haven't emerged from the state of acute paper crisis, I would offer the Petersburg branch of the State Publishing House to cut the edition down to 4,000 copies at least, in order to get it published without delay.

People's Commissar of Education Lunacharsky" ([488], page 308).

The comment of the editors is also noteworthy:

“The contradiction between the two Lunacharsky's letters to Lenin dated 13 April and 12 August respectively can be explained by the fact that Lunacharsky had revised his initial reply. The complete collection of Lenin's works *erroneously* states that Lunacharsky expressed a

negative opinion of Morozov's work later on calling it non-scientific in vol. 53, page 403, comment 145" ([488], page 310).

Nevertheless, the first volume of *Christ* took three more years to be published in 1924. Morozov had to request support from the government yet again. This time it took the participation of F. E.

Dzerjinsky. Here is a fragment of F. E. Dzerjinsky's letter to Morozov dated 14 August 1924:

“Dear Nikolai Alexandrovich,

...I am prepared to provide any assistance you may need in order to get your writing published – just tell me what I have to do exactly, what obstacles need to

be removed and what people I need to talk to.

I will be most glad if I manage to be of use to you in any way at all.

14/VIII. Kindest regards, F. Dzerjinsky”.

All of the above notwithstanding, in 1932, after the publication of the seventh volume of *Christ*, Morozov’s opponents had finally succeeded in stopping the publication of his further materials on the topic.

3.1.4. Recent publications of German scientists containing criticisms of Scaligerian chronology

In the period since the publication of our works on chronology, which started to appear in 1980, several German scientists have also published the rather interesting results of their research containing a critical analysis of the Scaligerian chronology. The first of these publications appeared in 1996; the ones we consider the most noteworthy are those written by Uwe Topper ([1462] and [1463]), as well as Heribert Illig's *Was There Really a Charlemagne?* ([1208]) which claims that many documents which we ascribe to Charlemagne's epoch today are really more recent forgeries, and builds a

hypothesis that one needs to withdraw about three centuries from the mediaeval history, including that of Charlemagne's age.

It has to be said that the chronological obtruncation suggested by Heribert Illig is of a local nature; Illig and his colleagues are of the opinion that the contradictions they noticed in the Scaligerian history can be resolved by minor corrections, such as subtracting 300 years from the history of mediaeval Europe. Our works demonstrate the deficiency of such local expurgations; what we claim is that the entire edifice of the Scaligerian chronology needs a

cardinal revision in all that concerns the times preceding the XIII-XIV century A.D.

The veracity of the Scaligerian chronology of “ancient” Egypt is questioned in *When Did the Pharaohs Live?* by Gunnar Heinsohn and Heribert Illig. One has to mention that the authors fail to make so much as a passing reference to the scientific œuvres of N. A. Morozov which were published in the early XX century. Morozov’s epic body of work entitled *Christ*, which was published in 1924-1932 and questioned the entire chronology of “ancient” Egypt, pointed out the numerous “collations” of

Egyptian dynasties and reasoned the necessity of a substantial concision of the “ancient” Egyptian history. Alack and alas, there are no known translations of Morozov’s works except for the *German* text of the *Revelations in Storm and Tempest*. Despite our numerous appeals, Herbert Illig and his colleagues still refuse to recognize the existence of Morozov’s research; it was only recently that the alternative History Salon presided over by Professor E. Y. Gabovitsch finally managed to get the name of N. A. Morozov mentioned in German scientific debates.

We should also point out Gunnar

Heinsohn's *Assyrian Rulers Equalling Those of Persia* ([1185]), where certain parallels are drawn between the comparative "ancient" histories of Assyria and Persia. However, Heinsohn fails to raise the possibility of transferring the events of that age into the mediaeval epoch, leaving them in the "antediluvian" historical period, which we believe to be a mistake.

The suggestively titled *C-14 Crash* by Christian Blöss and Hans-Ulrich Niemitz ([1038]) is also interesting and contains a voluminous body of evidence used by the authors to question the feasibility of using the radiocarbon

analysis method (in its current state, at least), as well as the dendrochronological method, for the dating of historical artefacts with any degree of proficiency. Also see the bulletin [1491].

3.2. The questionable veracity of the Roman chronology and history. The hypercritical school of the XIX century

Let us give a brief account of the situation with the Roman chronology, which has played a leading role in the global chronology of the antiquity.

Fundamental criticisms of the tradition commenced as early as the XVIII century, in the Academy of Scriptures and Fine Arts that was founded in Paris in 1701 and two decades later hosted extensive discussions about the veracity of the entire Roman tradition (Pouilly, Freret, etc). The accumulated materials provided the basis for the more in-depth criticisms of the XIX century.

One of the prominent representatives of this important scientific current, later dubbed *hypercriticism*, was the well-known German historian Theodor Mommsen, who pointed out the discrepancies between various accounts

in such passages as:

“Despite the fact that Tarquin the Second had already been an adult by the time his father died, and that his reign had started thirty-nine years after that, he got inaugurated as a *young lad*.

Pythagoras, who had arrived in Italy almost an entire generation before the exile of the kings (which is supposed to have happened around 509 B.C. – A. F.) is nevertheless supposed to have been a friend of Numa Pompilius” ([538], page 876).

Historians are of the opinion that Numa died around 673 B.C. The discrepancy here reaches a century at least. To carry on quoting from T. Mommsen:

“The state ambassadors who went to the city of Syracuse in the year 262 since the foundation of Rome, had conversed with Dionysius the Senior, whose reign started *eighty-six years later*” ([538], page 876).

What we see is a deviation of about eight decades.

The Scaligerian chronology of Rome is constructed upon a most flimsy foundation indeed. The time interval between different datings of the foundation of Rome, which is a date of the greatest importance, is as large as 500 years ([538], page 876, or [579], pages 23-24).

According to Hellanicus and

Damastus, who are supposed to have lived in the IV century B.C., and whose opinion on this matter was later supported by Aristotle, Rome had been founded by Aeneas and Ulysses, and named after the Trojan woman Roma ([579], pages 23-24). Several mediaeval authors concurred with this as well; in Jean de Courcy's *Chronique de la Bouquechardièrre (Global Chronicle)*, we see a miniature notably named "Trojans Founding Cities: Venice, Cycambre, Carthage, and Rome" ([1485], pages 164, 165). The miniature can be seen in fig. 1.25. One has to remark that it represents a mediaeval

scene, and that the two Trojan kings who have arrived to inspect the building site are wearing warm fur hats with ear-flaps, qv in figs. 1.26 and 1.27.



y devant auer
 oup la reacion
 de la cite de troye
 et la maneece :
 pour qle cause
 elle fut destruite
 et qd eundrent
 ceulx qui en fa-
 rent la demolition. Et n'ou couurent
 apres par les des troyens qui estuy
 perent de celle fontaine. Et comme
 pour la cause que adontage ne estoit
 que peute de peuple en la n. partie de
 euwope y eulrent ilz plusieurs con-
 tines estuantes : y furent hitations
 C'ay plus le temps ne q fut le qrit
 de luyt ne auoit este la terre de pe-
 ple grame si non eo parties dont ne

auons prole. Et pour ce ainsi comme
 uicoms ce ouide de la destruction q fut
 en thessale pour les hautes aetines
 qui lors noirent toute celle contree si
 non le mont de panafus ou se avresta
 la nef deuchalion : y pieca la femme.
 Leffuel par le conseil de cheuola de
 esse des es de la grant mere peuple
 vent la contree. La qle mere signie la
 terre. De quoy tout le monde est vege-
 nax sans lo dominance : Doulors de na-
 ture qui tout le siecle a en trouuone-
 ment. Et pour ce que le nef destruit
 non si grande que par les frons qui
 naissent de terre et lumance qui en
 est exe ne couurent au vent na
 tuel ne par lumance soit dedesice
 C'ay en la maneece que par le tepe

Fig. 1.25. Ancient miniature from Jean de Courcy's *Global Chronicle* (*Chronique de la Bouquechardière*), titled "Trojans Founding Cities: Venice, Cycambre, Carthage, and Rome". The Trojan War and the foundation of the Italian Rome are thus made practically simultaneous, although Scaligerian chronology separates these events by 500 years. Taken from [1485], ill. 201.



Figs. 1.26, 1.27. Close-ups of the miniature. A curious detail is the warm fur hat with ear-flaps on the head of one of the Trojan kings.

Thus, the foundation of Rome occurs

immediately after the Trojan War which both Aeneas and Ulysses took part in. But in the consensual chronology of Scaliger, the interval between the Trojan War, which allegedly took place in the XIII century B.C., and the foundation of Rome, which is said to have occurred in the VIII century B.C., is 500 years. This means one of the following:

- the foundation of Rome took place 500 years later than it is generally thought;
- the Trojan War occurred 500 later; or
- the chronographers are deliberately lying about Aeneas and Ulysses

founding Rome.

Also, what happens to Romulus in this scenario? Could Romulus have been another name of Ulysses? A lot of questions arise, as you can see, and they only increase in number once we start delving further in.

A propos, according to a different version, the city was named by Romus, the son of Ulysses and Circe. Could this mean that Romus (or Remus, the brother of Romulus) was the son of Ulysses? This would be impossible within the paradigm of Scaligerian chronology, naturally.

The historian B. Niese has the

following to say about it:

“Rome, as well as many other Italian cities, was considered to have been founded by the heroes of Greece and Troy that wound up in those parts – there is a variety of legends to prove it. The most ancient one, which was quoted by Hellanicus and Damastus as early as the IV century B.C., and later by Aristotle, claims that the City was founded by Aeneas and Ulysses, and received its name from the Trojan woman Roma... Another version suggests Romus, the son of Ulysses and Circe, to have been its founder” ([579], page 23).

Let us reiterate that there are about 500 years separating this date from the

consensual one.

Such tremendous fluctuations in the determination of a date as important as that of the Foundation of the City (Rome) affect the datings of a great number of documents that use it as a temporal reference point. The well-known *History* by Titus Livy is one of them. Actually, the identification of the City with the Italian Rome is one of the hypotheses of the Scaligerian chronology. The possibility that the City can be identified as the famous *Rome upon the Bosporus*, or Constantinople, also known as *Czar-Grad*, or the City of the Kings, cannot be excluded.

By and large, historians are of the opinion that “the traditional Roman history has reached us via the works of a mere handful of authors, the most fundamental one doubtlessly being the historical opus by Titus Livy” ([719], page 3). It is believed that Titus Livy was born around 59 B.C., and described a 700-year period of Roman history. 35 books survived out of the original 144. The first publication of his writings took place in 1469, and was based *on a manuscript of unknown origin currently lost* ([719], page 3). The discovery of a manuscript with five more works occurred in Hessen some

time later ([544]).

T. Mommsen wrote:

“In what concerns... the global chronicle, everything was a lot worse... The development of the historical science gave hope for traditional history to be verified by documents and other dependable sources, but the hope was buried in complete frustration. The more research was conducted and the deeper it went, the more obvious the difficulties in writing a critical history of Rome became” ([539], page 512).

Furthermore, Mommsen tells us that:

“...*the numeric inveracities* have been systematic in his works [referring to Valerio Ancyrate – A. F.] until the

contemporary historical period... He [Alexander Polyhistor – A. F.] gave an example of putting the missing five hundred years that had passed since Troy fell and until Rome had been founded into chronological perspective [we have to remind the reader that according to a chronological version that differs from the consensual, Rome was founded immediately after the Fall of Troy ([579], pages 23-24) – A. F.] ...having filled this period with a list of ghostly rulers, just like the ones that were used widely by the chronographers of Egypt and Greece; apparently, he was the one who brought the kings Aventinus and Tiberinus, as well as the Albanian clan of Sylvians, into existence. The descendants didn't miss their opportunity to invent first names and

periods of reigning – they even painted portraits for better representation” ([539], pages 513-514).

These criticisms are also reviewed by Niese ([579], pages 4-6).

Theodor Mommsen was far from being the only scientist to suggest the revision of these most important dates from the “ancient times”.

A detailed account of what the historians later labelled the “ultra-sceptical stance” – the version questioning the veracity of the chronology of the “Regal Rome,” as well as our entire knowledge of the first five centuries of Roman history can be

found in [92] and [498]. The problems inherent in making the Roman documents concur with the chronology of Scaliger are related in [1481].

According to the historian N. Radzig:

“The matter here is that the Roman manuscripts have not survived until our times, so all of our presumptions are based on whatever the Roman annalists have to tell us. But even here... we run into major difficulties, the principal one being that even the annalist material is represented very poorly” ([719], page 23).

The Great Annals of Rome have perished ([512], pages 6-7). It is assumed that the Roman *fasti* gave

yearly chronological lists of all the civil servants of ancient Rome. These tables could theoretically provide for a trustworthy chronological skeleton of sorts.

However, the historian G. Martynov inquires:

“How do we make this all concur with the *constant controversy* that we encounter in almost every text of Livy, in the names of the consuls, their frequent omission, among other things, and a *complete laissez-faire attitude to the choice of names?* ... How do we make it correspond with the names of the military tribunes? *The fasti are literally mottled with errors and distortions that one cannot make*

heads or tails of. Livy himself was already aware of how *flimsy* this foundation of his chronology had been” ([512], pages 6-7, 14).

G. Martynov sums up with the following:

“Neither Diororus nor Livy possess a correct chronology... we cannot trust the fasti, which tell us nothing about who was made consul in which year, or the cloth writings that led Licinius Marcus and Tubero to contradictory conclusions. The most trustworthy documentation is the kind that becomes identified as much more recent forgeries after in-depth analysis” ([512], pages 20, 27-28).

It is thus somewhat disconcerting to hear the modern chronologer E. Bickerman assure us of the following: “Since we possess full lists of Roman consuls for 1050 years... the Julian dating for each one of them can be deduced easily, given that the ancient datings are veracious” ([72], page 76). The close-tongued implication is made that we possess a definite trustworthy Julian dating of the foundation of Rome, despite the fact that the 500-year fluctuations of this date affect the entire consul list, as well as the whole history of “ancient” Rome based on this list.

The actual monograph of E.

Bickerman ([72]) also sadly fails to contain so much as a hint of a *justification* for the fundamental dates in the “ancient” chronology. Instead of relating the dating basics, the book just offers a number of individual examples that explicitly or implicitly refer to the *a priori known* scheme of the consensual Scaligerian chronology.

4.

The problems in establishing a correct chronology of “ancient” Egypt

The significant discrepancies between the chronological data offered by the ancient sources and the global chronology of the ancient times as devised in the XVII century arose in other areas as well. For instance, the

establishment of the Egyptian chronology presented some substantial difficulties, since a great many documents contain chronological contradictions. Let us examine the correlation between the classical *History* by Herodotus, and the Scaligerian chronology.

For instance, in his consecutive and coherent account of Egyptian history, Herodotus calls Cheops *the successor* of Rhampsinitos ([163], 2:214, page 119). The modern commentator will immediately “correct” in the following manner: “Herodotus creates confusion in chronology of Egypt – Rhampsinitos (Ramses II) was a king of the XIX

dynasty (1345-1200 B.C.), whereas Cheops belonged to the IV (2600-2480 B.C.)” ([163], page 513, comment 136).

The discrepancy here equals 1200 years, no less. Just think of what the figure implies and of its sheer value: *twelve hundred years*. Let us carry on. According to Herodotus, Asychis was succeeded by Anysis ([163], 2:136-137, page 123). Modern commentary is also rash to tell us that “Herodotus *leaps* from the end of the IV dynasty (about 2480 B.C.) to the beginning of the Ethiopian reign in Egypt (about 715 B.C.)” ([163], page 514, comment 150).

The leap is one of 1800 years.

Eighteen hundred years!

In general, it turns out that “The chronology of kings given by Herodotus does not concur with that found in the fragments of Manetho’s list of kings” ([163], page 512, comment 108). As a rule, the chronology of Herodotus is much shorter than the Scaligerian version. The time intervals between kings according to Herodotus are often thousands of years shorter than corresponding periods as given by Manethon.

The *History* of Herodotus contains a great number of “minor errors”, those of 30-40 years; however, they only come to

existence as a result of attempts to fit his *History* into the Scaligerian chronology. We quote a few of the numerous examples of such occurrences. The modern commentator tells us that “Herodotus confuses king Sesostris with the king Psammetix I” ([163], page 512). Also: “Pittacus could not have met Croesus in 560 B.C. [by the way, Herodotus does not indicate the date in such terms – A. F.], since he died in 570 B.C.” ([163], page 502). Another event related by Herodotus is commented upon thusly: “It is an error made by Herodotus... Solon could not have met Croesus” ([163], page 502).

But how can this be true? Herodotus devotes an entire page to relating the interactions between Croesus and Solon ([163], 1:29-31, page 19). Scaligerian chronology, on the other hand, tells us no such interactions ever took place.

The commentators also accuse Herodotus of dating solar eclipses incorrectly ([163], pages 504, 534); and so on, and so forth.

We should note that the choice of one chronological version from several contradicting ones is far from simple. There had been a conflict between the so-called *short* and *long* chronologies of Egypt that were developed in the XIX

century. The short chronology is the one currently used, but it still contains a great many deep contradictions which remain unresolved.

The most prominent German Egyptologist, H. Brugsch, wrote:

“When the reader inquires about whether any epochs and historical moments concerning the Pharaohs can be considered to possess a finite chronological assessment, and when his curiosity makes him turn to the tables compiled by a great variety of scientists, he will be surprised to find himself confronted with a large number of opinions on the chronological calculations of the Pharaoh era belonging to the

representatives of the newest school. For instance, the German scientists date the ascension of Menes, the first Egyptian Pharaoh, to the throne as follows:

Boeckh dates this event to 5702 B.C.,
Unger – to 5613 B.C.,
Brugsch – to 4455 B.C.,
Lauth – to 4157 B.C.,
Lepsius – to 3892 B.C.,
Bunsen – to 3623 B.C.

The difference between the two extreme datings is *mind-boggling*, since it amounts to 2079 years... The most fundamental research conducted by competent scientists for the verification of the chronological sequence of the Pharaohs' reigns and the order of dynastical succession, had also proved the

necessity of allowing for *simultaneous* and *parallel* reigns that would greatly reduce the summary reigning time of the thirty Manetho's dynasties. Despite all the scientific discoveries made in this area of Egyptology, the numeric data condition remains extremely unsatisfactory to this day [late XIX century – A. F.]” ([99], pages 95-97).

The situation hasn't improved to the present day. Modern tables date the beginning of the reign of Menes differently, to “approximately 3100 B.C.,” “roughly 3000 B.C.,” etc. The fluctuation span for this date amounts to 2700 years. If we consider other opinions – those of the French

Egyptologists, for instance ([544], vol. 6), the situation becomes even more complex:

Champollion gives the dating as 5867 B.C.,

Lesueur – as 5770 B.C.,

Mariette – as 5004 B.C.,

Chabas – as 4000 B.C.,

Meyer – as 3180 B.C.,

Andrzejewski – as 2850 B.C.,

Wilkinson – as 2320 B.C.,

Palmer – as 2224 B.C., etc.

The discrepancy between the datings of Champollion and Palmer equals *three thousand six hundred forty-three*

years. No commentary is needed, really.

We discover that, generally,
“Egyptology, which had poured some light over the perpetual darkness that had covered the ancient age of Egypt, only came into existence 80 years ago,” as Chantepie de la Saussaye wrote at the end of the XIX century ([965], page 950). He also said that “*it has been the private domain of a very few researchers ... alack and alas, the results of their research have been popularized in too much haste...* Thus, many *erroneous views* had come into existence, which resulted in the inevitable sobering when Egyptology

became a lot less vogue and the *excessive trust* in the results of the research *was lost*... To this day, the construction of the Egyptian chronology remains impossible” ([966], pages 97-98; [965], page 95).

The situation with the list of kings compiled by Sumerian priests is even more complex. “It was a historical skeleton of sorts, one that resembled our chronological tables... But, sadly, this list was of little utility... By and large, the chronology of the king list makes no sense,” according to the prominent archaeologist L. Wooley ([154], page 15). Furthermore, the “*dynastical*

sequences have been set arbitrarily” ([154], page 107).

We see that the great antiquity ascribed to these lists today contradicts modern archaeological information. Let us give just one example that we consider representative enough.

Telling us about the excavations of what we consider to be the most ancient royal Sumerian sepulchres, dated roughly to the *third millennium before Christ*, Wooley mentions a series of findings of golden toiletry, which “was of Arabic origin and belonged to the early XIII century A.D., according to one of the best experts in the field.” Wooley

patronizingly calls the expert's mistake "a forgivable one, since no one had thought such advanced art could have existed in the third millennium before Christ" ([154], page 61).

Unfortunately, the development of the entire critical concept and the propagation of the hypercritical current of the late XIX – early XX century froze, due to the sheer lack of objective statistic methods at the time, ones that could provide for the independent and objective verification of the previous chronological identifications.

5.

The problem in dating
the “ancient”
sources. Tacitus and
Poggio. Cicero and
Barzizza. Vitruvius and
Alberti

The framework of the global Scaligerian
chronology was constructed as a result
of the analysis of the chronological

indications given by the ancient sources. It is natural that the issue of their origin should be of interest in this respect. Modern historiography manifests the paucity of evidence in what concerns the genesis of such “ancient” manuscripts. The general observation is made that the overwhelming majority of these documents surfaced during the Renaissance epoch that allegedly superseded the “dark ages.” The discovery of manuscripts often happened under circumstances that forbade the analysis which could allow the critical dating of such findings.

In the XIX century two prominent

historians, Hochart and Ross, published the results of their research proving that the famous “ancient” Roman *History* by Cornelius Tacitus was really written by the well-known Italian humanist Poggio Bracciolini ([21], [1195], and [1379]). The publications occurred in the years 1882-1885 and 1878; readers may turn their attention to [21], which covers this problem exhaustively. We should just note that we deem the *History* by Tacitus to be an edited original – that is, a partial forgery and not a complete one. However, the events related therein have been misdated and transposed far back in time.

The history of the discovery of Tacitus' books really provokes a great many questions ([21]). It was Poggio who discovered and published the opuses of Quintillian, Valerius Flaccus, Asconius Pedianus, Nonius Marcellus, Probus, some tractates by Cicero, Lucretius, Petronius, Plautus, Tertullian, Marcellinus, Calpurn Seculus, etc. ([21]) The circumstances of these discoveries and their datings have never been related in detail. See more about the history of Tacitus' books in *Chron1*, chapter 7.

In the XV century famous humanists such as Manuel Chrysolorus, Gemisto

Plethon, Bessarion of Nicaea and some others, came to Italy. They were the first ones to familiarize Europe with the achievements of the “ancient Greek thought.” Byzantium gave the West almost all of the known “ancient” Greek manuscripts. Otto Neugebauer wrote that “the major part of the manuscripts that our knowledge of the Greek science is based upon consists of Byzantine copies made 500-1500 years after the death of their authors” ([571], page 69).

According to Scaligerian history ([120]), the entire bulk of the “Classical ancient” literature only surfaced during the Renaissance. In most cases, detailed

analysis shows us that the obscurity of the literature's origins and the lack of documentation concerning its passage through the so-called "Dark Ages" leads one to suspect that none of these texts had really existed before the dawn of the Renaissance ([544]).

For instance, the oldest copies of the so-called incomplete collection of Cicero's texts are said to have been made in the IX-X century A.D.

However, one instantly finds out that the original of the incomplete collection "had perished a long time ago" ([949]).

In the XIV-XV century there is a surge of interest in Cicero, so:

‘Finally, about 1420 the Milanese professor Gasparino Barzizza... decided to undertake a rather precarious endeavour of filling the gaps in the incomplete collection with his own writings for the sake of consequentiality [! – A. F.]. However, before he could finish this volume of work, a miracle occurred: a forlorn manuscript with the complete text of all the rhetorical works of Cicero’s becomes unearthed in a parochial Italian town by the name of Lodi... Barzizza and his students eagerly embrace the new discovery, arduously decipher its ancient [presumably XIII century – A.F.] script, and finally produce a readable copy. Subsequent copies constitute the actual ‘complete collection.’... Meanwhile, the irrecoverable happens: the original of the

collection, the manuscript of Lodi, becomes abandoned since no one wants to confront the textual difficulties it presents, and finally gets sent back to Lodi, *where it disappears without a trace*: nothing is known of what happened to the manuscript since 1428. The European philologists still lament the loss.” ([949], pages 387-388)

Incidentally, the reverse or so-called Arabic reading of the name Barzizza gives TsTsRB without vocalisations, which is close to the consonant root of the name Cicero, TsTsR.

Figs. 1.28 and 1.29 show two ancient miniatures from a book by Cicero that was allegedly published in the late XV

century ([1485], page 162). In fig. 1.28 Cicero is portrayed from the left, writing the tractate *On the Old Age*. In fig. 1.29 Cicero is depicted from the right side, penning out the tractate *On Friendship*. We see a typically mediaeval setting. Cicero and his interlocutors are wearing mediaeval clothes, which means that the author of the miniatures (in the XV century or later) apparently didn't doubt Cicero to have been his historical contemporary.



Fig. 1.28. Ancient miniature allegedly dating from the XV century, depicting the “ancient” Cicero as a mediaeval writer. Modern commentary: “Cato, with Scipio and Lelius standing in front of him. Cicero can be seen on the left, working on his tractate *On the Old Age*” ([1485], page 163). The entire setting is typically mediaeval. Taken from [1485], page



Fig. 1.29. Ancient miniature allegedly dated XV century depicting the “ancient” Cicero and other “ancient” characters in a typically mediaeval setting. The modern commentary reads: “Lelius (on the left), Ennius, and Scaevola (centre); Cicero is seen composing

his tractate *On Friendship*” ([1485], page 163).

De vita XII Caesarum by Caius Suetonius is also only available as relatively recent copies. All of them hail back to the only “ancient manuscript” ([760]), that is presumed to have been in Einhard’s possession in the alleged year 818 A.D. His *Vita Caroli Magni* is supposed to represent a diligent copy of the biographical schemes of Suetonius today ([760], pp. 280-281). The original document, known as the *Fulda Manuscript*, did not reach our time, and neither did the first copies ([760], p. 281). The oldest of Suetonius’ copies is

hypothetically the IX century text that was only brought to light in the XVI century. Other copies are dated to the post-XI century epoch in the Scaligerian chronology.

The fragments from *De viris illustribus* by Suetonius also appeared very late. The alleged dating of the latest fragment is the IX century A.D.:

“This manuscript was discovered by Poggio Bracciolini in Germany in 1425... The Hersfeld Manuscript did not survive (nothing but several pages from the Tacitus part remained), but about 20 of its copies did – those were made in Italy in the XV century.” ([760], page 337)

The dating of the “ancient” sources was performed in the XVI-XVII century out of considerations that are perfectly nebulous to us nowadays.

De Architectura by Vitruvius was discovered as late as 1497 – according to N. A. Morozov ([544], vol. 4, page 624), the astronomical part of the book quotes the periods of heliocentric planetary circulations with the utmost precision! Vitruvius, an architect who is supposed to have lived in the I-II century A.D., knew these periods better than Copernicus the astronomer! Furthermore, his error in what concerns the circulation of Saturn differs from the

modern value of the period by a ratio of 0.00007. The error ratio for Mars is 0.006, and a mere 0.003 for Jupiter, q.v. in the analysis ([544], vol. 4, pages 625-626).

We should mark the magniloquent parallels between the books of the “ancient” Vitruvius and those of Alberti, the prominent humanist of the XV century ([18]), see fig. 1.30. One cannot fail to notice a certain semblance of the names Alb(v)erti and Vitruvius, bearing in mind the frequent inflexion of the sounds “b” and “v.” Alberti (1414-1472) is known as a prominent architect, the author of the fundamental theory of

architecture that is very similar to the theory of the “ancient” Vitruvius ([18], pages 3-4). As well as the “ancient” Vitruvius, the mediaeval Alberti was the author of a voluminous tractate that included mathematical, optical, and mechanical knowledge, as well as from his theory of architecture.



Fig. 1.30. Leon Battista Alberti. Self-portrait.
Bronze medallion from around 1430.
Washington, National Gallery. Taken from
[18], page 160.

The title of the mediaeval opus of Alberti's, *The Ten Books on Architecture*, >coincides with its “ancient analogue” by Vitruvius. Nowadays it is supposed that the “ancient” Vitruvius had been “his ultimate ideal that he emulated in the creation of his tractate” ([18], page 152). Alberti's volume is written “in an archaic manner,” accordingly. The specialists have long ago compiled tables comparing fragments of the works

by Alberti and Vitruvius which sometimes coincide word for word. Historians explain this fact in the following manner: “all of these numerous parallels... unveil the Hellenistic-Roman atmosphere that his thoughts evolved in” ([18], page 89).

So, the book of the “ancient” Vitruvius fits into the mediaeval atmosphere and ideology of the XV century A.D. absolutely organically. Furthermore, the majority of Alberti’s mediaeval constructions are “an emulation of the ancient style” ([18], pages 165, 167, 173). He creates a palace “made to resemble a Roman

amphitheatre in its entirety” ([18], page 179).

So, the leading mediaeval architect fills Italian towns with “ancient” edifices that are nowadays considered an emulation of the Classical age – but this by no means implies they were considered as such in the XV century. The books are also written in the manner that will be made archaic much later. *It is only after all of this*, in 1497 A.D., that the book of the “ancient architect Vitruvius” appears, occasionally coinciding with a similar book of the mediaeval Alberti word for word. One feels that the architects of the XIV-XV

century did not consider their endeavours to be an “emulation” of the Classical Age – they *were* the Classical Age. The emulation theory was to evolve much later, in the works of the Scaligerite historians, who were forced to explain the numerous parallels between the Classical Age and the Middle Ages.

One observes a similar situation with scientific literature. It would be expedient to remind the reader of how the acquaintance of the European scientists with the works of *Euclid*, *Archimedes*, and *Apollonius* occurred, since, as we can see, the Middle Ages

were the time when the “revival” of the “achievements of ancient science” took place.

M. Y. Vygotsky, an expert in the history of science, writes that “*not a single solitary copy of Euclid’s Elements has reached our times... the oldest manuscript we know of is a copy made in 888 ... there is a large number of manuscripts that date from the X-XIII century*” ([321], page 224). Fig. 1.31 shows a page from a deluxe edition of Euclid’s *Geometry* dated 1457 ([1374], page 103). It contains a picture of a “panoramic view of Rome.” It is most remarkable that the book by the

“ancient” Euclid contains a picture of the *mediaeval* Rome and not the “ancient” one. One can clearly see a *Christian Gothic cathedral* right in front. The commentators say that “such Christian monuments as Ara Coeli are depicted here” ([1374], page 103). One gets a clear implication that Euclid was really a mediaeval author.



Fig. 1.31. A panoramic view of Rome from the “ancient” *Geometry* by Euclides, from an edition allegedly dated 1457. We see mediaeval Rome, a Gothic Christian cathedral, etc. Taken from [1374], page 103.

I. G. Bashmakova, an expert in the history of mathematics informs us that even before the publication of the Latin translation of the *Arithmetica* by the “ancient” Diophantus, the European scientists “have been using the algebraic methods of Diophantus, remaining unaware of his works” ([250], page 25). I. G. Bashmakova assesses the situation as “somewhat paradoxical.” The first edition of the *Arithmetica* is dated to

1575 A.D. If Ptolemy's *Almagest* was instantaneously continued by Copernicus – let us remind the reader that the surge of interest in the *Almagest*'s publication immediately preceded the era of Copernicus, q.v. in detail in *Chron3* – Diophantus' opus must have been continued by Fermat (1601-1665).

The history of both manuscripts and printed editions of the “ancient” Archimedes follows the pattern already known to us. According to I. N. Veselovsky, all of the modern editions of Archimedes have been based on the *lost* manuscript of the XV century, and the Constantinople palimpsest that was

found as late as 1907. It is assumed that the first manuscripts of Archimedes reached Europe quite late, in 1204. The first translation is supposed to have been made in 1269, and the complete text found in 1884 – *the XIX century*. The first printed edition allegedly appeared in 1503, and the first Greek edition – only in 1544. The “works of Archimedes entered scientific circulation after that” ([40], pages 54-56).

On fig. 1.32 you can see an ancient portrait of Archimedes from his book *Opera* dating to the alleged XV century. We see a typical mediaeval scientist in his study. The commentators couldn't

fail to have marked this: “The study is represented in the Renaissance fashion” ([1229], page 87).



Fig. 1.32. Ancient miniature depicting the “ancient” Archimedes as a mediaeval scientist. Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Urb. Lat. 261, fol. 1r. Taken from [1229], page 87.

Conical Sections by the “ancient” Apollonius was not published until 1537. Furthermore, “Kepler, who was the first to discover the significance of conical sections (ellipses) in astronomy, didn’t live to see the publication of the complete works of Apollonius. The next three books... were first published in a Latin translation [a translation yet again! – A. F.] in 1631.” ([740], page 54)

So, the body of work of the “ancient” Apollonius only got to be published in

its entirety after the discovery of the objects that this “ancient” tractate deals with, in Kepler’s epoch.

By the way, could the works of “the ancient Apollonius” just be an edited version of the *Pole* Copernicus? The name Apollonius is almost identical to *Polonius* – a *Pole*, a native of Poland, or *Polonia*. The astronomer Copernicus (1473-1543) was the immediate precursor of the astronomer Kepler (1571-1630).

6.

Timekeeping in the
Middle Ages. Historians
discuss the “chaos
reigning in the
mediaeval datings.”
Peculiar mediaeval
anachronisms

The Scaligerian chronological version
was far from being the only one. It

competed with versions that were significantly different. Bickerman mentions the “chaos reigning in the mediaeval datings” ([72], page 73). Furthermore, the analysis of ancient documents shows us that old concepts of time were substantially different from modern ones.

“Before the XIII-XIV century the devices for time measurement were a rarity and a luxury. Even the scientists didn’t always possess them. The Englishman Valcherius... was lamenting the lack of a clock that afflicted the precision of his observations of a lunar eclipse in 1091.” ([1461], page 68)

“The clocks common for mediaeval Europe were sundials, hourglasses, and water clocks, or *clepsydrae*. However, sundials only were of use when the weather was good, and the *clepsydrae* remained a scarcity” ([217], page 94). In the end of the IX century A.D., candles were widely used for timekeeping. The English King Alfred took them along on his journeys and ordered them to be burned one after the other ([217], page 94). The same manner of timekeeping was used in the XIII-XIV century, in the reign of Charles V, for instance.

“The monks kept count of time by the amount of holy book pages or psalms

they could read in between two observations of the sky... For the majority, the main timekeeping medium was the tolling of the church bells” ([217], page 94). One is to bear in mind that astronomical observations require a chronometer that possesses a second hand, while we learn that “even after the discovery and the propagation of mechanical chronometers in Europe, they *had been lacking the minute hand for a long time*” ([217], page 95).

It has to be said that the ultra-sophisticated chronological Cabbala developed in the Middle Ages contradicts this imprecision of temporal

observation. For instance:

“The very periods used for measuring time on Earth... acquire an entirely different duration... when used for measuring the Biblical events... Augustine equalled every Genesis day to a millennium [! – A. F.], thus attempting to define the duration of the history of humankind.” ([217], pages 109-110)

Such an “inherent trait of the mediaeval historiography as its anachronistic propensity” is of importance to us.

“The past is described in the same categories as the contemporary epoch... the Biblical and the ancient characters wear mediaeval attire... a mediaeval

moralist ascribes “courteousness” to the ancient Romans, which was a purely knightly virtue... The epochs of the Old and the New Testament are not put in a direct temporal sequence... The fact that the portals of mediaeval cathedrals portray Old Testament kings and patriarchs together with the ancient sages and evangelical characters unravels the anachronistic attitude to history like nothing else... In the end of the XI century the crusaders were certain they came to punish the actual executioners of the Saviour, and not their offspring.” ([217], pages 117-118)

This fact is significant enough, and we shall come back to it later on.

Modern historians base their

observations on the Scaligerian chronology, believing that the mediaeval authors had “*attained a state of great confusion in what concerned both concepts and epochs*” due to their alleged ignorance, and that they had confused the ancient Biblical epoch with the Mediaeval one. Mediaeval painters, for instance, kept portraying the Biblical and the “ancient” characters in typically mediaeval costumes. However, another point of view is also viable, one that differs from the traditional “love for anachronisms” explanation. Namely, that all of the statements made by the mediaeval chronographers and artists

may have reflected reality, and we consider them to be anachronistic because we follow the erroneous Scaligerian chronology.

The Scaligerian chronological version only managed to immortalize one mediaeval chronological concept out of many. Other versions previously coexisted with the consensual chronology.

For instance, it was assumed that the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation in the X-XIII century A.D. *was the immediate descendant* of the “ancient” Roman Empire that is alleged to have existed in the VI century A.D.,

according to the Scaligerian version ([270], vol. 1, page 16). Mark the repercussions of the discussion that appears very odd in our time:

“Petrarch... made the statement that he was supposed to have based on a number of philological and psychological observations, that the privileges granted by Nero Caesar to the *House of Austrian Dukes* [in the XIII century A.D.! – A. F.] – were fake. It needed proof in those days” ([270], vol. 1, page 32).

For the modern historian [270], the thought that the “ancient” Caesar and Nero were the contemporaries of a

mediaeval Austrian house of dukes that had only commenced its reign in 1273 A.D., that is, about 1200 years after Caesar and Nero – is naturally a preposterous one. However, as we see, the mediaeval opponents of Petrarch were of a different opinion, since it “needed proof” qv above.

E. Priester makes the following observation in re the same notorious documents: “All the interested parties were perfectly aware that the documents were blatant and shameless forgeries [such is the modern interpretation of the fact – A. F.], and nevertheless politely shut their eyes on this circumstance”

([691], page 26). An abnormally large number of “anachronisms” that transpose ancient events into the epoch of the XI-XIV century is contained in the mediaeval German chronicles and texts. Detailed reference may be obtained from [469].

The reader must be accustomed to believing the famous gladiator fights only occurred “in the distant ancient age”. This is not the case, however. V. Klassovsky in [389], having told us of the gladiator fights in the “ancient” Rome, proceeds to add that *these fights took place in the mediaeval Europe of the XIV century as well!* For instance,

he mentions the gladiator fights in Naples around 1344 A.D., which were attended by Johanna of Naples and Andrew of Hungary ([389], page 212). These mediaeval fights *ended with the death of one of the fighters*, exactly the way they did in the “ancient” times ([389]).

7.

The chronology and the dating of Biblical texts

The datings of religious sources are virtually woven out of obscurity and confusion. The Biblical chronology and datings are of a very vague nature, since they are based on the authority of late Mediaeval theologians. The historians write the following:

“The true history of the origins of the books comprising the New Testament also

fails to concur with the one backed by the church... The order of the New Testament books [some of them – A. F.] that is used nowadays is the direct opposite of the one set by the ecclesial tradition... The real names of the authors of mediaeval books... remain unknown.” ([444], page 264)

As we shall learn, the consensual point of view about the Old Testament books *preceding* those of the New Testament also causes many doubts, and contradicts the results obtained by modern empirical-statistical dating methods. One should also consider the issue of the age of the Biblical manuscripts that have reached our time. They turn out to be of

mediaeval origin.

“The oldest more or less complete copies of the [Greek] Bible are the manuscripts of Alexandria, Vatican, and Mt. Sinai... All three manuscripts are dated [palaeographically; that is, with such an ephemeral concept as handwriting style used as a basis – A. F.] to the second half of the IV century A.D. The codex language is Greek... The least is known about the Vatican codex – nobody knows how the artefact manifested in Vatican around 1475... The Alexandrian codex is known to have been given to the English king Charles I by the Patriarch Cyril Lucaris in 1628...” ([444], pages 267-268)

The codex of Mt. Sinai was only

discovered in the XIX century by K. Tischendorf ([444], pages 268-270).

So, the three oldest codices of the Bible only surface after the XV century A.D. The reputation of their antiquity was created by the authority of K. Tischendorf, who had based his research on the style of handwriting. However, the very idea of palaeographical dating apparently *implies the existence of a known global chronology* of other documents and thus cannot be regarded as an independent dating method in any way. What we know for certain is that the history of these documents can be traced as far back as 1475 A.D.; in other

words, no other more or less complete “ancient” Greek Bibles exist [444].

Among separate Biblical books, the oldest ones are considered to be those of Zechariah and Malachi, dated to the alleged VI century A.D., also palaeographically ([444]). “The most ancient Biblical manuscripts are in Greek” ([444], page 270).

There are no Hebraic manuscripts of the Bible predating the IX century A.D. (!) in existence, although those of a more recent time, primarily the middle of the alleged XIII century A.D., are kept in many national libraries. The oldest Hebraic manuscript is a fragment of the

Books of Prophets, and it is dated to 859 A.D. One of the two second oldest manuscripts “is dated to 916 A.D. and contains the Books of the Prophets; the other is dated to 1008 A.D. and contains the text of the Old Testament.” ([444], page 270)

However, the first manuscript was dated to 1228 by the scribe. The so-called Babylonian punctuation of letters given here allows this text to be dated by the Seleucid Era, which gives us 916 A.D. However, there are no serious foundations for such a statement, and it is hence possible that the dating was given in years since Christ ([543], pp.

263-264), in which case the manuscript would belong to the XIII century and not the X.

The oldest Hebraic document containing the complete Old Testament can be ascribed to the alleged year 1008 A.D. ([444], page 270).

It is supposed that the Biblical canon was agreed upon by the Laodician Council in 363 A.D., but no edicts of this council remain in existence, and the same concerns the previous councils [765], page 148. The canon was really made official by the new Trident Council called in 1545, the epoch of the Reformation, and continued until 1563.

In fig. 1.33 we can see a painting of one of the council's sessions by Titian.




Fig. 1.33. The Trident Council (1545-1563). A painting by Titian. Kept in the Louvre, Paris.
Taken from [\[328\]](#), page 238.

A great many books were destroyed by the edict of the Trident Council – the ones considered apocryphal, namely, the *Chronicles of the Judaic and Israeli Kings* ([765]). *We shall never be able to read these books*, but there is one thing that we can be perfectly certain of. They were destroyed, since they had described history differently from the books approved by the winning faction of Scaligerite historians. We should emphasize that “there were a lot more apocryphal opuses, than those... certified canonical” ([471], page 76), and that most biblical datings are wholly dependent on palaeography, which

means that they are based upon the a priori chronological knowledge of the Scaligerian school and would change automatically if a chronological paradigm shift occurred.

Let us give an important example: “In 1902 the Englishman Nash purchased a fragment of an Egyptian papyrus manuscript whose dating cannot be agreed upon by the scientists to this day” ([444], page 273). The final agreement was made that the text corresponds to the beginning of our era. Later on, “after the discovery of the Qumran Manuscripts, the comparison of the handwriting styles in both Nash’s papyrus and the

Manuscripts allowed for the determination of a greater antiquity of the latter” ([444], pages 272-273). Thus, one papyrus fragment whose dating “cannot be agreed upon” pulls a whole lot of other documents after it.

Nevertheless, the “dating of the [Qumran – A. F.] scrolls provoked major dispute amongst scientists (the dating range was given from the II century and until the epoch of the Crusades)” ([471], page 47).

The “early A.D.” dating is considered proven after 1962, when a radiocarbon research of the Qumran manuscripts was conducted. However, as we shall

mention again later on, the radiocarbon method is really unsuitable for the dating of specimens whose age falls into the span of 2-3 millennia, since the ensuing datings cover too wide a time range (this may reach as wide a span as 1-2 thousand years, for specimens whose age reaches 1-2 thousand years).

Although [444] dated the Qumran Manuscripts to 68 A.D., the American historian S. Zeitlin categorically insists on “the *mediaeval* origin of these texts” ([444], page 27).

We shall give a more detailed account of matters concerning the Biblical manuscripts in Chron6.

8.

Difficulties and contradictions arising from the reading of old texts

8.1. How does one read a text written in consonants exclusively? The vocalisation problem

The datings of other Biblical fragments

that we possess today also need attentive additional analysis.

Attempts to read most of the old manuscripts, such as the Biblical and the Ancient Egyptian ones, often confront historians with severe difficulties.

“The first steps of our research into the primordial language of the Old Testament bring us to the fact of paramount importance, which is that written Hebrew neither had signs for vowels originally, nor any other signs to replace them... The books of the Old Testament were written in nothing but consonants.” ([765], page 155)

The situation is typical. Ancient

Slavonic texts, for instance, also come as chains of consonants, often even lacking the vocalisation symbols and separation of individual words from one another – just an endless stream of consonants.

Ancient Egyptian texts also contained nothing but consonants.

“The names of the [Egyptian – A. F.] kings... are rendered [in modern literature – A. F.] *in a perfectly arbitrary manner*, à la primary school textbook content... There is a plethora of significant variations that defy all attempts of classification, being a result of *arbitrary interpretation* [! – A. F.] that became tradition.”([72], page 176)

It is possible that the scarcity and the high cost of writing materials made the ancient scribes extremely frugal, and the vowels were eliminated as a result.

“It is true that if we take a Hebraic Bible or a manuscript nowadays, we shall find a skeleton of consonants filled with dots and other signs that are supposed to refer to the missing vowels. Such signs were not included in the ancient Hebraic Bible...

The books had been written in consonants exclusively, and filled with vowels by the readers to the best of their ability and in accordance with the apparent demands of common sense and oral tradition.”([765], page 155)

Imagine how precise the kind of writing

that consisted of nothing but consonants would be today, when the combination BLD, for instance, could mean blood, bled, bold, build, boiled, bald, etc.; RVR could stand for river, rover, or raver, etc. The vocalisation aleatory quotient in ancient Hebraic and other old languages is exceptionally high. Many consonant combinations may be vocalised in dozens of ways ([765]). Gesenius wrote that “it was easily understood how imperfect and unclear such writing method had been” (quoted in [765]).

T. F. Curtis also noted that “even for priests the meaning of the scriptures

remained extremely doubtful and could only be understood with the aid of the tradition and its authority” (quoted in [765], p. 155). Robertson Smith adds that “the scholars had no other guide but the actual text, that was often ambiguous, and oral tradition. They had no grammatical rules to follow; the Hebraic that they wrote in often allowed for verbal constructions that were impossible in the ancient language” (quoted in [765], page 156). Scaligerian history considers this status quo to have prevailed for many centuries ([765]).

It is furthermore assumed that “this paucity of the Hebraic Bible was only

remedied in the VII or VIII century of our era,” when the Massorets had processed the Bible and “added... symbols that stood for vowels, but they had no other guides but their own intuition and very fragmentary oral tradition, and this fact is known perfectly well to every expert in the Hebraic language” ([765], pages 156-157).

Driver points out that:

“Since... the Massorets and their efforts in the VII and VIII centuries, the Jews have started to protect their holy books with the utmost zeal and vigour when it had already been too late to mitigate... the damage done to them in any way. The result of this overzealous protection had been the

immanetization of the distortions that had been made equal to the original text in authority.” (Text given by [765], page 157.)

“The common opinion used to be that the vowels were introduced to the Hebraic text by Ezra in the V century B.C. ... When Levita and Capellus proved this wrong in the XVI and XVII century France, demonstrating that the vowels have only been introduced by the Massorets, the discovery made a great sensation in the entire Protestant Europe. Many were of the opinion that this new theory might lead to the complete dethronement of religion. If the vowels weren't received in an Epiphany of divine inspiration, being merely a human creation, and a relatively recent one, at that, how could one rely on

the text of the Holy Writ?... The debate that followed had been amongst the most heated in the history of the new Biblical criticism, and had carried on for over a century. It has finally ended when the veracity of the new opinion was acknowledged by everyone.” ([765], pages 157-158)

If such fierce disputes flared up around the Biblical vocalisations in the XVI-XVII century, could this mean these very vocalisations were *introduced very recently*? Could this have happened in the XV-XVI century? And since this vocalisation version was far from the commonly accepted version, it had to encounter opposition, which may have

been quite vehement. It was only much later that the Massoret deciphering of the Bible shifted (by Levita and Capellus?) into the VII-VIII century A.D. so as to give the Biblical text the authority of antiquity.

The situation with the Koran must have been similar. We are informed that:

“Arabic writing... becomes developed further in the middle of the VII century, when the first transcription of the Koran took place (651 A.D.). The additional diacritic marks on, above, or beneath the letter were introduced in the 2nd half of the VII century for differentiating between similarly written letters, for... vowels and doubled vowels.” ([485], page 41)

Other sources tell us that the vocalisations were only introduced in the second half of the VIII century by Al-Khalil Ibn Ahmed ([485], page 39). Could all of this activity have taken place in the XV-XVI century?

8.2. The sounds “R” and “L” were often confused in the Middle Ages

We shall give some direct evidence of the fact that the sounds “R” and “L” were often subject to flexion.

Amsterdam, among others, is a city whose name was affected by such instability and was called AmsteRdam,

AmsteLdam, Amstelodami, etc. ([35], page XLI). We should mention another interesting fact here. Fig. 1.34 shows the title page of a book on navigation published in Amsterdam in 1625. The name of the city is already given as Amsterdam, the way it is written today – however, the old engraving that one sees on the same page gives the *old* name in a rather peculiar spelling – *AmsteLRedam*, q.v. in fig. 1.35. Both consonants are present here, and a bizarre combination of sounds is achieved as a result. This reminds us that the names of many European towns and cities had remained unstable until fairly recently, when they

became immanentized in the printing press epoch. Numerous other examples of this phenomenon are given below.




Fig. 1.34. The title page from a book published

in Amsterdam and dated 1625. The city is called AmsteRdam, spelt with an “R”. However, in the ancient engraving that we see on the same page, we see the name AmsteLRedam, with both sounds that were often mistaken for each other included (“R” and “L”). Taken from [1160], page 287.



Fig. 1.35. Close-up of a fragment of the engraving, with Amsterdam spelt in a rather curious manner, “AmsteLRedam.”

9.

Problems in the Scaligerian geography of Biblical events

9.1. Archaeology and the Old Testament

The vocalisations of quotidian lexemes may not be all that important to our purposes, but the consonant sequences used for names of cities, countries, and rulers definitely are. Hundreds of

different vocalisations were spawned, some of which were arbitrarily localized in the Middle East due to the hypothesis that binds Biblical events to that area exclusively.

The archaeologist Millar Burroughs expresses his unswerving trust in the correctness of the Scaligerian geography, writing that “in general... archaeological work doubtlessly gives one a very strong confidence in the dependability of the Biblical indications” (quoted in [444], page 16). One of the modern archaeological authorities, the American William Albright, wrote, albeit hazily, that “one

should not doubt that archaeology [in reference to the excavations in modern Palestine – A. F.] confirms just how substantially historical the Old Testament tradition is” (quoted in [444], page 16; also see [1003], [1443]). However, Albright concedes that the situation with Biblical archaeology was so chaotic in the beginning of the 1919-1949 period that the varying views on chronological issues could not have reached any sort of convergence at all, and that “under those circumstances one really could not have used the archaeological data concerning Palestine for illustrating the Old Testament”

(quoted in [444], page 16).

The one-time Director of the British Museum, Sir Frederic Kenyon, categorically insists that archaeology has refuted “the destructive criticism of the second half of the XIX century”. W. Keller even published a book titled, suggestively enough, *And Yet the Bible is Right* ([1219]), which tries to convince the reader of the veracity of the Scaligerian interpretation of Biblical data.

However, here is some information from the eminent archaeologist L. Wright, also an avid supporter of the theory that the Scaligerian localizations

and datings of the Biblical events were correct:

“The overwhelming majority of findings neither prove nor disprove anything; they fill the background and provide a setting for history... Unfortunately, many of the works that can be understood by the average reader have been written with excessive zeal and desire to prove the Bible correct. *The evidence is misused for making erroneous and semi-correct conclusions*” (quoted in [444], page 17).

The pioneers of archaeology in Mesopotamia were C. J. Rich, A. H. Layard, and P. E. Botta in the XIX century – however, in order to get their research subsidized, they had to

advertise their findings in a sensational manner, associating their findings with Biblical towns in a rather arbitrary manner.

But the accumulation of material evidence resulted in a significant quandary. Actual facts show that none of the Old Testament books have concrete archaeological proof of their Scaligerian dating and localization. In the XX century L. Wooley, the prominent archaeologist, performed excavations of a town that he tried to identify as “the Biblical Ur.” However, it turned out that “unfortunately, one cannot give satisfactory chronological datings of the

episodes [concerning the Biblical Abraham – A. F.] within the span of the second millennium of Middle Eastern history ([1484], [444], page 71).

The Scaligerian history insists that all the events concerning the Biblical patriarchs occurred precisely and exclusively on the territory of the modern Mesopotamia and Syria. Nevertheless, it is immediately acknowledged that “as to what concerns the identity of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, one can just reiterate that the information obtained as a result of the most fruitful excavations in Syria and Mesopotamia was extremely

meagre, *or simply nonexistent*” ([1484], [444], page 77).

One might wonder just how justifiable it is to search for traces of the Biblical patriarchs in modern Mesopotamia.

Furthermore, Scaligerian history is of the opinion that all of the events involving the Biblical Abraham and Moses occurred on the territory of modern Egypt. It is evasively stated that:

“The historical intensity of this tradition *is not confirmed archaeologically*, but its historical plausibility is, together with an account of the circumstances that may have been the setting of the patriarchs’ biography.” ([444], page 80)

We are also warned that:

“One is to be cautious in one's use of cultural and social indications for dating purposes: since we have the principal concepts in what regards the era of the patriarchs, one needs to possess a certain flexibility in the fixation of chronology.”
(quoted in [444], page 82)

As we shall soon see, this flexibility may stretch as far as hundreds and even thousands of years.

W. Keller proceeds to tell us that
“Egypt remains indebted to the researchers. *In addition to the fact they found nothing about Joseph, neither documents nor any other traces of his*

time have been discovered” [1219]. Egypt remains “in debt” in what concerns Moses as well ([444], page 91). In this case one may wonder yet again about the possibility of Biblical events having taken place in a different country – not necessarily bound to the territory of modern Egypt.

The archaeologist Albright, an avid supporter of the Scaligerian interpretation of the Bible, has nevertheless got to agree with the fact that “the previous concept of the Exodus to Haran from the Chaldaean Ur found *no archaeological evidence* except for the actual city” (quoted in [444], page

84).

Furthermore,

“It turned out that the very location of Mount Sinai is unknown. Another complication is that the Bible often states Mount Horeb to have been the place where the Revelation was given. If we are to take the Biblical description of the natural phenomena accompanying said procedure seriously, one has to presume the mountain to have been a volcano... The problem is that the mountain called Sinai nowadays *has never been a volcano.*”
([444], page 133)

Some archaeologists place Sinai in North Arabia, claiming that it was located in Midian, near Kadesh ([444],

page 133). But *none of these mountains were volcanoes, either.*

The Bible says that "...the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven" (Genesis 19:24). Scaligerian history locates this event somewhere in modern Mesopotamia. "The first idea that one gets in this respect is *the assumption of a volcanic eruption. But there are no volcanoes in this area*" ([444], page 86). It seems natural to search for these cities in some area that *does* have volcanoes. However, the search is still conducted in Mesopotamia with great effort and no results

whatsoever. And finally a “solution” is reached: the southern part of the Dead Sea appears to conceal some debris resembling tree trunks under a 400 metre layer of very salty water of poor transparency ([444], page 86). This has sufficed for the American archaeologist D. Finnegan, as well as W. Keller after him, to claim that “the valley of Siddim,” together with the charred remains of both cities, had submerged ([444], page 86).

The Bible scholar and historian Martin Noth states explicitly that there is no reason to ascribe the destruction of the cities found by the archaeologists in

Palestine, to the Israeli invasion in search of the so-called “Promised Land” ([1312]). As it was noted above, from the archaeological point of view the entire Scaligerian interpretation of the conquest of Canaan by Joshua, the son of Nun, becomes suspended in thin air ([1312], [1486]). Are we conducting our search for the Biblical Promised Land in the correct place? Could the troops of Joshua have been predominantly active elsewhere?

It is further written that:

‘No archaeological proof of any Biblical report of the ‘Epoch of the Judges’ exists to this day. All the Judges’ names

contained in the Old Testament aren't known from any other source and weren't found on any archaeological artefacts from either Palestine or any other country. This concerns the names of the first kings Saul, David, and Solomon.” ([444], page 158)

Scaligerian history convinces us that Noah's Ark had moored to Mount Ararat in the Caucasus. Werner Keller ([1219]) assures us that the Armenian village of Bayzit still keeps the legend of a shepherd who saw a large wooden vessel on the Mount. The Turkish expedition of 1833 mentions “some ship made of wood that was seen over the southern glacier.” Keller proceeds to

tell us that in 1892 a certain Dr. Nuri was leading an expedition in search of the sources of the Euphrates, and saw a fragment of a ship on the way back which was “filled with snow and dark red on the outside.” The Russian aviator officer Roskovitsky claimed to have seen the Ark’s remnants from his aeroplane during the First World War. Czar Nikolai the Second is supposed to have commanded an entire expedition there, which had not only seen, but also photographed, the remains of the Ark. The American historian and missionary Aaron Smith from Greenborough, an expert in the problem of the Great

Deluge, wrote a history of Noah's Ark mentioning 80 thousand publications on the topic. Finally, a scientific expedition was arranged. In 1951 Smith spent 12 days on top of Mount Ararat with 40 of his colleagues. They found nothing. Nevertheless, he made the following claim: "Even though we *failed to find so much as a trace of Noah*, my trust in the Biblical tale of the Deluge had only become firmer; we shall yet return" (quoted in [444]). In 1952 the expedition of Jean de Riquer obtained similar results. This somewhat anecdotal account here merely scratches the surface of the problem of geographical

locations that is so acute for Scaligerian chronology, as it were.

Herbert Haag in his foreword to Cyrus Gordon's *Historical Foundations of the Old Testament* credits the author with the following:

“His aim isn't apologetic, which makes him quite unlike other authors that drown the book market in paperbacks attempting to “prove the Bible” by jumbling together all sorts of sensationalist “proof” received from ancient Oriental sources.”([444], page 18)

Various museums, institutes, and universities send expeditions to the Middle East for “Biblical excavations.”

Great sums of money are invested in such excavations, and a great many special societies and funds have been founded with the sole purpose of conducting archaeological research in the Scaligerian “Biblical Countries.”

The first one of these institutions was the Research Fund of Palestine founded in 1865; currently there are about 20 similar organizations in existence ([444]). Among them we find the American Institute for Oriental Studies, the Jerusalem Affiliate of the Vatican Institute of Bible Studies, and the Israeli Research Society. No other region of the planet has been studied by

archaeologists with such intensity as the Scaligerian “Biblical” territories. A great variety of literature is published on this subject as well – special magazines, monographs, atlases and albums for the popularization of Biblical archaeology.

The Biblical topic is often given priority at the expense of other archaeological issues. The prominent Soviet historian who studied the antiquity, Academician V. V. Struve, has got the following to say about it:

“The excavations in Egypt and Babylonia were only of interest to the bourgeois science since they could be linked to Palestine. In order to find the funding

needed for the excavations, the historians had to prove that an ancient copy of the Bible could be unearthed as a result of their research, or the sandals of Moses, mayhap, and then the monies were provided instantly.” ([444], page 44)

The following example is very representative. In the early XX century a tablet archive was found in the city of Umma, Mesopotamia. But since Umma isn't mentioned in the Bible, and no enthusiastic entrepreneur could identify it as some Biblical town, the excavations in Umma were stopped, and the archives scattered without even being studied. The tablets were sold to

Parisian collectors for one franc per piece ([444]).

“Archaeology as well as historical science in general can find no proof to the Biblical legend about the Egyptian slavery of the Jews” ([444], page 102). The Egyptologist Wilhelm Spielberg tells us that “what the Bible reports about the plight of Israel in Egypt isn’t any more of a historical fact than the accounts of Egyptian history related by Herodotus” (quoted in [444], page 103). V. Stade wrote that “anyway, it is clear that the research concerning the Pharaoh under whose rule Israel moved into Egypt and left it represents nothing but

the juggling of names and dates void of all meaning” (quoted in [444], page 103). Let us repeat our question: could an altogether different country be described by the name of Egypt?

The Bible lists a great many geographical locations that the People of Israel visited during their 40 years of wandering after the Exodus from “Egypt.” The archaeologists still fail to find these locations where the Scaligerian history places their Biblical descriptions. Wright says that “few sites on the way to Mount Sinai can be identified with any degree of certainty” (quoted in [444], page 128). V. Stade

wrote that: “checking the itinerary of Israel has as much sense as, say, tracking the way of the Burgundians’ return from King Etzel as described in the *Nibelungenlied*.” The Egyptologist W. Spielberg quotes this statement, saying that “we can still sign under every word of Stade’s” and that “the depiction of events following the Exodus, the listing of the sites where stops were made, the crossing of the desert – *all of this is fiction*” (quoted in [444], page 132). Many sites that were considered to have been on the itinerary of the Israelis were excavated thoroughly and intensively for a long time now. No traces have ever

been found!

The Biblical account of the destruction of Jericho is well known. One of the Arabic settlements in the Middle East had been arbitrarily identified as the Biblical Jericho whose walls were destroyed by the sounds of the horn. The settlement has been subject to thorough excavations since the endeavours of Sellin, Watzinger, and Garstang in late XIX century. There were no results. In 1952 an Anglo-American archaeological expedition led by Kathleen Kenyon ventured to continue Garstang's research. No justifications for identifying the excavated town as

Jericho have ever been found. Wright wrote that “the information received about Jericho was called disappointing, and it is true: not only is it hard to interpret the Biblical tale of Jericho, one cannot so much as trace the outline of the tradition’s history... The Jericho issue is more problematic today than ever” (quoted in [444]).

The Bible says that after Jericho the Israelis destroyed the city of Ai. The site where this city was supposed to have been located according to the “calculations” made by the historians has also been subject to fundamental research. Yet again, the results have

failed to satisfy. The German archaeologist and specialist in Biblical history Anton Jirku ([1213]) expresses his grief over the futility of the “Jericho” excavations, and proceeds to describe those of “Ai” as afflicted by “an even greater discrepancy between the report of the conquest of Ai that ensued and the results of the excavations” (quoted in [444], pages 145-151).

According to the Bible, the capital of Judaea in the reign of king Saul was the city of Gibeah. The historians have given birth to a hypothesis identifying it as the ruins excavated in the Tell el-Ful Hill six kilometres to the north of

modern Jerusalem. However, it is conceded that “not a single inscription was found in town, and no clear evidence that the ruins belong to Saul’s palace or a tower that he built” ([444], page 158). But had Saul’s palace really been built there?

Conclusion: Archaeological research shows that the books of the Old Testament have no archaeological proof of their localization and dating as suggested by the Scaligerian tradition. Thus, the entire “Mesopotamian” Biblical theory becomes questionable.

9.2. Archaeology and the New

Testament

The traditional localization of the events described in the New Testament isn't in any better condition. The lack of archaeological proof of the Scaligerian localization of the New Testament is explained by the fact that "Jerusalem was destroyed in the years 66-73, and that the Jews had been forbidden... to come anywhere near the city" ([444], page 196). Scaligerian history is of the opinion that Jerusalem can be located at the settlement that the locals call El Kuds, whose site used to be perfectly barren before, also known as Aelia Capitolina. It was after the passage of

some time that “the ancient Jerusalem” was reborn here. The “historical remnants of Biblical times” shown to tourists today, such as the Wailing Wall, etc., do not hold up to even minimal scientific criticism, in full absence of historical and archaeological proof.

Fig. 1.36 shows an ancient miniature, allegedly dating from 1470, that depicts the pillaging of Jerusalem by the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphane ([1485], pages 164, 165). As we can see, the mediaeval author of the miniature didn't hesitate to represent Jerusalem as a typically mediaeval town with Gothic buildings and towers, and all the warriors wearing

mediaeval plate armour.



Fig. 1.36. Ancient miniature allegedly dated to

1470 from Jean de Courcy's *Global Chronicle* (*Chronique de la Bouquechardièrre*). We see

Jerusalem pillaged by the Syrian king Antiochus Epiphane. Jerusalem is pictured as a mediaeval Gothic town. There is an Ottoman crescent on the spire of one of the towers.

Taken from [1485], ill. 200.

One must emphasise that other versions exist apart from the Scaligerian. The Catholic Church, for instance, has been claiming the “very house” that Virgin Mary had lived in and where “Archangel Gabriel appeared before her” to have been located in the Italian town of Loreto since the XIII century, which means that the Catholic version transfers a part of evangelical events to Italy. The

earliest document concerning the “Loreto house” is the bull issued by Pope Urban VI dated to 1387. In 1891 Pope Leo XIII issued an encyclical “in celebration of the 600 years of Loreto’s Miracle.” Thus, the “miracle” is dated to XIII century A.D. Historians mark that “Loreto remains a holy pilgrimage place for the Catholics to this day” ([970], p. 37).

A. Y. Lentzman tells us the following in re the search of St. Peter’s sepulchre, for instance:

“In 1940, the excavations sanctioned by Pope Pius XII were commenced under the Vatican crypts, and their peak fell on the

post-war years... In the late 1940's a solemn statement was made by the press, especially the Catholic press [since the excavations must have been expensive – A. F.], that *not only the burial spot of the Apostle Peter was found, but his remains as well*... An objective analysis of the results of Vatican excavations demonstrated all of these claims to have been false. Pope Pius even had to make a radio announcement on the 24 December 1950 where he had acknowledged “the impossibility of making any veracious claims about the unearthed human bones belonging to the Apostle.” ([471], pages 45-49)

The location of the town of Emmanus near which Jesus is said to have

appeared before his disciples after the Resurrection defies all attempts of being determined. The place of the Transfiguration of Jesus, Mount Tabor, also remains impossible to locate. Even the location of Golgotha is doubted by historians.” ([444], page 201).

Seeck in his *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt* (History of the Ancient World's Decline, III, 1900) wrote that “we have no intention... of picturing his [Christ's – A. F.] earthly destiny... all the issues of the origins of Christianity are so complex that we are glad to have the opportunity and the right to leave them

well alone” (quoted in [259], page 46).
A convenient stance, and one that has got absolutely nothing to do with science.

The archaeologist Schwegler sums up in the following way: “This is where the tragedy begins for the believer whose primary need is to know the place on Earth where his Saviour had lived and suffered. But it is the location of the place of his (Christ’s) death, that remains covered in impenetrable darkness, if we’re to think in archaeological categories.” (quoted in [444], page 202)

Apparently, there is no possibility of determining the location of the cities of

Nazareth and Capernaum, as well as that of Golgotha etc., on the territory of modern Palestine. ([444], pages 204-205)

We shall quote the following noteworthy observation to sum up:

“Reading the literature related to Evangelical archaeology leaves a strange impression. Tens and hundreds of pages are devoted to the descriptions of how the excavations were organized, what the location of the site and the objects relevant to the research looked like, the historical and Biblical background for this research, etc.; and the final part, the one that is supposed to cover the result of the research, just contains a number of

insubstantial and obviously embarrassed phrases about how the problem was not solved, but there's still hope, etc. It can be said categorically and with all certainty that *not a single event described in the New Testament has any valid archaeological basis for it* [in Scaligerian chronology and localization – A. F.]... This is perfectly true in what concerns the identity and the biography of Jesus Christ. There is no proof for the location of any of the places where the evangelical events are traditionally supposed to have occurred.” ([444], pages 200-201)

We ask yet again: is it correct to search for the traces of the events described in the New Testament in the Middle Eastern Palestine? Could they have taken

place somewhere else?

10.

Ancient historical events: geographic localization issues

10.1. The locations of Troy and Babylon

The correct geographic localization of a large number of ancient historical events is truly a formidable task. Naples, for instance (whose name merely stands for “New Town”) is reflected in the ancient

chronicles as the following cities:

1. Naples in Italy, existing to this day.
2. Carthage, also translating as “New Town” ([938], page 13, B, 162-165).
3. Naples in Palestine ([268], page 130).
4. The Scythian Naples (see the collection of the State History Museum of Moscow).
5. New Rome a.k.a. Constantinople or Czar-Grad, which could also be referred to as “New Town”.

Thus, if a chronicle is referring to an event that occurred in Naples, one has to

devote all of one's attention to making sure one understands which town is meant.

Troy may be seen as yet another example. One of the consensual localizations for Homer's Troy is near the Hellespont straits. Schliemann used this hypothesis for solemnly baptizing as "Troy" the 100×100 metre excavation site of a minuscule ancient settlement that he had discovered near the Hellespont ([443], page 107). Actually, the very localization of Hellespont itself is highly controversial. See *Chron2* for more details.

The Scaligerian chronology and

history tell us that Homer's Troy met its final fate of destruction and utter desolation in the XII-XIII century B.C. ([72]). However, we know that the Italian town of Troy played an important role in mediaeval history, particularly in the well-known war of the XIII century. This town still exists ([196]).

Many Byzantine historians of the Middle Ages refer to Troy as an *existing mediaeval town*, among them Nicetas Aconiatus ([934], Volume 5, page 360), and Nicephorus Gregoras ([200], Volume 6, page 126).

According to Titus Livy, Troy and the entire Trojan region were located in

Italy ([482], Volume 1, pages 3-4). He tells us that the surviving Trojans landed in Italy soon after the fall of Troy, and that the place of their first landing was called Troy. “Aeneas... wound up in Sicily; his fleet sailed thenceforth, and came to the Laurentian region. *This place is called Troy as well*” ([482], Volume 1, pages 3-4, Book 1, No. 1).

Several mediaeval historians *identify Troy as Jerusalem*, for instance ([10], pages 88, 235, 162, 207). This fact embarrasses modern historians greatly, leading them to such comments as: “Homer’s actual book somewhat suddenly turns into an account of the

devastation of Jerusalem” [in a mediaeval text describing Alexander’s arrival in Troy – A. F.] ([10], page 162).

Anna Comnena, a mediaeval author, somewhat unexpectedly locates Jerusalem in Ithaca, the island where Ulysses was born ([419], Volume 2, pages 274-285). This is most peculiar indeed, since it is known perfectly well that modern Jerusalem isn’t located on an island.

Another name for Troy is Ilion, while Jerusalem is also known as Aelia Capitolina ([544], Volume 7). Aelia and Ilion are rather close phonetically. It is

possible that *the same city* was called Troy and Ilion by some, and Jerusalem and Aelia by others. Eusebius Pamphilus writes that somebody “referred to the small Phrygian towns, Petusa and Timion as ‘Jerusalem’” (quoted in [544], page 893).

The facts quoted above demonstrate the fact that the name of Troy had multiplied in the Middle Ages, and had been used for referring to different cities. Could an archetypal mediaeval original have existed? Scaligerian chronology contains information that allows the construction of the hypothesis that Homer’s Troy was really

Constantinople, or Czar-Grad.

Apparently, the Roman emperor Constantine the Great took into account the wish of his fellow townsmen and “had initially chosen the *place where the ancient Ilion, the fatherland of the first founders of Rome, had been located*”. This is what the prominent Turkish historian Jalal Assad tells us in his *Constantinople* ([240], page 25). Historians proceed to tell us that Constantine “changed his mind” afterwards, and founded New Rome nearby, in the town of Byzantium. But it is a known fact in Scaligerian history that Ilion is another name for Troy.

What we encounter here may well be a remainder of the fact that the same town located on the Bosphorus had been referred to by different names: Troy, New Rome, Czar-Grad, Jerusalem. It might also be true that since Naples means New Town, it was the name that had been used for New Rome as well.

Let us mention the fact that southern Italy used to be called the Great Greece in the Middle Ages (Eusebius Pamphilus) ([267], pages 282-283).

Nowadays it is assumed that the city of Babylon was located in modern Mesopotamia. Some of the mediaeval texts hold a cardinally different opinion.

The well-known book *Serbian Alexandria*, for instance, locates Babylon in Egypt. Moreover, it tells us that Alexander the Great died in Egypt as well – according to the Scaligerian version, this event took place in Mesopotamia ([10], page 255).

Furthermore, we see that “Babylon is the Greek name of the settlement that had been located opposite the pyramids [the Tower of Babel? – A. F.]... *In the Middle Ages it had been a frequently used name for Cairo*, whose suburb this settlement eventually became” ([464], page 45). The name Babylon can be translated, as well as the names of many

other cities, and thus may have been used for referring to other locations.

Eusebius tell us that Rome used to be called Babylon ([267], page 85).

Furthermore, “the Byzantine historians [in the Middle Ages – A. F.] often called Baghdad Babylon” ([702], page 266, comment 14). Michael Psellus, the author of the alleged XI century refers to Babylon as one would to an existing town – not a destroyed one ([702], page 9).

In fig. 1.37 we can see an ancient miniature dating from 1470 depicting “ancient” Babylon as a typically mediaeval Gothic town ([1485], pages

164, 165). The Tower of Babel is being constructed on the right. The “ancient” king Nimrod is also portrayed as a mediaeval knight in plate armour. Modern commentators deem this to be a fantasy bearing little semblance to reality: “on the left we see Babylon presented as a *fantasy Gothic town with elements of Muslim architecture*. The giant in the centre is Nimrod. The construction of the tower of Babel is pictured on the right” ([1485], page 164). It is most probable, however, that this is not a fantasy. The artist had been perfectly aware of what he was painting, and the picture reflects mediaeval

reality.




Fig. 1.37. Ancient miniature allegedly dated to 1470 from Jean de Courcy's *Global Chronicle*

(Chronique de la Bouquechardière). We see the “extremely ancient” King Nimrod in the “ancient” Babylon, which is depicted as a Gothic mediaeval town with elements of Muslim architecture. Taken from [1485], ill. 199.

10.2. The geography of Herodotus is at odds with the Scaligerian version

Let us quote some examples from Herodotus, who plays a key role in the Scaligerian chronology. He claims the African river Nile to be parallel to Ister, that is nowadays identified as the Danube (and, oddly enough, not

Dniester) ([163], page 492). This is where we find out that “the opinion that Danube and Nile were parallel reigned in the *mediaeval Europe* until as late as the end of the XIII century” ([163], page 493). Thus, the mistake of Herodotus proves to be mediaeval in its origins.

Herodotus proceeds to tell us that “the Persians inhabit all of Asia to the very Southern Sea that is also called the Red Sea” ([163], 4:37, page 196). According to consensual geography, the Southern Sea is the Persian Gulf. Giving a description of the peninsula that contemporary historians identify with the Arabian peninsula, Herodotus writes

that “it begins near the Persian land and stretches to the Red Sea” ([163], 4:39, page 196). Everything appears to be correct here. However, this contradicts the opinion of those historians who identify the Red Sea mentioned by Herodotus as the Persian Gulf ([163]). This is why modern commentators hasten to “correct” Herodotus: “Red Sea stands for Persian Gulf here” ([163], Appendices, Part 4, comment 34).

Let us continue. The Red Sea in its modern interpretation may indeed “reach further up than the Persians” according to Herodotus ([163], Volume 4:40), but only meeting one condition, namely, that

the map used by Herodotus was *inverted* in relation to the ones used nowadays. Many mediaeval maps are like that, with North and South swapped (qv below). This makes the modern historians identify the Red Sea as the Persian Gulf ([163], Appendix, Part 4, comment 36), although the Persian gulf is “below” the Persians in this case, or to the East of them, but doesn’t reach “further up” at any rate.

Historians identify the same sea mentioned by Herodotus in 2:102 as the Indian Ocean ([163], Appendix, Part 2, comment 110). What we observe here is the inversion of the East and the West.

Could the map that Herodotus had used have been an inverted one, then?

In book 4:37 Herodotus identifies the Red Sea as the South Sea, q.v. above. This proves to be the final straw of confusion for the modern commentators who try to fit Herodotus into the Procrustean geography of the Scaligerian school, and the maps used nowadays. They are forced to identify the Red (Southern) Sea as the Black Sea! See book 4:13, [163], Appendix, Part 4, comment 12. We see yet another inversion of the East and the West in relation to the Persians.

Thus, identifying the geographic data

as offered by Herodotus with the Scaligerian map runs us into many difficulties. The numerous corrections that the modern historians are forced to make show us that the map that Herodotus had used may have been inverted in relation to the modern ones, which is a typical trait of *mediaeval* maps ([1468]).

As we can see, the commentators have to make a conclusion that Herodotus uses different names to refer to the same seas in his

History. If we're to believe the modern historians, we have to think that Herodotus makes the following

identifications: Red Sea = South Sea = Black Sea = North Sea = the Mediterranean = the Persian Gulf = Our Sea = Indian Ocean ([163], Appendix, comments 34, 36, 110, etc.).

The mentions of the Crestonians, the town of Creston, and the region of Crossaea sound most peculiar coming from an allegedly ancient author ([163], 1:57, page 27; 5:3, page 239; 5:5, page 240; 7:123, page 344; 7:124, pages 344-345; 7:127, page 345; 8:116, page 408; page 571). One constantly gets the feeling that he is referring to the mediaeval *crusaders*. “Cross” and “Crest” are the roots one most often

associates with the Middle Ages. Just how veracious are the datings of the events related by Herodotus?

The unbiased analysis of Biblical geography yields many oddities as well ([544]).

10.3. The inverted maps of the Middle Ages

Modern maps place the East on the right, and the West on the left. However, we find that the opposite is true for many mediaeval maps – all of the sea charts of the alleged XIV century had the *East* on the *left*, and the *West* on the *right*, qv in the atlas [1468]. Some of these old

inverted charts from Genoa can be seen in figs. 1.38, 1.39, 1.40 and 1.41. These charts may have been used by either traders or the military fleet.




Fig. 1.38. An old inverted map of the Black Sea. This is a so-called “portolano” by the Genoese Pietro Vesconte, allegedly dating from 1318 ([1468], page 3). Several points on

the coast of the Black Sea are marked. The centre of the map says Pontus Euxinus. The North is at the bottom, the East on the left. The East used to be referred to as *Levant*, see [1468], page 37, which means “situated on the left”. There are traces of the name remaining in the German language, among others, where the Middle East is still called *Levant*. See [573], page 333. The Crimean peninsula, it will be observed, is “upside down” in comparison to its location on modern maps. Taken from [1468], map 3.




Fig. 1.39. An old inverted map of a part of the Mediterranean. A portolano by the Genoese Pietro Vesconte, allegedly dating from the XIV century. The North is at the bottom, the East on

the left. This is probably the reason why the East used to be referred to as *Levant*, or “located on the left.” Taken from [1468], map 4.




Fig. 1.40. An old inverted map of Spain and a part of Africa. Africa is on top, and Spain at the bottom. Thus, the North is at the bottom, and the East is on the left. Another portolano by

Pietro Vesconte, allegedly dating from the XIV century. These maps most probably date from the XV-XVI century. Taken from [1468], map 8.




Fig. 1.41. An old inverted map of England and France. France is on top, and England at the bottom. The East is on the left. A portolano of the Genoese Pietro Vesconte, allegedly dating

from the XIV century. Taken from [1468], map 10.

The word *levant*, for instance, still means “oriental” in French. The Middle East is also often referred to as *Levant* in German ([419], page 733). This may be a reflection of the fact that the Orient was on the left of the maps (*leviy* means “left” in Russian, and the adverb for “on the left” is *sleva*). It is possible that the Russian word *leviy* was adopted by some of the Western European languages in order to refer to the Orient. See our Parallelism Glossary in *Chron7*.

Why did the old maps, and sea charts in particular, have the East on their left,

and the West on their right? The reason may have been that the first seafarers of Europe would sail forth from the seaports located on the European coast of the Mediterranean, as well as the Black and Azov seas, and so they had to move *from the North to the South*. The South was therefore in front, and the Northern coast behind them. A ship captain sailing into the Mediterranean from the Bosphorus would look at the approaching African coast. Thus, the *East was on the left*, and the *West* was on the right.

This is why the first sea charts of both the traders and the military put the East

on the left. It made sense to put that which lay in front on the top of the map. Thus, the way one looks at the map corresponds with the direction of one's movement.

11.

A modern analysis of Biblical geography

The fact that many Biblical texts clearly refer to volcanic activity has been well known to historians for a long time. The word Zion is widely known; theologians interpret it as “pillar” ([544], Volume 2). Identifying Zion as Sinai and Horeb is common in both theology and Bible studies. Hieronymus in particular noted that: “it appears that the same mountain

is called by two different names, Sinai and Horeb” ([268], page 129). I. Pomyalovsky wrote that: “the Old Testament often identifies it [Mt. Horeb – A. F.] as Sinai” ([268], page 326). “Mount Zion” can be translated as “The Pillar Mountain” ([544], Volume 2). The Bible explicitly describes Mount Sinai/Zion/Horeb as a volcano, q.v. below. In this case “The Pillar Mountain” makes sense in the way of referring to *a pillar of smoke* above the volcano. We shall be referring to God as the Thunderer below, following the interpretation suggested in [544], Volume 2.

According to the Bible,

“the Lord said unto Moses, Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud... upon mount Sinai... when the trumpet soundeth long, they shall come up to the mount... there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud... And mount Sinai was altogether in smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly. And when the voice of the trumpet sounded long, and waxed louder and louder, Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice.” (Exodus 19:9, 19:11, 19:13, 19:16, 19:18-19)

Also: “And all the people saw the thunderings, and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking” (Exodus 20:18). In fig. 1.42 we can see an ancient engraving from a 1558 Bible (*Biblia Sacra*) ([544], Volume 2, page 210, illustration 94). The mediaeval painter portrays Moses ascending a fiery mountain.



Fig. 1.42. Moses ascending a fiery mountain.
An ancient illustration from a Bible allegedly
dating from 1558 (*Biblia Sacra*). Taken from
[544], Volume 2, page 210, ill. 94.

Furthermore:

“The day that thou stoodest ... in Horeb ...

and the mountain burned with fire unto the midst of heaven, with darkness, clouds, and thick darkness. And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice.”
(Deuteronomy, 4:10-12)

The destruction of the Biblical cities of Sodom and Gomorrah has long been considered a result of a volcanic eruption. The Bible says that “the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven... and, lo, the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace” (Genesis 19:24, 19:28).

On Albrecht Dürer’s engraving “Lot

Fleeing with his Daughters from Sodom”
we can see a volcanic eruption
destroying the Biblical cities of the plain
in a fountain of fire and stones (fig.
1.43).



Fig. 1.43. Albrecht Dürer's engraving titled "The Destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah."

What we see here is a powerful volcanic explosion, as one might expect, destroying the Biblical cities of the plain. Taken from [1234],

Let us turn to the Lamentations of Jeremiah that contain a description of the destruction of Jerusalem. It is assumed to be an account of the destruction of the city by a hostile army; however, the text contains many fragments such as “How hath the Lord covered the daughter of Zion with a cloud in his anger ... and remembered not his footstool in the day of his anger! The Lord hath swallowed up all the habitations ... he burned ... like a flaming fire, which devoureth round about” (The Lamentations of Jeremiah, 2:1-3).

Then we encounter the following in the chapters 3 and 4 of the Lamentations:

‘I am the man that hath seen affliction by the rod of his [God’s – A. F.] wrath; he hath led me, and brought me into darkness, but not into light... he hath broken my bones... *he hath inclosed my ways with hewn stone*, he hath made my paths crooked... he hath also broken my teeth with gravel stones, he hath covered me with ashes... thou hast covered with anger, and persecuted us: thou hast slain, thou hast not pitied. Thou hast *covered thyself with a cloud*... the stones of the sanctuary are pored out... the punishment... is greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom... their [the survivors’ – A. F.] visage is blacker than a coal... The Lord

hath accomplished his fury; he hath poured out his fierce anger, and hath kindled a fire in Zion, and it hath devoured the foundations thereof.” (The Lamentations of Jeremiah, 3:1-2, 3:4, 3:9, 3:16, 3:43-44, 4:1, 4:6, 4:8, 4:11)

Theologians insist all of this is metaphorical; however, a literal reading of the text divulges an account of the destruction of a large city by a volcanic eruption. The Bible refers to volcanic activity quite often; here's a list of all such references, compiled by V. P. Fomenko and T. G. Fomenko:

Genesis 19:18, 24, Exodus 13:21, 22, Exodus 14:18, Exodus 20:15, Exodus

24:15, 16, 17, Numbers 14:14, Numbers 21:28, Numbers 26:10, Deuteronomy 4:11, 36, Deuteronomy 5:19, 20, 21, Deuteronomy 9:15, 21, Deuteronomy 10:4, Deuteronomy 32:22, The Second Book of Samuel 22: 8-10, 13, The First Book of the Kings 18:38, 39, The First Book of the Kings 19:11, 12, The Second Book of the Kings 1:10-12, 14, Nehemiah 9:12, 19, The Book of Psalms (Psalm 11, verse 6, Psalm 106, verse 17), (Psalm 106, verse 18), Ezekiel 38:22, Jeremiah 48:45, The Lamentations of Jeremiah 2:3, The Lamentations of Jeremiah 4:11, Isaiah 4:5, Isaiah 5:25, Isaiah 9:17, 18, Isaiah 10:17, Isaiah 30:30, Joel 2:3, 5, 10.

Seeing these descriptions as referring to Jerusalem in Palestine and the

traditional Mount Sinai is very odd indeed, since *Mt. Sinai located on the modern Sinai Peninsula had never been a volcano*. Where did the events really take place, then?

It suffices to study the geographic map of the Mediterranean region ([440], pages 380-381, 461) to see that there are no volcanoes on the Sinai Peninsula, and there aren't any in either Syria or Palestine. There are zones of Tertiary and Quaternary volcanic activity, but one encounters those in the vicinity of Paris as well. There has been no volcanic activity recorded in documented history (the post-A.D.

period).

The only relevant geographic zone that possesses powerful volcanoes active to this day is the area including Italy and Sicily, since there are no volcanoes in Egypt or anywhere in the north of Africa ([440]). We are looking for:

1. A powerful volcano that was active in the historical epoch;
2. A destroyed capital near the volcano (see the Lamentations of Jeremiah);
3. Two more destroyed cities near the volcano, Sodom and Gomorrah.

There is just one volcano in the entire Mediterranean area that fits these criteria – *Vesuvius*. It is one of the most powerful volcanoes active in the historical period. The famous Pompeii – a capital? – and two destroyed cities: Stabia (Sodom, perhaps?) and Herculaneum (Gomorrah?). The names do possess a slight similarity.

N. A. Morozov was of the opinion that the origin for the name Sinai given to Vesuvius is the Latin word *sinus* (or *sino* in Old Latin) – “mountain with bowels,” and Horeb has its origins in the Latin word *horribilis*, “horrible.” In [544] we can see the results of an

interesting research that Morozov conducted concerning the Biblical text as read without vocalisations, and considering the localization of Mount Sinai/ Horeb/Zion in Italy.

Let us quote several examples. The Bible says, “the Lord our God spake to us in Horeb, saying, Ye have dwelt long enough in this mount: turn you, and take your journey... to the land of the Canaanites (CNUN)” (Deuteronomy, 1:6-7). Theologians vocalise CNUN as Canaan, and localize it in a desert near the Dead Sea coast, but another vocalisation is possible: CNUN – Cenoa, as a variant of Genoa (the area of

Genoa in Italy). Apart from that, the word Canaan sounds like (the land of the) Khans.

The Bible gives the direction as “to the land of CNUN (the Canaanites), and unto LBNUN” (Deuteronomy 1:7), that is commonly vocalised as “Lebanon” – however, LBNUN is also often used for “white,” and may have been used to refer to Mont Blanc – the White Mountain, literally. The land of the Canaanites may mean the same as the Khan’s land, or the Land of the Khan.

Furthermore, we see “unto the great river, the river PRT” in Deuteronomy 1:7. PRT is localized as Euphrates;

however, what lies beyond Mont Blanc is the river Danube with its large tributary *Prut*.

The Bible says, “when we departed from Horeb, we went through all that great and terrible wilderness” (Deuteronomy 1:19). The famous Flegrean Fields that are located near Vesuvius (Horeb) fit this description perfectly – large areas of scorched land full of small volcanoes, fumaroles, and layers of lava.

According to the Bible, the Israelites “came to KDSH V-RNAE” (Deuteronomy 1:19). KDSH V-RNAE is vocalised as “Kadesh-barnea” –

however, the town in question may well be Cadiz upon the Rhone ([544], Volume 2, page 166). Cadiz on the Rhone might be another name of the modern Geneva – or indeed the Bulgarian city of Varna.

Further in the Bible we see, “and we compassed mount Seir many days” (Deuteronomy 2:1). Theologians left the word “Seir” without translation; if we translate it, we shall get “The Devil’s Mountains” ([544], Volume 2, page 166). A mountain by this name exists near Lake Geneva – Mount Diableret, “The Devil’s Mountain.”

The *sons of Lot* encountered on the way may well be the Latin population

(LT without vocalisations) ([544],
Volume 2, page 167).

The River Arnon (ARNN) is mentioned in Deuteronomy 2:24. This may well be the Italian river Arno!

The Israelites “Went up the way to Bashan” according to Deuteronomy 3:1. The town of Bashan is often mentioned by the Bible. Amazingly enough, a town by the name of Bassano still exists in Italy.

The Bible proceeds to mention that “the king of Bashan came out against us... to battle at Edrei” (Deuteronomy 3:1). This is clearly a reference to Adria (near the Po estuary). As for Po itself—

ancient Latin authors (see Procopius, for instance) often refer to it as “Jordan” (Eridanus) ([544], Vol. 2). The name concurs with the Biblical JRDN perfectly well ([544], Vol. 2, page 167).

According to the Bible, “there was not a city which we took not from them, threescore cities” (Deuteronomy 3:4). Indeed, many large towns were located in this area in the Middle Ages – Verona, Padua, Ferrara, Bologna, etc.

The Bible mentions the land “from the river of Arnon (Arno, ARN) unto mount HRMN (Hermon)”, q.v. in Deuteronomy 3:8. However, the HRMN mountains can also be vocalised as the German

mountains.

“For only Og king of Bashan remained... his bedstead [coffin here – A. F.] was a bedstead of iron; is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon?” (Deuteronomy 3:11). Rabbath is Ravenna, and the coffin of Og [Goth?] is the sepulchre of Theodoric the Goth located in Ravenna! Theodoric is supposed to have lived in 493-526 A.D., so this Biblical text could not have appeared before the VI century A.D., even in Scaligerian chronology.

The Israelites are supposed to have stopped at TBRAE, or “the place Taberah” (Numbers 11:3). Bearing the

previous identifications in mind, we can recognize the Italian river Tiber in this name. Furthermore, CN is Siena (to the south-east from Livorno), the Biblical Hebron (HB-RUN, Genesis 23:2) is possibly Gorgo du Rhone ([544], Volume 2, pages 229-237). The slopes of Monte Viso are called Jebus (VUZ) in Judges 19:10. The city of Rome is called Ramah (RAMA) in Judges 19:13. All the quotes are from the authorized version of the Bible, and there are many more examples.

It is thus possible that a part of the events described in the Bible, namely, the journey of the Israelites led by

Moses, and their subsequent conquest of the “Promised Land” with Joshua, took place in Europe, and particularly in Italy (as opposed to Palestine).

The localization of the “ancient” states mentioned in the Bible also raises a vast number of questions. The Bible often mentions the Phoenician towns of Tyre and Sidon; since we now allow for possibilities of mediaeval interpretations of many Biblical names, one cannot fail to notice the similarities between the names of Venetia and Phoenicia – they may well be the same name if we consider the usual rules of flexion. One comes up with the

hypothesis of *localizing the Biblical Phoenicia as the mediaeval Venice*.

Indeed, the Bible describes the “ancient” Phoenicia as a powerful nation of seafarers that reigned over the entire Mediterranean, with colonies in Sicily, Spain, and Africa. “Ancient” Phoenicians traded extensively with faraway lands, as can be seen in the book of Ezekiel, chapter 27. All of these Biblical criteria are met by the mediaeval Venetian republic, a well-known and powerful state.

The Scaligerian history claims the principal Phoenician towns to have been the modern Tyre and Sidon (Saida). Do

these towns fit their Biblical descriptions of lavishness and splendour? A XIX century volume of sailing directions for seamen ([494]) tells us the following about Saïda:

“The town had 1600 inhabitants in 1818... There is a small bay to the south... A small pier that is barely visible in our day used to belong to a small harbour that is now completely covered by the sands... Plague often rages fiercely here... One finds no traces of former splendour in Saïda nowadays... There’s a reef on the south end, and it’s very shallow in the north... The depth between the town and the

island is uneven... The passage is narrow, and the bottom is full of stones. A large ship's boat cannot come close to the shore, which makes it impossible to replenish water supply here" ([494], quoted in [544], Volume 2, page 637).

The town is located in the estuary of a river that isn't navigable by ships. Its main means of survival in the XIX century had been the local gardens. Strategically speaking, Saida's location is perfectly hopeless. It used to belong to virtually everyone during the crusades epoch; there are no records mentioning it as a large independent trade centre ([544], Volume 2).

All of this contradicts the Biblical descriptions of the greatness of Sidon and Phoenicia. The situation with Tyre is similar ([494], [544], Volume 2). Evidently, the Bible is referring to other locations.

12.

The mysterious Renaissance epoch as a product of the Scaligerian chronology

The Scaligerian chronology is very fond of the renaissance motif, appealing to the archetypal recurrence of the Classical Age.

The ancient Plato is supposed to have been the founding father of Platonism.

His teaching allegedly falls into oblivion for centuries to come, and is revived by the famous Neoplatonist Plotinus, allegedly in 205-270 A.D. The similarity of his name to that of his teacher is purely accidental, of course. Then Neoplatonism perishes as well, in order to be revived again in the XV century A.D. by another famous Platonist – Gemisto Pleton, whose name is also identical to that of his teacher as a result of sheer coincidence. The mediaeval Pleton is supposed to have revived the “ancient” Platonism, having been an avid advocate of “the ancient sage Plato.” Furthermore, it is only in the XV

century that Plato's manuscript was unearthed ([247], pages 143-147). This is precisely the epoch of Gemisto Pleton.

Pleton founds "Pleton's Academy" in Florence in the image of the "ancient" Plato's Academy ([247]). A. A. Vasiliev writes that "His [Pleton's – A. F.] sojourn in Florence... had been one of the most important periods for Italy when it was importing the ancient Greek science, and Plato's philosophy in particular" ([675], Volume 3, Pt. 2; [120]).

Both Plato and Pleton write Utopian works. Gemisto Pleton is reported to

have been the author of the famous *Tractate on the Laws*, which sadly failed to reach us in its entirety.

However, the full text of Plato's tractate by the same title did. Pleton, who lived in the XV century, also suggests the construction of an ideal state, with his programme being extremely close to Plato's. Plotin, who had allegedly lived in 205-270 A.D., is yet another one to have hoped the Emperor would aid the foundation of the city of Platonopolis in Campagna (Italy again), where he had planned to introduce communal aristocratic institutions à la Plato ([122], Volume 4, pages 394-397).

Many prominent ecclesial leaders have historical doppelgangers in Scaliger's chronology. Eusebius in his *Historia Ecclesiastica* ([267]) makes many references to a certain Bishop Victor who played a key role in the so-called Easter Dispute, or the introduction of the Paschalian rules ([267], page 306). There is indeed an Easter dispute known to history and associated with the name of Victor, as reflected in the term "The Paschalian Cycle of Victor" ([76], table 17). However, this dispute and Victor's lifetime are ascribed to 463 A.D., whereas Eusebius who reports this is

supposed to have lived in the III-IV century A.D. The Scaligerian chronology would appear to be inverted.

Furthermore, in [267] Eusebius tells us of a famed Dionysius who formulated the rules for celebrating Easter, having linked it to the Spring Equinox and the “suffering of the Saviour.” According to Eusebius, Dionysius is supposed to have died in the 12th year of Gallienus, which is 265 A.D. in the Scaligerian chronology. It is most remarkable that another well-known scientist by the name of Dionysius existed in the VI century A.D. – namely, Dionysius Exiguus (Dionysius the Little). He is

supposed to have conducted an in-depth study of the Paschalian problem, and deduced the date of Christ's birth for the first time. Apart from this, he calculated the advent of Easter for many years ahead, affixing it to the Spring Equinox ([76], table 18). We have two eminent scientists by the name of Dionysius who studied the Paschalian problem and the relation of Easter to the vernal equinox, both following Victor who already possesses a duplicate of his own. However, they are separated by a period of three centuries according to Scaligerian chronology. This is evidently a mistake; there was only one

Dionysius whose double existed on paper exclusively. Actually, we are to acquaint ourselves with yet another Dionysius the Little, who must have been the prototype of both. We are referring to Dionysius Petavius who lived in the XVII century.

We see strange duplicates in the Scaligerian history of the famous *Res Romana* as well ([5]). F. Schupfert writes that:

“The series of prominent Roman lawyers ends with Erennius Modestine who died in 244 A.D. After that, the entire discipline of law enters a lethargic phase to be revived in nine hundred years by Erennius [who was the double of Erennius in

activity as well as the name – A. F.]... It suddenly resurrected in the entirety of its primordial grace... in Bologna.” ([879], page 187)

The mediaeval Irnerius (“ancient” Erennius?), the founder of the school, started lecturing in Roman Law around 1088 A.D., “reviving” it after an alleged nine-century period of oblivion. He is also supposed to have “collected” the ancient codices of Justinian.

There are two famous Homers in Scaligerian history: the ancient poet and the mediaeval Angilbert Homer who is supposed to have belonged to Charlemagne’s court in the IX century

A.D. “He must have received his academic name Homer for his poetical works,” suggests G. Weber. “Very few poetic works of Angilbert have reached us” ([122], Volume 5, page 391). This *mediaeval Homer* had been “an important member of the circle of scientists that existed in the Aachen court of Charlemagne” ([122], Volume 5, page 391).

It has to be noted that Charlemagne is in no way a personal name as we tend to think today; most probably, it used to mean “The Great King.” The question of who exactly was referred to in that manner deserves a special study, and we

shall return to it below. In fig. 1.44 we can see a portrait of Charlemagne painted by Albrecht Dürer in the XVI century.



Fig. 1.44. Charlemagne's portrait (he allegedly reigned in 742-814). Albrecht Dürer, 1514. The portrait is kept in the German Museum, Nuremberg. Taken from [328], page 25, ill. 3.

Nowadays the “ancient Roman” count of time by ides and calends is assumed to have gone out of use in the VI-VII century A.D. Nevertheless, the mediaeval chronographers of XIV century A.D. appear to have been unaware of this fact, using the “long-forgotten” ides and calends wherever they saw fit ([229], p. 415).

There's a large number of such odd

doubles in the Scaligerian history. We are not claiming they prove our statements; one may indeed find a large number of isolated coincidences. What we emphasize is the global nature of these duplicates and parallels, fitting the general scheme of chronological shifts which cover sequences of *hundreds of years* “side by side” and “following each other” for hundreds of years to come.

One of the principal indications of the mediaeval origins of many ancient documents is the very existence of a Renaissance Epoch when all of the ancient scientific disciplines,

philosophy, arts, and culture in general are assumed to have been revived. The “resplendent Classical Latin” degrades into a rough and clumsy lingo that only manages to regain its former splendour in the Renaissance epoch. This “revival” of Latin and Classical Greek begins in the VIII-IX century A.D. the latest ([335], page 23).

The famed mediaeval troubadours begin to use the plots that the historians call “a masquerade of classical recollections” in the alleged X-XI century. The “history of Ulysses” (Odyssey) appears in the XI century as a “mediaeval remake” of the “well-known

Classical story” complete with knights, belles dames, jousting tournaments, etc.; in fact, all the elements that shall later be considered integral to a “Classical” plot, ([335], pages 83-84).

“The troubadours were proudly claiming the story [of the Trojan War – A. F.] to have been an original one, *it had neither been told nor written by anyone before*... The troubadours’ primary concern was the Trojan War, it had almost been a native story for them” ([335], pages 85-86). The Francs considered themselves descendants of the Trojans, while the alleged VII century author Fredegarius Scholasticus

refers to King Priam as a representative of the previous generation ([335], pages 85-86).

Furthermore, “The voyage of the Argonauts became confused with the Trojan War... when the crusader conquerors [apparently, the mediaeval prototypes of the “ancient” Argonauts – A. F.] had set forth in the direction of faraway Asian lands” ([335], pages 85-86). In mediaeval texts the ancient Alexander the Great “compliments the French” ([335], pages 85-86).

Certain Slavonic texts of the Middle Ages use the name Parizh (the Russian name for the city of Paris) in order to

refer to Paris, the abductor of Helen when they speak of the “ancient” Trojan War. Could it have referred to somebody from Paris? The following is said, for instance: “Parizh called himself Alexander and deceived Helen” ([10], page 234, comment 76). The same mediaeval texts often demonstrate the flexion of P and F spelling Parizh as Farizh.




Fig. 1.45. An old miniature from the book titled *Les Grandes Chroniques de France*,

Paris, allegedly dating from the early XV century. The siege of Troy is on top, and the foundation of Paris at the bottom. The miniature illustrates the Trojan origins of the French, with the “ancient” Greeks and Trojans portrayed as mediaeval knights wearing heavy plate armour identical to that of the knights founding Paris at the bottom of the miniature, also mediaeval. Taken from [1485], ill. 115.

On fig. 1.45 we see an ancient miniature from the *Great French Chronicle* dated to the alleged XV century that depicts the Trojan origins of the Franks. Modern commentary is as follows:

“The miniature illustrates the idea that the French can trace their ancestry back to Francion, the son of Hector and grandson

of the Trojan king Priam. This is why we see the foundation of Paris directly under the picture of the fall of Troy.” ([1485], page 104)

So, Troy barely has the time to fall when Paris is founded! The “ancient” Troy is also represented as a mediaeval city here.

Scaligerian chronology reckons that the so-called apocalyptic nations of Gog and Magog mentioned in the Bible disappeared from the historical arena in the early Middle Ages. However, reading modern commentary to the mediaeval *Alexandria* ([10]) we find out that “The names Gotti and Magotti must

be a repercussion of the apocalyptic nations of Gog and Magog identified as the memories *of the Goths and the Mongols* (the Book of Revelation, XX, 7), who were well known in the Middle Ages” ([10], page 248, comment 165).

The pressure of Scaligerian chronology and all of these oddities brings historians to the conclusion that:

“The Middle Ages were the time when all idea of chronological consequentiality had been lost: monks with crosses and thuribles at the funeral of Alexander the Great, Catilina attending mass... Orpheus becomes a contemporary of Aeneas, Sardanapal a Greek king, and Julian the Apostate – a Papal chaplain. Everything

acquires a *hue of fantasy* in this world [this perplexes the modern historian greatly – A. F.]. The most blatant anachronisms and *the strangest fancies* coexist peacefully.” ([879], pages 237-238)

All these facts, and thousands of others, are rejected by historians, since they contradict the consensual chronology of Scaliger and Petavius.

Christian saints and “ancient pagan characters” can be seen side by side on mediaeval Gothic cathedrals, q.v. in fig. 1.46 which shows the sculptures of Aristotle and Pythagoras together with the Christian saints from the western

façade of the Chartres Cathedral. The historians try to explain this chronological heresy in a rather vague manner: “Aristotle and Pythagoras... the two pagan philosophers on a Christian cathedral symbolize the importance of scientific knowledge” ([930], page 169).



Fig. 1.46. The sculptures of the *ancient Pagans* Aristotle and Pythagoras from the Chartres Cathedral, near the *Christian saints*. The western façade, allegedly dating from

1145-1170. "Aristotle and Pythagoras actually represent music and dialectic". Similar proximity of "ancient" and mediaeval characters is common in the bas-reliefs and murals of Christian temples in Europe and Russia. Taken from [930], page 169.

The oldest biography of "the ancient" Aristotle is dated to 1300 A.D. The manuscript's condition "rapidly deteriorates; certain places which could be read perfectly well in the XIX century are a great effort to make out nowadays" ([300], page 29). All of this despite the fact that, according to Scaligerian chronology, certain manuscripts whose age exceeds a

thousand years are still perfectly legible, and their parchment remains in a excellent condition, q.v. in Chron6, Chapter 2. Historians are most probably right in their estimation of manuscript destruction rate – many old texts may be well-preserved precisely because they really are not quite as old as we think them to be.

Presumably, “the best Greek codices of Aristotle’s works belong to the X-XII century” ([300], page 206). The “ancient” argument between the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle is revived in the XV century when Pleton and Scholarius, a devotee of Aristotle,

engage in a similar dispute. This is yet another odd mediaeval duplicate of ancient events.

The history of Europe's first acquaintance with the works of Aristotle wasn't studied until the XIX century ([300]). It is written that "Aristotle's philosophy had remained in a state of stagnation and taciturnity... only... 1230 years since the birth of Christ... the Latin population learnt of the philosophy of Aristotle" (quoted in [330], page 230). We would also like to quote the opinion of contemporary historians on this issue, namely, that "the mediaeval authors had a penchant of referring to

texts that they often were altogether unacquainted with” ([333], page 117).

In the Middle Ages “the somewhat barbaric shape... of the dispute between the realists and the nominalists... really represents the *renaissance* of the two immortal schools of idealism and empiricism... Nominalism and realism... signified a *rebirth* of the teachings of Plato and Aristotle in the XII century” ([335], pages 167-168). It is also assumed that the originals of Plato’s and Aristotle’s works were unknown in Europe in that epoch ([335]). Weren’t yet written, perhaps?

Yet another chronological duplicate:

“antiquity” = Middle Ages. “Three of the four principal philosophical systems of the Classical age were represented in the mediaeval science” in XII-XIII century Paris ([335], page 175). “The collision of realism... and nominalism... gave birth to scepticism at last... Another system that was the latest to have appeared in Greece had also seemed imminent... namely, that of mysticism” ([335], page 175). Indeed, mysticism soon becomes “revived” by Bonaventura ([335]).

Thus, the evolution of mediaeval philosophy faithfully mirrors even the minute details of the development of its

predecessor. Let us present this information as a table:

The Middle Ages	The Classical Age
1. Realism	1. Idealism
2. Nominalism	2. Empiricism
3. Pleton – the initiator of the revival of Platonism	3. Plato – the founder of Platonism
4. Scholarius – the initiator of the revival of Aristotelism	4. Aristotle – the founder of Aristotelism
5. Confrontation between the two schools	5. Confrontation between the two schools
6. Confrontation	6. Confrontation

between Pleton and Scholarius	between the Platonists and the Aristotelists
7. The naissance of scepticism	7. The naissance of scepticism
8. Mysticism evolves after the three schools	8. Mysticism evolves after the three schools
9. A total of four principal mediaeval schools of thought	9. A total of four principal Classical schools of thought.

A long time before the “discovery” of the “ancient” manuscript of *The Golden Ass*, the entire “ass topic” had been well-developed by the mediaeval troubadours ([335]). The “Classical ass

story” that surfaced as late as the Renaissance is a *logical conclusion* of the entire *mediaeval* cycle. One has to note that long before the discoveries of the “Classical” originals all of the main plots they contain had been developed by the troubadours, the “ancient” originals being in fact subsequent chronologically as well as structurally ([335], pages 142-143).

Long before the discovery of the “ancient” fables of Aesop, similar tales were told in the Middle Ages, in the alleged XI-XIII century ([335]).

An important fact to note is that the ancient people didn't have fixed names

in the modern sense; what they used instead were *aliases* which had explicit meanings in the original language. The aliases characterized a person in some manner; the more remarkable qualities a person had, the more aliases he or she would be likely to possess. B. L.

Smirnov says that “one seldom finds a name that would mean nothing” ([519], Volume 6, page 526, comments 126, 31. Also see J. Frazer’s works [917], [918], [919], [920]). For instance, the chroniclers could refer to an emperor by the alias used in their own region, and so different chronicles referred to the same rulers by different names.

The Egyptian Pharaohs used to have different names before and after their coronation. As multiple coronations would take place in different regions, the list of names kept growing. These aliases usually translate as “The Mighty,” “The Fair,” etc.

The father of a Roman consul who lived in the alleged year 169 B.C. had 13 names; his son had 38 ([872], page 101). The Torah scholars quote 94 names for the Biblical god ([544], Volume 6, page 978).

The same phenomenon was typical in Russian history. “Czar Ivan III was also known as Timothy; Czar Basil III was

known as Gabriel... Prince Dmitri (who had been killed in Uglich) was called Uar; one name was secular, and the other ecclesial” ([586], page 22). The name Uar most probably simply meant “Czar.”

Nowadays we tend to assume that mediaeval names differed significantly from the “ancient” ones. However, the analysis of a number of texts shows us that ancient names were in use throughout the Middle Ages. Nilus of Sinai, who is supposed to have died in 450 A.D., writes to his contemporaries addressing them with typically “ancient” names – Apollodorus, Amphiction, Atticus, Anaxagoras, Demosthenes,

Asklepiodes, Aristocles, Aristarchus, Alciviades, Apollos, etc. ([836]). Many of the names considered “exclusively ancient” nowadays were still in use in Byzantium in the XII-XIV century. Georgius Phrantz uses the following names in his *History* (1258-1476): Antioch, Argo, Amorius, Hermetian, Demetrios, Dionysius, Dioscorus, Epidaurus, Calliope, Cleope, Kritopulos, Laconicus, Macrobius, Minos, etc. – typical ancient names worn by people of the XIII-XV century.

Handwritten books remained in existence for a long time after the invention of the printing press. They

were made in large quantities in the XV-XVIII century all across Europe ([740], pages 13, 25). In the Balkans, “handwritten books managed to compete with the printed ones” as recently as in the XIX century ([740], page 26). Apart from a few exceptions, the entire Irish literature of the VII-XVII century “only exists in the handwritten form” (quoted by [740], page 28). Up until 1500 A.D., 77 percent of all printed books are supposed to have been in Latin, possibly due to the fact that Romanic fonts were easy to make. Other fonts made their way into the printing practice extremely slowly. Diacritic signs were difficult to

make, as well as the ones used for stresses, vocalisations, etc. This is why “the scribes remained without competition in what concerned copying the Greek, Arabic and Hebraic manuscripts” for centuries after the invention of the printing press ([740], page 57).

This may be the reason why many Greek, Arabic and Hebraic manuscripts considered “very ancient” really pertain to the epoch of printing. Among them are many classical texts, Tischendorf’s Biblical codices, etc.; see *Chron6*, Chapter 2.

It appears that the region richest in

handwritten books dating from the epoch of printing was Greece – the country that is considered to have a very long ancient history, one that gave the world a large number of “ancient manuscripts.”

Historians tell us that “due to the lack of publishing houses in Greece, *books were copied manually*” ([740], page 106).

One wonders how many handwritten books of the XV-XIX century were to be declared ancient later on.

The following information clearly demonstrates the lack of a solid scientific foundation under the very concept of palaeographical dating - that is, dating by the “handwriting style.” It

turns out that “the creation of the deluxe Greek codices with the texts of ancient authors was ordered by humanists and philanthropist collectors” ([740], page 109). Let us repeat the question: how many of these mediaeval codices were later declared extremely ancient?

One might suggest a method that allows the differentiation between real manuscripts and handwritten copies of printed books, namely, comparing the misprints in the printed versions with the handwritten errors, since during the manual copying of printed literature most misprints would get copied as well.

The foundations of the Scaligerian chronology had been laid by the analysis of *written sources*. A secondary analysis of these datings free from a priori hypotheses about the antiquity of the documents, may lead to the discovery of serious contradictions, as we have demonstrated.

13.

The foundations of archaeological methods have been based on the Scaligerian chronology from the very beginning

“HOW COME THERE WAS NO BATTLE?” The results of excavations conducted by the Swiss anthropologist Georg Glovacki in Italy proved sensational. The scientist discovered that there was no military action conducted in

the area where the troops of Hannibal had allegedly defeated the Roman legions in the battle of Cannes. A study of the barrows showed that the remains belong to the victims of the XIII century plague epidemic, and not to Roman soldiers, as everyone was accustomed to thinking.

Sovetskaya Rossiya, 28 November 1984.

13.1. The ambiguity of archaeological datings and their dependence on the existing chronology

The reader may inquire about the state of affairs concerning other methods of dating historical sources and artefacts

used nowadays. Modern archaeologists speak of the “ignorant diggers” of the previous centuries in pained tones, since many artefacts have become defaced in the search for valuables. The archaeologist Count A. S. Ouvarov excavated 7729 mounds in the Vladimir-Suzdal area. A. S. Spitsyn has the following to say about it: “when the items [found in the excavations of 1851-1854 – A. F.] came to the disposal of the Rumyantsev museum, they were a chaotic pile of materials with no markings whatsoever, and no one could tell which mound this or the other object had belonged to. The grandiose

excavations of 1851-1854... shall be mourned by the scientists for years to come” ([19], pages 12-13). Nowadays the excavation methods are a lot more advanced – however, applying them to “ancient” excavations is an impossibility since these have already been conducted by the “diggers” of the past ([389]).

The basics of archaeological dating methods are as follows: “the best way of deducing the age of a given European culture is finding out which Egyptian dynasty this European tribe traded with” ([390], page 55). The findings of Mycenae-made Greek vessels in the Egyptian mounds of the 18th-19th

dynasties allow the archaeologists to consider the dynasty and the culture as contemporaries. Similar vessels are found later on in Mycenae together with a particular kind of pin that is later also found in Germany near some urns. A similar urn is found near Fanger, together with a different kind of pin, which resembles the one found in Sweden, in the so-called Barrow of King Bjorn, which can thus be dated as a contemporary of the 18th-19th Egyptian dynasties ([390]). However, it turns out that King Bjorn's Barrow "could not have belonged to Bjorn, king of the Vikings [a well-known mediaeval

character – A. F.] since it predates his time by about two millennia” ([390], pages 55-56).

Firstly, one fails to understand what criteria of similarity have been used here. Secondly, and a lot more importantly, all of these methods are heavily dependent on the a priori datings of the “ancient” Egyptian Pharaoh dynasties. This method, which is also known as “the dominoes method,” and all similar ones are based on pure unadulterated subjectivism, and, principally, on Scaligerian chronology. Newly-found artefacts such as vessels are compared to similar findings dated

in accordance with the consensual chronology. The alteration of the chronological scale automatically alters the chronology of the new archaeological findings. An erroneous chronology completely invalidates all such methods.

It is little wonder that the archaeologists investing their trust in such methods are constantly confronted with bizarre facts. It appears that “in certain remote parts of Europe one encounters the coexistence of things whose prototypes in the East are *separated from each other by centuries*” ([390], pages 55-56).

Furthermore, L. S. Klein ([390]) firmly denies all connexions between King Bjorn's Barrow and the mediaeval Bjorn, king of the Vikings. This method tells us only that Bjorn's Barrow is contemporary to the 18th-19th Egyptian dynasties; it tells us nothing about the possible datings of these actual reigns, which may well be mediaeval, along with Bjorn the Viking.

“The first schemes of Egyptian chronology were based on the work of Manethon... who had compiled the list of the Pharaohs [allegedly in the III century B.C. – A. F.] and grouped them into 30 dynasties, having added up all

the years of reigns [and assuming that their reigns have all been consecutive – A. F.]. *The figures he got proved formidable.* Flinders Petrie, L. Borhardt, and other Egyptologists had estimated the duration of the history of Ancient Egypt to equal 5-6 thousand years. This is how the “long” chronology of Egypt was born, the one that had been prevalent for a long time. E. Meyer and his followers had developed the so-called “short” chronology as an alternative. The problem is that *the Pharaohs, and their entire dynasties, often reigned simultaneously* (as co-rulers) in different parts of the country.

Manethon was making the assumption that the state had been a monolithic one under a single ruler, and so *he had lined all of the Pharaohs into a sequence and thus considerably extended the entire history of the state*" ([390], pages 54-55).

We should add that the "short" chronology of Egypt is still way too long, and should really have been called "a slightly shorter chronology."

As we have already mentioned in reference to the data provided by the Egyptologist Heinrich Brugsch, the so-called "short" chronology is also based on ethereal foundations. We learn that its

creator, E. Meyer, “has based his deductions on the annual records and entries referring to memorable events made by the Pharaohs themselves. However... this chain of knowledge has reached us as *separate links, with many gaps and distortions*” ([390], pages 54-58). This is why attaching the archaeological material to the “Egyptian scale” does not solve the problem of absolute (or indeed even relative) dating.

13.2. The excavations of Pompeii. The dating of this town’s destruction

The excavations of the “ancient” town of Pompeii are a perfect illustration to the problems that arise in the dating of archaeological materials. First and foremost, it isn’t clear *which year’s eruption* destroyed it. Apparently, the XV century author Jacopo Sannazaro wrote: “We were approaching the town (Pompeii), and could already see its towers, houses, theatres and temples, *untouched by the centuries* [?! – A. F.]” (quoted in [389], page 31). It is assumed, however, that the town of Pompeii has got destroyed and completely buried after the eruption of 79 A.D. This is why the archaeologists

have to interpret Sannazaro in the following manner: “in the XV century some of the buildings of Pompeii were already emerging from the debris” ([389], page 31). It is thus assumed that Pompeii had been covered by a thick layer of earth, since the ruins of the town were only found in 1748, and the discovery was purely accidental. Herculaneum was discovered in 1711 ([389], pages 31-32). Nowadays the history of the discovery of Pompeii is related after the documented recollections of that epoch as follows: “during the construction of a canal on the river Sarno (1594-1600), the ruins of an

ancient town were found. *Nobody had the merest notion* it might be Pompeii... Methodical scientific excavations were started as late as 1860 by Giuseppe Fiorelli. However, his method of work was far from the usual scientific standards” ([433], page 49).

The excavations were indeed conducted in a barbaric manner. “Nowadays it is hard to estimate the damage done by the sheer vandalism of that time... if somebody thought a picture or a figurine wasn’t artful enough or visually pleasing, it would become destroyed and thrown away as trash. Sculpture fragments had been sold as

souvenirs, often as statuettes of saints” ([434], pages 224-225). Some of these “Christian forgeries” may have been mediaeval originals that did not fit the Scaligerian chronology, and hence wound up sold as souvenirs instead of becoming part of a museum’s collection.

If one’s cogitation is to be confined within the paradigm of the Scaligerian chronology, the artistic level of the artefacts found in Pompeii is very high indeed – be it frescoes, inlays, or statues. The state of science is also deemed advanced enough to *correspond to that of the Renaissance epoch*. One of the findings was a sundial with

uniform hourly divisions, which were considered a high level of precision even towards the end of the Middle Ages. This finding was analyzed by N. A. Morozov. An “ancient” picture of a part of such a device that had been found on a villa near the town of Pompeii can be seen in fig. 1.47.



Fig. 1.47. “Ancient” mural from the Boscoreale

villa near Pompeii. “We can distinctively see a terrestrial globe shown in an approximate perspective. The object was also related to the sundial” ([1177], ill. 4, inset between pages 106-107). Taken from [1177], plate 4.

V. Klassovsky wrote that “a set of surgical instruments has been discovered that is all the more noteworthy since some of the items have been previously supposed to belong to the modern times, *discovered and introduced by the scientific avant-garde of the operative medicine*” ([389], page 126).

Some of the graffiti art found on the walls of Pompeii is *clearly mediaeval in its origin*. For instance, the picture of

a *hooded henchman* ([389], page 161, qv in fig. 1.48). We see a mediaeval henchman that drags his victim (a man in a cape) onto a scaffold with a rope. V. Klassovsky tells us this is a “copy from a drawing made on plaster with some sharp object.” Another drawing that is definitely worthy of our attention is that of a mediaeval warrior wearing a helmet *with a visor* ([389], page 161, see fig. 1.49). These two drawings are but a small part of the Pompeian graffiti that is explicitly mediaeval in its content (qv in the illustrations to [873]). One should mark the illustration that one sees on page 44 of [873] (fig. 1.50). Nowadays

we are told that it portrays “ancient” gladiators ([873], page 44). However, what we see is clearly *a mediaeval knight with a visor on his helmet*. This is well-known military equipment of the Middle Ages.




Fig. 1.48. A picture found on a Pompeian wall.

We see a hooded mediaeval henchman, dragging a caped figure by a rope onto a wooden scaffold. Taken from [389], page 161.



Fig. 1.49. A picture of a mediaeval knight wearing a helmet with a visor, found in “ancient” Pompeii. Taken from [389], page 161.

DIVCRETI

SCR
CELER

SCR
MEMILIYS

SA TRÍ VALENTIS FLAMINIS NERÓNIS CAESARIS AVG. FÍLI CELER SING.
PERPETVÍ GLADIATORVM PARIA XX ET D LVCRETIO VALENTIS FÍLI AD LVNA
GLAD. PARIA X PVG. POMPEII S. VI. V. IV. III PR. S DVS. APR. V Í NATIO LEGITIMA
ET VELA ERVNT

OCEANVS L XIIIV



ARACINTVS. L VIII



SEVERV

XII ALBANV S. SCL XIX V



Fig. 1.50. Pictures of the Nero epoch painted on the wall of an “ancient” Pompeian residence. The “ancient” gladiators are depicted as mediaeval knights here; one can clearly see helmets with visors, which were invented in the Middle Ages. Taken from [389], page 44.

V. Klassovsky sums up his general impression of the excavations of Pompeii as follows: “I have been amazed many a time... to find that *ancient Pompeian artefacts often prove to be spitting images of the objects of a much later epoch*” ([389], page 133).

We also find out that, according to Klassovsky, many of the famous Pompeian inlays bear *an amazing*

resemblance to the *mediaeval* frescoes of Rafael and Giulio Romano in composition, colouring and style ([389], page 171, comment A). To put it simply, they look like mediaeval frescoes. An example of such an inlay can be seen in fig 1.51, ([389], page 172, table XII). This is assumed to be the ancient battle of Alexander the Great and the Persian king Darius (on the right). The inlay was discovered in 1831 and is now in the domain of the National Museum in Naples ([304], Volume 1, pages 232-233).



Fig. 1.51. An “ancient” Pompeian inlay showing the battle of Alexander and Darius at Issa. Modern drawn copy. Taken from [\[389\]](#).

V. Klassovsky’s comment runs as follows:

“On the floor of the triclinium one sees the famous mosaic from coloured stone, which now crowns the collection of the museum in Naples. The colouring and the technique are unparalleled, the

composition may well be compared to the best works of Raphael and Giulio Romano... It is most remarkable indeed that there should be a semblance between the work of the anonymous ancient artist and Raphael's 'Battle between Constantine and Maxentius' in style and the composition of the main group. Certain decorations of the Roman thermae of Titus bear amazing resemblance to some of Raphael's frescoes as well [sic!].”
([389], page 171)

The Scaligerian history as followed by Klassovsky tries to convince us that all these works of “ancient” art were created in the I century A.D. the latest, and have remained buried until very

recently, when the excavations of Pompeii finally began. Raphael, Giulio Romano and other artists of the Renaissance are supposed to have created paintings strongly resembling these “ancient originals” without even having seen them. All of this is highly suspicious. The hypothesis that we put forward is as follows: *Pompeii is a mediaeval town of the Renaissance epoch*. It has been destroyed by one of the relatively recent eruptions of the Vesuvius. The “ancient” Pompeian artists were contemporaries of Raphael and Giulio Romano, hence the stylistic semblances. Pompeii might have been

destroyed and buried by ashes during the well-known eruption of the Vesuvius that occurred in 1500 ([389], page 28), or even by the eruption of 1631. See more in Chron2, Chapter 2.

Most of the Pompeian graffiti cannot be used for dating purposes, such as quotidian announcements, slang, etc. However, some of the inscriptions explicitly contradict the Scaligerian chronology. One of them can be found in [389], and was translated by N. A. Morozov as follows: “The hunt and the decorations of *Valentis Nero* Augustus the Holy, son of the Holy D. Lucretius Valentis the Immanent, the 28th of

March.” We run into a contradiction between the Scaligerian history and actual inscriptions discovered as a result of excavations. An emperor with the double name of Valentis-Nero is mentioned here, whereas in Scaligerian chronology these names belong to two different emperors separated by about 300 years.

A longer version of the same “ancient” announcement referring to the pageants of 6-12th April can be seen in [873], No. 73 (see fig. 1.52). The translation offered by V. Fyodorova in [873], page 74, *separates* Nero from Valentis, as we had expected. We had no

opportunity of checking the authority of both translations.



Fig. 1.52. “Ancient” gladiators wearing mediaeval helmets with visors. Pompeian artwork, close-up of a fragment. Taken from

Artefacts of *the Christian epoch* have been found in the “ancient” town of Herculaneum. In fig. 1.53, for instance, one can see a Christian chapel discovered during the excavations of Herculaneum with a large cross on the wall.



Fig. 1.53. A rare picture of a Christian tabernacle unearthed in the “ancient”

13.3. The allegedly accelerated destruction of the “ancient” monuments

The archaeologists of the XX century have noticed a rather odd tendency. The overwhelming majority of the ancient monuments report deterioration in their condition that allegedly started two or three hundred years ago (from the moment their study began, in other words), and has become more intense than during the preceding centuries and even millennia. The examples are

widely known: the Theatre of Epidauros, Parthenon, the Coliseum, the palaces of Venice, etc. ([228], [144], [207], [456]). Here's another example in the form of an article from the *Izvestiya newspaper*, 31 October 1981:

“A sphinx in peril. The famous figure of the El Giza sphinx in Egypt has stood steadfast for five millennia. However, pollution has afflicted it terribly. A large piece of the sculpture (a paw) has fallen off. The reasons for this are as follows: high humidity, salty ground, and, primarily, the accumulation of sewage around the sphinx that isn't filtered in any way at all.”

It is nevertheless supposed to have stood

for five thousand years without any problems whatsoever.

This condition of deterioration is usually explained by the “negative effect of modern industry” ([144], [456]). However, as far as we know, there has been no quantitative research conducted to this day, as to whether or not modern industry afflicts ancient constructions made of stone. One logically assumes all of these buildings to be a lot more recent than what the Scaligerian chronology tells us. They are subject to erosion, and have a constant natural destruction rate, which is rather high.

13.4. When did the construction of the Cologne Cathedral really begin?

Nowadays we are being told that the construction of the famous Cologne Cathedral carried on for *several centuries*. It is assumed that the construction began in the IV century ([1015], page 3). After that, the cathedral has allegedly been rebuilt many times, and nothing remained from the “original cathedrals” whatsoever. The construction of the Gothic cathedral is supposed to have commenced in 1248 – some sources even mention the exact

date as 15 August 1248 ([1015], page 6). It is further assumed that the construction was “finished for the most part” by the XVI century, circa 1560 ([1015], page 8). After that, this gigantic mediaeval cathedral has allegedly undergone minor renovations, but, by and large, its shape remained unaltered (see fig. 1.54).



Fig. 1.54. The Cologne Cathedral as it is today.

Cologne, Germany. Taken from [1017],
photograph 3.

How valid is this point of view? When was the cathedral that we can see today really constructed? Is the construction that we see truly mediaeval, dating from the XIII-XVI century for the most part?

In fig. 1.55 we can see a schematic drawing from a technical brochure that demonstrates which parts of the cathedral are mediaeval, and which ones were built over the last two centuries. The full name of the brochure is *Gefahr für den Kölner Dom. Bild-Dokumentation zur Verwitterung. Auszug aus dem Kölner-Dom-Lese- und*

Bilderbuch. Professor Dr. Arnold Wolff. (The Dome of Cologne in danger. Graphic documents on weathering.) It was originally addressed to professionals specializing in the preservation and restoration of stone constructions. It was printed in Cologne, and can be obtained inside the cathedral.

The most important masonry layers of the Cologne Cathedral

- 1  Trachyte and andesite
Drachenfels (1248-1560), erodes slowly.
Medium endangerment rate.
- 2  Stenzelberg, Wölkensberg, Berkum (1829-1875)
Peels off. Low endangerment rate.
- 3  Sandstone
Schlaiddorf (1842-1863), intense erosion,
highest endangerment rate.
- 4  Obernkirchen (1845-1880),
no endangerment as to yet.
- 5  Limestone
Limestone from Main and Muschel (1904-1939)
erodes readily, poses danger in the future.
- 6  Savonnières, Caen etc (1845-1875). No danger
in protected locations (portals), erodes readily
without protection.
- 7  Basalt lava
Mayen, Niedermendig (1826-1872), no danger.
- 8  Ländorf (1952 and on), no danger.




Fig. 1.55. The chronology of the Cologne Cathedral masonry. Taken from the technical brochure titled *The Danger to the Cologne Cathedral. An Illustrated Documentary of the*

Erosion. Excerpt from the Illustrated Textbook on the Cologne Cathedral (Gefahr für den Kölner Dom. Bild-Dokumentation zur Verwitterung. Auszug aus dem Kölner-Dom-Lese- und Bilderbuch) by Professor Dr. Arnold Wolff. We obtained the brochure in the Cologne Cathedral. (1 – 1248-1560; 2 – 1829-1875; 3 – 1842-1863; 4 – 1845-1880; 5 – 1904-1939; 6 – 1845-1875; 7 – 1826-1972; 8 – 1952.)

According to the scheme, the oldest part of the masonry, that which belongs to the years 1248-1560, is represented by horizontal shading. The rest – shown by seven other kinds of shading, such as diagonal, dotted. etc. – was constructed a lot later, *after* 1826!

Amazingly enough, the oldest part of the masonry (horizontal shading) *amounts to a small part of the modern edifice*. Really, it only covers half of the cathedral's foundation, and even this small mediaeval fragment is not whole, since it consists of two parts that are pretty distant from each other (qv in fig. 1.55). The rest of the masonry – that is, *the major part of the entire modern edifice* – only appeared in the early XIX century. The absence of masonry dating to 1560-1825 is particularly suspicious. Does it mean that there were no works at all conducted in 250 years, or that they did not affect the structure of the

cathedral in any way worthy of mentioning?

What German historians and architects are telling us in this manner is that *the cathedral that we see today was essentially built in the XIX century!* By what criteria does Scaligerian history call it a mediaeval cathedral, in that case? Someone might say that despite the fact that the cathedral was built in the XIX century, it should still faithfully represent the mediaeval original that has stood there ever since the XIII century.

We would like to ask about the groundwork for this hypothesis. Are there any *genuine* mediaeval graphical

representations of the Cologne Cathedral before the XVII century? Apparently, there are *none*. The same brochure by Arnold Wolff contains an engraving dated 1834/1836 that depicts the cathedral pretty much the way it is nowadays. The album [\[1017\]](#) contains what appears to be the oldest picture of the cathedral on page 21 – dating from 1809. We consider all of this to mean that the construction of the cathedral *in its present form* has only commenced in the XIX century, which is proven by the masonry scheme as shown above. The cathedral was built between 1825 and 1835 for the most part, and the engraving

dating from 1834/1836 reflected the final stages of the cathedral's construction. There were renovations done in the XIX-XX century, but no major changes.

There were some traces of an ancient building on the site of the modern cathedral, since some mysterious masonry dating from 1248-1560 is present on the scheme. However, this very scheme explicitly tells us that this mediaeval masonry was used as building material for the XIX century construction. Let us study fig. 1.55 yet again. The lower part of the left tower is made of stones dating from the XIX

century laced with layers dating from the XIII-XVI century. The upper part of this tower is a construction of the XIX century, and the same is true for the other tower. The old mediaeval building that had stood on the place of the modern cathedral was deconstructed in the XIX century, its masonry used as construction material for the new edifice.

We would like to pose the following questions to the historians and the archaeologists:

1. Are there any genuine mediaeval pictures of either the Cologne cathedral or its predecessor that had existed before the XVII

century?

2. Does the modern Cologne cathedral bear any resemblance to the mediaeval cathedral that had stood on the same site before the XVIII-XIX century? Our hypothesis is that if there has really been a cathedral here, it was significantly different from the modern one – a great deal smaller, for one thing.
3. Why are there no traces of masonry dating to the period between 1560 and 1825 in the walls of the modern Cologne cathedral? Doesn't this mean that the construction really commenced in the XIX century on

the spot that had been previously occupied by a building of smaller proportions dating from the XIII-XVI century? One should also question the reasons for dating the old masonry to the XIII-XVI century; these stones may well belong to the XVII-XVIII century. Another enquiry that we find worthy of making concerns the methods used by modern archaeologists for dating masonry fragments. How can they be certain that a given stone was used for the construction of a cathedral wall in the year that they consider to be the

correct dating, and not some other?

We conclude with a general observation concerning the unnaturally prolonged construction of many historical buildings of mediaeval Europe. According to Scaligerian history, they were built *very slowly indeed*, for centuries on end. The Strasbourg cathedral is a perfect example. It used to be the tallest building in Europe. We are now being told that its construction began in 1015, and ended as late as 1275 ([415], Volume 1, page 333). That makes 260 years. The Erwin von Steinbach tower allegedly took 162 years to build. The historian Kohlrausch makes the logical conclusion

that “the entire edifice [of the cathedral – A. F.] *took 424 years to build*” ([415], Volume 1, page 333) – almost half a millennium!

Kohlrausch also couldn't have missed the unnaturally procrastinated construction of the Cologne cathedral. Apparently realizing the necessity of explaining such unnaturally extended terms, he offers the following as a theory: “The Cologne cathedral, whose construction began... in 1248... and lasted for 250 years. Such tardiness can be explained by the fact that its stones bear a great amount of artwork” ([415], Volume 1, page 333). As we are

beginning to understand, artwork has got absolutely nothing to do with the matter at hand – it is the erroneous Scaligerian chronology that has arbitrarily extended the construction period into several centuries.

13.5. Archaeological methods are most often based on Scaligerian datings

The modern methods of archaeological dating rely on the Scaligerian chronology to a great extent, and may often lead the researcher to great errors, which are blatantly obvious in some cases. Let us give a few examples.

The excavation of a barrow that was “dated with absolute certainty” to the epoch of Kiev Russia (the alleged IX-XII century), according to the “archaeological method,” occurred relatively recently. However, *nineteenth century coins* were found in the same barrow, among the bones. This is mentioned in the article by the Byelorussian historian Zaikovsky published in 1997 in the 12th issue of the *Almanach of History and Archaeology* on page 83. It is clear that the coins could not have made their way into the barrow by chance. Is there an explanation? As a matter of fact, there is,

and a simple one at that. The “ancient” barrow belongs to the XIX century. And there is nothing surprising about it, since the pagan church also known as “Romish” had existed in Russia and Byelorussia until the XX century, complete with specific burial rites. The centre of the Romish church had been in the Byelorussian village of Romy. In the XIX century it had possessed an archbishop, more that a hundred parishes, and a special language used by priests in sacraments. There is a XIX-century volume containing a detailed description of this old Russian pagan church.

Another example. A different barrow is being excavated, and the archaeologists make another “perfectly certain dating” that ascribes it to the Bronze Age. The ground under the barrow had been virgin until the hole that preceded the barrow had been dug. Some *XVIII century* ceramics were found in this hole; it could only have got there during the burial. This is yet another case of archaeologists using “scientific methods” for the dating of a XVIII century mound to the Bronze Age, or the time when the rather inexperienced humanity could not have fathomed the intricacies of iron

metallurgy. But the XVIII century was a period when both iron and steel were already known quite well. This barrow only got dated to the *Bronze Age* since it hadn't contained any steel or iron items.

In the cases described, the barrows contained objects that contradicted their initial datings. If there are no such objects, the archaeologists date the barrows “scientifically” to times immemorial. The very method of “archaeological dating” appears extremely flawed and wholly dependent on the a priori known *Scaligerian chronology*.

13.6. One of the numerous problems of the Scaligerian history – the problem of bronze manufacture before the discovery of tin

Many chemists and metallurgists have been reporting the following peculiar circumstance for quite a while, namely, that no bronze could possibly be manufactured in the Scaligerian “ancient” Bronze Age. Professor Michele Giua, “a prominent and versatile specialist in organic synthesis, as well as the chemistry of explosives and plastics” ([245], from the cover

annotation), the author of an in-depth work titled *The History of Chemistry*, writes the following (basing his logical construction on Scaligerian chronology, naturally):

“Copper... had been known from the prehistoric times not just in its free state... but also as bronze, an alloy of copper and tin. During the prehistoric epoch known as *Bronze Age*, bronze was used for the manufacture of various utensils, jewellery, weapons etc. However, the issue of ancient tin metallurgy remains extremely nebulous. Metallic tin had not been known in the Bronze Age; *nevertheless, it must have been used for the manufacture of bronze. All we can do is assume that a metal of a higher*

fusibility was manufactured as a result of fusing copper with some minerals rich in tin content. Thus, copper was discovered earlier than tin, whose metallurgy is a lot more complex. However, the fact that *bronze was discovered earlier than tin* does not clarify numerous other problems of ancient history.” ([245], pages 17-18)

The picture is perfectly clear. As we can see, the fact that tin metallurgy is more complex than that of copper is common knowledge. Hence bronze, being a fusion of copper and tin, *must have* appeared after the discovery of the latter. Scaligerian history has it the other way round – bronze is supposed to have been discovered before tin, in the

Bronze age. This contradiction inherent in Scaligerian chronology can be explained by the fact that the chronologers of that school were neither chemists nor metallurgists. How were they to know that the compilation of a history textbook requires that the description of the discovery of tin should precede that of the invention of bronze? However, the historians of the XVII-XVIII century were driven by altogether different considerations, neither caring much for tin, nor indeed for science itself. None of them would consider consulting with a chemist. As a result, “ancient” Greek heroes happily

hack at each other with bronze swords that need tin for their manufacture, which had not yet been discovered in than epoch. Modern chemists are naturally confused by such historical tableaux, and are earnestly questioning the reasons for the existence of such oddities in Scaligerian history of chemistry and metallurgy.

Our explanation is a very simple. The Bronze Age falls within the epoch of the XIV-XVI century, when tin had already been discovered (after copper, of course). Consider the allegedly ancient bronze idols from Luristan currently in the Louvre's possession, qv in fig. 1.56.

Michele Giua cites them as examples of “ancient” bronze art. However, these artful Bronze Age figurines were most probably made in the XV-XVII century.



Fig. 1.56. “The Bronze Idols from Luristan,” allegedly extremely ancient ([245], page 19). Kept in the Louvre in Paris. These artefacts most probably date from a much more recent

period. Taken from [245], page 19.

The same applies to the “ancient” bronze girandole that has received the dating of V century B.C., also from the Louvre’s collection, that we see in fig. 1.57. It may well be an item made in the XVI-XVIII century.



Fig. 1.57. A bronze figurine, presumably “very old,” dated to the V century B.C. This scone most probably belongs to a much more recent age, namely, the XVI-XVIII century. Taken from [1237].

14.

The problems and
deficiencies of
dendrochronology and
several other dating
methods

14.1. The consequent scale of
dendrochronological datings
does not extend further back
in time than the X century

A.D.

The *dendrochronological* method is one of the modern dating methods claiming to be capable of dating historical artefacts independently. It is based on the assumption that the yearly growth of tree rings is uneven. Annual ring thickness rates are supposed to be roughly similar for the trees of the same kind that grow in similar conditions.

In order to make this method fit for actual dating, one has to construct a reference scale of annual ring thickness for trees of a particular kind for a historical period of sufficient length. Let us call this graph a dendrochronological

scale. If such a scale is constructed, it might aid one in the attempt at dating archaeological findings containing wooden pieces. One has to determine the timber type, saw off a sample, measure the thickness of rings, build a diagram and try to find out whether it concurs with any part of the reference scale. One should also consider the question of what deviations of compared diagrams can be ignored safely.

However, the European dendrochronological scales only reaches several centuries back in time, which does not allow for the dating of “ancient” constructions.

“Many European scientists have started to experiment with the dendrochronological method... however, obtaining results appeared a very complex task. *The oldest trees in the European forests are only 300-400 years old...* Deciduous trees have *vaguely defined* rings which are hard to study and most reluctant to tell the researcher anything about the past... Quality archaeological material proved extremely scarce, against all expectations.” ([616], page 103)

American dendrochronology is in better conditions, since it is based on Douglas fir, mountain pine and yellow pine ([616], page 103). However, this region is far away from the zone of “ancient

history.” Furthermore, there is always a large number of ignored factors, such as the weather conditions for the period in question, soil quality, humidity level fluctuation for the area in question, its geography, and so on. All of them affect the growth rate of the rings significantly ([616], pages 100-101). It is most important that the creation of dendrochronological scales was based on *the existing Scaligerian chronology* ([616], page 103). Thus, any alteration of the chronology of documents should *automatically* alter these scales, whose independence is thus greatly compromised.

It appears that the dendrochronological scales for Europe and Asia only reach several centuries back from our age. We shall give a more detailed account of the contemporary state of such scales for Italy, the Balkans, Greece, and Turkey.

Let us refer to a diagram of *dendrochronological dating scales* for those countries that reflects the state of affairs in this area as of spring 1994 (fig. 1.58). This diagram was kindly provided by Professor Y. M. Kabanov (Moscow). He took part in a conference in 1994 where the American Professor Peter Ian Kuniholm made a report on the

modern state of dendrochronology,
presenting this rather noteworthy
diagram that had been compiled in the
Malcolm and Carolyn Wiener
Laboratory for Aegean and Near Eastern
Dendrochronology, Cornell University,
Ithaca, New York, USA.




Fig. 1.58. The modern condition of the

dendrochronological scales. One can observe that they are considered to extend until as late as the X century A.D. uninterrupted. The “scale” pertinent to earlier epochs is merely an assortment of unrelated fragments.

In fig. 1.58 we can see fragments of dendrochronological scales for different kinds of timber: oak, box, cedar, pine, juniper, and conifers in general.

All of these scales have a very obvious gap around 1000 A.D. Thus, none of them can be continued without intervals further back in time than the X century A.D.

All of the earlier fragments of dendrochronological scales as shown on

the diagram cannot be used for independent datings, since their attachment to the time axis is wholly dependent on the Scaligerian chronology, which had served as a basis for the dating of several individual “ancient” pieces of wood.

A piece of wood found in a Pharaoh’s tomb thus gets the dating of some distant millennium before Christ due to “historical considerations” based on the Scaligerian chronology. After that, other “ancient” pieces of wood are linked to the one that has already been dated. These attempts occasionally succeed, which results in the construction of a

fragment of the dendrochronological scale around the first piece of wood. Relative datings of ancient findings within this fragment may be correct. However, their absolute dating, that is, the placement of this fragment on the time axis, is *wrong*. The reason is that the first dating was based on the erroneous Scaligerian chronology.

Let us return to the basics of the dendrochronological methods. In theory, the dendrochronological scale is supposed to grow, beginning with the current period and extending into the past. This implies the collation of ring thickness scales of different specimens.

What is the principle of this collation?

A modern source [1055] gives an in-depth analysis of the problem on page 341. It turns out that the method used is a combination of mathematical statistical methods and “visual” subjective assessments. Hence, the boundary between dated and undated dendrochronological scales becomes very vague.

The book [1055] tells us rather frankly that:

“If we can find a collation position whose diagrams concur with those of the traditional chronology to the best of our certainty and knowledge, the new

specimen is considered dated. If we fail to discover such a collation position, the specimen remains undated, although even in this case a dendrochronologist can point out one or more collation methods whose concurrence is 'good,' but not 'perfect' (in his opinion). Needless to say, *the Dendrochronological Society has to agree on what is to considered perfect concurrence.*" ([1055], page 341)

Dendrochronology is thus affected by subjectivity and arbitrariness. Different dendrochronological datings have different veracity. The veracity of a dendrochronological dating depends on the certainty of the collations on the dendrochronological scale. Dubious

collations cast the shade of ambiguity over the entire scale. The book [1055], page 341, uses a special term for referring to such datings, namely, “the grey zone” (with white zone referring to certain datings, and the black one, to the total absence of datings of any kind).

The recently published book by Christian Blöss and Hans-Ulrich Niemitz subjects the dendrochronological method to some very sharp criticisms that leave no stone unturned ([1038]).

14.2. Sedimentary layer datings. The methods of

radium-uranium and radium-actinium analysis

The Scaligerian chronology implicitly or explicitly affects the scale graduations of methods, even the rough physical ones supposed to give the absolute age of objects.

A. Oleinikov tells us that:

“Over the eighteen centuries that have passed since the time of the Roman invasion [in reference to the territory of the modern Savoy – A. F.], the weathering processes have created a 3 mm erosion layer on the walls near the quarry’s entrance. Comparing the thickness of this 1800-year-old layer [according to the

Scaligerian chronology – A. F.] to the 35-cm erosion crust that covers the glacier-polished hills leads one to believe that the Ice Age left these latitudes about 216 thousand years ago... The proponents of this method have been well aware of the difficulty of obtaining a referential scale for something like erosion speed... it differs for various climates: the same type of rock erodes at varying speeds in the tropics and beyond the Arctic Circle. Erosion speed also depends on the temperature, humidity, rainfall and sunshine. This means that every biospheric zone requires the compilation of special scales and diagrams; besides, one cannot be certain that the weather conditions have remained unaltered since the exposure of the layer that we're interested in." ([616],

There were many attempts of deducing absolute age by the speed of sedimentary layer formations. They didn't lead anywhere, which is perfectly understandable.

Oleinikov tells further that:

“The research in this direction has been conducted by the scientists of many countries; however, the results failed to meet the expectations. It became apparent that *similar types of rock erode at different rates even under similar conditions, and establishing a regular pattern of these processes is hardly possible at all*. For instance, ancient documents [a reference to the Scaligerian

chronology yet again! – A. F.] tell us that the Egyptian Pharaoh Ramses II reigned about 3000 years ago. The buildings that were constructed in his lifetime are now covered by a three metre layer of sand. This means that about a metre of sand accumulated every millennium. At the same time, certain areas of Europe have a *millenarian* rate of three centimetres of sediment, whereas for the firths in the South of the Ukraine this is an *annual* rate.” ([616], page 39)

The development of other methods was attempted as well. “The radium-uranium and radium-actinium methods are valid for the time interval of 300 thousand years. They are convenient for the

datings of geological formations when the required precision does not exceed 4-10 thousand years” ([616], page 70). However, this isn’t precise enough for the ends of historical chronology, and cannot contribute to it in any substantial manner at all.

15.

Are radiocarbon datings to be trusted?

15.1. The radiocarbon datings
of ancient, mediaeval, and
modern specimens are
scattered chaotically

*15.1.1. Libby's initial idea.
The first failures*

The most popular method claiming the

capability of dating ancient artefacts independently is the radiocarbon method. However, the accumulation of radiocarbon datings has exposed the difficulty of the method's application.

According to Oleinikov, "Another problem had to be considered. The intensity of the atmospheric radiation is affected by many cosmic factors. The radioactive carbon isotope production rate should also vary, and one needs to find a method that would take these variations into account. Apart from that, over the period when highways and industrial plants have been introduced by the civilization, a gigantic amount of

carbon from the combustion of wood, coal, oil, turf, oil-shales and their products emanated into the atmosphere. How does this atmospheric carbon affect the production of its radioactive isotope? In order to get veracious datings, one has to introduce complex corrections into calculations that reflect the changes in the content of the atmosphere over the last millennium. *This issue, as well as a number of technical difficulties, casts a shadow of doubt over the precision of many radiocarbon datings.*” ([616], page 103)

W. F. Libby, the author of the method,

wasn't a historian, and did not question the veracity of the Scaligerian datings, which had been used for the justification of his method according to his book. However, the archaeologist Vladimir Miloicic has proved this method to give random errors of 1000-2000 years, while its "independent" dating of the ancient specimens faithfully follows the datings offered by the consensual chronology. Naturally, there can be no talk of "proof" here ([391], pages 94-95).

Let us quote some rather meaningful details. As we have already noted, W. F. Libby had a priori been certain of the

veracity of Scaligerian datings. He wrote that they “...had no contradictions with the historians in what concerned ancient Rome and Egypt. *We did not conduct anything in the way of extensive research related to this epoch* [sic! – A. F.], since its chronology in general is known to the archaeologists a lot better than whatever our methods could estimate, so the archaeologists were doing us a favour providing specimens [which are actually destroyed, being burned in the radiocarbon measurement process – A. F.]”([478], page 24).

This confession of Libby's tells us a

lot, since the deficiencies of Scaligerian chronology directly concern the regions and epochs that he and his team “*did not research extensively enough.*”

We can see that the Scaligerite archaeologists were most reluctant about letting the radiocarbon method enter the “certainty epochs” of Scaligerian history for fear of embarrassing discoveries. Archaeologists have naturally got no objections against applying this method to the undocumented prehistory since nothing capable of compromising consensual chronology can possibly be found there.

In what concerns the several reference

measurements that were conducted on ancient artefacts, the situation is as follows. The radiocarbon dating of the Egyptian collection of J. H. Breasted “suddenly discovered the third object that we analyzed to have been contemporary,” according to Libby. “It was one of the findings... considered... to belong to the V dynasty [2563-2423 B.C., or roughly four millennia before our time. – A. F.]. *It has proved a heavy blow indeed*” ([478], page 24).

Why could it have been such a blow? The physicists appear to have restored the veracious dating of the Egyptian specimen, proving the old one to have

been wrong. What's the problem with that?

The problem is of course the simple fact that any such dating would prove a menace to the Scaligerian chronology. Carrying on in that vein would lead Libby to compromising the entire history of ancient Egypt.

The specimen that Libby had been careless enough to have claimed as modern had to be *called a forgery* and disposed of ([478], page 24), which is only natural since the archaeologists could not have possibly let the heretical thought of the XVI-XVII century A.D. (considering the method's precision)

origin of the “ancient” Egyptian finding enter their minds.

“The evidence that they [the proponents of the method – A. F.] use for proving the veracity of their method is rather insubstantial, with all the indications being indirect, the calculations imprecise, and the interpretation ambiguous, the main argument being the radiocarbon datings of the specimens whose age is known for certain used for reference... Every time referential measurements are mentioned, everybody quotes the results of the first referential datings that were obtained *for a very limited number of specimens*

[sic! – A. F.]” ([391], page 104).

Libby recognizes the absence of substantial referential statistics. Together with the *millenarian* dating deviations mentioned above (explained as a consequence of a series of forgeries), we may thus question the very validity of the method as used for dating specimens belonging to the period that we're interested in, covering the two millennia preceding our century. This discussion does not concern the applicability of the method for geological purposes, however, where millenarian deviations are considered insubstantial.

W. F. Libby writes that “there was no deficiency in materials belonging to the epoch preceding ours by 3700 years for checking the precision and the dependability of the method” ([478], pages 24-25). However, there is *nothing* here to compare radiocarbon datings to, since there are no dated written documents dating from those epochs. Libby also informs us that his historian acquaintances “are *perfectly certain* of the veracity of the datings referring to the last 3750 years, however, their certainty does not spread as far as the events that precede this era” ([478], pages 24-25).

In other words, the radiocarbon method has been used most extensively for the period of time that doesn't allow the verification of the results by any other independent method, which makes life a lot easier for the historians. The example that we quote below is most typical.

“The radiocarbon datings of the three inscription-bearing plaques found in Romania have put archaeologists in a quandary... The ashes that they were found in prove them to be 6000 years old at the very least. Could the discovery of literacy have happened in a rural community in Europe and not in the urban and highly-developed Sumerian civilization? [Such an

awful lot of space for the flight of exalted fantasy – A. F.] The scientists consider this probability to be very low... There have been many theories put forward for the explanation of this discovery that apparently refuted the reigning opinion on the origins of written language. Some of the archaeologists, without doubting the scientific principles of the radiocarbon method have suggested *the method to be error-prone due to the effects of factors that haven't been studied as of yet*" ([478], page 29).

Could it be that the errors of the method are rather insubstantial and allow for an approximate dating of the specimens belonging to the last two or three millennia? The state of affairs appears to

be a graver one. The errors of radiocarbon dating are too great and too chaotic. They can amount to several millennia in what concerns contemporary and mediaeval objects (q.v. below).

In 1984 the *Technology and Science* magazine had published the results of the radiocarbon method-related discussions from the two symposiums in Edinburgh and Stockholm (No 3, page 9):

“*Hundreds* [sic!] of analysis examples were quoted with dating errors ranging from 600 to 1800 years. In Stockholm the scientists lamented the fact that the radiocarbon method appears to produce

the greatest distortions when applied to the history of ancient Egypt in the epoch preceding ours by 4000 years. There are other examples, some of them pertaining to the history of Balkan civilizations... Specialists have reached solidarity in their opinion that the radiocarbon method remains ambiguous due to the impossibility of proper calibration, which renders it unacceptable since it gives no calendar datings.”

15.1.2. A criticism of the application of the radiocarbon method to historical specimens

According to L. S. Klein, the

radiocarbon datings "...have confused the archaeologists greatly. Some of them were characteristically overzealous... to follow the advice of the physicists... These archaeologists hastened to reconstruct the chronological schemes [which implies they aren't constructed firmly enough – A. F.]... The first archaeologist to have opposed the radiocarbon method was Vladimir Miloicic, who... attacked the practical usage of radiocarbon datings, and... criticised the very theoretical foundation of the physical method sharply and bitterly... The comparison of individual measurements of modern specimens with

their average value allowed Miloicic to support his scepticism with a series of brilliant paradoxes.

The shell of a *living* American mollusc has the radioactivity index of 13.8 as compared to the average value of 15.3, which makes it 1200 years old. A *live* North African wild rose flower with the radioactivity of 14.7 has been dead for 360 years, according to the physicists... as for the Australian eucalyptus with a radioactivity of 16.31, it isn't likely to exist anywhere in the next 600 years. A shell from Florida with a value of 17.4 shall only appear in 1080 years...

Since in the past radioactivity wasn't distributed any more evenly than it is now, similar fluctuations and errors may afflict ancient objects as well. A prime example is the result of the radiocarbon dating of a mediaeval altar fragment from Heidelberg... which demonstrates that the wood used for the repair of the altar hadn't existed at that time... In the Iranian Welt cavern the lowest layers were dated to 6054 B.C. (give or take 415 years) and 6595 (give or take 500 years) before Christ, whilst the layer on top was dated to 8610 B.C., give or take 610 years. The upper layer is thus 2556 years older than the lower, which is

clearly an impossibility. There is a vast number of similar examples...” ([391], pages 94-95)

Thus, the radiocarbon dating method can only be used for the approximate datings of objects whose age amounts to dozens of millennia, when the error rate is *comparable with the actual specimen age* reaching one-two or more thousand years.

Live molluscs have been dated with the radiocarbon method, and proved to be *2300 years old* as a result, which is perfectly preposterous (qv in *Science* magazine, No. 130, dated 11 December 1959). The radiocarbon dating deviation

amounts to twenty-three hundred years here.

A few more examples of relatively recent radiocarbon datings made around 1970-1971:

1. No. 225 of *Nature* magazine dated 7 March, 1970 reports the results of analyzing the C-14 content of organic material contained in the mortar of an English castle which is known to have been built 738 years ago. The radiocarbon dating gave the age of 7370 years as a result, being *6500 years off the mark*. The radiocarbon dating deviation amounts to six millennia and a half.

One wonders whether there was any point in quoting decades with such precision.

2. The radiocarbon analysis of seals that have just been shot defined their age as 1300 years, i.e. dating mistake of 1300 years. Seals mummified 30 years ago have been dated as 4600 years old, with a dating error of 4570 years. Quote from the *Antarctic Journal of the United States*, No. 6, 1971.

The above examples demonstrate that radiocarbon dating can make the specimens thousands of years older than they really are. As we have seen, there

are examples of the opposite, when the specimen is dated as belonging to the distant future.

One shouldn't wonder about radiocarbon analysis making mediaeval objects fabulously old.

Let us return to L. S. Klein's review. He writes that: "Miloicic suggests to cease the tendentious "critical" editing of the radiocarbon datings, which is constantly done by the physicists, and calls upon their patrons the archaeologists to do away with the "critical" censorship that axes the publication of the complete result. He appeals to both physicists and

archaeologists to publish all of the results of their research without filtering out the dates that strike them as improbable. He also tries to convince the archaeologists to stop the practice of familiarizing the physicists with the age of the finding, and not giving them any figures until they publish theirs! Otherwise, after such editing, which reflects the private viewpoints of the researchers themselves, the dating is bound to be subjective, so the study of the concurrence between historical and radiocarbon datings becomes impossible.

Thus, in Groningen, where the

archaeologist Becker has been a supporter of the short [European – A. F.] chronology, radiocarbon datings are usually recent, whereas in Schleswig and Heidelberg, where Schwabedissen and others have been proponents of the longer version of chronology, these datings are usually a lot more ancient.” ([391], pages 94-95)

We think that no commentary to the above is required.

We may be told that the radiocarbon method may have attained a higher level of precision over the last couple of years. This may be true concerning the theory and the actual measurements. The

question is, however, whether these improved methods are used in modern archaeological practice, and if so, what results are obtained in this manner. *Do the new radiocarbon datings concur with Scaligerian chronology?* Let us quote a relatively fresh example.

15.2. The dating of the Shroud of Turin

The reports of the radiocarbon dating of one of the most famous Christian holy objects – the Shroud of Turin, qv in figs. 1.59, 1.60, 1.61 – caused a great resonance in 1988. According to the traditional version, this piece of cloth

bears the image of the body of crucified Christ and dates from the I century A.D., which is supposed to make it about two thousand years old. However, radiocarbon datings have given a different dating: roughly XI-XIII century A.D. The radiocarbon analysis has been conducted in three laboratories – in Oxford University, Arizona University, and the Swiss Technological Institute in Zurich ([769], page 80).



Fig. 1.59. Photograph of the celebrated Shroud of Turin ([387], pages 16-17).



Fig. 1.60. A fragment of the Shroud. Taken from [46]. Also see [1055], page 138, ill. 7.1, as well as [358], pages 16-17.





Fig. 1.61. Negative and positive images of the Shroud of Turin ([358], pages 16-17).

A scientific work specifically dedicated to the radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin claims the linen fabric that the shroud is made of to be produced between 1050 and 1350 A.D. ([1055], page 141). The authors cite the results of the Shroud's radiocarbon analysis performed in the laboratory of the Oxford University ([1055], page 140). The laboratories of Arizona and Zurich have given more recent datings, 1304 and 1274 (with the error rates of 31 and

27 years) respectively ([769], page 82).

These results have proved shocking for many. “In September 1988... a report appeared telling of the analysis and the fact that it *gave a certain dating of the shroud’s fabric which turned out a thousand years more recent than the alleged date of Christ’s death... even if the Shroud is dated as a XI century artefact...*” ([46], page 25). The author ceases the discussion of the dating after this, and begins to ponder the veracity of Christ’s image as seen on the Shroud.

One arrives to the following conclusions:

1. Either the Shroud of Turin is a

forgery;

2. the radiocarbon datings can contain errors of several centuries or even millennia;
3. or the Shroud of Turin is original, but dated to the XI-XIII century A.D. If this be the case, it is natural to ask about the century that Christ's lifetime pertains to. Could it really have been the XII?

We discuss the radiocarbon dating of the Shroud in our book entitled "King of the Slavs". The second half of the XII century turns out to be the most likely dating.

As we demonstrate in our book

entitled “King of the Slavs”, the radiocarbon dating of the Shroud (the middle of the XII century) concurs with other independent datings of Christ’s lifetime. In particular, he must have been born in 1152 and crucified in Czar-Grad in 1185. We must note right away that our attitude towards the results of radiocarbon datings is highly critical (we shall discuss the reasons at length below). However, the situation with the dating of the Shroud is somewhat different. The specimens of its fabric were dated by a number of different laboratories, which makes the results of this research somewhat more plausible.

The radiocarbon dating of the Shroud of Turin to the XI-XIII century A.D. made the historians rather worried, and provoked a series of attempts to refute the result. A. Agureyev, the ITAR-TASS correspondent, had made a report from New York in 1998 that can be found printed in the

Gudok newspaper dated 4 April 1998. This report stated that the radiocarbon dating of the shroud “contradicts the Biblical tradition. However, according to the scientists of the University of Texas, their Italian colleagues *should not have used the radiocarbon analysis system*”. The

Shroud could allegedly “have fallen prey to a fungus” in the XI-XIII century; this may have affected the radiocarbon dating. “However, the scientists have no opportunity of conducting further research, since the Catholic church refused to provide any more specimens, and even insisted on the return of all of the ones that were at scientists’ disposal” (same source).

Since the results of the radiocarbon dating of the Shroud gave results that contradicted the Scaligerian dating of the life of Jesus Christ, the radiocarbon method had to be exposed to public attention. The protection of the

Scaligerian dating of Christ's life had been provided by the publication of new facts important enough to considerably aggravate the dubiety of the radiocarbon method in what concerns its applicability to historical chronology, already great enough. Let us quote some of the critical materials belonging to the proponents of the Scaligerian chronology ([358]). The publication belongs to Rev. Gleb Kaleda, a prominent geologist, Professor, and Doctor of Sciences. Also see [717] for critical material.

“There are several other factors, either local or planetary, that affect the

concentration of C-14 in the atmosphere, hydrosphere, and organic matter, thus complicating and limiting the use of the radiocarbon method in chronology.

a) Natural or artificial radiation.

Neutrons released in nuclear and thermonuclear reactions, as well as cosmic rays, turn N-14 into C-14. The atmosphere content of C-14 had *doubled* in the period between 1956 and August 1963. A *drastic increase* in C-14 content began after the thermonuclear explosions in 1962.

...

d) The local effect of volcanic gases on C-14 content had been described by

L. D. Sulerzhitsky and V. V. Cherdantsev ([717]).

In a number of cases radiochronological age calculations give *results that are clearly absurd* and contradict the entirety of accumulated geological and palaeontological data. In such cases “absolute chronological figures” are to be ignored as blatantly erroneous. *The discrepancies between geochronological definitions using different isotope methods may reach a factor of 10x.*

In 1989 the British Science and Technology Council analysed the precision of the radiocarbon method

(see the 8th issue of the *New Scientist* magazine for 1989). 38 laboratories from all across the world were involved in the research. All of them received specimens of wood, turf, and carbonate salts whose age had only been known to the organizers of the experiment, and not to actual analysts. Only seven laboratories (of thirty-eight! – A. F.) reported satisfactory results; *others proved wrong by factors of 2x, 3x and higher*. The comparison of the data received by different researchers that used various analysis methods has shown that the causes of the dating errors were not limited to the

imprecision of a specimen's radioactivity estimation as it had been assumed; apparently, the technology of preparing specimens for analysis had also served as an entropy agent. The diagnostic errata are caused by the calefaction of specimens as well as some methods of preliminary chemical processing. *Everything points at the necessity of using the radiocarbon dating method with the utmost caution*" ([358], pages 14-16).

In 1997 the German authors Christian Blöss and Hans-Ulrich Niemitz have published a book titled suggestively enough *C-14 Crash* ([1038]). They have

collected a great body of *modern* material demonstrating rather convincingly the fact that *the radiocarbon method in its current form cannot serve as a valid basis for absolute datings of historical artefacts.*

More on the subject can be seen in the bulletin [1491] that contains the following critical publications of 1991-1995 that interest us:

1. Christian Blöss and Hans-Ulrich Niemitz (1996), *Der Selbstbetrug von C14-Methode und Dendrochronologie;*
2. Hans-Ulrich Niemitz (1995), *Die “magic dates” und “secret*

*procedures” der
Dendrochronologie;*

3. Herbert Illig (1991),
*Dendrochronologische
Zirkelschüsse.*

As we can see, radiocarbon dating might prove more or less effective in analyzing objects whose age is measured by tens and hundreds of millennia. The errors of tens and thousands of years naturally inherent in the methods are of minor importance here, although this is far from obvious. However, the mechanical use of the method for the dating of objects no older than two thousand years, which is the historical epoch that

interests us most in what concerns the reconstruction of the true history of documented civilization, appears perfectly impossible without being preceded by extensive and detailed statistical research and calibrations employing specimens of known ages. As far as we know, no such research has ever taken place, so there are no referential statistics. There is also no knowledge of whether improving the method's precision is a possibility at all. Also see [\[718\]](#).

Other physical dating methods do exist; unfortunately, the spectrum of their applicability is considerably more

limited than that of the radiocarbon method, and their precision is also insufficient for the historical epochs relevant to our ends. For instance, in the early XX century some scientists proposed to define the ages of buildings by the shrinkage of their foundations or the deformation of columns; however, no steps have been made in this direction due to the impossibility of calibrating this method and estimating the real shrinkage and deformation speed.

Two more methods have been suggested for dating ceramics: the archaeomagnetic method and the thermoluminescent method. However,

they have calibration issues of their own. The archaeological datings offered by these methods for the Eastern Europe, for instance, are limited to the Middle Ages.

Let us return to the Shroud of Turin for a second in order to put forth the following hypothesis concerning the nature of the alleged human figure that one sees on the Shroud's fabric. One shouldn't exclude the possibility that an embalmed body had really been wrapped in this linen at some point. Let us recollect that the "ancient" Egyptians had the practice of wrapping a body up in several tight layers of cloth saturated

with various elixirs. This may have resulted in a “carbon copy” of a body on the fabric of the cloth which was later removed for some reason, and stored with great care. See our book entitled “King of the Slavs” for more details.

15.3 Modern radiocarbon analysis of Egyptian artefacts demonstrates serious contradictions

We shall once again consider the alleged reliability of the radiocarbon method used for supporting the traditional version of the “ancient” history,

particularly Egyptian, as reflected in a fundamental and detailed article published by the Manchester Museum in England in 1979 as part of the project named “The Mummies of the Manchester Museum” ([1196]). This most remarkable material was recommended to us by Professor A. Kravtsevich from the Alberta University Department of Mathematics, Edmonton, Canada.

The topic of the article is a dating that had amazed and confused the authors of the article ([1196]). The radiocarbon dating of the mummy #1770 from the Manchester Museum collection attributed the mummy's bones to 1000

B.C., whereas the cloth that the mummy has been wrapped in received the dating of 380 A.D. The discrepancy between the datings of the mummy and the cloth equals some 1400 years, although the dates should be equal. The cloth may be somewhat older than the mummy if an old cloth had been used by the embalmers, but it couldn't possibly have belonged to a later age.

According to the authors of the article, this gap of nearly a millennium and a half cannot be explained by the possible errors of the radiocarbon dating, the way it is usually done today. That is why they had to come up with the rather amusing

“explanation” that the old mummy was exhumed after fifteen hundred years, and re-wrapped in a *new* cloth, and then restored to its rightful place as though it had remained unperturbed all the while.

We think this to be perfectly preposterous. Our take is that we encounter yet another imprecision of the actual method of radiocarbon dating which is apparently affected by effects of an undefined nature leading to great discrepancies in datings of 1,500 years, for instance (see the examples of the greatly misdated modern specimens cited above, with the fluctuation amplitude reaching up to two millennia).

The authors of the article also confess to the fact that at the very dawn of the radiocarbon method “*ancient*” *Egyptian specimens* were used for its calibration, *with their dates taken from history textbooks* ([1196], page 137). Here’s a verbatim quote: “the use of the method commenced in 1948 in Chicago University and was initiated by Professor W. F. Libby... the Egyptian chronology played a great role in the naissance of the method, since Egyptian specimens, such as wood or charcoal, among others, have been used as standards for the known historical dates” ([1196], page 137). Thus, the

radiocarbon scale used nowadays had initially been made largely dependent on the Scaligerian chronology of the “ancient” Egypt, and therefore needs to be revised.

16.

Critical analysis of the hypotheses on which the radiocarbon method is based

(This section contains quotations from works by A. S. Mischenko, Doctor of Physical and Mathematical Sciences from the Moscow State University Department of Mathematics and Mechanics, a prominent scientist of the V. A. Steklov Mathematics Institute of the Russian

Academy of Sciences, nominated State Premium of the Russian Federation Laureate in 1996, a specialist in topology and geometry, functional analysis, differential equations and their applications.)

16.1. W. F. Libby's initial idea

A better representation of the modern problems most frequently encountered in the archaeological application of the radiocarbon method requires that we return into the 50's and the 60's for a close study of the foundations that the edifice of historical and archaeological applications is based upon. The matter is that the first steps of the method's

creation and development led to a large number of natural complications, many of which *afflict it to this day, and lead to further error aggravation*. Also see the book [1038], and the article [1491] recently published in Germany. These complications need to be addressed again in order to attract the attention *of the physicists* to the necessity of a fresh analysis of the foundations of this method's archaeological applications, especially considering what we learn about Scaligerian chronology.

The actual concept of radiocarbon dating belongs to W. F. Libby ([1250]). “Shortly after the end of WW II, the

American Willard Frank Libby published the results of the discovery that made him world famous, the laureate of the Guggenheim Award and the Nobel Prize. Studying the interaction between artificially produced neutrons and nitrogen atoms, Libby came to the conclusion (1946) that the nuclear reactions observed in his experiments should also occur naturally – that is, the neutrons produced by the atmosphere of the Earth should become absorbed by nitrogen atoms and transform into ^{14}C , the radioactive isotope of carbon. Minute amounts of this radioactive carbon mix with the stable isotopes of

carbon, ^{12}C and ^{13}C , taking part in the formation of carbon dioxide molecules that are subsequently consumed by plants, and animals (including humans) further up the food chain. Such molecules should be present in the tissues as well as the effluvia of living bodies. The discovery of mild radioactivity of the miasma emanated by Baltimore sewage in 1947 was the first proof of the correctness of Libby's estimations. The radioactivity of growing trees, seashells etc was estimated in the following two years, 1948-1949. As well as any other radioactive element, the radioactive

carbon isotope has a constant hallmark decay rate. Its global concentration would keep on diminishing by a factor of two every 5568 years, according to Libby, if it hadn't been for the constant generation of ^{14}C in the atmosphere that keeps the supply regular. The amount of ^{14}C lost equals the amount gained.

The death of a living organism excludes it from this process and makes it stop accumulating carbon from air (plants) or food (animals). The radioactivity of a dead organic body (a corpse, piece of wood, charcoal) keeps on falling – at a constant rate, which is an important fact.

Therefore it suffices to measure how much the overall radioactivity of a dead organism has decreased in comparison to the living ones in order to determine the time when this organism stopped refreshing its cells – the date when a tree was cut down, a bird was shot, or a human has died. This is naturally far from being an easy task, since the radioactivity of carbon as found in natural conditions is very weak (even before the death of an organism – *one ^{14}C atom per every 10 billion atoms of regular carbon*). However, Libby had developed the means and the techniques of measurement and numeric conversion

that led to the naissance of the radiocarbon method of dating ancient objects” ([390], pages 52-53).

Let us now consider the basics of this method, particularly [390], [391], [1250], [1080], [986], [110], [1081], [1082], [1480], [414], [1431], [1432], [1433], [1025], [1124], [1473], [567], [480], and [478].

16.2. Physical basics of the radiocarbon method

Cosmic rays produce neutrons as they pass through the atmosphere of Earth. The density of the neutron current depends on the altitude. The results of

density measurement of this current with aerostatic probes can be seen in fig. 1.62 on graph A ([986], page 138). The measurements were conducted in the state of New Jersey, USA, and belong to the period preceding 1955. The peak of neutron content falls on the height of approximately 40 thousand feet (12 kilometres). Close to the actual surface of Earth, the neutron current density drops to zero. This leads us to the following two conclusions:





Fig. 1.62. Atmosphere neutron density as a height function. Taken from [986], page 138.


1. Neutrons are generated in the stratospheric layers of the atmosphere, thus being secondary cosmic ray particles that are born with the passing of the primary cosmic rays through the atmosphere.
2. All of these neutrons immediately engage in nuclear reactions, and only a minute part of them reaches the surface of the Earth.

Graph B in fig. 1.62 reflects the dependence of the neutron current on the



height of 30 thousand feet on the geomagnetic latitude ([986], page 139). The measurements were conducted before 1955. This graph makes one think that the primary particles of cosmic radiation that give birth to neutrons are charged and reflected by the magnetic field of the Earth. It is significant that the neutron current density in the latitudes of 50 degrees (the latitude of Paris, Prague, Kiev and Kharkov) is *three times higher* than measured at the latitudes of 20-30 degrees (the Red Sea coast, the north coast of Africa).

The atmospheric neutron generation rate per minute equals roughly 6×10^{20}

neutrons/min, with error rate equalling 25% ([986], p. 139). Thus, every minute $4.5 \times 10^{20} - 7.5 \times 10^{20}$ neutrons are generated on planet Earth. These neutrons collide with the atoms of atmospheric nitrogen and oxygen and react with them. The probability rate of a neutron reacting with a nitrogen atom is supposed to be a few thousand times higher than such for oxygen atoms ([986], pp. 139-140). Neutrons of low energy levels (heat neutrons) engage in ^{14}C radioactive carbon reactions for the most part:



The section of this reaction comprises roughly $1.7 \times 10^{-24} \text{ cm}^2$. See [986], page 140. Fast neutrons may react in two more ways:



However, compared to the section of the reaction (1), their sections are very small. The reaction (3) results in the production of tritium ^3H that has a half-life period of 12.5 years and transforms into He^3 , a stable helium isotope. The speed of tritium ^3H generation is

estimated to equal 1% of that of ^{14}C generation.

M. J. Aitken writes the following in his monograph titled *Physics and Archaeology*: “A relatively small amount of neutrons reaches the surface of the Earth ... and it would be *reasonable to suggest* (? – A. F.) that every neutron produced by the cosmic rays creates a radiocarbon atom, hence the speed of neutron generation equals that of radiocarbon production. This amounts to roughly 7.5 kilos of radiocarbon per year” ([986], page 104). Radiocarbon C^{14} decays according to the formula:



The half-life period equals approximately 5600 years, so 1% of radiocarbon decays in about 80 years. It is thus easy to estimate that the amount of ^{14}C that is constantly present on Earth equals about 60 tonnes, with the error rate comprising about 25%, that is, 45 to 75 tonnes.

The generated radiocarbon mixes with other elements in the atmosphere, and is assimilated by oceans and living beings. The carbon propagation sphere is called the carbon exchange reservoir. This

includes the atmosphere, the biosphere, sea surface and ocean depths, qv in fig. 1.63 ([986], page 30). The numbers on this picture refer to the carbon content in one part of the carbon reservoir or the other, with atmosphere carbon content equalling 1. The part of carbon that escapes the reservoir as oceanic sediment is not shown on the diagram. “We use the term *radiocarbon age* in order to refer to the period of time between the point that the object ceases to be part of the exchange reservoir and the moment the ^{14}C measurements are conducted” ([110], page 32).




Fig. 1.63. The structure of the carbon exchange reservoir.

16.3 The hypotheses that the radiocarbon method is based upon

In theory, the radiocarbon age measurement concept is a simple one. It suffices to know:

- 1) The radiocarbon volume for the moment of the object's departure from the exchange reservoir;

- 2) the exact half-life period of radiocarbon ^{14}C .

After that, provided the specimen volume is sufficient, one has to measure the current radiocarbon content, and calculate the time elapsed since the moment that the object stopped taking part in carbon exchange by simple subtraction and division. However, this seemingly simple idea encounters a

number of serious complications in practical application. We should also note right away that any *diminishing* of the relative ^{14}C content in the specimen for any reason at all leads to the *increase of its alleged age*.

16.4. The moment of the object's departure from the exchange reservoir

So, what does “the moment of the object's departure from the exchange reservoir” actually mean? *The first hypothesis* of Libby's is that this moment should coincide with the time of the object's death. However, despite the

fact that the moment of death might differ from the moment that interests the historians (for instance, a piece of wood from a Pharaoh's tomb may belong to a tree that had been cut down a lot earlier than the sepulchre had been built), it is obvious that identifying the moment of death as that of an object's departure from the carbon exchange reservoir only seems correct initially. The matter is that carbon exchange *does not stop with death*. It just slows down and assumes a different form, and one has to bear this in mind. At least three processes may alter the radiocarbon content in a body ([110], page 31):

1. Organic decomposition;
2. Isotopic exchange with foreign carbon;
3. The absorption of environmental carbon.

According to M. J. Aitken, “The only possible kind of decomposition results from the production of carbon oxide or dioxide. However, this process *isn't relevant to us*, since it only concerns the *carbon lost by an object*” ([986], page 149). M. J. Aitken seems to imply that since the oxidation of carbon isotopes has the same speed, it does not affect the percentage of radiocarbon. However, in a different place he proceeds to tell us

the following:

“Although ^{14}C is identical to ^{12}C chemically, its greater atomic mass manifests as a result of natural processes. The exchange mechanism between the atmospheric carbon dioxide and the oceanic carbonates provides for a higher (by 1.2%) concentration of ^{14}C in carbonates; on the other hand, the photosynthesis of atmospheric carbon dioxide by the plants of Earth leads to their possessing a somewhat lower (by 3.7% in average) concentration of ^{14}C .”
([986], page 159)

Craig Harmon offers the following table of carbon and radiocarbon propagation for the various parts of the exchange

reservoir ([1080] and [986], page 143).

	Carbon content, trillions of tonnes	Division effect for C¹⁴
Atmosphere	0.64	1.037
Living biosphere of the Earth	0.30	1.000
Humus	1.10	1.000
Biosphere of the sea	0.01	1.024
Sea-solved organic substances	2.72	1.024
Inorganic substances in the sea	35.40	1.049

Therefore, *biosphere and humus are the lowest in radiocarbon content, whereas inorganic substances and sea water are the highest.*

The book [110] tells us nothing of the difference between the carbon isotope oxidation speed differences in decomposition processes, but the information cited above gives reason to believe them to be quite visible. In any case, *the carbon oxidation process is the reverse process to that of its photosynthesis from atmospheric gas, hence the isotope ^{14}C should oxidize faster (or with greater probability) than the isotope ^{12}C . Thus,*

decomposing (or decomposed)
specimens should have a lower content
of radiocarbon ^{14}C , which should make
the specimens appear a lot older than
they really are. This is one of the
mechanisms that leads to the gathering of
extra age by the specimens that distorts
the true picture. We have witnessed
actual examples of such artificial ageing
above, which distorts radiocarbon
datings often throwing them
considerably off the mark.

Counting other possibilities of carbon
exchange between the specimens and the
exchange reservoir is *next to*
impossible. It is supposed that “wood

and organic matter appear to be the most inert in what concerns carbonization, whereas a large quantity of bones and shell carbonates show frequent changes in isotope content” ([110], page 31).

Since measuring the actual carbon is de-facto an impossibility, it gets ignored, by and large. Standard methods and procedures of radiocarbon measurements are at best concerned with the ways of possible cleansing of the specimen from foreign radiocarbon and reasons of specimen contamination. S. V. Boutomo finds it sufficient to merely state that “charred organic matter and wood in *a good condition* (?! – A. F.)

are dependable enough in most cases” ([110], page 31).

M. J. Aitken adds that “in order to work with any specimen at all, one has to clean it thoroughly from foreign roots and other fibres, and treat it with acid in order to solve all sedimentary carbonates. The removal of humus is achieved by washing the specimen in a base solution” ([986], page 149).

Note that the important question of whether this chemical cleansing might affect the specimen’s radiocarbon content had not been raised back in the day – and we’re talking about the time when it was claimed that the

radiocarbon method “gives solid proof to historical chronology”.

16.5. Radiocarbon content variations in the exchange reservoir

The second hypothesis of Libby's is that the radiocarbon content in the exchange reservoir *remains constant all the time*. Quite naturally, this hypothesis is also an *erroneous* one, and one has to consider the effects that affect the radiocarbon content of the exchange reservoir. The estimations of the general volume of radiocarbon on Earth as cited above imply that in a modern specimen the

ratio is one radiocarbon atom per every 0.8×10^{12} atoms of regular carbon. This means that every minute *about 15 decays* occur in a gramme of natural carbon ([986], page 143). Thus, if the radiocarbon content in the exchange reservoir for the moment of a specimen's death differed from the current by a ratio of 1%, the calculations of this specimen's age shall contain an error of about 80 years, 2% shall give an error of 160 years etc (!). A deviation of 10% shall give a dating error of 800 years, and higher deviations shall also alter the linear rule, and so a 20% deviation shall lead to an error of 1760

years, and not 1600, and so on. The radiocarbon content in old specimens for the moment of their departure from the carbon reservoir cannot be estimated in any other manner but via the comparison with the radiocarbon content of the modern specimens considering several effects that alter the radiocarbon content in specimens with the passage of time. M. J. Aitken cites the following well-known effects that influence the radiocarbon content in the exchange reservoir:

1. The change of radiocarbon generation speed in accordance with the changes in the intensity of

cosmic radiation;

2. The change of the size of the exchange reservoir;
3. The finite speed of mixing between the different parts of the exchange reservoir;
4. The separation of isotopes in the exchange reservoir.

M. J. Aitken makes the justified remark that “any concrete data concerning points 1 and 2 is hard to obtain in any other way except for measurements conducted on the specimens veraciously dated with other methods” ([986], page 153). This pours light on the existence of a very important circumstance. The physicists

required veracious external reference for the correct graduation of the radiocarbon scale. Having absolute trust in the historians, they took the dates from history textbooks and chronological tables. It appears that the physicists have been misinformed from the very beginning, since the radiocarbon method had been based on the same old *Scaligerian chronology* of historical specimens. Its reconstruction shall invariably affect at least some of the fundamental concepts that define the actual method.

Furthermore, one has to notice two more modern effects that affect the

current radiocarbon concentration, namely, the increase in radiocarbon content due to experimental thermonuclear explosions, and the decrease (the so-called Süss effect) thereof that is caused by the burning of fossil fuels – oil and coal, whose radiocarbon content should be minute due to their great age. The estimation of the change in radiocarbon production speed (see point 1) has been attempted by many authors. Crowe, for instance, has researched the “materials with veracious historical datings” and shown that there was a correlation between the errors of radiocarbon dating and the

changes in the magnetic field of the Earth ([1082], also [110], page 29). The measurements of the yearly layers formed by sequoia trees are cited nearby for comparison ([110], page 29; [1480]).

It is assumed that the specific activity has been varying within the range of 2% in comparison to the average from 600 A.D. to the present time, with the maximal alterations occurring every 100-200 years ([110]). We see yet again that the creation of the “radiocarbon scale” involved the materials that the Scaligerian chronology dated as belonging to 600 A.D. or maybe even

earlier. We do already know, however, that this chronology isn't to be trusted with anything that concerns the times preceding the XIII-XIV century. The physicists have been deceived by the Scaligerian chronology yet again.

Thus, the radiocarbon dating is implicitly based on the same old incorrect chronology of Scaliger and Petavius. In order to separate it from the very basics of radiocarbon dating, we shall have to trust the historical objects that can really be dated veraciously. However, we're beginning to understand that the age of such "trustworthy objects" cannot exceed 500-600 years, since none

of them predate the XIV century A.D. Thus, *all the work on the calibration of the radiocarbon method shall have to be done again*. The results that the physicists will achieve in this case may strike them as surprising.

“Apparently, the changes in cosmic radiation occurred before, but due to the brevity of their period, the effect of these fluctuations is *hard to consider*. We base our assumption that the intensity of cosmic radiation over the last 35000 years has been constant within the error range of 10-20% on the coincidence of the calculated value of specific activity and on the proximity of the age of

oceanic sediment estimated with the aid of mutually independent carbon and ionium methods” ([110], page 29). Let us remind the reader that the “constancy” within the range of 20% means an error of 1760 years in the dating of the specimen. It isn’t that significant an age compared to 35000 years, but the fluctuation rate is unacceptably high for what concerns the issues of the so-called “ancient” history. We have already given examples of *millenarian* discrepancies between the radiocarbon datings and the Scaligerian “ancient” chronology. The fluctuations of 10-20% mentioned by the physicists are a reality,

and not just theory.

In America – the regions withdrawn from the entire “Classical scene” – the dendrologists of the Arizona University have discovered plantations of bristlecone pine (*Pinus aristata*) whose age exceeded 4000 years. Some dead standing trees have been found nearby which have remained in their current condition for several thousand years ([414], page 6). It is assumed that cross-dating, that is, the temporal superposition of living and dead tree specimens, allowed for the creation of a dendrochronological scale spanning 7117 years ([1431], [1432], [1433]).

However, this American dendrochronological scale, even if it is indeed correct, cannot help “ancient” European and Asian dendrochronology in any way at all, q.v. above.

In [414] on page 7 we can see a schematic drawing of the correlation of dendrochronological and radiocarbon datings based on the measurements conducted with the aid of over 300 specimens. If we’re to consider the dendrochronological dating absolutely veracious (which is wrong, as we have already pointed out), the maximal radiocarbon dating error equals to the following values:

Dendrochronological dating	Radiocarbon dating	Error
300	30	-2
500	250	-2
800	900	+1
1500	1600	+1
1900	2100	+2
2700	2400	-3
4000	3500	-5
5000	4300	-7

The error rate keeps on growing with a negative value.

These American data can be interpreted in the following manner. The radiocarbon content in American

bristlecone pine has been varying over the years in the following manner (in comparison to its current radiocarbon content):

Years	Radiocarbon content
1965	1
1700	1.035
1500	1.031
1200	0.988
100	0.975
-700	1.038
-2000	1.063
-3000	1.100

Furthermore, on page 7 the authors of [414] write that “it is estimated, that the C-14 variations are of a global character – that is, they happen simultaneously all across the planet”. No argumentation is given. It would thus be appropriate to inquire about the possible grounds for making hypotheses that arose from the analysis of nothing but American materials, and ones belonging to a rather small and very specific geographical location at that, valid for the entire planet.

The authors of [414] also make the conclusion that the difference between the dendrochronological and

radiocarbon datings is a result of a *temporal* variation of radiocarbon content in the exchange reservoir. However, this very difference might lead one to an alternative hypothesis that a growing tree *continues to take part in carbon exchange* after the formation of the rings, which isn't even mentioned in [414]!

On page 4 of [414] we see the schematic drawing also included in [1025] that displays the correlation between the historical dates of the “ancient” Egypt and the hypothetical radiocarbon datings, and comparisons of the same dates to European monuments

and artefacts. The commentary is as follows: “this drawing shows us that the datings of the Roman period are virtually identical, whereas the datings of the early dynastic period differ by 500-700 years” ([414], page 7). Apart from this, we have already seen the data showing that the radiocarbon datings of at least some of the “ancient” Egyptian specimens really pertain to the *late Middle Ages*.

In 1964 Kigoshi conducted precise measurements of ^{14}C concentration in the tree rings of an old Japanese cryptomeria whose age reached 1890 years ([567], page 172). This

information is also of little utility for the European dendrochronology and radiocarbon scale. The results of this research proved somewhat different from the ones related to a small area in America as cited above, but show the radiocarbon concentration for 1000 A.D. to have been 2% lower than it is currently ([567]). The conclusion is apparently valid for some small area in Japan.

The variations in the exchange reservoir (see point 2 above) are primarily determined by the alterations of the ocean level. Libby claims that a change of 100 metres in the sea level

curbs the volume of the reservoir by 5% ([986], page 157). If this were accompanied by a temperature drop, during the Ice Age, for instance, the concentration of carbonates in the water would diminish, and the entire carbon exchange reservoir would shrink by 10%. We are to be aware that we are considering hypotheses that are extremely hard to prove nowadays, and all such proof is, it turn, based on other hypotheses that are just as hard to prove.

The data that concern the mixing speed as mentioned in point 3 are somewhat contradictory. Ferguson, for instance, having studied the radioactivity

of tree rings (also in a small geographical area) reckons that this speed is rather high, and that the average time that it takes the carbon molecule to reach a different part of the reservoir equals seven years maximum ([986], page 158). On the other hand, thermonuclear test explosions have produced about half a tonne of radiocarbon, which shouldn't affect the general radiocarbon mass of 60 tonnes that greatly in theory – however, the activity of the specimens *grew by 25% as measured in 1959, and this growth had reached 30% by 1963*. This speaks in favour of the *low mixing level*

hypothesis.

According to Süss, it takes about 1500 years for all of the water to mix in the Pacific, and 750 is the figure given for the Atlantic ocean by E. A. Olson and W. S. Brecker ([480], page 198). But the mixing of ocean waters is greatly affected by the temperature. A 50% increase in the mixing of both shallow and deep waters shall imply a 2% shrinkage of the atmospheric radiocarbon concentration.

16.6. Variations in radiocarbon content of living bodies

The third hypothesis of Libby's is that the radiocarbon content is *equal for all of the organisms on the entire Earth*, and thus independent from the *latitude* and the species. In order to verify this hypothesis, Anderson (Chicago University) had conducted an in-depth research and discovered *that the radiocarbon content does indeed fluctuate, as one should have expected* ([480], page 191). See the table below.

Specimens	Geomagnetic latitude	Per minute decay frequency for one

White fir (Yukon)	55 degrees in lat. North	14.84 ± 0.30
Norwegian fir (Sweden)	55 degrees in lat. North	15.37 ± 0.54
Fir (Chicago)	53 degrees in lat. North	14.72 ± 0.54
Ash (Switzerland)	49 degrees in lat. North	15.16 ± 0.30
Honeysuckle leaves (USA)	47 degrees in lat. North	14.60 ± 0.30
Pine branches (USA, 3.6 km above sea level)	44 degrees in lat. North	15.82 ± 0.47
Heather (North Africa)	40 degrees in lat. North	14.47 ± 0.44

Oak (Palestine)	34 degrees in lat. North	15.19 ±0.40
Unidentified timber (Iran)	28 degrees in lat. North	15.57 ±0.31
Manchurian ash (Japan)	26 degrees in lat. North	14.84 ±0.30
Unidentified timber (Panama)	20 degrees in lat. North	15.94 ±0.51
Chlorophora excelsa timber (Liberia)	11 degrees in lat. North	15.08 ±0.34
Sterculia (Bolivia, 2.7 km above sea level)	1 degree in lat. North	15.47 ±0.50
Ebony tree (The Marshall	0 degree	14.53

Isles)		± 0.60
Unidentified timber (Ceylon)	2 degrees in lat. South	15.37 ± 0.49
Eucalyptus (Australia)	45 degrees in lat. South	16.31 ± 0.43
Seal-oil (The Antarctic)	65 degrees in lat. South	15.69 ± 0.30

Thus, modern radiocarbon activity varies from 14.03 (North African heather) to 16.7 (Australian eucalyptus) decays per minute depending on the geographical location and the species of the tree. This gives a deviation rate of 8.5% as compared to the average radiocarbon content value. Libby tell us

the following:

“Over the ten years that have passed since that time, this information has not been refuted; the only exceptions concern the carbonate rock formations, where ground waters dissolve and wash away a significant part of ancient carbon, thus making carbon-14 content lower in comparison with the average planetary rate of the atmosphere-biosphere-ocean system. Such cases are extremely rare (? – A. F.), and can easily be accounted for” ([480]).

17.

Summary

Let us sum up the information that we have just considered. We have learnt that the real activity of ancient specimens may alter from the average value for the following reasons:

1. A temporal change in timber activity: 2% deviation range;
2. Cosmic ray intensity changes (theoretical estimation): 20% deviation range;

3. Short-term changes of solar activity: additional 2%;
4. An increase in the mixing rate of the oceanic water: minus 2%;
5. Variations in radiocarbon concentration depending on the geographical location and the tree species: 8.5% deviation range;
6. Variations in radiocarbon content resulting from decomposition processes: ? (unknown);
7. Variations in radiocarbon content resulting from a specimen's chemical processing: ? (unknown);
8. The variations in the exchange reservoir radiocarbon content

resulting from the washing out of carbonate rock formations: ?
(unknown);

9. Variations in radiocarbon content caused by large quantities of carbonates produced by volcanic eruptions: ? (unknown). This reason can provide for significant distortion of radiocarbon datings for the areas close to volcanoes, such as Italy with its Vesuvius and Etna.

One should also bear in mind the dating deviation resulting from the temporal gap between the cutting of a tree, for instance, and the use of the wood for the

object or building researched. Finally, one has to consider the imprecision of the currently used ^{14}C half-life value, that has been corrected *by almost 10%* as of late, and the errors of experimental measurement of a specimen's radioactivity (background radioactivity consideration etc). We do not cover these errors (whose correction has cost the physicists lots of labour) presently, since having learned of all the factors mentioned, we deem it nonsensical to attempt the precise measurement of a value whose theoretical *uncontrolled error rate* may equal 10% if we're to make modest assumptions. *The most*

optimistic calculations give a radiocarbon dating uncontrolled error range of 1200 years of arbitrarily added or subtracted age.

This makes the placidity of the following conclusion made by B. A. Kolchin and Y. A. Sher most peculiar indeed: “Summing up the brief overview of the centurial ^{14}C variation research, one has to point out that apart from its mere failing to undermine the trust that we have in radiocarbon chronology, this research had made its precision even higher (?! – A. F.)” ([414], page 8). Another specialist in radiocarbon datings, S. V. Boutomo, is of a more

realistic opinion: “due to the *considerable fluctuations* of ^{14}C ’s specific activity rate, the radiocarbon datings of *relatively young specimens (under 2000 years of age)* cannot be used as fundamental referential data for the absolute chronological scale” ([110], page 29). However, from the point of view of the “Classical age” studies, including those of the “ancient” history of Egypt, these “relatively young specimens” are of the greatest interest. Thus, certain specialists in the field of radiocarbon dating confess openly (albeit in special scientific literature) that the use of the radiocarbon method in

its current state for the specimens whose age is 2000 years or less appears a most dubious endeavour.

We could have finished our overview of the radiocarbon dating method here if it hadn't been for the criticisms of the method coming from archaeologists and certain oddities in the behaviour of the radiocarbon method specialists themselves. We have quoted some of the examples above. The first thing to attract one's attention is the absolute trust of the authors in the infallibility of historical datings, as one sees from such passages as "the ages of specimens younger than 5000 years concur well (?! – A. F.) with

the historical estimations” ([986], page 155). Such statements appear very odd indeed considering what we have just learnt.

Libby wrote that “further research has been undertaken involving specimens of known ages... The results... span a historical period of 5000 years... Thus, the general reliability of the radiocarbon method is well-proven” ([986], page 135). As we have already demonstrated, the popular myth of the “concurrence” between the Scaligerian chronology and the radiocarbon datings is based on flimsy foundations, and proves immaterial at closer study; the myth’s

popularity is clearly of an unnatural origin. Let us remind the reader of something that Libby himself has mentioned in this respect: “One of the exceptions was discovered when we have worked on the materials of a large collection collected by James H. Breasted in Egypt together with the specialists of the well-known Chicago Institute for Oriental Studies. The third object suddenly turned out to have proved modern after analyzing. The finding belonged to a collection ascribed to the time of the V dynasty. It had really been a heavy blow” ([478], page 24). As we have already mentioned, this

object was claimed a forgery. The fact that Libby mentions this “strange occurrence” makes one wonder how many of those he remained taciturn about.

As we have already demonstrated, the calibration of the radiocarbon method has been largely based on the Scaligerian chronology. It would be expedient to check *whether the radiocarbon method can actually be made independent from written sources.*

Libby cites the table of modern carbon activity for various rock formations claiming that “it has been

shown that there are no significant differences between the studied specimens collected at various latitudes from pole to pole” ([480], page 191).

Wait a second, we have just learnt that the deviation range equals 8.5% in one direction or the other, that is, *over 700 years*. How is it possible to claim five pages further on that “the carbon content that we have estimated concurs well with the expected value, all deviations being nothing but acceptable reference point errors” ([480], page 196). Could it be that Libby had been certain that the readers would not be interested in the details of Anderson’s

table? Libby also says that their “conclusions may have proved wrong if the measurement errors of all kinds – those of cosmic ray intensity, mixing rate and ocean depths, had been in correlation. However, since this is not the case, we reckon that large error rates are improbable” ([480], page 193).

We are not quite certain as to what kind of improbability is being talked about here, since the cosmic ray intensiveness, mixing speed, and other physical values affecting the initial radiocarbon content in a specimen for the moment of its departure from the exchange reservoir are *far from being*

random – all of these values had all equalled something at a given point in time. If we do not know these values and have to make a choice from some interval of possible values, the radiocarbon dating error shall equal the sum (!) of all the errors that have been made in the estimation of the source data for the specimen.

Libby writes that “despite the *great differences* between the cosmic ray intensiveness values at different geographical latitudes (they are a lot higher in the northern and southern latitudes than they are around the equator), *one has to expect* (? – A. F.)

the radioactive carbon propagation rate to be *homogeneous* for the entire planet” ([478], page 23). The effect mentioned may nevertheless result in “extra age” gathered by specimens in Egypt, for example.

Libby proceeds to tell us the following:

“The coincidence of the age of the core and the entire tree shows that the sap from the core of gigantic sequoias is not chemically balanced in comparison to the fibre and other molecules of the tree. In other words, the carbon in the central part of the tree had been stored there about 3000 years ago, although the actual tree had only been cut down several decades

ago” ([480], page 195).

However, three years after this, the radioactivity of tree rings was researched by Süss, who has found the discrepancies between the radiocarbon datings and the dendrochronological ones. Did he make the conclusion that Libby’s initial hypothesis was wrong? He did not. Süss made the claim that the radiocarbon content in the ancient times used to be higher than it is today instead. What we see is a vicious circle.

L. S. Klein gives a similar example in [391]. First Libby proves the veracity of the radiocarbon method using the historical chronology of the “ancient”

Egypt; however, when control measurements showed deviations, Libby immediately questioned the Egyptian chronology concerning these particular specimens ([391], page 104). Similarly, Libby had used dendrochronology in support of the radiocarbon method, explaining arising deviations by the fact that several tree-rings may be formed in a year. However, Libby is far from being the only one to demonstrate the lack of logic where its presence is undesired.

In the article by Kolchin and Sher ([414]) we read that “the dates calculated in assumption of the

constancy of atmospheric ^{14}C content from the ancient times to our age need to be revised. Does this mean they aren't true? The following analogy appears congruent..." ([414], page 6). The authors proceed to tell us how the distance between the Earth and the Moon had been calculated in several stages, each time with a greater precision. The same allegedly applies to the radiocarbon method where gradual corrections make the calculations more precise as time goes by. This may well be so in theory. However, we read in the very same article that "the half-life period for ^{14}C is 5570 years, with the

possible deviation range of 30 years in each direction..." (page 4), and that "the half-life period for ^{14}C is set (!? – A. F.) at 5730 years, give or take 40". 160 years – that's some correction!

M. J. Aitken writes that "an important characteristic of all these methods is their output, that is, the carbon content in the original volume that is transformed into gas. It would be expedient to have an output of 100% in order to eliminate all possibility of ^{14}C turning into gas more readily than ^{12}C , or the other way round" ([986], page 168). We also learn that "the shortcoming of the synthesis of the latter is that only 10% of the carbon

is transformed into benzol; this increases the possibility of error resulting from isotope separation” ([986], page 17. The author appears to have full awareness of the necessity of considering the isotope separation effect in all chemical reactions. However, in 6.3, while discussing the issues of a specimen’s suitability for measurements, M. J. Aitken writes that “charcoal and wood in good condition are considered the best specimens: their taking part in exchange is improbable (? – A. F.), and the only possible kind of decomposition results from the production of carbon oxide or dioxide. However, this process

isn't relevant to us, since it only concerns the *carbon lost by an object*" ([986], page 149). What about isotope separation? The radiocarbon content in a specimen may change as a result of decomposition!

Such careless attitude of specialists to the effects that may greatly affect the research results remains enigmatic for us. We have listed some of these effects in the general list. Some of them may really be difficult to evaluate currently. *However, a number of effects reflected in literature may be quantitatively assessed after a series of experiments. No careful activity reports of either*

living or dead specimens have been made for any of the below:

1. latitude;
2. longitude;
3. proximity to certain geological and geographical formation on dry land and in the ocean;
4. altitude above the sea level;
5. climate, etc.

Without such analysis, the self-righteous claims of the alleged independence of specimen activity from their locations and other characteristics are altogether impossible to understand.

Therefore, we have to concede the following:

1. The radiocarbon method in its current condition has deviation rate of 1000-2000 years for specimens whose age is estimated as under 1000 years. This means there's not much to be learnt about the events of the last two millennia from this method.
2. The radiocarbon method needs a fresh graduation that would not be based on Scaligerian chronology at the very least.
3. Other physical dating methods are even less precise, ergo, they can

tell us nothing about the dating of objects younger than 2000 years.

4. The actual archaeological methods that aren't based on documented chronology can give no absolute dates; these methods can only aid the estimation of relative chronology of some findings in a limited number of cases.
5. Scaligerian chronology implicitly or explicitly affected the graduations of scales used for archaeological and even physical methods, including the radiocarbon method. This also questions the usability of the method in its current

condition for the dating of historical objects.

6. According to a number of archaeologists (see above), the unacceptable practice of familiarizing the physical laboratories that perform radiocarbon datings with the opinions of the archaeologists about the estimated ages of findings still exists.

18.

Numismatic dating

It is assumed that in some cases certain archaeological findings can be dated with the aid of the ancient coinage found on the site. However, one should be aware that the so-called numismatic dating as used today *is wholly dependent on Scaligerian chronology*. This chronology was created in the XVI-XVII century, and all the kings and rulers described in chronicles and other documents took certain chronological

places. Then the ancient coins were distributed along the time axis – for instance, coins bearing the legend “Nero” were dated to the I Scaligerian century A.D., the ones saying “Justinian,” as the VI Scaligerian century A.D., etc., since those are the centuries where Scaligerian chronology locates the Roman emperors Nero and Justinian.

After that, all of the coins found in the XVIII-XX century have either been dated by the same “method,” or compared to the ones that have already received datings, and placed on the time axis accordingly.

It is perfectly obvious that any

alteration of the Scaligerian chronology that this “method” is based upon shall automatically alter the “numismatic datings” as well. Furthermore, an independent comparison of different coins that isn’t based on external chronological considerations, *cannot even tell us anything about the relative chronology of the coins under comparison*, let alone their absolute chronology. Comparing actual coins as metallic objects bearing graphical designs of some sort cannot give us exact knowledge of which coin is older and which is newer. The analysis of the metal that the actual coin is made of can

point at its *geographical point of origin* in some cases. However, the calculation of the *date* – absolute or relative – sadly remains an impossibility. It is possible that some method will be developed eventually that will estimate absolute ages of coins after a study of the alloys that they are made of. However, as far as we know, no such method has yet been developed. This opens a great many opportunities for physicists, chemists and metallurgists.

The historians write that “numismatics as a science is a *relatively recent phenomenon*. The transition period between the collection of coins to

scientific methods of their study... can be estimated to fall into the very end of the XVIII century” ([345], pages 13-14). We shall thus repeat that the entire numismatic science is based on Scaligerian chronology that was based on written sources, and can in no way be considered an independent dating method.

As a result, we encounter many oddities nowadays when we compare “ancient” coins to their mediaeval counterparts. An abnormally large number of parallels and even direct coincidences appear between the “ancient” and the mediaeval –

sometimes even late mediaeval – coinage. These parallels have been known for a long time, and their number keeps on growing. Historians try to explain them by elaborate and nebulous theories of “imitation”, “copying,” etc. The English Edwardian pennies allegedly dating from 1042-1066 A.D. *copy* the Constantinople solidi of Justin II dated 565-578 A.D. in Scaligerian chronology ([1163], page 449). The chronological difference between the “original” and the “copy” exceeds 450 years here! No such cases of “copying” coins from 450-year-old “originals” have been registered in either late

mediaeval or newer history.

The coinage history has allegedly seen an “ancient dawn,” then the Dark Ages are supposed to have come, and later on the Renaissance epoch. It is assumed that between the VIII and XIII century A.D. all Roman golden coinage disappeared from Italy ([1070]). This strange effect is noticeable enough to have entered the names of chapters of certain monographs on history and numismatics, such as “The End of Roman Coinage (V century),” or “Imitation epoch (VI century)” ([1164]), or “The Lack of Gold Coinage” ([64], page 151).

Let us pay close attention to the following information provided by specialists in numismatic history. It turns out that in the Middle Ages “the West of Europe did not try to compete with Byzantium and the Muslims in this respect [coin minting – A. F.]. The idea of having regular gold coinage was given up, and most mints produced silver coins” ([1070], page 20; [1435]). It is also said that “regular golden coinage had *practically ceased* in VIII-century Western Europe, and towards the end of the same century on the Italian peninsula as well. Even in Muslim Spain *no golden coinage was minted* between

the beginning of the VIII century and the beginning of the X” ([1070], page 20).

Numismatists attempt to give some sort of explanation to this mysterious “mediaeval gap” in coinage history. It is suggested that “gold coinage was ceased by an order issued by Pepin”. The council at Reims allegedly forbade the use of the golden solidi of imperial Rome, and the type of circulating coinage allegedly “became barbaric” in the VIII century ([64], page 151).

Doesn’t this imply that the “ancient” Western European coinage is really mediaeval, minted after the XIV century A.D., and cast way back in time by

Scaligerian chronology?

Historians proceed to tell us that “there are *no Papal coins* from the time of Benedict VII (who died in the alleged year 984 A.D. – A. F.) to that of Leo IX [allegedly the middle of the XI century – A. F.] *in existence*; this is purely incidental, since the coinage must have existed, naturally... There is only one coin from the times of Leo IX... Even stranger is the fact that not a single coin remained from the times of Gregory VII” ([196], Volume 4, page 74, comment 41).

Where did all these mediaeval coins go? Let us formulate a hypothesis. All of

these coins have been misdated, and thrown back into the past, transforming into “ancient coins” as a result. Some of them are exhibited in museums as “very old ones” nowadays.

Apparently, the naissance of golden and silver coinage in Western Europe really dates to the XIII century A.D. at the earliest. Confronted by the non-existence of mediaeval Western European coins predating the XIII century A.D., the numismatists were faced with the necessity to invent various theories aimed at explaining the economical stagnation of Europe that allegedly followed the “flourishing

Classical age”. The strange “stagnation” in Roman minting between the VIII and XIII century A.D. is all the more amazing since it follows a very fruitful and glorious period of Roman coinage of the alleged I-VI century A.D. Golden coins of this “ancient” empire are on a par with the mediaeval ones dated to the XIII-XVII century in quality and detail. This oddity is most probably explained by the misdating of the XIII-XVII century coins that have been moved a long way into the past.

Let us point out another strange effect. According to the historians, the coin caches of the X-XIII century found on the

territory of Russia *hardly contain any* Italian, French, or Spanish coins of X-XIII century A.D. ([685]). Only *single Italian coins (!)* of the X-XIII century have been found among the tens of thousands of coins dating from that period. Historians have created a theory that is supposed to explain this strange occurrence – namely, that there were no economical or trade connexions between Russia and Italy in the X-XIII century ([685], pages 200-211). This “numismatic theory” contradicts written sources explicitly mentioning extensive trade and economic relations ([685], page 201). The historian’s commentary

is that “the contradictions between the numismatic and other data is purely illusionary” ([685], page 201).

However, no explanations of any kind are given. We shall formulate the following hypothesis: Western Europe and Italy in particular really minted a very small number of gold coins before the XIII century, which is why they aren't found in treasure caches on the territory of Russia.

However, in 1252 A.D. full-scale golden coinage is allegedly “resurrected” in Rome all of a sudden, and it becomes international currency over a very short period of time, chasing


the Byzantine coinage off the market ([1070]). This sudden appearance of Italian gold coinage in the XIII century is considered to be “a dramatic change of the situation prevalent for the first half of the mediaeval period” ([1070], pages 20-21). However, most probably, no such dramatic occurrences really took place. What we appear to witness here is more likely the real naissance of European coinage in the XIII-XIV century as a result of serious changes that happened in the life of Western Europe. See more about the nature of these changes in *Maps and Coins vs History*.

The concept of uniform mass coinage is extremely close to that of printing engravings and books. Thus, qualified coin minting shouldn't predate the birth of book-printing by too long, and that event is dated to the XV century nowadays ([797], page 352).

What mainstream historians say about the New Chronology?

The New Chronology is a fringe theory regarded by the academic community as

pseudohistory, which argues that the conventional chronology of Middle



Eastern and European history is fundamentally flawed, and that events attributed to the civilizations of the Roman Empire, Ancient Greece and Ancient Egypt actually occurred during the Middle Ages, more than a thousand years later. The central concepts of the New Chronology are derived from the ideas of Russian scholar Nikolai Morozov (1854-1946), although work by French scholar Jean Hardouin (1646-1729) can be viewed as an earlier predecessor. However, the New Chronology is most commonly associated with Russian mathematician Anatoly Fomenko (b. 1945), although

published works on the subject are actually a collaboration between Fomenko and several other mathematicians. The concept is most fully explained in *History: Fiction or Science?* book series, originally published in Russian.

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

between AD 800–1000, and most known historical events took place in AD 1000–1500.

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

History of New Chronology

The idea of chronologies that differ from the conventional chronology can be traced back to at least the early XVII century. Jean Hardouin then suggested

that many ancient historical documents were much younger than commonly believed to be. In 1685 he published a version of Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* in which he claimed that most Greek and Roman texts had been forged by Benedictine monks. When later questioned on these results, Hardouin stated that he would reveal the monks' reasons in a letter to be revealed only after his death. The executors of his estate were unable to find such a document among his posthumous papers. In the XVII century, Sir Isaac Newton, examining the current chronology of Ancient Greece, Ancient Egypt and the

Ancient Near East, expressed discontent with prevailing theories and proposed one of his own, which, basing its study on Apollonius of Rhodes's *Argonautica*, changed the traditional dating of the Argonautic Expedition, the Trojan War, and the Founding of Rome.

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

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

“... almost all important civilized peoples have early woven myths around and

glorified in poetry their heroes, mythical kings and princes, founders of religions, of dynasties, empires and cities—in short, their national heroes. Especially the history of their birth and of their early years is furnished with phantastic [*sic*] traits; the amazing similarity, nay literal identity, of those tales, even if they refer to different, completely independent peoples, sometimes geographically far removed from one another, is well known and has struck many an investigator.”

(Rank, Otto. *Der Mythos von der Geburt des Helden*.)

Fomenko became interested in Morozov's theories in 1973. In 1980, together with a few colleagues from the mathematics department of Moscow

State University, he published several articles on “new mathematical methods in history” in peer-reviewed journals. The articles stirred a lot of controversy, but ultimately Fomenko failed to win any respected historians to his side. By the early 1990s, Fomenko shifted his focus from trying to convince the scientific community via peer-reviewed publications to publishing books. Beam writes that Fomenko and his colleagues were discovered by the Soviet scientific press in the early 1980s, leading to “a brief period of renown”; a contemporary review from the journal *Questions of History* complained, “Their

constructions have nothing in common with Marxist historical science.” (Alex Beam. “A shorter history of civilization.” *Boston Globe*, 16 September 1991.)

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

Fomenko's claims

According to New Chronology, the traditional chronology consists of four overlapping copies of the “true” chronology shifted back in time by significant intervals with some further revisions. Fomenko claims all events

and characters conventionally dated earlier than XI century are fictional, and represent “phantom reflections” of actual Middle Ages events and characters, brought about by intentional or accidental misdatings of historical documents. Before the invention of printing, accounts of the same events by different eyewitnesses were sometimes retold several times before being written down, then often went through multiple rounds of translating and copyediting. Names were translated, mispronounced and misspelled to the point where they bore little resemblance to originals.

According to Fomenko, this led early

chronologists to believe or choose to believe that those accounts described different events and even different countries and time periods. Fomenko justifies this approach by the fact that, in many cases, the original documents are simply not available. Fomenko claims that all the history of the ancient world is known to us from manuscripts that date from the XV century to the XVIII century, but describe events that allegedly happened thousands of years before, the originals regrettably and conveniently lost.

For example, the oldest extant manuscripts of monumental treatises on

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

Central to Fomenko's New Chronology is his claim of the existence of a vast Slav-Turk empire, which he called the "Russian Horde", which he says played the dominant role in Eurasian history before the XVII century. The various peoples identified in ancient

and medieval history, from the Scythians, Huns, Goths and Bulgars, through the Polyanes, Duleby, Drevlians, Pechenegs, to in more recent times, the Cossacks, Ukrainians, and Belarusians, are nothing but elements of the single Russian Horde. For the New Chronologists, peoples such as the Ukrainians, Belarusians, Mongols, and others who assert their national independence from Russia, are suffering from a historical delusion.

Fomenko claims that the most probable prototype of the historical Jesus was Andronikos I Komnenos (allegedly AD 1152 to 1185), the

emperor of Byzantium, known for his failed reforms; his traits and deeds reflected in ‘biographies’ of many real and imaginary persons (A. T. Fomenko, G. V. Nosovskiy. *Czar of the Slavs* (in Russian). St. Petersburg: Neva, 2004.). The historical Jesus is a composite figure and reflection of the Old Testament prophet Elisha (850-800 BC?), Pope Gregory VII (1020?-1085), Saint Basil of Caesarea (330-379), and even Li Yuanhao (also known as Emperor Jingzong, or “Son of Heaven”, emperor of Western Xia, who reigned in 1032-1048), Euclides, Bacchus and Dionysius. Fomenko explains the

seemingly vast differences in the biographies of these figures as resulting from difference in languages, points of view and time frame of the authors of said accounts and biographies.

Fomenko also merges the cities and histories of Jerusalem, Rome and Troy into “New Rome” = Gospel Jerusalem (in the XII and XIII centuries) = Troy = Yoros Castle (A. T. Fomenko, G. V. Nosovskiy. *Forgotten Jerusalem: Istanbul in the light of New Chronology* (in Russian). Moscow: Astrel, AST, 2007). To the south of Yoros Castle is Joshua’s Hill which Fomenko alleges is the hill Calvary depicted in the Bible.

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

On the other hand, according to Fomenko the word “Rome” is a placeholder and can signify any one of several different cities and kingdoms. He claims the “First Rome”, or “Ancient Rome”, or “Mizraim”, is an ancient Egyptian kingdom in the delta of the Nile with its capital in Alexandria. The

second and most famous “New Rome” is Constantinople. The third “Rome” is constituted by three different cities: Constantinople (again), Rome in Italy, and Moscow. According to his claims, Rome in Italy was founded around AD 1380 by Aeneas, and Moscow as the third Rome was the capital of the great “Russian Horde.” Similarly, the word “Jerusalem” is actually a placeholder rather than a physical location and can refer to different cities at different times and the word “Israel” did not define a state, even not a territory, but people fighting for God, for example, French St. Louis and English Elizabeth called

themselves the King/Queen of Israel.

He claims that parallelism between John the Baptist, Jesus, and Old Testament prophets implies that the New Testament was written before the Old Testament. Fomenko claims that the Bible was being written until the Council of Trent (1545–1563), when the list of canonical books was established, and all apocryphal books were ordered to be destroyed. Fomenko also claims that Plato, Plotinus and Gemistus Pletho are one and the same person; according to him, some texts by or about Pletho were misdated and today believed to be texts by or about Plotinus or Plato. He

claims similar duplicates Dionysius the Areopagite, Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, and Dionysius Petavius. He claims Florence and the House of Medici bankrolled and played an important role in creation of the magnificent ‘Roman’ and ‘Greek’ past.

Specific claims

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

- Historians and translators often “assign” different dates and locations to different accounts of

the same historical events, creating multiple “phantom copies” of these events. These “phantom copies” are often misdated by centuries or even millennia and end up incorporated into conventional chronology.

- This chronology was largely manufactured by Joseph Justus Scaliger in *Opus Novum de emendatione temporum* (1583) and *Thesaurum temporum* (1606), and represents a vast array of dates produced without any justification whatsoever, containing the repeating sequences of dates with shifts equal to multiples of the

major cabbalistic numbers 333 and 360. The Jesuit Dionysius Petavius completed this chronology in *De Doctrina Temporum*, 1627 (v.1) and 1632 (v.2).

- Archaeological dating, dendrochronological dating, paleographical dating, numismatic dating, carbon dating, and other methods of dating of ancient sources and artifacts known today are erroneous, non-exact or dependent on traditional chronology.
- No single document in existence can be reliably dated earlier than

the XI century. Most “ancient” artifacts may find other than consensual explanation.

- Histories of Ancient Rome, Greece and Egypt were crafted during the Renaissance by humanists and clergy - mostly on the basis of documents of their own making.
- The Old Testament represents a rendition of events of the XIV to XVI centuries AD in Europe and Byzantium, containing “prophecies” about “future” events related in the New Testament, a rendition of events of AD 1152 to 1185.
- The history of religions runs as

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

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

- 37 complete Egyptian horoscopes found in Denderah, Esna, and other temples have unique valid astronomical solutions with dates ranging from AD 1000 and up to as late as AD 1700.
- The Book of Revelation, as we know it, contains a horoscope, dated to 25 September - 10 October 1486, compiled by cabbalist Johannes Reuchlin.
- The horoscopes found in Sumerian/Babylonian tablets do not contain sufficient astronomical data; consequently, they have solutions every 30–50 years on the

time axis and are therefore useless for purposes of dating.

- The Chinese tables of eclipses are useless for dating, as they contain too many eclipses that did not take place astronomically. Chinese tables of comets, even if true, cannot be used for dating.
- All major inventions like powder and guns, paper and print occurred in Europe in the period between the X and the XVI centuries.
- Ancient Roman and Greek statues, showing perfect command of the human anatomy, are fakes crafted in the Renaissance, when artists

attained such command for the first time.

- There was no such thing as the Tartar and Mongol invasion followed by over two centuries of yoke and slavery, because the so-called “Tartars and Mongols” were the actual ancestors of the modern Russians, living in a bilingual state with Turkic spoken as freely as Russian. So, Russia and Turkey once formed parts of the same empire. This ancient Russian state was governed by a double structure of civil and military authorities and the hordes were actually

professional armies with a tradition of lifelong conscription (the recruitment being the so-called “blood tax”). The Mongol “invasions” were punitive operations against the regions of the empire that attempted tax evasion. Tamerlane was probably a Russian warlord.

- Official Russian history is a blatant forgery concocted by a host of German scholars brought to Russia to legitimize the usurping Romanov dynasty (1613-1917).
- Moscow was founded as late as the mid-XIV century. The battle of

Kulikovo took place in Moscow.

- The tsar Ivan the Terrible represents a collation of no fewer than four rulers, representing two rival dynasties: the legitimate Godunov rulers and the ambitious Romanov upstarts.
- English history of AD 640–1040 and Byzantine history of AD 378–830 are reflections of the same late-medieval original.

Fomenko's methods

Statistical correlation of texts

One of Fomenko's simplest methods is

statistical correlation of texts. His basic assumption is that a text which describes a sequence of events will devote more space to more important events (for example, a period of war or an unrest will have much more space devoted to than a period of peaceful, non-eventful years), and that this irregularity will remain visible in other descriptions of the period. For each analysed text, a function is devised which maps each year mentioned in the text with the number of pages (lines, letters) devoted in the text to its description (which could be zero). The function of the two texts are then compared. (*Chron1*, pp. 187–

194.)


For example, Fomenko compares the contemporary history of Rome written by Titus Livius with a modern history of Rome written by Russian historian V. S. Sergeev, calculating that the two have high correlation, and thus that they describe the same period of history, which is undisputed. (*Chron1*, pp. 194–196.) He also compares modern texts, which describe different periods, and calculates low correlation, as expected. (*Chron1*, pp. 194–196.) However, when he compares, for example, the ancient history of Rome and the medieval history of Rome, he calculates a high

correlation, and concludes that ancient history of Rome is a copy of medieval history of Rome, thus clashing with mainstream accounts.

Statistical correlation of dynasties

In a somewhat similar manner, Fomenko compares two dynasties of rulers using statistical methods. First, he creates a database of rulers, containing relevant information on each of them. Then, he creates “survey codes” for each pair of the rulers, which contain a number which describes degree of the match of each considered property of two rulers.

For example, one of the properties is the way of death: if two rulers were both poisoned, they get value of +1 in their property of the way of death; if one ruler was poisoned and another killed in combat, they get -1; and if one was poisoned, and another died of illness, they get 0 (Fomenko claims there is possibility that chroniclers were not impartial and that different descriptions nonetheless describe the same person). An important property is the length of the rule. (*Chron1*, pp. 215–223.)



Sample Fomenko parallelism.

Fomenko lists a number of pairs of unrelated dynasties – for example, dynasties of kings of Israel and emperors of late Western Roman Empire (AD 300-476) – and claims that this method demonstrates correlations between their reigns. (Graphs which show just the length of the rule in the two dynasties are the most widely known; however, Fomenko's conclusions are also based on other parameters, as described above.) He also claims that the regnal history from the XVII to XX centuries never shows correlation of “dynastic flows” with each other, therefore Fomenko insists history was multiplied

and outstretched into imaginary antiquity to justify this or other “royal” pretensions.

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

XIX and XX centuries.

Astronomical evidence

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

- He says the mysterious drop in the value of the lunar acceleration parameter D (“a linear combination of the [angular] accelerations of the Earth and Moon”) between the years AD 700–1300, which the American astronomer Robert Newton had

explained in terms of “non-gravitational” (i.e., tidal) forces. By eliminating those anomalous early eclipses the New Chronology produces a constant value of D” beginning around AD 1000.

(*Chron1*, pp. pp.93-94, 105-6.)

- He associates initially the Star of Bethlehem with the AD 1140 (± 20) supernova (now Crab Nebula) and the Crucifixion Eclipse with the total solar eclipse of AD 1170 (± 20). He also believes that Crab Nebula supernova could not have exploded in AD 1054, but probably in AD 1153. He connects it with

total eclipse of AD 1186.

Moreover he holds in strong doubt the veracity of ancient Chinese astronomical data.

- He argues that the star catalog in the *Almagest*, ascribed to the Hellenistic astronomer Claudius Ptolemy, was compiled in the XV to XVI centuries AD. With this objective in sight he develops new methods of dating old stellar catalogues and claims that the *Almagest* is based on data collected between AD 600 and 1300, whereby the telluric obliquity is well taken into account.

- He refines and completes Morozov's analysis of some ancient horoscopes, most notably, the so-called Dendera Zodiacs—two horoscopes drawn on the ceiling of the temple of Hathor—and comes to the conclusion that they correspond to either the XI or the XIII century AD. Moreover, in his *History: Fiction or Science?* series finale, he makes computer-aided dating of all 37 Egyptian horoscopes that contain sufficient astronomical data, and claims they all fit into XI to XIX century timeframe. Traditional history

usually either interprets these horoscopes as belonging to the I century BC or suggests that they weren't meant to match any date at all.

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

he was actually describing the conflict between the medieval Navarrans and Catalans in Spain from AD 1374 to 1387.

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

Rejection of common dating methods

On archaeological dating methods,
Fomenko claims:

“Archaeological, dendrochronological, paleographical and carbon methods of dating of ancient sources and artifacts are both non-exact and contradictory, therefore there is not a single piece of firm written evidence or artifact that could be reliably and independently dated earlier than the XI century.” (*Chron1.*)

Dendrochronology is rejected with a claim that, for dating of objects much older than the oldest still living trees, it isn't an absolute, but a relative dating method, and thus dependent on traditional chronology. Fomenko specifically points to a break of dendrochronological scales around AD 1000.

Fomenko also cites a number of cases where carbon dating of a series of objects of known age gave significantly different dates. He also alleges undue cooperation between physicists and archaeologists in obtaining the dates, since most radiocarbon dating labs only accept samples with an age estimate suggested by historians or archaeologists. Fomenko also claims that carbon dating over the range of AD 1 to 2000 is inaccurate because it has too many sources of error that are either guessed at or completely ignored, and that calibration is done with a statistically meaningless number of

samples. Consequently, Fomenko concludes that carbon dating is not accurate enough to be used on historical scale.

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

He fully agrees with absolute dating methods for clay tablets or coins like thermoluminescence dating, optically stimulated luminescence dating,

archaeomagnetic, metallographic dating, but claims that their precision does not allow for comprehensive pinpointing on the time axis either.

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

Reception

Fomenko's historical ideas have been universally rejected by mainstream scholars, who brand them as pseudoscience, but were popularized by former world chess champion Garry Kasparov. Billington writes that the theory "might have quietly blown away in the wind tunnels of academia" if not for Kasparov's writing in support of it in the magazine *Ogoniok*. Kasparov met Fomenko during the 1990s, and found that Fomenko's conclusions concerning certain subjects were identical to his own regarding the popular view (which is not the view of academics) that art

and culture died during the Dark Ages and were not revived until the Renaissance. Kasparov also felt it illogical that the Romans and the Greeks living under the banner of Byzantium could fail to use the mounds of scientific knowledge left them by Ancient Greece and Rome, especially when it was of urgent military use. However, Kasparov does not support the reconstruction part of the New Chronology. Russian critics tended to see Fomenko's New Chronology as "an embarrassment and a potent symbol of the depths to which the Russian academy and society have generally sunk ... since the fall of

Communism.” Western critics see his views as part of a renewed Russian imperial ideology, “keeping alive an imperial consciousness and secular messianism in Russia.”

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

Critics have accused Fomenko of altering the data to improve the fit with his ideas and have noted that he violates a key rule of statistics by selecting matches from the historical record which support his chronology, while ignoring those which do not, creating artificial, better-than-chance correlations, and that these practices undermine Fomenko's statistical arguments. The new chronology was given a comprehensive critical analysis in a round table on "The 'Myths' of New Chronology" chaired by the dean of the department of history of Moscow State University in December 1999. One of the participants in that

round table, the distinguished Russian archaeologist, Valentin Yanin, compared Fomenko's work to "the sleight of hand trickery of a David Copperfield."

Linguist Andrey Zaliznyak argued that by using the Fomenko's approaches one can "prove" any historical correspondence, for example, between Ancient Egyptian pharaohs and French kings.

James Billington, formerly professor of Russian history at Harvard and Princeton and currently the Librarian of Congress placed Fomenko's work within the context of the political movement of Eurasianism, which sought to tie Russian history closely to that of

its Asian neighbors. Billington describes Fomenko as ascribing the belief in past hostility between Russia and the Mongols to the influence of Western historians. Thus, by Fomenko's chronology, "Russia and Turkey are parts of a previously single empire." A French reviewer of Billington's book noted approvingly his concern with the phantasmagorical conceptions of Fomenko about the global "new chronology."

H.G. van Bueren, professor emeritus of astronomy at the University of Utrecht, concluded his scathing review of Fomenko's work on the application of

mathematics and astronomy to historical data as follows:

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

Mathematics and Logic.)

Convergence of methods in archaeological dating

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

In the specific case of dendrochronology, Fomenko claims that this fails as an absolute dating method because of gaps in the record. However, independent dendrochronological sequences beginning with living trees

from various parts of North America and Europe extend back 12,400 years into the past. Furthermore, the mutual consistency of these independent dendrochronological sequences has been confirmed by comparing their radiocarbon and dendrochronological ages. These and other data have provided a calibration curve for radiocarbon dating whose internal error does not exceed ± 163 years over the entire 26,000 years of the curve.

In fact, archaeologists have developed a fully anchored dendrochronology series going back past 10,000 BCE. “The absolutely dated tree-ring

chronology now extends back to 12,410 cal BP (10,461 BC).”

Misuse of historical sources and forced pattern matching

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

“Fomenko ... provides no fair-minded review of the historical literature about a topic with which he deals, quotes only those sources that serve his purposes, uses evidence in ways that seem strange to professionally-trained historians and

asserts the wildest speculation as if it has the same status as the information common to the conventional historical literature.”

They also note that his method of statistically correlating of texts is very rough, because it does not take into account the many possible sources of variation in length outside of “importance.” They maintain that differences in language, style, and scope, as well as the frequently differing views and focuses of historians, which are manifested in a different notion of “important events”, make quantifying historical writings a dubious proposition

at best. What's more, Fomenko's critics allege that the parallelisms he reports are often derived by alleged forcing by Fomenko of the data – rearranging, merging, and removing monarchs as needed to fit the pattern.

For example, on the one hand Fomenko asserts that the vast majority of ancient sources are either irreparably distorted duplicate accounts of the same events or later forgeries. In his identification of Jesus with Pope Gregory VII (*Chron2*, p. 51) he ignores the otherwise vast dissimilarities between their reported lives and focuses on the similarity of their appointment to

religious office by baptism. (The evangelical Jesus is traditionally believed to have lived for 33 years, and he was an adult at the time of his encounter with John the Baptist. In contrast, according to the available primary sources, Pope Gregory VII lived for at least 60 years and was born 8 years after the death of Fomenko's John-the-Baptist equivalent John Crescentius.)

Critics allege that many of the supposed correlations of regnal durations are the product of the selective parsing and blending of the dates, events, and individuals mentioned in the original text. Another point raised by

critics is that Fomenko does not explain his altering the data (changing the order of rulers, dropping rulers, combining rulers, treating interregna as rulers, switching between theologians and emperors, etc.) preventing a duplication of the effort and effectively making this whole theory an ad hoc hypothesis.

Selectivity in reference to astronomical phenomena

Critics point out that Fomenko's discussion of astronomical phenomena tends to be selective, choosing isolated examples that support the New Chronology and ignoring the large

bodies of data that provide statistically supported evidence for the conventional dating. For his dating of the Almagest star catalog, Fomenko arbitrarily selected eight stars from the more than 1000 stars in the catalog, one of which (Arcturus) has a large systematic error. This star has a dominant effect on Fomenko's dating. Statistical analysis using the same method for all "fast" stars points to the antiquity of the Almagest star catalog. Rawlins points out further that Fomenko's statistical analysis got the wrong date for the Almagest because he took as constant Earth's obliquity when it is a variable that changes at a

very slow, but known, rate.

Fomenko's studies ignore the abundance of dated astronomical records in cuneiform texts from Mesopotamia. Among these texts is a series of Babylonian astronomical diaries, which records precise astronomical observations of the Moon and planets, often dated in terms of the reigns of known historical figures extending back to the VI century BCE. Astronomical retrocalculations for all these moving objects allow us to date these observations, and consequently the rulers' reigns, to within a single day. The observations are sufficiently

redundant that only a small portion of them are sufficient to date a text to a unique year in the period 750 BCE to 100 CE. The dates obtained agree with the accepted chronology. In addition, F. R. Stephenson has demonstrated through a systematic study of a large number of Babylonian, Ancient and Medieval European, and Chinese records of eclipse observations that they can be dated consistently with conventional chronology at least as far back as 600 BCE. In contrast to Fomenko's missing centuries, Stephenson's studies of eclipse observations find an accumulated uncertainty in the timing of

the rotation of the earth of 420 seconds at 400 BCE, and only 80 seconds at 1000 CE.

Magnitude and consistency of conspiracy theory

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

supporting New Chronology and conflicting traditional history is said to be thanks to the majority of such documents being destroyed by the same conspirators.

Consequently, there are many thousands of documents that are considered authentic in traditional history, but not in New Chronology. Fomenko often uses “falsified” documents, which he dismisses in other contexts, to prove a point. For example, he analyzes the Tartar Relation and arrives at the conclusion that Mongolian capital of Karakorum was located in Central Russia (equated with present-

day Yaroslavl). However, the Tartar Relation makes several statements that are at odds with New Chronology (such as that Batu Khan and Russian duke Yaroslav are two distinct people). Those are said by Fomenko to have been introduced into the original text by later editors.

Many of the rulers that Fomenko claims are medieval doppelgangers moved in the imaginary past have left behind vast numbers of coins. Numismatists have made innumerable identifications of coins to rulers known from ancient sources. For instance, several Roman emperors issued coinage

featuring at least three of their names, consistent with those found in written sources, and there are frequent examples of joint coinage between known royal family members, as well as overstrikes by kings who were known enemies.

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

Popularity in forums and amongst Russian imperialists

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

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

(Wikipedia text retrieved on 2nd August, 2015)

Afterword from the publisher

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

- radiocarbon dating methods pass

the black box tests, or

- astronomy refutes their results on ancient eclipses, or
- US astrophysicist Robert Newton was proved wrong to accuse Ptolemy of his crime.

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

finetuning to get the dates “to order” of historians. *Circulus vitiosus* is perfect.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Separate books on the New Chronology

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

1. *Introduction.*

2. *Methods 1-2.*
3. *Methods 3.*
4. *The New Chronology of Russia, Britain and Rome.*
5. *The Empire.*
6. *The Biblical Russia.*
7. *Reconstruction.*

• **BOOK ONE. *Introduction.***

[Intro]:1. Fomenko, A. T. *New Experimental Statistical Methods of Dating Ancient Events and their Application to the Global Classical and Mediaeval Chronology*. Pre-print. Moscow, The State Television and Radio Broadcast Committee, 1981. Order #3672. Lit. 9/XI-81. No. BO7201, 100 p.

[Intro]:2. Fomenko, A. T. *Some New Empirico-Statistical Methods of Dating and the*

Analysis of Present Global Chronology.

London, The British Library, Department of Printed Books, 1981. Cup. 918/87. 100 p.

[Intro]3. Fomenko, A. T. *A Criticism of the Traditional Chronology of the Classical Age and the Middle Ages (What Century Is It Now?)*. Essay. Moscow, Publishing House of the Moscow State University Department of Mechanical Mathematics, 1993. 204 p.

[Intro]:4. 2nd edition, revised and expanded. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *A Criticism of the Traditional Chronology of the Classical Age and the Middle Ages (What Century Is It Now?)*. Moscow, Kraft-Lean, 1999. 757 p. Kraft Publications released a concise version of this book in 2001. 487 p.

[Intro]:5. Another revision. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *What Century Is It*

Now? Moscow, AIF-Print Publications, 2002. 511 p.

• **BOOK TWO, PART ONE: *Methods-1*.**

[*Meth1*]:1. Fomenko, A. T. *The Methods of Statistical Analysis of Narrative Texts and their Chronological Applications*. (The identification and dating of dependent texts, statistical chronology of the antiquity, as well as the statistics of ancient astronomical accounts.) Moscow, The MSU Publishing House, 1990. 439 p.

[*Meth1*]:2. 2nd revised edition came out in 1996 as *The Methods Of Mathematical Analysis of Historical Texts. Chronological applications*. Moscow, Nauka Publications, 1996. 475 p.

[*Meth1*]:3. Several chapters of the book came out in 1996, revised and extended, as a

separate book: Fomenko, A. T. *The New Chronology of Greece. Antiquity in the Middle Ages*, Vols. 1 and 2. Moscow, MSU Centre of Research and Pre-University Education, 1996. 914 p.

[Meth1]:4. The English translation of the book, extended and revised to a large extent, was released under the following title: Fomenko, A. T. *Empirico-Statistical Analysis of Narrative Material and its Applications to Historical Dating*. Vol. 1, *The Development of the Statistical Tools*. Vol. 2, *The Analysis of Ancient and Mediaeval Records*. The Netherlands, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994. Vol. 1: 211 p. Vol. 2: 462 p.

[Meth1]:5. A Serbian translation titled Фоменко А. Т. *Статистичка хронологија. Математички поглед на историју. У ком смо веку?* was published

in 1997. Belgrade, Margo-Art, 1997. 450 p.

[*Meth I*]:6. The book was published in a revised and substantially extended version in 1999 as Volume 1 in a series of two: Fomenko, A. T. *The Methods of Statistical Analysis of Historical Texts. Chronological Applications*. Vol. 1. Moscow, Kraft and Lean, 1999. 801 p.

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

Vol. 1: 588 p. Vol. 2: 564 p.

• **BOOK TWO, PART TWO: *Methods-2*.**

[*Meth2*]:1. Fomenko, A. T. *Global Chronology*. (A Research of the Classical and Mediaeval History. Mathematical Methods of Source Analysis. Global Chronology.) Moscow, MSU Publications, 1993. 408 p.

[*Meth2*]:2. A revised and substantially extended version of the book as the second volume in a series of two: Fomenko, A. T. *The Methods of Statistical Analysis of Historical Texts. Chronological Applications*, Vol. 2. Moscow, Kraft and Lean, 1999. 907 p.

[*Meth2*]:3. A revised version of the book was published as the last volume in a series of three in the USA (in Russian) under the title:

Fomenko A. T. *Antiquity in the Middle Ages (Greek and Bible History)*, the trilogy bearing the general name: Fomenko A. T. *New Methods of the Statistical Analysis of Historical Texts and their Chronological Application*. The publication is part of the series titled *Scholarly Monographs in the Russian Language*. Lewiston, Queenston, Lampeter, The Edwin Mellen Press, 1999. 578 p.

• **BOOK THREE: *Methods-3*.**

[*Meth3*]:1. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G. V. Nosovskiy. *Geometrical and Statistical Methods of Analysis of Star Configurations. Dating Ptolemy's Almagest*. USA: CRC Press, 1993. 300 p.

[*Meth3*]:2. The Russian version of the book was published in 1995 in Moscow by the

Faktorial Publications under the title:
Kalashnikov V. V., Nosovskiy G. V.,
Fomenko A. T. *The Dating of the Almagest
Star Catalogue. Statistical and
Geometrical Analysis*. 286 p.

[Meth3]:3. A substantially extended and revised
version of the book: Kalashnikov, V. V., G.
V. Nosovskiy, and A. T. Fomenko. *The
Astronomical Analysis of Chronology. The
Almagest. Zodiacs*. Moscow, The Delovoi
Express Financial Publications, 2000. 895
p.

[Meth3]:4. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V.
Nosovskiy. *The New Chronology of Egypt.
The Astronomical Dating of Ancient
Egyptian Monuments. Research of 2000-
2002*. Moscow, Veche Press, 2002. 463 p.

• **BOOK FOUR: *Russia, Britain and Rome.***

[RBR]:1. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.
*The New Chronology and Conception of
the Ancient History of Russia, Britain, and
Rome. Facts, Statistics, Hypotheses. Vol. 1,
Russia. Vol. 2, Britain and Rome.* Moscow,
MSU Centre of Research and Pre-
University Education. Two editions, 1995
and 1996. 672 p.

[RBR]:2. A somewhat adapted and revised
version of the book came out in 1997:
Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.
*Russia and Rome. How correct is our
understanding of Eurasian history?* Vols.
1 and 2. Moscow, Olymp Publications,
1997. 2nd edition 1999. The next three
volumes from this series of five were
published in 2001. Vol. 1: 606 p. Vol. 2:
621 p. Vol. 3: 540 p. Vol. 4: 490 p. Vol. 5:
394 p.

[RBR]:3. A revised version of the first volume

was published in 1997 as a separate book: Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *The New Chronology of Russia*. Moscow, Faktorial Publications, 1997. Re-editions 1998 and 1999. 255 p.

[RBR]:4. A new, substantially extended and revised version of the first two-volume edition as a single volume: Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *The New Chronology of Russia, Britain and Rome*. Moscow, Anvik, 1999. 540 p.

[RBR]:5. A new revised version of this book came out as a single volume: Fomenko A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. Moscow, The Delovoi Express Financial Publications, 2001. 1015 p.

• **BOOK FIVE: *The Empire*.**

[Emp]:1. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.

The Empire (Russia, Turkey, China, Europe, Egypt. The New Mathematical Chronology of Antiquity). Moscow, Faktorial, 1996. Re-editions 1997, 1998, 1999, 2001 and 2002. 752 p.

• **BOOK SIX: *The Biblical Russia*.**

[BR]:1. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *The Mathematical Chronology of the Biblical Events*. Moscow, Nauka Publications, 1997. 407 p.

[BR]:2. A substantially revised and extended version: Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *The Biblical Russia. The Empire of Horde-Russia and the Bible. The New Mathematical Chronology of Antiquity*. Vols. 1 and 2. Moscow, Faktorial, 1998. Vol. 1: 687 p. Vol. 2: 582 p.

[BR]:3. A somewhat condensed version, which

nevertheless contained some important new material: Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *Horde-Russia on the Pages of the Biblical Books*. Moscow, Anvik Publications, 1998. 430 p.

[BR]:4. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *The Biblical Russia. Selected Chapters I (The Empire of Horde-Russia and the Bible. The New Mathematical Chronology of Antiquity. History of the Manuscripts and Editions of the Bible. The Events of the XI-XII Century A.D. in the New Testament. The Pentateuch.)*. Moscow, Faktorial, 1999. 173p.

[BR]:5. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *The Biblical Russia. Selected Chapters II (The Empire of Horde-Russia and the Bible. The New Mathematical Chronology of Antiquity. History of the XIV-XVI*

Century in the Last Books of the Kings. The History of the XV-XVI Century in the Last Chapters of the Books of the Kings. History of the XV-XVI Century in the Books of Esther and Judith. The Reformation Epoch of the XVI-XVII Century). Moscow, Faktorial Press, 2000. 223 p.

• **BOOK SEVEN: *Reconstruction.***

[Rec]:1. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *A Reconstruction of Global History (The New Chronology).* Book 1. Moscow, The Delovoi Express Financial Publishers, 1999. 735 p.

[Rec]:2. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *A Reconstruction of Global History. The Research of 1999-2000 (The New Chronology).* Moscow, The Delovoi

Express Financial Publishers, 1999. 615 p.
[Rec]:3. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.
*A Reconstruction of Global History. Joan
of Arc, Samson, and the History of Russia.*
Moscow, The Delovoi Express Financial
Publishers, 2002.

We have to point out that the publication
of our books on the New Chronology has
influenced a number of authors and their
works where the new chronological
concepts are discussed or developed.
Some of these are: L. I. Bocharov, N. N.
Yefimov, I. M. Chachukh, and I. Y.
Chernyshov ([93]), Jordan Tabov
([827], [828]), A. Goutz ([220]), M. M.
Postnikov ([680]), V. A. Nikerov

([579:1]), Heribert Illig ([1208]), Christian Blöss and Hans-Ulrich Niemitz ([1038], [1039]), Gunnar Heinsohn ([1185]), Gunnar Heinsohn and Heribert Illig ([1186]), Uwe Topper ([1462], [1463]).

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

Sources in Russian

- [1]. Abalakin, V. K. *The Essential Ephemeris Astronomy*. Moscow, 1979.
- [2]. Abbas, Shalabi. *The Entire Egypt, from Cairo to Abu-Simbel and Sinai*. 2nd extended Russian edition. Florence, Bonechi, 1996.
- [2:1]. Avadyaeva, E., and L. Zdanovich. *The Hundred Great Afflictions*. Moscow, Veche, 1999.
- [3]. Agathius. *The Reign of Justinian*. Moscow-Leningrad, USSR Academy of Sciences Publications, 1953. See also Agathius, Scholasticus. *Agathiae Myrinaei Historiarum libri quinque*. Berolini, 1967.
- [4]. Mez, Adam. *The Muslim Renaissance*. Moscow, Nauka, 1966. German edition: Mez, A. *Die Renaissance des Islams*.

Heidelberg, 1922.

- [5]. Azarevich, D. I. *The History of the Byzantine Law*. Yaroslavl, 1876-1877.
- [6]. Aydarova-Volkova, G. *The Priceless Experience. A Cultural Dialogue. Looking Across the Centuries*. The Kazan magazine, Issue 9-10 (1999): 13-21.
- [7]. Acropolite, George. *The Chronicle of the Great Logothete George Acropolite*. St. Petersburg, 1863.
- [8]. *The Historical Acts Compiled and Published by the Archaeographical Commission*. St. Petersburg, The State Document Preparation Expedition Typography. Vols. 1 and 2. 1841.
- [9]. Nazarov, V. D., ed. *The Acts of the State of Russia. Archives of the Muscovite Monasteries and Cathedrals*. The XV – early XVII century. Moscow, The Ladomir

Research and Publication Centre, 1998.

- [10]. *Alexandria. A Novel about Alexander the Great Based on a Russian Chronicle of the XV century*. Moscow-Leningrad, Nauka, 1966.
- [11]. Petrukhno, A. S., N. I. Shirinya, S. A. Gleybman, and O. IV. Zavgorodniaya. *Alexander's Village (Alexandrovskaya Sloboda, or, literally, "The Freeman's Village of Alexander")*. An Album. The Russian Federation Ministry of Culture. City of Alexandrov. The State Museum of Art, History, and Architecture of Alexander's Village. The City Council of the City of Alexandrov. 1996.
- [12]. *Alexander's Village (Alexandrovskaya Sloboda)*. The materials of a scientific and practical conference. Vladimir, Golden Gate Publications, 1995.

- [13]. Alexandrovsky, M. I. *A Historical Reference Book for the Churches of Moscow*. Moscow, The State Museum of History, Department of Visual Arts, the Architectural Graphics Fund, 1917 (with an additional written before 1942).
- [14]. Alexeyev, M. P. *On the Anglo-Russian Relations in the Time of Yaroslav the Wise*. The Scientific Bulletin of the Leningrad State University (4, 1945): 31.
- [15]. Alexeyev, Y. *My Monarch Sent Me to the Sultan*. The *Rodina* magazine, No. 2 (1997): 31-36.
- [16]. Alessandro, Angelini. *Piero della Francesca*. The *Great Italian Masters* series. Moscow, Slovo, 1997. The Italian edition: Italy, Scala, Istituto Fotografico Editoriale, 1995.
- [16:1]. [*Altarpieces*] Caterina Limentani Viridis

and Mari Pietrogiovanna. *Altarpieces. The Art of the Early Renaissance*. Translated from Italian. Byely Gorod, 2002. Arsenale editrice, Italy, 2001.

[17]. *The Alphabetic Syntagm of Matthew Vlastar*. Translated from Greek by Rev. Nikolai Ilyinsky, a teacher from the Seminary School of Tauris. Simpheropol, 1892. A new edition: Moscow, Galaxy Publications, 1996.

[18]. Alberti, L. *Leon Battista Alberti*. A collection of essays. Moscow, the USSR Academy of Sciences, Nauka, 1977. *Complete ed.* Oxford, Phaidon, 1977.

[19]. Amalrik, A. S., and A. L. Mongayt. *The Essential Archaeology*. Moscow, Prosveshchenie, 1963.

[19:0]. [Amartoles, George]. Matveyenko, V., and L. Shchegoleva. *The Chronicle of*

George the Monk. Russian text, comments, indications. Moscow, Bogorodskiy Pechatnik, 2000.

[19:1]. The catalogue of the exhibition *500 Years Since the Discovery of America*. The Hermitage. Russian National Library. St. Petersburg, Slavia-Interbook, Inc., 1993.

[20]. Amousin, I. D. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Moscow, Nauka, 1960.

[21]. Amphiheatrov, A. *Collected Works in 8 Volumes*. Vol. 4. St. Petersburg, Prosveshchenie, 1911.

[22]. Anastasov, L. *A New Direction in Science? Be careful!* *The Science and Technology* magazine (Moscow), No. 8 (1983): 28-30.

[23]. Müller, V. K., comp. *The English-Russian Dictionary*. 70,000 words. Moscow, The State National and Foreign

Dictionary Publishing House, 1961.

- [24]. Andreyeva, V., V. Kuklev, and A. Rovner. *An Encyclopedia of Symbols, Signs, and Emblems*. Moscow, Lokid/Myth/Ad Marginem, 1999.
- [25]. Anninskiy, S. A. *The News of the Tartars in Europe Brought by the Hungarian Missionaries*. Included in *The Historical Archive*, 71-112. Moscow-Leningrad, The RAS Institute of History, RAS Publications, 1940.
- [26]. *Antwerp and its Sights*. Antwerp, Editions THILL S.A. Brussels, 1999. In Russian.
- [27]. Antonov, A. V. *Genealogical Murals of Late XVII Century*. The Archaeographical Centre. The Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts. *The Russian Historical Research*, No. 6. Moscow, the

- [28]. Antonova, V. I., and N. E. Mneva. *The Catalogue of Ancient Russian Art from the Tretyakov Gallery*. Moscow, 1963. Vol. 1: p. 256; Vol 2: pp. 413 and 421.
- [29]. *The Apocryphal Jesus, Holy Family, and Christ Witness Legendry*. Svetsitskaya, I. S., and A. P. Skogorev, comp. Moscow, Kogelet, 1999.
- [30]. Apollodorus. *The Mythological Library*. Leningrad, Nauka, 1972. English edition: Apollodorus. *The Library*. London-New York: Loeb Classical Library, 1921.
- [30:1]. Arago, F. *The Biographies of the Famous Astronomers, Physicists, and Geometricians*. Books 1 and 2 (Vols. 1-3). Translated by D. Perevoshchikov. Moscow-Izhevsk, The Scientific Research Centre for Regular and Chaotic Dynamics, 2000.

[31]. Arenkova, Y. I., and G. I. Mekhova. *The Don Monastery*. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1970.

[32]. Aristaenetus. *The Love Epistles*. Eustathius, Macrembolites. *The Story of Ismene and Istmenias*. Moscow-Leningrad, Nauka, 1965. Also see Aristaenetus. *The Love Epistles*. In W. Kelley. *Erotica*. London, Bohn's Classical Library, G. Bell & Sons, 1848. Eustathius, Macrembolites. *Ismene and Istmenias*. London, 1788.

[33]. Zdanovich, G. B., ed. *Arkaim. Research. Prospects. Findings*. A collection of essays. From the series titled *The Historical Pages of Southern Ural*. The Arkaim Reserve works, State University of Chelyabinsk, the Specialized Arkaim Nature and Landscape Centre of History and Archaeology. The State Reserve of Ilmen. Chelyabinsk, the Kamenny Poyas Creative

Group, 1995.

[34]. Arnold, Y. *El Señor Kon-Tiki*. Moscow, Mysl, 1970.

[35]. Aronov, V. *The Elseviers (A History of Literary Art)*. Moscow, Kniga, 1975.

[36]. *The Chronicler of Archangelsk. A complete collection of Russian chronicles*, Vol. 37. Leningrad, Nauka, 1982.

[37]. Archangelskiy, Leonid. *The Samurai Steel*. An article for the magazine called *Magnum. The New Magazine on Arms* (November-December 1998): 18-21.

[38]. Avdousina, T. D., and T. D. Panov. *Archaeological Antiquities: The Muscovite Kremlin*. The Moscow Kremlin State Museum and Reserve for History and Culture. Moscow, 1996.

[39]. Serge, Archbishop. *The Complete*

Oriental Menology. Vols. 1-3. Vladimir, Typography & Lithography of V. A. Parkov in Vladimir, 1901. Reprinted Moscow, Orthodox Encyclopaedia Centre of Ecclesiastic Research, Palomnik Publications, 1997.

[40]. Archimedes. *The Works*. Moscow, Fizmatgiz, 1962. English edition: Archimedes, *The Works of Archimedes*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1912.

[40:0]. Asov, A. I. *The Book of Veles*. Moscow, Menedzher, 1995, 2nd edition.

[40:00]. Asov, A. I., Konovalov, M. Y. *The Ancient Aryans. The Slavs. Russia*. Moscow, Veche, 2002.

[40:1]. Gentili, Augusto, William Barcham, and Linda Whiteley. *The National Gallery of London*. From the *The Great Museums of*

the World series. Moscow, Slovo, 2001. A translation of the Italian edition Udine: Magnus Edizioni, 2000.

- [41]. Nikitin, Afanasiy. *Voyage over the Three Sees. Published in the Literary Monuments of Old Russia. 2nd Half of the XV Century.* Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1982.
- [42]. Nikitin, Afanasiy. *Afanasiy Nikitin's Voyage over the Three Sees. 1466-1472.* Foreword, translation, text preparation and commentary by N. I. Prokofiev. Moscow, Sovetskaya Rossiya, 1980.
- [43]. Akhmanova, O. S., and others. *Precise Methods of Language Study.* Moscow, 1961.
- [44]. Bayev, K. L. *Copernicus.* From the *Celebrity Biographies* series, Issue 7 (55). Moscow, The Magazine and Newspaper

Consociation, 1935.

- [45]. Beyer, Rolf. *The Queen of Sheba*. From the *Mark In History* series. Rostov-on-Don, Fenix Publications, 1998. A translation from the German original by Beyer, Rolf. *Die Königin von Saba*. The *Question Mark* series, Gustav Lübke Verlag GmbH, Bergisch Gladbach. 1987.
- [46]. Balandin, R. K. *A Miracle or a Scientific Enigma? Science and Religion Discussing the Shroud of Turin*. Moscow, Znaniye, 1989. The *Question Mark* series, Issue 1, 1989.
- [47]. Balandin, R., and L. Bondarev. *Nature and Civilization*. Moscow, Mysl, 1988.
- [48]. Baldin, V. I., and T. P. Manushkina. *The Laura of Serge and The Trinity. The Architectural Set and the Collections of Ancient Russian Art of the XIV-XVII*

Century. Moscow, Nauka, 1996.

- [49]. Baranov, V. *Logic Isn't Facts*. The *Science & Technology* magazine (Moscow), No. 4 (1983): 24-28.
- [50]. Baronius, C. *The Ecclesial and Secular Annals from the Birth of Christ and until the Year 1198*. Typography of P. IP. Ryabushinsky, from Baronius, *Annales ecclesiastici a Christo nato ad annum 1198*. Moscow, 1913.
- [51]. Bartenev, S. *The Moscow Kremlin in the Antiquity and Nowadays*. Moscow, Synodal Typography, 1912.
- [52]. de las Casas, Bartólome. *History of the Indias*. Leningrad, Nauka, 1968.
- [53]. Baskakov, N. A. *Russian Names of Turkic Origin*. Moscow, Nauka, The Main Oriental Literature Editing Board, 1979.

- [54]. Magarichev, Y. M., ed. and comp. *The Cultural and Historical Reserve of Bakhchisaray*. Simferopol, Tavria, 1995.
- [55]. Bakhshi, Iman. *Jagfar Tarikhy. A Collection of Bulgarian Manuscripts from 1680*. Russian translation of the Bulgarian text by I. M. K. Nigmatoullin. Orenburg, The Orenburg Press Contact, KOPF, editorial board of the *Bulgaria Courier*, 1993.
- [56]. Bashmakova, I. G., and G. S. Smirnova. *The Naissance and the Development of Algebra*. Published in the *Aperçus on the History of Mathematics* edited by B. V. Gnedenko. Moscow, MSU Publications, 1997.
- [57]. Belenkiy, M. S. *Judaism*. Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1966.
- [58]. Bellosi, Luciano. *Giotto*. Moscow, Slovo Press, 1996. Translated from the 1995

Italian edition by Scala, Istituto Fotografico Editoriale.

[59]. Belova, A. G. *The Historical Morphology of the Arabic Language*. Moscow, 1994.

[59:0]. Belova G. A, Sherkova T. A. *Russians in the Land of Pyramids. Travellers, Scientists, Collectioners*. Moscow, Aleteya, 2003.

[59:1]. Belyavsky, V. A. *Legendary and Historical Babylon*. Moscow, Mysl, 1971.

[60]. Belyavsky, M. T. M. V. *Lomonosov and the Foundation of the Moscow University (1755-1955)*. Edited by M. N. Tikhomirov. Moscow, MSU Publications, 1955.

[61]. Belyaev, D. V. *Byzantine. Essays, Materials and Notes concerning Byzantine Antiquity*. Book III. St. Petersburg, 1891-1906.

[62]. Belyaev, L. A. *The Ancient Monasteries of Moscow According to Archaeological Data*. Moscow, The Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Archaeology. Research and materials concerning the archaeology of Moscow. Vol. 6. 1995.

[63]. Belyaev, Y. *100 Monsters of Antiquity*. An illustrated encyclopaedia of mythology. Moscow, Raritet, 1997.

[64]. Bémont, C., and G. Monod. *The Mediaeval History of Europe*. Petrograd, 1915. French edition: Bémont, C., and G. Monod. *Histoire de l'Europe au Moyen Âge*. Paris, 1921.

[64:1]. Berg, L. S. *The Discovery of Kamchatka and Bering's Expedition*. Moscow-Leningrad, The USSR Academy of Sciences Press, 1946.

[64:2]. Berg, L. S. *Essays on the History of*

Russian Geographical Discoveries.

Moscow-Leningrad, The USSR Academy of Sciences Press, 1946.

[65]. Berry, A. *Concise History of Astronomy.*

Translated by S. Zaimovskiy. Moscow-Leningrad, GITTL, 1946.

[66]. Archimandrite Nicephor. *The Biblical Encyclopedia (The Full Illustrated Biblical Encyclopedia).* Moscow, The A. I.

Snegiryova Typography, 1891. A modern reprint was published by the Laura of St. Serge and the Holy Trinity in 1990.

[67]. *The Bible.* 10th edition. St. Petersburg, 1912.

[68]. *The Bible. Books from the Old and the New Covenant in Russian Translation with Anagoges and Appendices.* Moscow, Moscow Patriarchy Press, 1968. There are numerous re-editions in existence, for

instance, the one published by the Russian Biblical Society in Moscow, 1995.

[69]. *The Bible. Books of the Holy Writ from the Old and the New Covenant*. Russian translation with appendices. 4th edition. Brussels, Life with God Press, 1989.

[70]. *The Bible, or the Books of the Holy Writ from the Old and the New Covenant with Anagoges*. 2nd edition. St. Petersburg, Synodal Typography, 1900. Reprinted by the Russian Biblical Society in Moscow, 1993. (This version of the Bible dates to the 1st half of the XVIII century and is therefore occasionally called Elizabethan.)

[71]. *Scorina's Bible*. A facsimile edition of the Bible published by Francisco Scorina in 1517-1519. Volumes 1-3. Minsk, The Petrus Brovka Byelorussian Sovetskaya Encyclopaedia Press, 1990.

- [72]. Bickerman, E. *Chronology of the Ancient World*. Moscow, Nauka, 1975. Translated from the English edition published in London by Thames & Hudson, 1968-1969.
- [73]. Biroulia, Y. N. *Russian Naval Charts of 1701-1750. Copies from originals (Atlas)*. St. Petersburg, The Military Navy Publications, 1993.
- [74]. *The Book of Good Tidings. Interpretations of the Holy Gospel by St. Theophylactus, the Archbishop of Bulgaria. The Gospel According to Mark Interpreted*. St. Petersburg, P. P. Soykin's Publications. Reprinted St. Petersburg, Satis Press, 1993.
- [75]. Blazhko, S. N. *A Course of Practical Astronomy*. Moscow, Nauka, 1979.
- [76]. Blair, G. *Chronological Tables Spanning the Entire Global History*,

Containing Every Year since the Genesis and until the XIX Century, Published in English by G. Blair, a Member of the Royal Society, London. Vols. 1 and 2. Moscow University Press, 1808-1809. The English edition: Blair's Chronological and Historical Tables, from the Creation to the Present Time, etc. London, G. Bell & Sons, 1882.

[77]. Bobrovnitskaya, T. A. *The Royal Regalia of the Russian Rulers. The Kremlin in Moscow. Published to Commemorate the 500th Anniversary of the State Coat of Arms and the 450th Anniversary of the Inauguration of the First Russian Czar Ivan the Terrible.* Moscow, The Moscow Kremlin State Museum and Reserve for History and Culture, 1997.

[78]. Bobrovnitsky. *The Origins and the Process of the Roman Catholic Liturgy.*

Kiev, 1873.

- [79]. Bogdanov, Ivan. *Name Lists of the Bulgarian Khans*. Sofia, Otechestvenia Front Press, 1981.
- [80]. Gousseva, E., A. Lukashov, and others. *Our Lady of Vladimir*. A collection of materials. Exhibition catalogue. The State Tretyakovskaya Gallery, The Moscow Kremlin State Museum and Reserve for History and Culture. Moscow, Avangard Press, 1995.
- [80:1]. Boguslavskiy, V. V. *The Slavic Encyclopaedia*. Vols. 1 and 2. Moscow, OLMA-Press, 2001.
- [81]. Bozhilov, Ivan. *The Asen Dynasty (1186-1460). Genealogy and Prosopography*. Sofia, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences Press, 1994.
- [82]. Bolingbroke. *Epistles on Historical*

Studies and their Utility. Moscow, Nauka, 1978.

[83]. Bolotov, V. V. *Lectures on Ancient Ecclesial History.* Vols. 1-4. Published posthumously under the editorship of Prof. A. Brilliantov. St. Petersburg, 1907. Reprinted Moscow, Spaso-Preobrazhensky Monastery of Valaam, 1994.

[84]. Bolkhovitinov, E. A. (Metropolitan Eugene). *The Concise Chronicle of Pskov.* Pskov, Otchina Press, 1993.

[85]. *The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia.* Vols. 1-51. 2nd edition. Moscow, The Soviet Encyclopaedia Press, 1949-1957.

[85:1]. *The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia.* Vols. 1-30. 3rd edition. Moscow, 1969-1978. (Electronic version on 5 CD-ROMs.)

[86]. *The Great Catechism.* Moscow, 7135 (1627 ad). Reprinted by the Royal Grodno

typography in 7291 (1683 AD).

[87]. *The Great German-Russian Dictionary*. 2nd edition, Stereotyped. Moscow, Russkiy Yazyk, 1980.

[87:1]. *The Great Turkish-Russian Dictionary*. 20,000 words and word groups. The RAS Institute for Oriental Studies. 2nd edition. Moscow, Russkiy Yazyk, 1998.

[88]. *The Great Encyclopaedic Dictionary*. Moscow, The Great Russian Encyclopaedia Press, 1998.

[89]. Borisov, N. S. *Ivan Kalita*. The *Celebrity Biographies* series. Moscow, Molodaya Gvardia, 1995.

[90]. Borisovskaya, N. *Engraved Ancient Maps and Plans of the XV-XVIII century. Cosmography, Maps, Star Charts, City and Battle Plans. From the Pushkin State Museum of Art Collection*. Moscow,

Galaktika Press, 1995.

[91]. *Bosch, Hieronymus*. Self-titled album of reproductions. Moscow, Uniserv, 1995.

[91:1]. *Botticelli*. An album from the *Masters of Art* series. Text by Elena Carpetti. 1997, Giunti Gruppo Editoriale, Florence, 2002. Russian edition by Byely Gorod, Moscow, 2001.

[92]. Beaufort, Louis de. *Dissertation sur l'incertitude des cinq premiers siècles de l'histoire Romaine*. Utrecht, 1738. Republished Paris, Blot, 1886.

[93]. Bocharov, L. I., N. N. Yefimov, I. M. Chachoukh, and I. Y. Chernyshev. *The Conspiracy Against Russian History. (Facts, Mysteries, Versions)*. Moscow, Anvik, 1998.

[93:1]. Brant, Sebastian. *Ship of Fools*. Part of the *The World Literature Bibliothèque*

series (Series 1, Vol. 33). Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1971.

[94]. Brownley, C. A. *Statistical Theory and Methodology in Science and Technology*. Moscow, Nauka, 1977.

[95]. Brashinskiy, I. B. *Looking for the Scythian Treasures*. Leningrad, The USSR Academy of Sciences, Nauka, 1979.

[96]. Brodsky, B. *Kremlin – The Heart of the Fatherland*. Moscow, Izobrazitelnoye Iskusstvo, 1996.

[97]. Bronstein, I. N., and K. A. Semendyaev. *A Reference Book on Mathematics*. Moscow, Nauka, 1986.

[98]. Bronsten, V. A. *Claudius Ptolemy*. Moscow, Nauka, 1988.

[99]. Brugsch, Heinrich. *History of the Pharaohs*. Translated by G. K. Vlastov.

Published in the series titled *The Chronicles and the Monuments of the Ancient Egypt*. St. Petersburg, I. I. Glazounov's Typography, 1880. English edition: *Egypt under the Pharaohs. A History Derived Entirely from the Monuments*. London, J. Murray, 1891.

[99:1]. *Bruges: its Sights and Delights. City Plan*. (Russian version). E.E.C., Editions Thill S. A., Brussels, 1997.

[100]. Bryusova, V. G. *Andrei Rublev*. Moscow, Izobrazitelnoye Iskusstvo, 1995.

[101]. Bouganov, V. I. *Razin and his Followers. Documents, Accounts of the Contemporaries*. Moscow, Nauka, 1995.

[102]. Bouganov, S. I. *Native Historiography of Russian Chronicles*. Moscow, Nauka, 1975.

[103]. Bouzeskoul, V. P. *An Introduction into*

Greek History. Lectures. Vol. 1. Petrograd, 1915.

[104]. Boukreyeva, T. N. *The Basel Museum of Arts.* Moscow, Izobrazitelnoye Iskusstvo, 1987.

[105]. Boulatov, A. M. *The Historical Plans of Moscow.* Release III. Moscow, Zhiraf, 2000.

[106]. Burian, Y., and B. Moukhova. *The Enigmatic Etruscans.* Moscow, Nauka, 1970.

[107]. Bouseva-Davydova, I. L. *The Temples of the Muscovite Kremlin: Holy Relics and other Antiquities.* Moscow, The Nauka Int'l Academic Publishing Co., 1997.

[108]. Boutkevich, T. I. *An Overview of Russian Sects.* Kharkov, 1910.

[109]. Boutkov, P. *Defending the Russian Chronicle of Nestor from the Vituperation*

of the Sceptics. St. Petersburg, 1840.

- [110]. Boutomo, S. I. *Radionuclear Datings and the Construction of an Absolute Chronological Scale of Archaeological Monuments*. In *Archaeology and Natural Sciences*. Moscow, Nauka, 1965. 35-45.
- [111]. Boutromeyev, V. *Global History in Individual Personalities. Late Middle Ages*. Moscow, Olma, 1999.
- [112]. Kalougin, V. I., comp. *Folk Tales and Legends*. Moscow, Sovremennik, 1991.
- [113]. Bychkov, A. A., A. Y. Nizovsky, and P. Y. Chernosvitov. *The Conundrums of Ancient Russia*. Moscow, Veche, 2000.
- [114]. Bychkov, V. V. *The Mediaeval Aesthetics of Russia. XI-XVII century*. Moscow, Mysl, 1992.
- [114:1]. Bauval, Robert, and Adrian Gilbert.

The Orion Mystery. Unlocking the Secrets of the Pyramids. Russian translation. Moscow, Veche, 1996.

[115]. *Bulgaria. A Traveller's Map.* Scale: 1:530000. Sofia, Datamap Revue, 1997.

[116]. Wagner, G. K. *Soviet Union and its Famous Works of Art. Old Cities of Russia. A traveller's guide.* Moscow, Iskusstvo, Edizion Leipzig, 1980.

[116:1]. Weinstein S., and M.Kryukov. *The Saddle and the Stirrup. The Znaniye-Sila (Knowledge is Power) magazine (Moscow),* August 1985, 24-26.

[117]. Valishevsky, K. *Ivan the Terrible.* Moscow, IKPA-press, 1989. Reprinted from Moscow, Obshchestvennaya Polza Typography, 1912.

[118]. Valishevsky, K. *Ivan the Terrible.* Moscow, Svarog, 1993.

- [119]. Valishevsky, K. *The First Romanovs*. Moscow, Kvadrat, 1993.
- [120]. Vasiliev, A. A. *The History of Byzantium. The Fall of Byzantium. The Palaeiologi Epoch (1261-1453)*. Leningrad, Academia, 1925.
- [121]. *An Introduction into Special Historical Disciplines*. Moscow, MSU Publications, 1990.
- [122]. Weber, George. *Universal History*. Moscow, 1892. English edition: Weber, G. *Outline of Universal History from the Creation of the World to the Present Time*. London, 1851.
- [122:1]. *Hungarian-Russian Dictionary*. 40,000 words. Moscow-Budapest, Russkiy Yazyk, The Hungarian Academy of Sciences Publishing House, 1974.
- [123]. Weisman, A. D. *Greek-Russian*

Dictionary. 5th edition. St. Petersburg, published by the author, 1899. Reprinted Moscow, Graeco-Latin Department of Y. A. Shichalin, 1991.

[124]. Weisman, A. D. *Latin-Russian Dictionary*. St. Petersburg: published by the author, 1899. Reprinted Moscow, Graeco-Latin Department of Y. A. Shichalin, 1991.

[125]. Venelin, Y. *News of the Varangians as Related by Arab Scribes; their Alleged Crimes as Seen by the Latter*. The Imperial Moscow University Society for History and Russian Antiquities Readings, Book IV, Section V: 1-18. 1870.

[125:1]. Vereshchagin V. V. *Vereschagin, the Artist. Napoleon I in Russia, 1812*. Tver, the Sozvezdie Agency of Tver, 1993.

[125:2]. Vermoush, G. *Diamonds in World History and Stories about Diamonds*.

Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya, 1988.

[126]. Veselovsky, A. N. *Russians and Veltins in the Saga of Tidrec of Berne (Verona)*. St. Petersburg, Typography of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1906. A separate engraving from the *Russian Language and Belles Lettres Department Courier*, Vol. XI (1906), Book 3: 1-190.

[127]. Veselovsky, I. N. *Aristarchus of Samos – The Copernicus of the Antiquity*. Historical and astronomical research. Issue 7: 44. Moscow, Nauka, 1961.

[128]. Veselovsky, S. B. *A Research into the History of Oprichnina*. Moscow, 1963.

[129]. *The Russia Academy of Sciences Courier*, Vol. 68, No. 10 (October 1998). Moscow, Nauka.

[129:1]. Palaudirias, S. A., Editorial Escudo de

Oro. *The Entire Antwerp*. In *The Entire Europe* Collection. Antwerp, published in Russian. Barcelona, 1998.

[129:2]. Bersnev, P. V., comp. *The Old Testament Apocrypha. The Book of the Jubilees. Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Translated by A. V. Smirnov. Published in the *Alexandrian Library* series. St. Petersburg, Amphora, 2000.

[129:3]. Vzdornov, G. I. *Book Art in Old Russia. Handwritten Books in the North-Eastern Russia in the XII – Early XV century*. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1980.

[130]. Widukind of Corvea. *The Deeds of the Saxons*. Moscow, Nauka, 1975. See also Widukind. *Sächsische Geschichten*. Translated by R. Schottin, foreword by W. Wattenbach. GV. Leipzig, 1882. Also see: Widukind. *Sächsische Geschichten*. New

revision by Paul Hirsch. GV, Bd. 33,
Leipzig, 1931.

- [131]. *The Byzantine Book of the Eparch*.
Moscow, Oriental Literature Publications,
1962. Also see *The Book of the Eparch. Le
livre du préfet*, with an introduction by
Prof. Ivan Dulcev. "Reprint of ... the
publication (by Jules Nicole) of the *Book of
the Eparch*, to which is added ... a facsimile
of the complete manuscript and Freshfield's
English translation." 1970.
- [132]. *Byzantine Historians. Dexippos,
Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Malchus, Peter
the Patrician, Menander, Candides,
Nonnos, Theophanes the Byzantine*. St.
Petersburg, 1858.
- [133]. *Byzantine Legends*. Leningrad, Nauka,
1972.
- [134]. Vilinbakhov, G. V. *The State Coat of*

Arms of Russia. 500 Years. St. Petersburg, Slavia. The State Hermitage. The Presidential State Heraldry Commission. The Moscow Kremlin State Museum and Reserve for History and Culture, 1997.

[135]. Vilinbakhov, G., and T. Vilinbakhova. *St. George and his Image as Used in Russia.* St. Petersburg, Iskusstvo, 1995.

[136]. de Villehardouin, Geoffroy. *The Conquest of Constantinople.* Moscow, Nauka, 1993.

[137]. Vinogradov, V. K. *Theodosia. A Historical Aperçu.* Yekaterinodar, Kilius & Co Typography, 1902. (A reprint of the first part of the book is given in the historical and literary almanac titled *Okoyem [Horizon]*, No. 2 for 1992, Theodosia.)

[138]. Vittorio, Serra. *The Entire Rome. (Flowers. Churches. Museums.*

Monuments. Fountains. The Vatican. The Sistine Chapel. Tivoli. Ostia Antica).

Bonechi Edizioni “Il Turismo.” Florence, 1994.

[139]. Vladimirov, L. I. *The Omnified Literary History.* Moscow, Kniga, 1988.

[140]. Vlasov, Sergei. *The Deeds of Constantine the Great.* First Experimental Typography of the State Committee of Russian Federation, Eleemosynary Institution “The Order of Constantine the Great”, 1999.

[141]. Vnouchkov, B. C. *The Prisoner of Schliesselburg.* Yaroslavl, the Upper Volga Publications, 1988.

[142]. Voyekova, I. N., and V. P. Mitrofanov. *Yaroslavl.* From the series titled *Museum Cities.* Leningrad, Aurora, 1973.

[143]. *The Military Topographic Map of*

Moscow and its Environs (1860). The map was published in the *Rarities of Russian Cartography* series. Moscow, Kartair, the scientific and editorial publishing house of I. R. Anokhin, 1998.

[144]. *Around the Coliseum*. The *Izvestiya* newspaper, 18 May 1977.

[145]. *The Vologda Chronicle*. The Anthology of Ancient Russian Literature, Vol. 37. Leningrad, Nauka, 1982.

[145:1]. *The Land of Volokolamsk. Dedicated to 400 Years of Glorifying the Most Reverend Joseph of Volotsk*. Under the general editorship of Pitirim, the Metropolitan of Volokolamsk and Yurievsk. Moscow, Prosvetitel, 1994.

[146]. Volfkovich, S. I. *Nikolai Alexandrovich Morozov as a Chemist (1854-1946)*. The Journal of the USSR Academy of Sciences,

Department of Chemistry, No. 5 (1947).

[147]. Volkovich, S. I. *Nikolai Alexandrovich Morozov. His Life and Works on Chemistry*. The *Priroda (Nature)* magazine, No. 11 (1947).

[148]. Voronikhina, L. N. *Edinburgh*. The *Cities and Museums of the World* series. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1974.

[149]. Vostokov, A. *A Description of the Russian and the Slovenian Manuscripts of the Rumyantsev Museum as Compiled by Alexander Vostokov*. St. Petersburg, Typography of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, 1842.

[150]. *The Chronicle of Ivan Timofeyev*. Prepared for printing, translated and commented by O. A. Derzhavina. Moscow-Leningrad, 1951.

[151]. *Global History*. 10 volumes. Moscow,

USSR Academy of Sciences, The Socio-Economic Literature Department Publications, 1958.

[152]. *The Unified Library of Russia, or the Book Catalogue for an Exhaustive and Detailed Description of our Fatherland.* 2nd extended edition. Moscow, 1845.

[153]. Maggi, G. and Valdes, G. *The Entire Turkey.* Florence, Casa Editrice Bonechi, 1995.

[154]. Wooley, L. *Ur of the Chaldees.* Moscow, Oriental Literary, 1961 (1972). English edition: Wooley, L. *Ur of the Chaldees.* London, Benn, 1950. See also: Wooley, L. *Excavations at Ur. A Record of Twelve Years.* London, Benn, 1955.

[155]. Galfridus Monmutensis. *History of the Brits. The Life of Merlin.* Moscow, Nauka, 1984. English edition: *Histories of the*

Kings of Britain by Geoffrey of Monmouth.
Translated by L. A. Paton. London-New
York, 1912. See also: Giles, J. A., ed. *Six
Old English Chronicles.* London, 1848.

[156]. Garkavi, A. Y. *The Accounts of the Slavs
and the Russians as Given by Muslim
Authors (from mid-VII century until the
End of the X century AD).* St. Petersburg,
1870 (1872).

[157]. Genova, E., and L. Vlahova. *24 Church
Plates from the Rila Monastery.* Sofia,
Bulgarsky Khudozhnik, 1988.

[158]. *GEO.* A monthly magazine. No. 1
(January, 2000). Moscow, Gruner and Yar
Ltd.

[159]. *Geographical Atlas.* Moscow, The
General Council of Ministers, Department
of Geodetics and Cartography. 1968.

[160]. Herberstein. *Baron Sigismund*

Herberstein. Notes on the Affairs of the Muscovites. St. Petersburg, A. S. Souvorin's Press, 1908. *Rerum moscoviticarum commentarii.* Wien, S. l. et d., 1549. *Rerum moscoviticarum commentarii.* Basiliae, 1551. *Rerum moscoviticarum commentarii.* Basiliae, 1556. *Moscovia, der Hauptstat in Reissen.* Wien, 1557. Major, R. H., ed. *Notes upon Russia.* 2nd edition. New York, London Hakluite Society, 1963. Vol. 10: 1-116; Vol. 12: 3-174.

[161]. Herberstein, Sigismund. *Notes on Moscovia.* Moscow, MSU Publications, 1988.

[161:1]. Herberstein. *Ziga Herberstein. Sigismund Herberstein – the Warrior, Statesman, Diplomat and Peacemaker.* An edition of the Dr. F. Preshern Society for Contact Development between Slovenia and Russia. Moscow Byelye Alvy Press, Bilio,

Humar Press, 2000.

[162]. von Winkler, P. P., comp. *Coats of Arms of Cities, Provinces, Regions and Towns of the Russian Empire Included into the Complete Collection of Laws and Regulations between 1649 and 1900*. St. Petersburg: published by the book salesman Iv. Iv. Ivanov, 1899. New edition: Moscow, Planeta, 1990.

[163]. Herodotus. *History*. Leningrad, Nauka, 1972. English edition: *The History of Herodotus*. From the series *Great Books of the Western World*. Vol. 5. Chicago, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., The University of Chicago, 1952 (2nd edition 1990). See also: Herodotus. *The Histories of Herodotus, etc.* London and New York, Everyman's Library, 1964.

[164]. Herzen, A. G., and Y. M. Mogarichev.

The Fortress of Gems. Kyrk-Or, Chufut-Kale. Published as part of the series *The Archaeological Monuments of the Crimea*. Simferopol, Tavria, 1993.

[165]. Herzen, A. G., and Y. M. Mogarichev. *Salachik. The Ouspensky Monastery. Bakhchisaray*. The State Museum and Reserve for History and Culture of Bakhchisaray. 1991.

[165:1]. Hertzman, Yevgeni. *The Lost Centuries of Byzantine Music*. The XX International Congress of Byzantine Scholars. St. Petersburg, The Humanitarian Academy Publishing Centre, 2001.

[166]. Gerchouk, Y. Y. *History of Drawing and Book Art*. Moscow, Aspect, 2000.

[167]. Gililov, I. *A Passion Play of William Shakespeare, or the Mystery of the Great Phoenix*. Moscow, "Artist. Rezhissyor.

Teatr” Publications, 1997.

[168]. Glazounov, I. *Russia Crucified*. The *Our Contemporary* magazine, Issues 1-5, 7-9, 11 (1996). This material was subsequently published as a book.

[169]. Gnedenko, A. M., and V. M. Gnedenko. *For One's Comrades, or Everything about the Cossacks*. Moscow, The Int'l Fund of Slavic Writing and Culture. ARP Int. Co., 1993.

[170]. The A. V. Shchusev Museum of Architecture, archive 1246/1-13.

[171]. Golenishchev-Kutuzov, I. N. *The Mediaeval Latin Literature of Italy*. Moscow, Nauka, 1972.

[172]. Golitsyn, N. S. *The Great Warlords of History*. Vol. 1. St. Petersburg, 1878.

[173]. Golovanov, Y. *Etudes on Scientists*.

Moscow, Molodaya Gvardiya, 1976.

[174]. Golovin, B. N. *Language and Statistics*. Moscow, 1971.

[175]. Goloubovsky, P. V. *The Pechenegs, the Torks, and the Polovtsy before the Tartar Invasion*. Kiev, 1884.

[176]. Goloubtsov, A. P. *Selected Readings on Ecclesial Archaeology and Liturgy*. St. Petersburg, Statis, 1995.

[177]. Goloubtsova, E. S., and V. M. Smirin. "On the Attempts of Using the 'New Methods' of Statistical Analysis to Ancient Historical Material." *The Courier of Ancient History*, 1982, No. 1: 171-195.

[178]. Goloubtsova, E. S., and G. A. Koshelenko. *Ancient History and the "New Methods."* *Historical Issues*, No. 8 (1982).

[179]. Goloubtsova, E. S., and Y. A. Zavenyagin.

Another Account of the New Methods and the Chronology of Antiquity. Historical Issues, No. 12 (1983): 68-83.

- [180]. Homer. *Iliad*. Translated by N. I. Gnedich. Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1969. See also: Homer, *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago University Press, London, 1962.
- [180:1]. Homer. *The Odyssey of Homer*. New York, Harper & Row, 1967.
- [181]. Goneim, M. *The Lost Pyramid*. Moscow, Geographiz, 1959. English edition: Goneim, M. *The Lost Pyramid*. New York, Rinehart, 1956.
- [182]. Gorbachevsky, B. *Crosses, Fires, and Books*. Moscow, Sovetskaya Rossiya, 1965.
- [183]. Gordeyev, A. A. *History of the Cossacks*. Vol. 1-4. Moscow, Strastnoi Boulevard, 1992.

- [184]. Gordeyev, N. V. *The Czar Cannon*. Moscow, Moskovskiy Rabochiy, 1969.
- [185]. *The Towns and Cities of Russia. An Encyclopaedia*. Moscow, The Great Russian Encyclopaedia Publications, 1994.
- [186]. Gorsey, Gerome. *Notes on Russia. XVI – Early XVII century*. Moscow, MSU Press, 1990.
- [187]. *The State Armoury*. Album. Moscow, Sovetskiy Khudozhnik, 1988. A new edition by Galart Press, Moscow, 1990.
- [188]. *The A. S. Pushkin Museum of Fine Arts*. Catalogue of paintings. Moscow, 1995, Mazzotta. Printed in Italy.
- [189]. *The Ruler is a Friend of his Subjects, or Political Court Hortatives and Moralistic Speculations of Kan-Shi, Khan of Manchuria and China. Collected by his son, Khan Yun-Jin*. St. Petersburg, 1795.

- [190]. Goulianitsky, N. F., ed. *The Urbanism of the Muscovite State of the XVI-XVII centuries*. Moscow, The Russian Academy of Architecture. Stroyizdat, 1994.
- [191]. *The Faceted Chamber in the Moscow Kremlin*. Leningrad, Aurora, 1982.
- [192]. Granovsky, T. N. *Lectures on Mediaeval History*. Moscow, Nauka, 1986.
- [193]. Grebelsky, Peter K., and Alexander B. Mirvis. *The House of the Romanovs. Biographical Information about the Members of the Reigning House, their Predecessors and Relations*. St. Petersburg, LIO Redaktor, 1992.
- [194]. Mina, Gregory. *Uffizi and Pitti. The Art of the Florentine Galleries*. Album. From the *Great Museums of the World* series. Moscow, Slovo, 1999. A translation of the Italian edition by Magnus Edizioni, Udine,

Italy, 1994, 1996.

- [195]. Gregorovius, F. *Mediaeval History of Athens*. St. Petersburg, 1900. German edition: Gregorovius, F. *Geschichte der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter*. Stuttgart, 1889.
- [196]. Gregorovius, F. *Mediaeval History of Rome. The V-XVI century*. Vols. 1-5. St. Petersburg, 1902-1912. English edition: Gregorovius, F. *History of the City of Rome in the Middle Ages*. London, G. Bell & Sons, 1900-1909.
- [197]. Grekov, B. D., and A. Y. Yakubovsky. *The Golden Horde and its Decline*. Moscow-Leningrad, USSR Academy of Sciences, 1950.
- [198]. *Greece: Temples, Sepulchres and Treasures. The Lost Civilizations* Encyclopaedia. Translated from English by N. Belov. Moscow, Terra Publishing Centre,

1997. Original edition, Time-Life Books BV, 1994.

- [199]. Griбанов, E. D., and D. A. Balalykin. *Medicine of Moscow on the Medals of Imperial Russia*. Moscow, Triada-X, 1999.
- [200]. Nicephor, Gregoras. *Roman History, beginning from the Conquest of Constantinople by the Latins*. St. Petersburg, 1862.
- [201]. Grigorovich, V. *An Account of Travelling through European Russia*. Moscow, 1877.
- [202]. Grigoriev, V. V. *Saray: The Capital of the Golden Horde, and the Issue of its Location*. St. Petersburg, 1845.
- [203]. Grigoriev, G. L. *Who was Ivan the Terrible Really Afraid of? On the Origins of the Oprichnina*. Moscow, Intergraph Service, 1998.

- [204]. Grigoulevich, I. R. *The History of the Inquisition*. Moscow, Nauka, 1970.
- [205]. Grigoulevich, I. R. *The Inquisition*. Moscow, Politizdat, 1985.
- [206]. Grishin, Yakov. *The Tartars of Poland and Lithuania (the Heirs of the Golden Horde)*. Kazan, The Tartar Publishing House, 1995.
- [207]. Groslie, B. Borobudur. *The Greatest Collection of Buddhist Sculpture in the World is being Destroyed by Erosion*. The *UNESCO Courier*, No. 6 (1968): 23-27.
- [208]. Gudzy, N. K. *History of Early Russian Literature*. Moscow, Uchpedgiz, 1938. English edition: New York, Macmillan & Co, 1949.
- [209]. Gouliaev, V. I. *Pre-Columbian Voyages to America. Myths and Reality*. Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye Otnoshenia, 1991.

- [210]. Gouliaev, V. I. *America and the Old World in the Pre-Columbian Epoch*. Moscow, Nauka, 1968.
- [210:1]. Gouliaev, V. I. *Following the Conquistadors*. Moscow, The USSR Academy of Sciences, Nauka, 1976.
- [211]. Gumilev, L. N. *Ancient Russia and the Great Steppe*. Moscow, Mysl, 1992.
- [212]. Gumilev, L. N. *In Search of the Figmental Kingdom (the Legend of the Kingdom of Presbyter Johannes)*. Moscow, Tanais, 1994.
- [213]. Gumilev, L. N. *Hunnu*. St. Petersburg: Time-Out-Compass, 1993.
- [214]. Gumilev, L. N. *The Black Legend*. Moscow, Ekopros, 1994.
- [215]. Gumilev L. N. *The Huns in China*. Moscow, Nauka, 1974.

- [216]. Gumilev, L. N. *From Rus' to Russia*. Moscow, Ekopros, 1992.
- [217]. Gourevich, A. Y. *The Mediaeval Cultural Categories*. Moscow, Kultura, 1972.
- [218]. Gourevich, V. B. *An Introduction into Spherical Astronomy*. Moscow, Nauka, 1978.
- [219]. Gouter, R. S., and Y. L. Polounov. *Girolamo Cardano*. From the *Founding Fathers of Science and Technology* series. Moscow, Znaniye, 1980.
- [220]. Goutz, Alexander K. *The True History of Russia*. Omsk, Omsk State University Press, 1999.
- [221]. D. *The Stirrup of Quiet Don: the Enigmas of the Novel*. Paris, YMCA Press, 1974.

- [222]. Davidenko, I. V. *The Word Was, The Word Is, The Word Shall Always Be... A Philological Fantasy*. Moscow, Russkiy Dvor Press, 1999.
- [223]. Dal, V. *An Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Russian Language*. St. Petersburg-Moscow, The M. O. Wolf Society Press, 1912.
- [224]. Dal, V. *An Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Russian Language*. St. Petersburg-Moscow, The M. O. Wolf Society Press, 1914. Reprinted Moscow, Citadel, 1998.
- [225]. Dal, Vladimir. *An Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Russian Language*. Moscow, State National and Foreign Dictionary Publishing House, 1956.
- [226]. Damascene, John. *Dialectic*. Moscow, 1862. See also: John of Damascus.

Dialectica. New York, St. Bonaventure
Franciscan Institute, 1953.

- [227]. Damascene, John. *Three Apologies against the Detractors of the Holy Icons or Effigies*. St. Petersburg, 1893. English edition: Baker, T. *John Damascene on Holy Images Followed by Three Sermons of the Assumption*. London, 1898.
- [228]. Dantas, G. *Parthenon in Peril*. The *UNESCO Courier*, No. 6 (1968): 16-18, 34.
- [229]. Dante, Alighieri. *Minor Œuvres*. Moscow, Nauka, 1968. Also see: Dante, Alighieri. *Opere Minori*. Florence, 1856.
- [230]. Dante, Alighieri. *The Divine Comedy*. Translated from the Italian by A. A. Ilushin. Moscow, Philological Department of the M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, 1995.

[231]. Darethes of Phrygia. *The History of the Destruction of Troy*. St. Petersburg, Aleteya, 1997.

[232]. Darkevich, V. P. *The Secular Art of Byzantium. Works of Byzantine Art in the Eastern Europe of the X-XIII century*. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1975.

[233]. Darkevich, V. P. *The Argonauts of the Middle Ages*. Moscow, Nauka, 1976.

[233:1]. *The Gifts of the Magi – a Source of Bliss until Our Day*. Translated from modern Greek by M. Klimenko. The Holy Mount Athos, the Monastery of St. Paul the Apostle. Information about this book was obtained from the *Holy Lamp* newspaper published by the Preobrazhensky Temple in the Bolshie Vyazyomy village, No. 1 (1996).

[234]. *The Gifts Made by the Imperial House*

of Russia to the Museum of History.
Catalogue of an exhibition. Moscow, The
State Museum of History, Publishing
Department. 1993.

- [235]. Dowley, Tim. *The Biblical Atlas*.
Three's Company & Angus Hudson Ltd.,
1989. Russian translation: Moscow, The
Russian Biblical Society, 1994.
- [236]. Cameniata, Johannes. *Two Byzantine
Chronicles of the X century. The
Psamathian Chronicle; The Conquest of
Thessalonica*. Moscow, Oriental Literature
Publications, 1962. Also see: Cameniata,
Joannes. *De Excidio Thessalonicae*. In:
Clugnet, L. *Bibliothèque hagiographique
orientale*. Paris, 1901-1905.
- [237]. Dvoretzky, I. K. *Latin-Russian
Dictionary*. 50,000 words. Moscow,
Russkiy Yazyk, 1976.

- [237:1]. Deveuze, Lily. *Carcassonne*. The *Golden Book* series (in Russian). Florence, Bonechi, Central Typography, 2000.
- [238]. Dementyeva, V. V. “*The Roman History of Charles Rollen*” as Read by a Russian Nobleman. *The Ancient History Courier*, No. 4 (1991): 117-122.
- [239]. Denisov, L. I. *The Orthodox Monasteries of the Russian Empire*. Moscow, 1908. 389-393.
- [240]. Jalal, Assad. *Constantinople. From Byzantium to Istanbul*. Moscow, M. & S. Sabashnikov, 1919. French edition: Jalâl, A. *Constantinople de Byzance à Stamboul*. Paris, 1909.
- [241]. Jivelegov, A. K. *Dante Alighieri*. From the *Celebrity Biographies* series. Moscow, OGIZ, The Magazine and Newspaper Trust, 1933.

- [242]. Jivelegov, A. K. *Leonardo da Vinci*. From the *Celebrity Biographies* series. Moscow, OGIZ, The Magazine and Newspaper Trust, 1935.
- [243]. Giovanni, Villani. *The New Chronicle, or the History of Florence*. Moscow, Nauka, 1997. Italian edition: *Cronica di Giovanni Villani a miglior lezione redotta coll'aiuto detesti a penna*. Florence, Magheri, 1823; Rome, Multigrafica, 1980. Vols. 1-8.
- [244]. Giovanni, Novelli. *The Shroud of Turin: The Issue Remains Open*. Translated from Italian. Moscow, Franciscan Press, 1998.
- [245]. Giua, Michele. *The History of Chemistry*. Moscow, Mir, 1975. Italian original: Giua, Michele. *Storia della chimica, dell'alchimia alle dottrine moderne*. Chiantore, Turin, 1946; Union

Tipografiko-Editrice Torinese, 1962.

[246]. Digests of Justinian. Selected fragments translated by I. S. Peretersky. Moscow, Nauka, 1984.

[247]. Diehl, Ch. *History of the Byzantine Empire*. Moscow, IL, 1948. English edition: Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1925.

[248]. Diehl, Ch. *Chief Problems of the Byzantine History*. Moscow, 1947. French edition: Diehl, Ch. *Les Grands Problèmes de l'Histoire Byzantine*. Paris, Armand Diehl Library, A. Colin, 1947.

[249]. Diels, H. *Ancient Technology*. Moscow-Leningrad, ONTI-GTTI, 1934.

[250]. Diophantes. *Arithmetics*. Moscow, Nauka, 1974. See also: Diophantus, Alexandrinus. *Diophanti Alexandrini Opera Omnia, cum graecis commentaries*.

Lipsiae: in aedibus B. G. Teubner, 1893-1895.

[251]. Diringer, D. *The Alphabet*. Moscow, IL, 1963. English edition: London, Hutchinson & Co., 1968.

[252]. Dietmar, A. B. *Ancient Geography*. Moscow, Nauka, 1980.

[253]. Yankov, V. P., comp. *Following the Roads of the Millennia*. A collection of historical articles and essays. Book four. Moscow, Molodaya Gvardia, 1991.

[254]. Drboglav, D. A. *Mysteries of Ancient Latin Hallmarks of IX-XIV century Swords*. Moscow, MSU Press, 1984.

[255]. *Ancient Russian Icon Art*. Moscow, Kedr, 1993. From the collection of the Tretyakovskaya Gallery.

[256]. *Ancient Russian Literature. Depictions*

of Society. Moscow, Nauka, 1991.

[257]. Bonhard-Levin, G. M., ed. *Ancient Civilizations*. A collection of essays. Moscow, Mysl, 1989.

[258]. Struve, V. V., and D. P. Kallistov., eds. *Ancient Greece*. Moscow, USSR Academy of Sciences, 1956.

[259]. Drews, Arthur. *The Christ Myth*. Vol. 2. Moscow, Krasnaya Nov', 1924. English edition by T. Fisher Unwin. London and Leipzig, 1910.

[260]. Drews, Arthur. *Did St. Peter the Apostle Really Exist?* Moscow, Atheist, 1924. See also: A. Drews. *Die Petrus-le-gende*. Jena, E. Diederichs, 1924.

[261]. Drümel, Johann Heinrich. *An Attempt of Proving the Ararat Origins of the Russians Historically as those of the First Nation after the Deluge*. St. Petersburg, 1785. A

Russian translation of a German book published in Nuremberg in 1744.

[262]. Douboshin, G. N. *A Reference Book for Celestial Mechanics and Astrodynamics*. Moscow, Nauka, 1976.

[263]. Doubrovsky, A. S., N. N. Nepeyvoda, and Y. A. Chikanov. *On the Chronology of Ptolemy's Almagest. A Secondary Mathematical and Methodological Analysis*. The *Samoobrazovanie* (Self-Education) magazine (Moscow), No. 1 1999.

[263:1]. Duby, Georges. *The Middle Ages (987-1460). From Hugo Capet to Joan of Arc*. Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya, 2000. French original: Duby, Georges. *Le Moyen Âge. De Hugues Capet à Jeanne d'Arc (987-1460)*. Collection *Pluriel*. Hachette, 1987.

[264]. Dupuy, R. Ernest, and Trevor N. Dupuy.
*The Harper Encyclopaedia of Military
History. From 3500 BC to the Present.*
Commentary by the Polygon Press. Vol. 1:
3500 bc-1400 ad. Vol. 2: 1400–1800. St.
Petersburg-Moscow, Polygon-AST, 1997.
English original published by Harper
Collins.

[265]. Dürer, Albrecht. *Tractates. Diaries.
Letters.* St. Petersburg, Azbuka, 2000.

[265:1]. [Dürer] *Albrecht Dürer. Engravings.*
Moscow, Magma Ltd., 2001. First published
in 1980 by Hubschmidt et Bouret.

[265:2]. *The Jewish Encyclopaedia.* Vols. 1-
16. A reprint of the Brockhaus-Efron
edition for the Society for Scientific Judaic
Publications, St. Petersburg. Moscow,
Terra-Terra, 1991.

[266]. *The Hebraic Text of the Old Testament*

(*The Tanach*). London, the British and Foreign Bible Society, 1977.

[267]. Eusebius Pamphilus. *Ecclesial History*. St. Petersburg, 1848. English edition: Eusebius Pamphilus. *History of the Church*. London, 1890.

[268]. Eusebius Pamphilus. *Eusebius Pamphilus, Bishop of the Palestinian Caesarea, on the Toponymy of the Holy Writ. St. Jerome of Strydon on the Hebraic Locations and Names*. Translated by I. Pomyalovsky. St. Petersburg, 1894. Latin edition: Eusebius Pamphilus. *Eusebii Pamphili Episcopi Caesariensis Onomasticon Urbium et Locorum Sacrae Scripturae*. Berolini, 1862.

[269]. Eutropius. *A Concise History Starting with the City's Creation*. From the *Roman Historians of the IV century* series.

Moscow, Russian Political Encyclopaedia, 1997.

[270]. Yegorov, D. N. *An Introduction into the Mediaeval Studies. The Historiography and the Source Studies*. Vols. 1-2.

Moscow, High Courses of Female Education, Department of History and Philosophy, Publishing Society.

[271]. Yermolayev, G. *Mystery of the "Quiet flows the Don."* Slavic and European Journal, 18, 3 (1974).

[272]. Yermolayev, G. *The True Authorship of the "Quiet flows the Don."* Slavic and European Journal, 20, 3 (1976).

[273]. Yefremov, Y. N., and E. D. Pavlovskaya. *Dating the "Almagest" by the Actual Stellar Movements*. The USSR Academy of Sciences Archive, Vol. 294, No. 2: 310-313.

[274]. Yefremov, Y. N., and E. D. Pavlovskaya. *Determining the Epoch of the Almagest Star Catalogue's Creation by the Analysis of the Actual Stellar Movements. (On the Problem of Ptolemy's Star Catalogue Authorship). The Historical and Astronomical Research*. Moscow, Nauka, 1989. 175-192.

[275]. Jambus, M. *The Hierarchical Cluster Analysis and Related Correspondences*. Moscow, Finances and Statistics, 1988.
Also see: Kendall, M., and A. Stewart. *The Advanced Theory of Statistics* (4th edition). London, C. Griffin, 1977.

[275:1]. *Living History of the Orient*.
Collected works. Moscow, Znanie, 1998.

[276]. Zivkovic, Branislav. *Les monuments de la Peinture Serbe Médiévale*. Zivkovic, Branislav. *Zica. Les dessins des fresques*.

Belgrade, Institut pour la protection des monuments historiques de la Republique de Serbie, 1985.

[277]. *The Art of Ancient Russia. XI – early XIII century. Inlays, Frescoes, Icons.* Leningrad, Khudozhnik RSFSR, 1982.

[278]. Cellini, Benvenuto. *The Life of Benvenuto Cellini, the Son of Maestro Giovanni Cellini, a Florentine, Written in Florence by Himself.* Moscow, 1958. The English edition was published by Edito-Service in Geneva, 1968.

[278:1]. *The Hagiography of Reverend Sergiy (The Life and the Great Deeds of the Most Reverend and Blessed Father Sergiy the Thaumaturge, the Hegumen of Radonezh and the Entire Russia).* Compiled by Hieromonk Nikon (subsequently an Archimandrite). 5th edition. The Laura of

Serge and The Holy Trinity. Own typography. 1904.

[279]. *The Life of Savva Storozhevsky.*

Reprinted after an old XVII century edition.

Published in the *Zvenigorod Region*

History Materials, Issue 3. Moscow, The Archaeographical Centre, 1994.

[280]. Zhitomirsky, S. V. *The Astronomical*

Works of Archimedes. Historical and

Astronomical Research, Issue 13. Moscow, Nauka, 1977.

[281]. Zholkovsky, A. V. *Pasternak's Book of*

Books. The *Zvezda (Star)* magazine, No. 12 (1997).

[282]. Zabelin, I. E. *Quotidian Life of Russian*

Czarinas in the XVI and XVII centuries.

Novosibirsk, Nauka, 1992.

[283]. Zabelin, I. E. *The History of Moscow.*

Moscow, Svarog, 1996.

- [284]. Zabelin, I. E. *The History of Moscow*. Moscow, Stolitsa, 1990.
- [285]. Zabelin, I. E. *The Historical Description of the Stauropigial Monastery of Moscow*. 2nd edition. Moscow, 1893.
- [286]. Zaborov, M. A. *History of the Crusades in Documents and Materials*. Moscow, Vyshchaya Shkola, 1977.
- [287]. Zaborov, M. A. *Crusaders in the East*. Moscow, Nauka, Chief Editing Board of Oriental Literature, 1980.
- [288]. Zavel'skiy, F. S. *Time and its Keeping*. Moscow, Nauka, 1987.
- [289]. Porfiriev, G., ed. *The Mysteries and Conundrums of the "Quiet flows the Don."* Collected works. Samara, P.S., 1996.
- [290]. *The Gospel Teachings*. Jordanville, the Rev. Job. Pogayevsky Typography, 1987.

[290:1]. Zaliznyak, A. A., and V. L. Yanin. *The XI century Psalm Book of Novgorod as the Oldest Book in Russia*. The RAS Courier, Vol. 71, No. 3 (2001): 202-209.

[291]. Zamarovsky, V. *Mysteries of the Hittites*. Moscow, Nauka, 1968. Also see: Zamarovsky, V. *Za tajemstvom rise Chetitu*. Prague, 1964.

[291:1]. Zamkova, M. V. *Louvre. (The Masterpieces of World Art in your Home)*. Album. Moscow, Olma-Obrazovanie, 2002.

[292]. *Notes of the Russian and Slavic Archaeology Department of the Russian Archaeological Society*. Vol. XII. Petrograd, Typography of Y. Bashmakov & Co, 1918.

[293]. *Star Charts of the Northern and the Southern Hemisphere*. Edition: *Maru severni a jizni hvezdne oblohy*.

Czechoslovakia, Kartografie Praha, 1971.

[294]. Kondrashina, V. A., and L. A. Timoshina, eds. *Zvenigorod Over Six Centuries*. A collection of articles. To the 600th anniversary of the Savvino-Storozhevsky monastery. The Moscow Oblast Administration Culture Committee. The Zvenigorod Museum of History, Arts, and Architecture. The Federal Archive Service of Russia. Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts. Moscow, URSS Press, 1998.

[294:1]. Zgura, V. V. *Kolomenskoye. An Aperçu of its Cultural History and Monuments*. Moscow, O.I.R.U., 1928.

[295]. Zelinskiy, A. N. *Constructive Principles of the Ancient Russian Calendar*. The *Context 1978* collection. Moscow, Nauka, 1978.

[296]. Zelinskiy, F. *Selected Biographies of*

Ideas. Vols. I-IV. St. Petersburg, 1905-1922.

[297]. Zenin, D. *The Ancient Artillery: Truth and Fiction*. *The Science and Technology* magazine, No. 5 (1982): 25-29.

[298]. Zenkovsky, S. A. *Old Ritualists of Russia. The XVII century Religious Movements*. Moscow, Tserkov, 1995.

[299]. Zima, D., and N. Zima. *Nostradamus Deciphered*. Moscow, Ripol Klassik, 1998.

[299:1]. *The Banner of Reverend Serge (Sergiy) of Radonezh*. Psalmyr, 1934.
Reprinted by RIO Dennitsa, Moscow, 1991.

[300]. Zoubov, V. P. *Aristotle*. Moscow, The USSR Academy of Sciences Press, 1963.

[301]. *Ivan IV The Terrible*. Essays. St. Petersburg, Azbuka, 2000.

[301:1]. Ivanov, O. *The Zamoskvorechye*:

Chronicle Pages. Moscow, V. Shevchouk Publications, Inc., 2000.

[302]. Idelson, N. *History of the Calendar*. Leningrad, Scientific Publications, 1925.

[303]. Idries, Shah. *Sufism*. Moscow, 1993.

[304]. Ieger, Oscar. *Global History*. Vols. 1-4. St. Petersburg, A. F. Marx, 1894-1904.

[304:1]. Ieger, Oscar. *Global History*. Vols. 1-4. St. Petersburg, A. F. Marx, 1904. Amended and expanded. Faximile reprint: Moscow, AST, 2000.

[304:2]. Ieger, Oscar. *Global History*. Vols. 1-4. St. Petersburg, A. F. Marx, 1904. 3rd ed., amended and expanded. Faximile reprint: Moscow, AST, 2001; St Petersburg, Polygon, 2001.

[305]. *Jerusalem in Russian Culture*. Collected essays. Moscow, Nauka, 1994.

[306]. *Selected Letters of A. N. Roudnev to V. N. Leonova*. Frankfurt-am-Main, Nadezhda, 1981.

[306:1]. *A Representation of the Terrestrial Globe*. Russian map from the *Rarities of Russian Cartography* series. (There is no compilation date anywhere on the map. The publishers date it to mid-XVIII century, q.v. in the annotation). Moscow, the Kartair Cartographical Association, 1996.

[307]. Derevenskiy, B. G., comp. *Jesus Christ in Historical Documents*. From the *Ancient Christianity* series, *Sources* section. St. Petersburg, Aleteya, 1998.

[308]. Ouspensky, L. A. *Icon Art of Ancient Russia*. Album. Foreword by S. S. Averintsev, compiled by N. I. Bednik. St. Petersburg, Khudozhnik Rossii, 1993.

[309]. Ilyin, A. A. *The Classification of*

Russian Provincial Coins. Issue 1.

Leningrad, The State Hermitage, 1940.

[310]. Ilyin, M., and T. Moiseyeva. *Moscow and its Environs*. Moscow, 1979.

[311]. Ilyin, M. *The Ways and the Quests of an Arts Historian*. Moscow, Iskusstvo Publications, 1970.

[312]. Illarion. *On the Law and the Bliss*. Moscow, Stolitsa and Skriptoriy, 1994.

[312:1]. *The Names of Moscow Streets* (multiple authors). Under the general editorship of A. M. Pegov. Moscow, Moskovskiy Rabochiy, 1972.

[313]. de la Vega, Inca Garcilazo. *History of the State of the Incas*. Leningrad, Nauka, 1974.

[314]. *Foreigners on Ancient Moscow. Moscow of the XV-XVII centuries*.

Collected texts. Moscow, Stolitsa, 1991.

[315]. of Hildesheim, Johann. *A Legend of the Three Holy Kings*. Translated from German. Moscow, Enigma-Aleteya, 1998. German edition: von Hildesheim, Johan. *Die Legende von den Heiligen Drei Königen*. Berlin, 1925.

[316]. *The Art of the Countries and the Peoples of the World. A Brief Scientific Encyclopaedia*. Vol. 1. Moscow, Soviet Encyclopaedia Publications, 1962.

[317]. *Islam: an Encyclopaedic Dictionary*. Moscow, Nauka, General Editing Board for Oriental Literature, 1991.

[318]. Martzyshevskaya, K. A., B. J. Sordo-Peña, and S. Mariñero. *Spanish-Russian and Russian-Spanish Dictionary*. Moscow, Russkiy Yazyk, 1990.

[319]. *Historical and Astronomical Research*.

Moscow, Fizmatgiz, 1955.

[320]. *Historical and Astronomical Research*.
Issue 8. Moscow, Fizmatgiz, 1962.

[321]. *Historical and Astronomical Research*.
Issue 1. Moscow-Leningrad, 1948.

[322]. *Historical Notes of Nicephorus
Vriennius*. St. Petersburg, 1858.

[323]. *History of Byzantium*. Vol. 1. Moscow,
Nauka, 1967.

[324]. *History of Byzantium*. Vols. 2-3.
Moscow, Nauka, 1967.

[325]. *History of the Orient. Vol. 2.*
Mediaeval Orient. Russian Academy of
Sciences, the Department of Oriental
Sciences. Moscow, Vostochnaya Literatura,
RAS, 1995.

[326]. Kouzishchin, V. I., ed. *History of the
Ancient Orient*. Moscow, 1979.

- [327]. Kouzishchin, V. I., and A. G. Bokshchanin., eds. *History of the Ancient Rome*. Moscow, 1971.
- [328]. *History of Europe*. Published in Europe as an initiative of Frederic Delouche. A Collective of 12 European Historians. Minsk, Vysheyshaya Shkola; Moscow, Prosveshchenie, 1996. Translated from *Histoire de l'Europe*. Hachette, 1992.
- [328:1]. *History of Europe. The Renaissance*. Moscow, Minsk, Harvest, AST, Inc., 2000.
- [329]. Melnik, A. G., ed. *History and Culture of the Land of Rostov. 1998*. Collected essays. Rostov, The Rostov Kremlin State Museum and Reserve, 1999.
- [330]. *History of the Inquisition in Three Volumes*. Vols. 1 and 2: Lee, Henry Charles. *History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*. A reprint of the F. A. Efron, I. A.

Brockhaus edition. 1911-1912. Vol. 3:
Lozinsky, S. G. *History of the Spanish
Inquisition*. A reprint of the F. A. Efron, I.
A. Brockhaus edition. 1914. Moscow, The
Ladimir Scientific and Publishing Centre,
1994.

[330:1]. *History of Moscow in the Documents
of the XII-XVIII century from the Russian
State Archive of Ancient Acts*. The Russian
State Archive of Ancient Acts, Moscow
Municipal Archive Association. Moscow,
Mosgorarkhiv, 1997.

[331]. Sakharov, A. N., ed. *History of Moscow.
From the Earliest Days until Our Time*.
Three volumes. Moscow, the RAS Institute
of Russian History, the Moscow Municipal
Association, Mosgorarkhiv Press. Vol. 1:
XII-XVII century. Vol. 2: XIX century.
1997.

- [332]. *Russian History. From the Ancient Slavs to Peter the Great. Encyclopaedia for Children*. Vol. 5. Moscow, Avanta, 1995.
- [333]. Udaltsov, A. D., E. A. Kosminsky, O. L. Weinstein, eds. *Mediaeval History*. Moscow, OGIZ, 1941.
- [334]. Skazkin, S. D., ed. *Mediaeval History*. Volumes 1-2. Moscow, 1977.
- [335]. *History of French Literature*. Collected essays. St. Petersburg, 1887. English edition: Demogeot, J., *History of French Literature*. London, Rivingstons, 1884 (1883).
- [336]. Helmolt, H., ed. *The History of Humanity. Global History*. Vols. 1-9. Translated from German. St. Petersburg: Prosveshchenie, 1896.
- [337]. Istrin, V. M. *I-IV Editions of the*

Explanatory Paleya. St. Petersburg, The Imperial Academic Typography, 1907.

[338]. Istrin, V. M. *The Chronicle of John Malalas in Slavic Translation*. A reprint of V. M. Istrin's materials. Moscow, John Wiley & Sons, 1994.

[339]. Pouchkov, P. I., ed. *Extinct Nations*. Collected essays. Moscow, Nauka, 1988.

[340]. *Itogi (The Resume)*. Weekly magazine. No. 37 (223) (12 September 2000). Moscow, Sem Dney Press.

[341]. Duchich, Jovan. *Duke Sava Vladislavich. The First Serbian Diplomat at the court of Peter the Great and Catherine I*. Belgrade, Dereta, 1999.

[342]. Kazhdan, A. P. *The Origins and the Purport of Christianity*. Moscow, 1962.

[343]. Kazhdan, A. P. *The Social Compound of*

the Byzantine Ruling Class of the XI-XII century. Moscow, Nauka, 1974.

[344]. Kazakova, N. A. *Western Europe in Russian Written Sources of the XV-XVI century.* Leningrad, Nauka, 1980.

[345]. Kazamanova, A. N. *An Introduction to Ancient Numismatics.* Moscow, Moscow University Press, 1969.

[346]. *The Cossack Circle.* Quiet flows the Don. Special edition 1. Moscow, Russkoye Slovo, 1991.

[347]. Skrylov, A. I., and G. V. Gubarev. *The Cossack Dictionary and Handbook.* Cleveland, 1966. Reprinted Moscow, Sozidanie Ltd., 1992.

[348]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G. V. Nosovskiy. *The Geometry of Mobile Star Configurations and the Dating of the Almagest.* Problems of stochastic model

stability. Seminar works. The National System Research Institute, 1988. 59-78.

[349]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G. V. Nosovskiy. *The Statistical Analysis and Dating of the Observations that the Almagest Star Catalogue is Based upon*. Report theses of the 5th Int'l Probability Theory Conference in Vilnius, the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences Institute of Mathematics and Cybernetics, Vol. 3 (1989): 271-272.

[350]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G. V. Nosovskiy. *Dating the Almagest by Variable Star Configurations*. The USSR AS Reports, Vol. 307, No. 4 (1989): 829-832. English translation published in Soviet Phys. Dokl., Vol. 34, No. 8 (1989): 666-668.

[351]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and

G. V. Nosovskiy. *A Retrospective Analysis of the Almagest Star Catalogue and the Problem of its Dating*. Preprint. Moscow, National System Research Institute, 1990. 60 p.

[352]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G. V. Nosovskiy. *A Quantitative Analysis of the Almagest Star Catalogue*. Pre-print. Moscow, National System Research Institute, 1990. 62 p.

[353]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G. V. Nosovskiy. *Dating the Almagest Star Catalogue*. Preprint. Moscow, National System Research Institute, 1990. 58 p.

[354]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G. V. Nosovskiy. *Ptolemy's Star Catalogue Dated by Mathematicians. Hypotheses, Predictions, and the Future of Science*. The Int'l Annual Journal. No. 23 (1990): 78-92.

Moscow, Znaniye.

- [355]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G. V. Nosovskiy. *A Statistical Analysis of the Almagest Star Catalogue*. The USSR AS Reports. Vol. 313, No. 6 (1990): 1315-1320.
- [356]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G. V. Nosovskiy. *Dating the Almagest Star Catalogue. A Statistical and Geometric Analysis*. Moscow, Faktorial, 1995.
- [356:1]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G. V. Nosovskiy. *An Astronomical Analysis of Chronology. The Almagest. Zodiacs*. Moscow, The Delovoi Express Financial, 2000.
- [357]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and S. T. Rachev. *New Methods of Comparing Volume Functions of Historical Texts*. Seminar works. Moscow, National System

Research Institute, 1986. 33-45.

[358]. Kaleda, G. *The Shroud of Our Lord Jesus Christ. To the Centenary of the Manifestation of the Holiest of Relics, 1898-1998*. 4th edition. Moscow, Zakatyevsky Monastery Press, 1998.

[358:1]. *Russia and the World on Russian Maps*. Moscow, published by Vneshtorgbank and the State Museum of History in 2001. Compiled by B. Sergeyev and A. Zaitsev. Maps from the collection of the State Museum of History, 16, Kuznetskiy Most, 103301, Moscow.

[359]. *The Stonework Chronicle of the old Moscow*. Moscow, Sovremennnik, 1985.

[360]. Kamensky, A. B. *The Life and the Fate of the Empress Catherine the Great*. Moscow, Znanie, 1997.

[361]. Kaneva, Katerina, Alessandro Cechi, and

Antonio Natali. *Uffizi. A Guide and a Catalogue of the Art Gallery*. Scala/Becocchi, 1997. Moscow, Izobrazitelnoye Iskusstvo, 1997.

[362]. Karamzin, N. M. *History of the State of Russia*. St. Petersburg, 1842. A reprint of the fifth edition that came out as 3 books with P. M. Stroyev's *Key* attached. Books I, II, III, IV. Moscow, Kniga, 1988, 1989.

[363]. Karamzin, N. M. *History of the State of Russia* (Academic edition). Moscow, Nauka. Vol. 1: 1989. Vols. 2-3: 1991. Vol. 4: 1992. Vol. 5: 1993.

[364]. Karger, M. K. *Ancient Kiev. Essays on the History of the Material Culture of this Ancient Russian City*. Vol. 1. Moscow-Leningrad, The USSR AS Press, 1958.

[365]. Karger, M. *Novgorod the Great*. Moscow, The USSR Academy of

Architecture. The Architectural History and Theory Institute. 1946.

[366]. *Karelin Andrei Osipovich. Legacy of an Artist.* Nizhni Novgorod, Arnika, 1994.

[367]. Karnovich, E. P. *Patrimonial Names and Titles in Russia.* St. Petersburg, 1886. Reprinted in Moscow, Bimpa Press, 1991.

[368]. Valcanover, Francesco. *Carpaccio.* Album. Moscow, Slovo, 1996. The Italian edition was published in the *Great Masters of Italian Art* series. Florence, Scala, Istituto Fotografico Editoriale, Antella, 1989.

[369]. Karpenko. V. V. *The Names on the Sky at Night.* Moscow, Nauka, 1981.

[370]. Carpiceci, Alberto Carlo. *The Art and History of Egypt. 5000 Years of Civilization.* Russian edition. Florence, Casa Editrice Bonechi, 1997.

- [371]. Carpiceci, Alberto Carlo. *The Art and History of Egypt. 5000 Years of Civilization*. Florence, Bonechi, 1999.
- [372]. Kartashev, A. V. *Essays on the History of Russian Church*. Vols. 1, 2. Moscow, Nauka, 1991.
- [373]. Kartashev, A. V. *Essays on the History of Russian Church*. Moscow, Terra, 1992.
- [374]. Carter, H. *The Tomb of Tutankhamen*. Moscow, Oriental Literature, 1959.
- [375]. Quintus Curtius Rufus. *The Story of Alexander the Great*. Moscow, MSU Press, 1993.
- [376]. Denisenko, D. V., and N. S. Kellin. *When Were the Famous Dendera Zodiacs Really Created? An appendix to Fomenko, A. T. Criticism of Traditional Chronology of Antiquity and the Middle Ages (What Century is it Now?)*. Moscow, MSU

Publications, the MSU Department of Mechanical Mathematics, 1993. 156-166.

[377]. Fomenko, A. T., N. S. Kellin, and G. V. Nosovskiy. *The Issue of the Veracity of the "Ancient" History of Russia by M. V. Lomonosov. Lomonosov or Miller?* The Moscow University Courier, Series 9: Philology, No. 1 (1991): 116-125.

[378]. Kenderova, Stoyanka, and Beshevliev, Boyan. *The Balkan Peninsula on Alldrisi's Map. Palaeographic, Historical and Geographical Research*. Part 1. Sofia, 1990.

[379]. Ceram, C. *Gods, Graves and Scholars*. Moscow, Inostrannaya Literatura, 1960. English original: London, Victor Gollancz in association with Sidgwick & Jackson, 1971.

[380]. Ceram, C. *Gods, Graves and Scholars*. St. Petersburg, Nizhegorodskaya Yarmarka,

KEM, 1994.

- [381]. Kibalova, L., O. Gerbenova, and M. Lamarova. *An Illustrated Encyclopaedia of Fashion*. Prague, Artia, 1966.
- [382]. Kinnam, Johann. *A Brief Review of the Reigns of John and Manuel Comneni*. St. Petersburg, 1859.
- [383]. Kinzhalov, R. V. *The Ancient Mayan Culture*. Leningrad, Nauka, 1971.
- [384]. Kiriaku, Georgios P. *Cyprus in Colours*. Limassol, Cyprus, K. P. Kiriaku (Books & Office Requisites) Ltd., 1987.
- [385]. Kirpichnikov, A. N. *The Pages of the "Iron Book."* *Nauka I Zhizn (Science and Life)* magazine, No. 6 (1966): 49-55.
- [385:1]. Kiselyova L. I. *What do the Mediaeval Chronicles Tell Us?* Leningrad, Nauka, 1978.

- [386]. Kyetsaa, H. *The Battle for the "Quiet flows the Don."* Seanado-Statica, 22, 1976.
- [387]. Kyetsaa, H. *The Battle for the "Quiet flows the Don."* USA, Pergamon Press, 1977.
- [388]. Klassen, E. I. *New Materials for the Studies of the Historical Dawn of Slavs in General, and pre-Ryurik Russo-Slavs in Particular, with an Aperçu of the BC History of Russia.* Issues 1-3. With the *Descriptions of the Monuments Explaining the History of the Slavs and the Russians Compiled by Fadey Volansky and Translated by E. Klassen.* Moscow University Press, 1854. Reprinted by Andreyev i Soglasie, St. Petersburg, 1995.
- [389]. Klassovsky, V. *A Systematic Description of Pompeii and the Artefacts Discovered There.* St. Petersburg, 1848.

[390]. Klein, L. S. *Archaeology Controverses Physics*. The *Priroda (Nature)* magazine, No. 2 (1966): 51-62.

[391]. Klein, L. S. *Archaeology Controverses Physics (continued)*. The *Priroda (Nature)* magazine, No. 3 (1966): 94-107.

[391:1]. Klengel-Brandt, E. *A Journey into the Old Babylon*. Moscow, Nauka, General Editing Board for Oriental Literature, the USSR AS, Institute of Oriental Studies, 1979. Translated from German: Klengel-Brandt, E. *Reise in das alte Babylon*. Leipzig, 1971.

[392]. Kligene N., and L. Telxnis. *Methods of Determining Change Points in Random Processes*. *Avtomatika i Telemekhanika (Automatics and Telemechanics)*, No. 10 (1983): 5-56.

[393]. Klimishin, I. A. *Chronology and the*

Calendar. Moscow, Nauka, 2nd edition, 1985.

[394]. Klimishin, I. A. *Chronology and the Calendar*. Moscow, Nauka, 3rd edition, 1990.

[395]. Klimishin, I. A. *The Discovery of the Universe*. Moscow, Nauka, 1987.

[396]. Klyuchevsky, V. O. *Unreleased Works*. Moscow, Nauka, 1983.

[397]. *The Book of the Mormon. Another Testament of Jesus Christ*. Translated by Joseph Smith, Jun. Salt Lake City, The Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints, 1991. (Quoting the Russian translation of 1988).

[398]. *The Book of Cosmas Indicopleustes*. Published by V. S. Golyshenko and V. F. Doubrovina. RAS, the V. V. Vinogradov Institute of the Russian Language. Moscow,

Indrik, 1997.

- [399]. Loparev, H. M., ed. *The Book of the Pilgrim. Holy Places in Czar-Grad Described by Anthony, the Archbishop of Novgorod in 1200*. "The Orthodox Palestinian Collection," Vol. 17, 3rd edition. St. Petersburg, 1899.
- [400]. *Literary Centres of the Ancient Russia in the XI-XVI century*. St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1991.
- [401]. Knorina, L. V. *Linguistic Aspects of the Hebraic Commentary Tradition. Voprosy Yazykoznanania (Linguistic Issues)*, No. 1 (1997): 97-108.
- [402]. Kowalski, Jan Wierusz. *Papacy and the Popes*. Moscow, Political Literature Publications, 1991. A translation of the Polish book *Poczet Papiezy*. Warsaw, 1985.
- [403]. Kovalchenko, I. D. *The Use of*

Quantitative Methods and Computers in Historical Research. The Voprosy Istorii (Historical Issues) journal, No. 9 (1984): 61-73.

[404]. Kogan, V. M. *The History of the House of Ryurikovichi*. St. Petersburg, Belvedere, 1993.

[405]. Kozlov, V. *A Case of Church Robbery. The Moskovskiy Zhurnal (Moscow Magazine), No. 7 (1991).*

[406]. Kozlov, V. *Under the Flag of Nihilism. The Moskovskiy Zhurnal (Moscow Magazine), No. 6 (1991).*

[407]. Kozlov, V. P. *Falsification Mysteries. An Analysis of Historical Source Forgeries of the XVIII-XIX centuries*. Moscow, Aspekt, 1996.

[407:1]. Kozlov, V. T. *The 30-Year War. European Splendour. The Renaissance.*

Humanism. The Enlightenment. Moscow, The V. T. Kozlov Regional Public Fund for the Support and Development of Arts and Culture, 2001. 44.

[408]. Kozlov, P. *Yaroslavl*. Yaroslavl, The Upper Volga Publishing House, 1972.

[409]. Kozlov, P. I., and V. F. Marov. *Yaroslavl. A Guide and a Reference Book*. Yaroslavl, The Upper Volga, 1988.

[410]. Kokkinoftas, Kostis and Theocharidis, Ioannis. “*Enkolpion.*” *A Brief Description of St. Kykkos Monastery*. Nicosia, The St. Kykkos Monastery Research Centre, 1995.

[411]. Kolodny, L. “Turbulence over the ‘Quiet flows the Don.’ Fragments of the Past: the Sources used for a Certain XX century Animad version. *Moskovskaya Pravda* (5 and 7 March, 1989).

[412]. Rauschenbach, B .V., ed. *Bells. History*

and Contemporaneity. Compiled by Y. V. Pukhnachev. The Scientific Counsel for World Culture History, the USSR AS. Moscow, Nauka, 1985.

[413]. Kolosov, Vassily. *Perambulations in the Environs of the Simonov Monastery*. Moscow, 1806.

[414]. Kolchin, B. A., and Y. A. Sher. *Absolute Archaeological Datings and their Problems*. Moscow, Nauka, 1972.

[415]. Kohlrausch, F. *History of Germany*. Vols. I, II. Moscow, 1860. English edition: Kohlrausch, F. *A History of Germany, from the Earliest Period to the Present Time*. New York, D. Appelton & Co, 1896.

[415:1]. Kolyazin, V. F. *From The Passion Play Mystery to the Carnival. The Histrionics of the German Religious and Popular Stage of the Early and the Late*

Middle Ages. Moscow, Nauka, 2002.

- [416]. *Archimandrite Palladius Kafarov Commentary on Marco Polo's Voyage through Northern China*. St. Petersburg, 1902.
- [417]. Comnena, Anna. *The Alexiad*. Moscow, Nauka, 1965. English edition: Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1969.
- [418]. Comnena, Anna. *The Alexiad*. St. Petersburg. Aleteya, 1996.
- [419]. Comnena, Anna. *A Brief Account of the Deeds of King Alexis Comnenus*. St. Petersburg, 1859.
- [420]. Kondakov, N. P. *The Iconography of Our Lady*. 3 volumes. Moscow, Palomnik. Vols. 1 and 2, 1998. Vol. 3, 1999.
- [420:1]. Kondratov, Alexander. *The Mysteries of the Three Oceans*. Leningrad,

Gidrometeoizdat, 1971.

[421]. Kondratyev, I. K. *The Ancient Moscow. A Historical Review and a Full List of the City's Monuments*. Moscow, Voenizdat, 1996.

[422]. Kondrashina, V. A. *The Savvino-Storozhevsky Monastery. 600 Years since the Foundation of the Coenoby of Rev. Savva*. An album of photographs. Moscow, Leto, 1998.

[423]. Koniskiy, G. (The Archbishop of Byelorussia). *The History of Russians, or the Lesser Russia*. The Moscow University Typography, 1846.

[424]. *Konstantin Mikhailovich from Ostrovitsa. The Notes of a Janissary*. Introduction, translation, and commentary by A. I. Rogov. Published in the *Monuments of Mediaeval History of the Nations of*

Central and Eastern Europe series. The USSR AS, Institute of Slavic and Balkan Studies. Moscow, Nauka, 1978.

[425]. Konstantinov, N. *The Secret Alphabet of Stolnik Baryatinsky*. The *Nauka i Zhizn* (*Science and Life*) magazine, No. 10 (1972): 118-119.

[426]. *Context 1978*. Collected works. Moscow, Nauka, 1978.

[427]. *The Koran*. Moscow, Oriental Literature, 1963.

[428]. *The Koran*. Translated by I. Y. Krachkovsky. Moscow, Raritet, 1990.

[429]. Al Rosha, Dr. Mohammed Said., ed. *The Koran*. 2nd edition, revised and enlarged by Valeria Prokhorova. Damascus-Moscow, The Al-Furkan Centre and Mikhar Corp., 2553, 10.2.95, 1996.

- [430]. *The Ecclesial Law Book (Kormchaya) of 1620*. 256/238, The Manuscript Fund of the Russian National Library (Moscow).
- [430:1]. Kornilov N. I., Solodova Y. P. *Jewels and gems*. Moscow, Nedra, 1983.
- [431]. Korkh, A. S. *Mikhail Illarionovich Koutouзов*. The Moscow State Museum of History. n.d.
- [432]. Korsh, M. *A Brief Dictionary of Mythology and Antiquities*. St. Petersburg, A. S. Souvorin, 1894. Reprinted: Kaluga, Amata, Golden Alley, 1993.
- [433]. Kosambi, D. *The Culture and Civilization of Ancient India*. Moscow, Progress, 1968. English edition: Kosambi D. *The Culture and Civilization of Ancient India in Historical Outline*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965.
- [434]. Kosidowski, Z. *When the Sun was God*.

Moscow, Nauka, 1968. Polish edition:
Kosidowsky Z. *Gdy Slonce Bylo Bogiem*.
Warsaw, 1962.

[435]. Kostomarov, N. I. *The Reign of the
House of St. Vladimir*. Moscow,
Voyenizdat, 1993.

[436]. Kostomarov, N. I. *The Age of Turmoil in
Early XVII century Moscovia (1604-1613)*.
Moscow, Charli, 1994.

[437]. Kostomarov, N. I. *Bogdan Khmel'nitsky*.
Moscow, Charlie, 1994.

[437:1]. Kochergina, V. A. *Sanskrit-Russian
Dictionary*. About 30.000 words. Moscow,
Filologia, 1996.

[438]. Golubev, A. A., comp. *The Kostroma
Region*. Moscow, Planeta, 1988.

[439]. Cramer, C. *Mathematical Methods of
Statistics*. Moscow, Mir, 1975. English

original: Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1958.

[440]. *The Concise Geographical Encyclopaedia*. Vol. 1, Moscow, State Academic Soviet Encyclopaedia Publications, 1960.

[440:1]. Krekshin, P. N. *A Criticism of the Freshly-Printed Book of 1761 about the Origins of Rome and the Actions of its People and Monarchs*. The reverse of the last sheet says: "Criticism by the Nobleman of the Great New Town Peter of Nicephor, son of Kreksha, in 1762, on the 30th day of September, St. Petersburg." The manuscript is kept in the State Archive of the Yaroslavl Oblast as Manuscript #43 (431).

[441]. *The Peasant War in Russia Led by Stepan Razin*. Collected documents. Vols. 1-4. Moscow, Academy of Sciences, 1954-

1970.

- [442]. Luchinat, Christina Acidini. *Benozzo Gozzoli*. Published in the *Great Masters of Italian Art* series. Moscow, Slovo, 1996. Italian edition: Scala, Istituto Fotografico Editoriale, 1995.
- [443]. Kriesch, Elli G. *The Treasure of Troy and its History*. Moscow, Raduga, 1996. German original: Kriesch, Elli G. *Der Schatz von Troja und seine Geschichte*. Carlsen, 1994.
- [444]. Kryvelev, I. A. *The Excavations in the "Biblical" Countries*. Moscow, Sovietskaya Rossia, 1965.
- [445]. Kryvelev, I. A. *A Book about the Bible*. Moscow, Sotsekgiz, 1958.
- [446]. Krylov, A. N. *Newton and his Role in Global Science. 1643-1943*. The USSR Academy of Sciences. Moscow-Leningrad,

USSR AS Publications, 1943.

- [447]. Xenophon. *History of the Hellenes*. Leningrad, Ogiz, 1935. English edition: Xenophon. *Hellenica*. In: W. Briggs, Tutorial Series, Books III, IV. London, 1894.
- [448]. Koublanov, M. M. *The New Testament. Research and Discoveries*. Moscow, Nauka, 1968.
- [449]. Koudriavtsev, M. P. *Moscow the Third Rome. A Historical and Urbanistic Research*. Moscow, Sol System, 1994.
- [450]. Koudriavtsev, O. F., comp. *Russia in the First Half of the XVI century. A European View*. The Russian AS, Global History Institute. Moscow, Russkiy Mir, 1997.
- [451]. Kouznetsov, V. G. *Newton*. Moscow, Mysl, 1982.

- [452]. Koulakovsky, Y. A. *Byzantine History*. Vols. 1, 2. St. Petersburg, Aleteya, 1996.
- [453]. Koulikovsky, P. G. *Stellar Astronomy*. Moscow, Nauka, 1978.
- [454]. Koun, N. A. *The Predecessors of Christianity*. Moscow, 1922.
- [455]. Kourbatov, L. G. *Byzantine History*. Moscow, Vyshaya Shkola, 1984.
- [456]. *The UNESCO Courier* magazine, No. 12 (1968).
- [457]. Koutouzov, B. *The Church Reform of the XVII century*. The *Tserkov (Church)* magazine (Moscow), Issue 1 (1992).
- [457:1]. Koutsenko, G., and Y. Novikov. *Make Yourself A Present of Health*. Moscow, Moskovskiy Rabochiy, 1988.
- [458]. Cimpan, F. *The History of the Pi Number*. Moscow, Nauka, 1971 (1984).

Romanian original: Cipman, F. *Istoria
Numarului pi*. Bucharest, Tineret Press,
1965.

[458:1]. Cumont, Franz. *The Mysteries of
Mithras. Magicum*. St. Petersburg, Eurasia,
2000. Original edition: Franz Cumont. *Les
Mystères de Mithra. Magicum*. Brussels, H.
Lamertin, 1913.

[459]. Lavissee, E., and A. Rambaud. *History of
the Crusades*. Vols. I and II. Moscow, 1914.
French original: *Histoire générale du IVe
siècle à nos jours. L'Europe féodale, les
croisades, 1095-1270*. Paris, A. Colin &
Cie, 1893-1901.

[460]. *The Lavrenty Chronicle*. (A complete
compilation of Russian chronicles). V. 1.
Moscow, Yazyki Russkoi Kulturi, 1997.

[461]. Lavrov, N. F. *A Guide to the Churches
of Uglich*. Uglich, the Municipal Museum of

Arts and History, 1994. A re-print from an 1869 original, Yaroslavl, the Province Typography.

[462]. Lazarev, V. N. *The Icon Art of Novgorod*. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1969.

[462:1]. Lombroso. C. *Genius and Madness*. Moscow, Respublika, 1995.

[463]. Lann, E. *A Literary Mystification*. Moscow, 1930.

[464]. Lauer, Jean-Philippe. *The Mystery of the Egyptian Pyramids*. Moscow, Nauka, 1966. French edition: *Le Mystère des Pyramides*. Paris, Presses de la Cité, 1974.

[465]. Deacon, Leon. *History*. Moscow, Nauka, 1988. See also: *Leonis Diaconi Caloensis Historiae libri decem*. E recensione C. B. Hasii. Bonnae, 1828.

[466]. Levandovsky, A. P. *Charlemagne. From*

the Empire towards Europe. Moscow, Soratnik, 1995.

- [467]. Levitan, E., and N. Mamouna. *The Star of Bethlehem*. The *Nauka i Zhizn (Science and Life)* magazine, No. 11 (1989).
- [468]. Levchenko, M. V. *Byzantine History*. Moscow-Leningrad, Ogiz, Sotsekgiz, 1940.
- [469]. *The Legend of Dr. Faustus*. Moscow, Nauka, 1978. Also see: *The History of the Damnable Life and Deserved Death of Doctor John Faustus*. London, G. Routledge; New York, E. P. Dutton, 1925.
- [470]. Lehmann. *An Illustrated History of Superstition and Sorcery from the Antiquity to Our Days*. Moscow, Knizhnoe Delo, 1900. Also see: Lehmann, A. *Overtog trolddom fra de aeldste til vore dage*. Copenhagen, J. Frimodt, 1893-1896.
- [471]. Lentsman, Y. A. *The Origins of*

Christianity. Moscow, USSR AS Press, 1958.

[471:1]. *The Life and Art of Leonardo*. Moscow, Byely Gorod, 2001. Giunti Gruppo Editoriale, Florence, 2000.

[472]. Leonid. *A Systematic Description of A. S. Ouvarov's Russo-Slavic Manuscripts*. Moscow, 1894.

[473]. Leontyeva, G. A., Shorin, P. A. and Kobrin, V. B. *The Keys to the Mysteries of Clio. Palaeography, Metrology, Chronology, Heraldic Studies, Numismatics, Onomatology and Genealogy*. Moscow, Prosveshchenie, 1994.

[473:1]. Leskov, A. M. *Burial Mounds: Findings and Problems*. Leningrad, Nauka, 1981.

[474]. Lesna, Ivan. *On the Ails of the Great*.

Prague, Grafit, 1990.

[475]. Lesnoy, Sergei. *History of the Slavs Revised*. Melbourne, 1956.

[476]. Lesnoy, Sergei. *A Non-Distorted History of the Russians*. Vols. 1-10. Paris, 1957.

[477]. Lesnoy, Sergei. *Russia, where are you from?* Winnipeg, 1964.

[477:0]. Lesnoy, Sergei. *The Book of Veles*. Moscow, Zakharov, 2002.

[477:1]. *A Chronicler of Hellas and Rome*. Vol. 1. The RAS Institute of Russian Literature (The House of Pushkin). St. Petersburg, Dmitry Boulanin, 1999.

[478]. Libby, W. F. *Carbon-14: a Nuclear Chronometer of Archaeology*. The *UNESCO Courier*, No. 7 (No. 139)(1968).

[479]. Libby, W. F. *The Radiocarbon Dating*

Method. The International Peaceful Nuclear Energy Conference materials (Geneva), Vol. 16 (1987): 41-64.

[480]. Libby, W. F. *Radiocarbon: an Atomic Clock*. The annual *Nauka i Chelovechestvo (Science and Humanity)* journal (1962): 190-200. Moscow, Znaniye.

[481]. Libman, M., and G. Ostrovskiy. *Counterfeit Masterpieces*. Moscow, Sovetskiy Khudozhnik, 1966.

[482]. Livy, Titus. *Roman History since the Foundation of the City*. 6 volumes. Translation and general editorship by P.■ Adrianov. Moscow, E. Herbeck Typography, 1897-1899.

[483]. Livy, Titus. *Roman History since the Foundation of the City*. Vols. 1, 2 and 3. Moscow, Nauka, Vol. 1 (1989), Vol.■2 (1991), Vol. 3 (1993). English edition:

Livy, Titus. *Works*. Cambridge, Mass; London, Heinemann, 1914.

[484]. Livraga, Jorge A. *Thebe*. Moscow, New Acropolis, 1995.

[485]. *Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary*. Moscow, Soviet Encyclopedia Publications, 1990.

[486]. Lipinskaya, Y., and M. Martsinyak. *Ancient Egyptian Mythology*. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1983.

[487]. Lituanus, Michalonis. *On the Customs of the Tartars, the Lithuanians and the Muscovites*. Moscow, MSU Publications, 1994. See also: Michalonis Lituani. *De moribus tartarorum, lituanorum et moschorum fragmina X, multiplici historia referta et Johannis Lascii poloni De diis samagitarum, caeterorumque sarmatarum et falsorum christianorum. Item de*

religione armeniorum et de initio regiminis Stephani Batori. Nunc primum per J. Jac. Grasserum, C. P. ex manuscriptio authentico edita. Basileae, apud Conradum Waldkirchium, MDCXV, 1-41.

[488]. *Literary legacy. V. I. Lenin and A. V. Lunacharsky. Correspondence, Reports, Documents.* Moscow, Nauka, 1971.

[489]. Lifshitz, G. M. *Essays on Early Christianity and Biblical Historiography.* Minsk: Vysheyshaya Shkola, 1970.

[490]. Likhachev, N. P. *The Artistic Manner of Andrei Rublev.* St. Petersburg, 1907.

[490:1]. Likhacheva, E. A. *The Seven Hills of Moscow.* Moscow, Nauka, 1990.

[491]. Lozinsky, S. G. *History of the Spanish Inquisition.* St. Petersburg, Brockhaus and Efron, 1914.

[492]. Lozinsky, S. G. *History of the Papacy*. Vols. I and II. Moscow, The Central TsS SWB Publications of USSR, 1934.

[493]. Lomonosov, M. V. *Selected Works*. Vol. 2. History, philology, poetry. Moscow, Nauka, 1986.

[493:1]. Gowing, Sir Lawrence. *Paintings in the Louvre*. Introduction by Michel Laclotte. Russian Translation by MK-Import, Ltd., Moscow, Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga, 1987. English edition: Stewart, Tabori & Chang, Inc., 1987.

[493:2]. Loades, D. *Henry VIII and his Queens*. The *Mark in History* series. Moscow, Feniks.

[494]. Pardi, J., comp. *The Pilot Chart of the Gibraltar and the Mediterranean*. Translated by I. Shestakov. Moscow, 1846.

[495]. Lourie, F. M. *Russian and Global*

History in Tables. Synchrony tables (XXX century BC – XIX Century). World Governors. Genealogical Tables. Glossary. St. Petersburg, Karavella, 1995.

[496]. Louchin, A. A. *The Slavs and History.* An appendix to the *Molodaya Gvardia (Young Guard)* magazine, No. 9 (1997): 260-351.

[497]. Lyzlov, Andrei. *History of the Scythians.* Moscow, Nauka, 1990.

[497:1]. Liozzi, Mario. *History of Physics.* Moscow, Mir, 1970.

[498]. Lewis, G. C. *A Research of Ancient Roman History and its Veracity.* Hannover, 1852. German edition: *Untersuchungen über die Glaubwürdigkeit der altrömischen Geschichte,* Hannover, 1858.

[499]. Magi, Giovanna. *Luxor. The Valleys of the Kings, Queens, Noblemen and*

Craftsmen. Memnon's colossi. Deir-el-Bakhari – Medinet-Abu – Ramesseum.
Florence, Casa Editrice Bonechi via Cairoli,
1999.

[500]. Makariy (Boulgakov), the Metropolitan of Moscow and Kolomna. *History of the Russian Church*. Books 1-7. Moscow, The Spaso-Preobrazhensky Monastery of Valaam Publications, 1994-1996.

[500:1]. Makariy, Archimandrite. *Ancient Ecclesial Monuments. History of the Hierarchy of Nizhniy Novgorod. The True Tales of Nizhniy Novgorod* series. Nizhniy Novgorod, Nizhegorodskaya Yarmarka, 1999.

- [501]. Makarov, A. G., and S. E. Makarova. *The Scotch Thistle Blossom. Towards the Sources of the "Quiet flows the Don."* Moscow, Photocopied by the General Research Institute of Gas Industry, 1991.
- [502]. Makarov, A. G., and S. E. Makarova. *Around the "Quiet flows the Don." From Myth Creation to a Search for Truth.* Moscow, Probel, 2000.
- [502:1]. Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince. Ruminations in re the First Decade of Titus Livy.* – St. Petersburg, Azbuka, 2002.
- [502:2]. Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The History of Florence.* – Leningrad, Nauka, 1973.
- [503]. Malalas, John. *The Chronicle.* Published by O. V. Tvorogov according to *The Chronographer of Sofia in the Works of the Ancient Russian Literature Department*, Vol. 37, pp. 192-221.

Moscow, Nauka. English edition: *The Chronicle of John Malalas*. Chicago, Chicago University Press, 1940.

[504]. Kantor, A. M., ed. *A Concise History of Fine Arts*. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1981; Dresden, VEB Verlag der Kunst, 1981.

[504:1]. *The Compact Soviet Encyclopaedia*. Vols. 1-10. Moscow, Sovetskaya Encyclopaedia, Inc., 1928.

[505]. Malinovskaya, L. N. *The Graveyard of the Khans (Mezarlyk)*. Bakhchisaray, the State Historical and Cultural Reserve, 1991.

[506]. Malinovskiy, A. F. *A Review of Moscow*. Moscow, Moskovskiy Rabochiy, 1992.

[507]. *A Concise Atlas of the World*. Moscow, General Department of Geodetics and Cartography of the USSR Council of Ministers. 1979.

- [508]. Malver, A. *Science and Religion*.
Russian translation by L. and E. Kroukovsky.
N.p., 1925.
- [509]. Marijnissen, R. H., and P. Ruyffelaere.
Hieronimus Bosch. Commentated album.
Antwerp, Mercatorfonds, 1987, 1995.
Russian translation by Mezhdunarodnaya
Kniga. Moscow, 1998.
- [510]. Marco Polo. *A Book on the Diversity of
the World*. The Personal Library of Borges.
St. Petersburg, Amphora, 1999.
- [511]. Markov, A. A. *One of the Uses of the
Statistical Method*. *The Academy of
Sciences News*, Series 6, Vol. X, Issue 4
(1916).
- [512]. Martynov, G. *On the Origins of Roman
Chronicles*. Moscow University Press,
1903.
- [513]. Massa, Isaac. *A Brief Report of the*

Beginning and the Origins of Modern Muscovite Wars and Unrest that Occurred Before 1610 in the Brief Time when Several Rulers Reigned. Moscow, The Sergei Doubnov Fund, Rita-Print, 1997.

[514]. Massa, Isaac. *A Brief Report on Moscovia.* Moscow, 1937.

[514:1]. Matveyenko, V. A., and L. I. Shchegoleva. *The Chronicle of George the Coenobite.* Russian text, comments, indications. Moscow, Bogorodskiy Pechatnik, 2000.

[515]. Matvievskaya, G. P. *Albrecht Dürer the Scientist. 1471-1528.* A series of scientist biographies. Moscow, The USSR AS, Nauka, 1987.

[516]. Matvievskaya, G. P. *As-Sufi.* In *Historical and Astronomical Research* (Moscow, Nauka), Issue 16 (1983): 93-138.

[517]. Matuzova, V. I. *Mediaeval English Sources*. Moscow, Nauka, 1979.

[518]. Vlastar, Matthew. *Collection of Rules Devised by Holy Fathers*. Balakhna, P. A. Ovchinnikov, The F. P. Volkov typography, 1908.

[519]. Smirnov B. L., editor and translator. *The Mahabharata*. Vols. 1-8. Tashkent, the Turkmenian SSR Academy of Sciences, 1955-1972. Vol. 1: two poems from the III book – *Nala and Savitri (The Greatness of Marital Virtue)* (2nd edition 1959); Vol. 2 – *The Bhagavad Gita* (1956); Vol. 3: *The Highlander* (1957); Vol. 4: *The Conversation of Markandhea* (1958); Vol. 5: *Mokshadharma* (1961); Vol. 6: *A Journey Through the Treasuries* (1962); Vol. 7: *The Book of Bheeshma and the Book of the Battle of Maces* (1963); Vol. 8:

Attacking the Sleeping Ones (1972).

English edition: Chicago-London, Chicago University Press, 1973. Also see the edition by the Jaico Publishing House, Bombay, 1976.

[519:1]. *The Mahabharata. Narayana*. Issue V, book 2. 2nd edition. Translated and edited by Academician B. L. Smirnov of the Turkmenian SSR Academy of Sciences. The TSSR AS, Ashkhabad, Ylym, 1984.

[519:2]. *The Mahabharata. The Four Tales*. Translated from Sanskrit by S. Lipkin. Interlineary by O. Volkova. Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1969.

[520]. *The Mahabharata. The Ramayana*. Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1974. Also see: *The Ramayana*. Madras, Periyar Self-Respect Propaganda Institution, 1972.

[520:1]. *The Mahabharata. Book 2.*
Sabhaparva, or the Book of the
Congregation. Translated from Sanskrit by
V. I. Kalyanov. The *Literary Monuments*
series. Moscow-Leningrad, Nauka, 1962.

[520:2]. *The Mahabharata. Book 4.*
Virataparva, or the Book of Virata.
Translated from Sanskrit by V. I. Kalyanov.
The *Literary Monuments* series. Leningrad,
Nauka, 1967.

[520:3]. *The Mahabharata. Book 5.*
Udhiyogaparva, or the Book of Diligence.
Translated from Sanskrit by V. I. Kalyanov.
The *Literary Monuments* series. Leningrad,
Nauka, 1976.

[520:4]. *The Bhagavad Gita as it is.* Complete
edition with authentic Sanskrit texts,
Russian transliteration, word-for-word and
literary translation, and extensive

commentaries. The Bhaktivedanta Book Trust. Moscow-Leningrad-Calcutta-Bombay-New Delhi, 1984. The first English edition of the Bhagavad Gita: Wilkins. *The Bhagavad Gita, or dialogs of Kreeshna and Arjoon*. London, 1785. See also: Etgerton, F. *Bhagavad Gita*, Vols. 1-2. Harvard University Press, 1946 (with transcr. of the text).

[520:5]. *The Mahabharata. Book 7.*

Dronaparva, or the Book of Drona.

Translated from Sanskrit by V. I. Kalyanov. The *Literary Monuments* series. St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993.

[520:6]. *The Mahabharata. Book 3. The Book of the Woods (Aryanyakaparva)*. Translated from Sanskrit by A. V. Vasilkov and S. L. Neveleva. The *Monuments of Oriental Literature* series. LXXX, 1987.

[520:7]. *The Burning of the Snakes. A Tale from the Indian Epic, the Mahabharata.* Translated by V. I. Kalyanov. Moscow, Goslitizdat, 1958.

[521]. Mezentsev, M. T. *The Fate of Novels (Concerning the Discussion on the “Quiet flows the Don” Authorship Problem).* Samara, P.I.S. Press, 1994.

[522]. Medvedev, R. *Who Wrote the “Quiet flows the Don”?* Paris, Christian Bourg, 1975.

[522:1]. Meyer, M. S., A. F. Deribas, and N. B. Shuvalova. *Turkey. The Book of Wanderings.* A historical guidebook. Project author S. M. Bourygin. Moscow, Veche, Khartia, 2000.

[523]. Melnikova, E. A. *Ancient Scandinavian Geographical Works.* Moscow, Nauka, 1986.

[524]. *Memoirs of Margaret de Valois.*

Translated by I. V. Shevlyagina. Introduction and comments by S. L. Pleshkova. French original: *Mémoires de Marguerite de Valois*. Paris, The Library of P. Jannet, MDCCCLVIII. Moscow University Press, 1995.

[525]. *Methods of Studying the Oldest Sources on the History of the USSR Nations.* Collected articles. Moscow, Nauka, 1978.

[526]. *Methodical Research of Absolute Geochronology. Report Theses of the 3rd Methodical Symposium of 1976.* Moscow, USSR AS Press, 1976.

[527]. Meshchersky, N. A. *History of the Literary Russian Language.* Leningrad, 1981.

[528]. Miceletti, Emma. *Domenico*

Ghirlandio. Moscow, Slovo, 1996. Italian original: Italy, Scala, Istituto Fotografico Editoriale, 1995.

[529]. Miller, G. F. *Selected Oeuvres on Russian History. The Monuments of Historical Thought* series. Moscow, Nauka, RAS, 1996.

[530]. *The World of the Bible*. Magazine. 1993/1(1). Published by the Russian Society of Bible Studies.

[531]. *The World of Geography. Geography and the Geographers. The Environment*. Moscow, Mysl, 1984.

[532]. Meletinsky, E. M., ed. *Dictionary of Mythology*. Moscow, Sovetskaya Encyclopaedia, 1991.

[533]. *Myths of the World. An Encyclopaedia*. Vols. 1 and 2. Moscow, Sovetskaya Encyclopaedia, 1980 (Vol. 1) and 1981

(Vol. 2).

- [534]. Mikhailov, A. A. *The Eclipse Theory*. Moscow, Gostekhteorizdat, 1954.
- [535]. Mikhailov, A. A. *This Peculiar Radiocarbon Method*. In *Science and Technology*, No. 8 (1983): 31-32.
- [536]. Mokeyev, G. A. *Mozhaysk – A Holy Town for the Russians*. Moscow, Kedr, 1992.
- [537]. Mokretsova, I. P., and V. L. Romanova. *French Miniature Illustrations of the XIII century in Soviet Publications. 1270-1300*. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1984.
- [537:1]. Moleva, N. M. *True Muscovite Stories. A Hundred Addresses of Russian History and Culture*. To the 850-year anniversary of Moscow. Moscow, Znaniye, 1997.

- [538]. Mommsen, T. *The History of Rome*.
Moscow, 1936.
- [539]. Mommsen, T. *The History of Rome*.
Vol. 3. Moscow, Ogiz, 1941. English
edition: London, Macmillan & Co, 1913.
- [540]. Mongayt, A. L. *The Writing upon the
Stone*. Moscow, Znanie, 1969.
- [541]. *Mongolian Sources Related to Dayan-
Khan*. A compilation. Moscow, Nauka,
1986
- [541:1]. Mordovtsev, D. L. *Collected works*.
Vols. 1-14. Moscow, Terra, 1995.
- [542]. Morozov, N. A. *The Revelation in
Thunder and Storm. History of the
Apocalypse*. Moscow, 1907. 2nd edition
Moscow, 1910. English translation:
Northfield, Minnesota, 1941.
- [543]. Morozov, N. A. *The History of the*

Biblical Prophecies and their Literary Characteristics. The Prophets. Moscow, the I. D. Sytin Society Typography, 1914.

[544]. Morozov, N. A. *Christ. History of Humanity in the Light of Natural Scientific Studies.* Vols. 1-7. Moscow-Leningrad, Gosizdat, 1924-1932. Vol. 1: 1924 (2nd edition 1927), Vol. 2: 1926, Vol. 3: 1927, Vol. 4: 1928, Vol. 5: 1929, Vol. 6: 1930, Vol. 7: 1932. The first volume was published twice: in 1924 and 1927. Kraft Publications in Moscow made a reprint of all seven volumes in 1998.

[545]. Morozov, N. A. *An Astronomical Revolution in Historical Science.* The *Novy Mir (New World)* magazine, No. 4 (1925): 133-143. In reference to the article by Prof. N. M. Nikolsky.

[546]. Morozov, N. A. *Linguistic Ranges.* The

AS Newsletter, Department of Russian Language and Literature. Books 1-4, Vol. XX, 1915.

[547]. Morozov, N. A. *On Russian History*. The manuscript of the 8th volume of the work *Christ*. Moscow, the RAS Archive. Published in Moscow by Kraft and Lean in the end of the year 2000, as *A New Point of View on Russian History*.

[547:1]. Morozov, N.A. *The Asian Christs. (History of Humanity in the Light of Natural Scientific Studies)*. Vol. 9 of the work titled *Christ*. Moscow, Kraft+ Ltd., 2003.

[547:2]. Morozov, N.A. *The Mirages of Historical Wastelands between Tigris and Euphrates. (History of Humanity in the Light of Natural Scientific Studies)*. Vol. 10 of the work titled *Christ*. Moscow, Kraft+

Ltd., 2002.

- [548]. Fomenko A. T., and L. E. Morozova.
*Quantitative Methods in Macro-Textology
(with Artefacts of the XVI-XVII “Age of
Troubles” Used as Examples)*. Complex
methods in the study of historical
processes. Moscow, the USSR Institute of
History, Academy of Sciences, 1987. 163-
181.
- [549]. *Moscow*. An album. Moscow, Aurora
Press; St. Petersburg, 1996.
- [550]. *Illustrated History of Moscow*. Vol. 1.
From the dawn of time until 1917. Moscow,
Mysl, 1985.
- [551]. *Moscow and the Moscow Oblast. City
Plan. Topographical Map. 1:200000*. 3rd
edition. Moscow, The Military Typography
Headquarters Department, 1998.
- [552]. *The Moscow Kremlin. Arkhangelsky*

Cathedral. Moscow, The Moscow Kremlin State Museum and Reserve for History and Culture, 1995.

[553]. *The Moscow Kremlin*. Ouspensky *Cathedral*. Moscow, The Moscow Kremlin State Museum and Reserve for History and Culture, 1995.

[554]. *The Moscow Chronicler*. Compilation. Issue 1. Moscow, Moskovskiy Rabochiy, 1988.

[555]. *The Moscow Oblast Museum of History in Istra. A Guide-book*. Moscow, Moskovskiy Rabochiy, 1989.

[556]. *The Andrei Rublev Museum*. A brochure. Published by the Central Andrei Rublev Museum of Ancient Russian Culture and Art in Moscow, 10, Andronyevskaya Square. n.d.

[557]. Mouravyev, M. V. *Novgorod the Great*.

A Historical Account and Guidebook.

Leningrad: The State Historical Material
Culture Academy Art Edition Popularization
Committee, n.d.

[558]. Mouravyev, S. *History of the First Four
Centuries of Christianity*. St. Petersburg,
1866.

[559]. Murad, Aji. *The Polovtsy Field
Wormwood*. Moscow, Pik-Kontekst, 1994

[560]. Murad, Aji. *Europe, the Turkomans and
the Great Steppe*. Moscow, Mysl, 1998

[561]. Mouratov, K. I. *Peasant War Led by E.
I. Pougachev*. Moscow, Prosveshchenie,
1980.

[562]. Mylnikov, A. S. *A Picture of a Slavic
World as Viewed from the Eastern Europe.
Ethnogenetic Legends, Conjectures, and
Proto-Hypotheses of the XVI – Early XVIII
century*. St. Petersburg, The Petersburg

Oriental Studies Centre, 1996.

- [563]. Mylnikov, A. S. *The Legend of the Russian Prince (Russo-Slavic Relations of the XVIII century in the World of Folk Culture)*. Leningrad, Nauka, 1987.
- [564]. Malory, Thomas. *Le Morte d'Arthure*. Moscow, Nauka, 1974. English original taken from *The Works of Sir Thomas Malory* edited by E. Vinaver, Oxford, 1947.
- [565]. Najip, E. N. *A Comparative Historical Dictionary of the XIV century Turkic Languages*. Book I. Moscow, 1979.
- [566]. *The Land of Smolensk*. Moscow, Moskovskiy Rabochiy, 1971.
- [567]. Takeshi, Nagata. *The Magnetic Field of the Earth in the Past*. In *Nauka i Chelovechestvo (Science and Humanity)*. 1965 annual edition. Moscow, Znaniye. 169-175.

- [568]. Nazarevskiy, V. V. *Selected Fragments of Muscovite History. 1147-1913.* Moscow, Svarog, 1996.
- [569]. Vyacheslav (Savinykh). *Concise History of the Andronicus Monastery.* Moscow, The Sudarium Temple of the Andronicus Monastery, 1999.
- [570]. *The Scientific Research Museum of Architecture.* Moscow, 1962.
- [571]. Neugebauer, O. *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity.* Moscow, Nauka, 1968. English edition in the series *Acta Historica Scientiarum Naturalism et Medicinalium.* Vol. 9. Copenhagen, 1957. New York, Harper & Bros., 1962.
- [572]. Neuhardt, A. A., and I. A. Shishova. *The Seven Wonders of the Ancient World.* The USSR AS, the Leningrad Department of the History Institute. Moscow-Leningrad,

Nauka, 1966.

- [573]. Leping, A. A., and N. P. Strakhova, eds. *German-Russian Dictionary*. 80,000 words. Moscow, The State National and International Dictionary Publications, 1958.
- [574]. Nemirovskiy, A. I. *The Etruscans. From Myth to History*. Moscow, Nauka, 1983.
- [575]. Nemirovskiy, E. L. *The Literary World from the Dawn of History until the Early XX century*. Moscow, Kniga, 1986.
- [576]. Nemoyevskiy, Andrei. *Jesus the God*. Petersburg, State Publishing House, 1920.
- [577]. Nennius. *History of the Brits*. From: Geoffrey of Monmouth. *History of the Brits. The Life of Merlin*. Moscow, Nauka, 1984. English edition: Nennius. *Historia Brittonum*. Galfridus Monemutensis (Geoffrey of Monmouth). *Historia Britonum. Vita Merlini. Six old English*

Chronicles. Edited by J.A.Giles. London, 1848.

[577:1]. Nersesyan, L. V. *Dionysius the Icon Master and the Murals of the Feropontov Monastery*. Moscow, Severniy Palomnik, 2002.

[578]. Nechvolodov, A. *Tales of the Russian Land*. Books 1 and 2. Moscow, Svarog, 1997. A new edition of the books published by the State Typography of St. Petersburg in 1913.

[579]. Niese, B. *A Description of the Roman History and Source Studies*. German edition: *Grundriss der römischen Geschichte nebst Quellenkunde*. St. Petersburg, 1908. German edition: Munich, 1923.

[579:1]. Nikerov, V. A. *History as an Exact Science*. (Based on the materials of A. T.

Fomenko and G. V. Nosovskiy. *The New Chronology*). Moscow, Ecmo-Press, Yauza, 2002.

[580]. Nikolayev, D. *The Weapon that Failed to Save Byzantium*. In *Tekhnika i Nauka (Science and Technology)*, No. 9 (1983): 29-36.

[581]. Nikolayeva, T. V. *The Ancient Zvenigorod*. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1978.

[582]. *Nikolai Aleksandrovich Morozov*. In *Bibliography of the Scientists of the USSR*. Moscow, Nauka, 1981.

[583]. *Nikolai Aleksandrovich Morozov, the Encyclopaedist Scientist*. A collection of articles. Moscow, Nauka, 1982.

[584]. *Nikolai Aleksandrovich Morozov. Biographical Stages and Activities*. The *USSR AS Courier*, Nos. 7 and 8 (1944).

[585]. Nikolskiy, N. M. *An Astronomical Revolution in Historical Science*. The *Novy Mir (New World)* magazine, Vol. 1 (1925): 157-175. (In re. N. Morozov's œuvre *Christ*. Leningrad, 1924.)

[586]. Nikonov, V. A. *Name and Society*. Moscow, Nauka, 1974.

[586:1]. *A Collection of Chronicles titled the Patriarchal, or the Nikon Chronicle*. The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles (CCRC), Vols. IX-XIV. Moscow, Yazyki Russkoi Kultury, 2000.

[587]. *Novellino*. Literary monuments. Moscow, Nauka, 1984.

[588]. Novozhilov, N. I. *The Meteorological Works of N. A. Morozov*. The *Priroda (Nature)* magazine, No. 10 (1954).

[589]. *The New Testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ*. Brussels, Life with God, 1965.

[590]. Nosovskiy, G. V. *Certain Statistical Methods of Researching Historical Sources, and Examples of their Application*. Source study methods of Russian social thinking; historical studies of the feudal epoch. A collection of academic publications. Moscow, The USSR History Institute, AS, 1989. 181-196.

[591]. Nosovskiy, G. V. *The Beginning of Our Era and the Julian Calendar*. Information processes and systems. Scientific and technological information, Series 2. Moscow, the National Science and Technology Information Institute, No. 5 (1992): 7-18.

[592]. Nosovskiy, G. V. *The True Dating of the Famous First Oecumenical Counsel and the Real Beginning of the AD Era*. An appendix of A. T. Fomenko's *Global*

Chronology. Moscow, The MSU
Mathematical Mechanics Department, 1993.
288-394.

- [593]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.
*The Determination of Original Structures
in Intermixed Sequences*. Works of a vector
and tensor analysis seminar. Moscow, MSU
Press, Issue 22 (1985): 119-131.
- [594]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.
*Some Methods and Results of Intermixed
Sequence Analysis*. Works of a vector and
tensor analysis seminar. Moscow, MSU
Press, Issue 23 (1988): 104-121.
- [595]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.
*Determining the Propinquity Quotient and
Duplicate Identification in Chronological
Lists*. Report theses of the 5th International
Probability Theory and Mathematical
Statistics Conference. Vilnius, The

Lithuanian AS Institute of Mathematics and Cybernetics, Vol. 4 (1989): 111-112.

[596]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *Statistical Duplicates in Ordered Lists with Subdivisions. Cybernetic Issues.* Semiotic research. Moscow, Scientific Counsel for the Study of the General Problem of Cybernetics. The USSR AS, 1989. 138-148.

[597]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *Duplicate Identification in Chronological Lists (The Histogram Method of Related Name Distribution Frequencies).* Problems of stochastic model stability. Seminar works. Moscow, The National System Research Institute, 1989. 112-125.

[598]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *Statistical Research of Parallel Occurrences and Biographies in British*

Chronological and Historical Materials. Semiotics and Informatics. Moscow, The National System Research Institute, Issue 34 (1994): 205-233.

[599]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *The New Chronology and the Concept of the Ancient History of Russia, Britain and Rome. (Facts. Statistics. Hypotheses.)* Vol. 1: *Russia*. Vol. 2: *England, Rome*. Moscow, the MSU Centre of Research and Pre-University Education, 1995. 2nd edition: 1996.

[600]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *Mathematical and Statistical Models of Information Distribution in Historical Chronicles.* The Mathematical Issues of Cybernetics. Physical and Mathematical Literature (Moscow, Nauka), Issue 6 (1996): 71-116.

- [601]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.
The Empire (Russia, Turkey, China, Europe and Egypt. New Mathematical Chronology of Antiquity). Moscow, Faktorial, 1996. Re-editions: 1997, 1998 and 1999.
- [602]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.
Russia and Rome. The Correctness of Our Understanding of Eurasian History. Vols. 1 and 2. Moscow, Olimp, 1997. 2nd edition: 1999.
- [603]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.
The New Chronology of Russia. Moscow, Faktorial, 1997. Re-editions: 1998 and 1999.
- [604]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.
The Mathematical Chronology of Biblical Events. Moscow, Nauka, 1997.
- [605]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.

The Biblical Russia. Vols. 1 and 2.

Moscow, Faktorial, 1998.

[606]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.

Horde-Russia as Reflected in Biblical Books. Moscow, Anvik, 1998.

[607]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *An*

Introduction to the New Chronology (Which Century is it Now?). Moscow, Kraft and Lean, 1999.

[608]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.

The New Chronology of Russia, Britain and Rome. Moscow, Anvik, 1999. A substantially revised and enlarged single-volume edition.

[608:1]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.

The New Chronology of Russia, Britain and Rome. Moscow, Delovoi Express Financial, 2001.

[609]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy.

The Biblical Russia. Selected Chapters I. (The Empire of Horde-Russia and the Bible. The New Mathematical Chronology of Antiquity. A History of Biblical Editions and Manuscripts. XI-XII century Events in the New Testament. The Pentateuch).

Moscow, Faktorial, 1999.

[610]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *A Reconstruction of Global History (The New Chronology)*. Moscow, Delovoi Express Financial, 1999.

[611]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *Old Criticisms and the New Chronology*. The Neva magazine (St. Petersburg), No. 2 (1999): 143158.

[612]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *The Biblical Russia. Selected Chapters II. (The Empire of Horde-Russia and the Bible. History of the XIV-XVI century in the*

Final Chapters of the Books of Kings. XV-XVI century History of the Pages of the Books of Esther and Judith. Reformation Epoch of the XVI-XVII century). Moscow, Faktorial, 2000.

[613]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *A Reconstruction of Global History. The Research of 1999-2000 (The New Chronology).* Moscow, Delovoi Express Financial, 2000.

[613:1]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *The New Chronology of Egypt. The Astronomical Dating of the Ancient Egyptian Monuments. The Research of 2000-2002.* Moscow, Veche, 2002.

[613:2]. Fomenko, A. T., and Nosovskiy, G. V. *The New Chronology of Egypt. The Astronomical Dating of the Ancient Egyptian Monuments.* 2nd edition, re-

worked and expanded. Moscow, Veche, 2003.

[614]. Newton, Robert. *The Crime of Claudius Ptolemy*. Moscow, Nauka, 1985. English original: Baltimore-London, John Hopkins University Press, 1977.

[615]. Olearius, Adam. *A Detailed Account of the Moscovian and Persian Journey of the Holstein Ambassadors in 1633, 1636 and 1639*. Translated from German by P. Barsov. Moscow, 1870.

[616]. Oleynikov, A. *The Geological Clock*. Leningrad, Nedra, 1975.

[617]. Orbini, Mavro. *A Historiographical Book on the Origins of the Names, the Glory and the Expansion of the Slavs. Compiled from many Historical Books through the Office of Marourbin, the Archimandrite of Raguzha*. Translated into

Russian from Italian. Typography of St. Petersburg, 1722.

[618]. Orbini, Mavro. *Kingdom of the Slavs*. Sofia, Nauka i Izkustvo, 1983.

[618:1]. Oreshnikov, A. V. *Pre-1547 Russian Coins*. A reprint of the 1896 edition by the State Museum of History. Russian State Archive of Ancient Acts. Moscow, The Archaeographical Centre, 1996.

[619]. Orlenko, M. I. *Sir Isaac Newton. A Biographical Aperçu*. Donetsk, 1927.

[620]. Orlov, A. S. *Certain Style Characteristics of Russian History Fiction of the XVI-XVII century*. In *Russian Philological News*, Vol. 13, Book 4 (1908): 344-379.

[621]. *The Ostrog Bible (The Bible, or the Books of the Old and the New Covenant, in the Language of the Slavs)*. Ostrog, 1581.

Reprinted as *The Ostrog Bible*. The Soviet Culture Fund Commission for the Publication of Literary Artefacts. Moscow-Leningrad, Slovo-Art, 1988. "The phototypic copy of the 1581 text was supervised by I. V. Dergacheva with references to the copies from the Scientific Library of A. M. Gorky Moscow State University."

[622]. *National History from the Earliest Days and until 1917*. Encyclopaedia, Vol. 1. Moscow, The Great Russian Encyclopaedia Publications, 1994.

[623]. Bavin, S. P., and G. V. Popov. *The Revelation of St. John as Reflected in the Global Literary Tradition*. The catalogue of an exhibition organized in Moscow by the Greek Embassy in 1994. A joint publication of the Greek Embassy and the State Library of Russia. Moscow, Indrik, 1995.

[623:1]. A postcard with an Egyptian zodiac.
The Creation Scene. Egypt, El-Faraana
Advertising & Printing, 2000.

[624]. *Historical and Folk Tale Aperçus*.
From Cheops to Christ. A compilation.
Translated from German. Moscow, 1890.
Reprinted by the Moscow Int'l Translator
School in 1993.

[625]. Pausanias. *A Description of Hellas, or a
Voyage through Greece in II century AD*.
Moscow, 1880. English edition: Pausanias.
Guide to Greece. Harmondsworth, Penguin,
1979.

[626]. Makarevich, G. V., ed. *The Architectural
Monuments of Moscow. The Earthenware
Town*. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1989-1990.

[627]. Posokhin, M. V., ed. *The Architectural
Monuments of Moscow. KitaiGorod*.
Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1982.

- [628]. Makarevich, G. V., ed. *The Architectural Monuments of Moscow. White Town.* Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1989.
- [629]. Makarevich, G. V., ed. *The Architectural Monuments of Moscow. Zamoskvorechye.* Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1994.
- [630]. *Artefacts of Diplomatic Relations with the Roman Empire.* Vol. 1. St Petersburg, 1851.
- [631]. Rybakov, B. A., ed. *Artefacts of the Kulikovo Cycle.* St. Petersburg, RAS, The Institute of Russian History. Blitz, the Russo-Baltic Information Centre, 1998.
- [632]. *Literary Artefacts of Ancient Russia. The XI – Early XII century.* Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1978.
- [633]. *Literary Artefacts of Ancient Russia. The XII century.* Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1980.

[634]. *Literary Artefacts of Ancient Russia.
The XIII century.* Moscow,
Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1981.

[635]. *Literary Artefacts of Ancient Russia.
The XIV – mid-XV century.* Moscow,
Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1981.

[636]. *Literary Artefacts of Ancient Russia.
Second Half of the XV century.* Moscow,
Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1982.

[637]. *Literary Artefacts of Ancient Russia.
Late XV – Early XVI century.* Moscow,
Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1984.

[638]. *Literary Artefacts of Ancient Russia.
Mid-XVI century.* Moscow,
Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1985.

[639]. *Literary Artefacts of Ancient Russia.
Second Half of the XVI century.* Moscow,
Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1986.

- [640]. *Literary Artefacts of Ancient Russia. Late XVI – Early XVII century*. Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1987.
- [641]. *Significant Works in Russian Law*. Issue 2. Moscow, 1954.
- [642]. *Significant Works in Russian Law*. Issue 3. Moscow, 1955.
- [643]. Pannekuk, A. *The History of Astronomy*. Moscow, Nauka, 1966.
- [644]. Parandowski, J. *Petrarch*. The *Inostrannaya Literatura (Foreign Literature)* magazine, No. 6 (1974). Also see: Parandowski, J. *Petrarca*. Warsaw, 1957.
- [645]. Paradisis, Alexander. *The Life and Labours of Balthazar Cossas (Pope John XXIII)*. Minsk, Belarus, 1980.
- [646]. Pasek. *A Historical Description of*

Simon's Monastery in Moscow. Moscow, 1843.

[647]. Romanenko, A. *The Patriarch Chambers of the Moscow Kremlin*. Moscow, The Moscow Kremlin State Museum and Reserve for History and Culture, 1994.

[648]. Pahimer, George. *The Story of Michael and Andronicus Palaeologi. The Reign of Michael Palaiologos*. St. Petersburg, 1862.

[648:1]. Pashkov, B. G. *Holy Russia – Russia – The Russian Empire. The Genealogical Tree of the Principal Russian Clans (862-1917)*. Moscow, TsentrKom, 1996.

[649]. *The First Muscovite Princes*. In *Historical Portraits* series. Moscow, Ganna, 1992.

[650]. Perepyolkin, Y. A. *The Coup of Amenkhotep IV*. Part 1. Books 1 and 2.

Moscow, Nauka, 1967.

- [651]. *The Correspondence of Ivan the Terrible and Andrei Kurbskiy*. In *Literary Landmarks* series. Leningrad, Nauka, 1979. 2nd edition: Moscow, Nauka, 1993.
- [652]. *The Song of Roland*. International Literature Collection. Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1976. English edition by J. M. Dent & Sons, 1972.
- [653]. Petrov, A. M. *The Great Silk Route. The Simplest, but Largely Unknown Facts*. Moscow, Vostochnaya Literatura, RAS, 1995.
- [654]. Petruchenko, O. *Latin-Russian Dictionary*. Moscow, published by the V. V. Dumnov and the Heirs of Silayev Brothers, 1914. Reprinted by the Graeco-Latin Department of Y. A. Shichalin, 1994.
- [654:1]. *The Maritime Voyage of St. Brendan*

(*Navigation Sancti Brendani Abbatis saec X AD*). St. Petersburg, Azbuka-Klassika, 2002. English translation: *Navigatio Sancti Brendani Abbatis from Early Latin Manuscripts*. Ed., introd. and notes: C. Selmer, Notre Dame, 1959.

[655]. *Plan of the Imperial Capital City of Moscow, Created under the Supervision of Ivan Michurin, the Architect, in 1739. The First Geodetic Plan of Moscow*. The General Council of Ministers, Department of Geodetics and Cartography (the Cartographer Cooperative). Published together with a calendar for 1989.

[656]. Plano Carpini, G. del. *History of the Mongols*. William of Rubruck. *The Journey to the Oriental Countries. The Book of Marco Polo*. Moscow, Mysl, 1997. See also: *The Journey of William of Rubruck to the Eastern Parts of the World, 1253-55*.

Prepared by W. W. Rockhill. 1900.

[657]. Plato. *Collected Works*. Vol. 3.

Moscow, Mysl, 1972. English edition: *The Works of Plato*. Bohn's Classical Library, 1848.

[658]. Pletnyova, S. A. *The Khazars*. Moscow, Nauka, 1976.

[659]. Pleshkova, S. L. *Catherine of Medici. The Black Queen*. Moscow, Moscow University Press, 1994.

[660]. Plutarch. *Comparative Biographies*. Vol. 1: Moscow, USSR AN Press, 1961; Vol. 2: Moscow, USSR AN Press, 1963; Vol. 3: Moscow, Nauka, 1964. English edition: Plutarch. *The Lives of the Noble Graecians and Romans*. In *Great Books of the Western World* series. Vol. 13. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. Chicago, University of Chicago, 1952 (2nd edition

1990). See also: Plutarch. *Plutarch's Lives*. London, Dilly, 1792.

[661]. Plyukhanova, M. B. *Subjects and Symbols of the Muscovite Kingdom*. St. Petersburg, Akropol, 1995.

[662]. *Kremlin. A Brief Guide*. Moscow, Moskovskiy Rabochiy, 1960.

[663]. *The Yearly Chronicle*. Part 1. Text and translation. Moscow-Leningrad, The USSR AN Press, 1950.

[664]. *The Yearly Chronicle*. Published in the *Dawn of the Russian Literature* series (XI – early XII century). Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1978. 23-277.

[665]. *The Tale of Varlaam and Ioasaph*. Leningrad, Nauka, 1985.

[666]. Likhachev, D. S., ed. *The Tale of the*

Kulikovo Battle. The Text and the Miniatures of the Authorized Compilation of the XVI century. Published by the XVI century manuscript kept in the USSR Academy of Sciences Library (The Authorized Compilation of Chronicles, Osterman's Vol. III, sheet 3 – 126 reverse). Leningrad, Aurora, 1984.

[666:1]. Podosinov, A. V., and A. M. Belov. *Lingua Latina. Latin-Russian Dictionary.* About 15,000 words. Moscow, Flinta, Nauka, 2000.

[667]. Pokrovskiy, N. N. *A Voyage in Search of Rare Books.* Moscow, Kniga. 2nd edition, 1988.

[668]. Polak, I. F. *A Course of General Astronomy.* Moscow, Gonti, 1938.

[669]. Polybius. *History in 40 Volumes.* Moscow, 1899.

- [670]. *The Complete Symphony of the Canonical Books of the Holy Writ*. St. Petersburg, The Bible For Everybody, 1996.
- [671]. *The Complete Collection of Russian Chonicles*. Vol. 33. Leningrad, Nauka, 1977.
- [672]. *The Complete Collection of Russian Chonicles*. Vol. 35. Moscow, Nauka, 1980.
- [673]. Polo, M. *The Journey*. Translated from French. Leningrad, 1940.
- [674]. Poluboyarinova, M. D. *Russians in the Golden Horde*. Moscow, Nauka, 1978.
- [674:1]. [*Pompeii*]. *Pompeii*. Album. Authors: Filippo Coarelli, Emilio de Albentis, Maria Paola Guidobaldi, Fabricio Pesando, and Antonio Varone. Moscow, Slovo, 2002. Printed in Italy.
- [674:2]. [*Pompeii*]. Nappo, Salvatore. *Pompeii*. Album. From the *World Wonder Atlas*

series. Moscow, Bertelsmann Media
Moskau, 2001. English original: Salvatore
Ciro Nappo. *Pompeii*. White Star, 1998,
Vercelli, Italy.

[675]. Popovskiy, M. A. *Time Conquered. A
Tale of Nikolai Morozov*. Moscow,
Political Literature, 1975.

[676]. *The Portuguese-Russian and Russian-
Portuguese Dictionary*. Kiev, Perun, 1999.

[677]. *The Successors of Marco Polo.
Voyages of the Westerners into the
Countries of the Three Indias*. Moscow,
Nauka, 1968.

[678]. Pospelov, M. *The Benediction of
Reverend Sergei*. The *Moskva* magazine,
1990

[679]. Postnikov, A. V. *Maps of the Russian
Lands: A Brief Review of the History of
Geographical Studies and Cartography of*

Our Fatherland. Moscow, Nash Dom – L'Age d'Homme, 1996.

[680]. Postnikov, M. M. *A Critical Research of the Chronology of the Ancient World*.

Vols. 1-3. Moscow, Kraft and Lean, 2000.

[A. T. Fomenko's remark: This book is a publication of a manuscript of more than 1000 pages written by Doctors of Physics and Mathematics A. S. Mishchenko and A. T. Fomenko. It was edited by M. M. Postnikov, and came out signed with his name. He acknowledges this fact in the preface to Vol. 1, on page 6, albeit cagily.]

[681]. Fomenko A. T., and M. M. Postnikov. *New Methods of Statistical Analysis of the Narrative and Digital Material of Ancient History*. Moscow, Scientific Counsel for the Study of the General Problem of Cybernetics, USSR AS, 1980. 1-36.

[682]. Fomenko A. T., and M. M. Postnikov.
*New Methods of Statistical Analysis of the
Narrative and Digital Material of Ancient
History*. Scientific note of the Tartu
University, works related to sign symbols.
XV, Cultural Typology, Cultural Influence
Feedback. Tartu University Press, Release
576 (1982): 24-43.

[683]. Postnikov, M. M. *The Greatest
Mystification in the World?* In *Tekhnika i
Nauka (Science & Technology)*, 1982, No.
7, pp. 28-33.

[684]. Potin, V. M. *Coins. Treasures.
Collections. Numismatic essays*. St.
Petersburg, Iskusstvo-SPb, 1993.

[685]. Potin, V. M. *Ancient Russia and the
European States of the X-XIII century*.
Leningrad, Sovetskiy Khudozhnik, 1968.

[685:1]. Pope-Hennessy, John. *Fra Angelico*.

Album. Moscow, Slovo, 1996. Scala, 1995, Istituto Fotografico Editoriale.

[686]. Pokhlyobkin, V. V. *The Foreign Affairs of the Holy Russia, Russia and the USSR over the 1000 Years in Names, Dates and Facts. A Reference Book*. Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye Otnoshenya, 1992.

[687]. *Merited Academician N. A. Morozov. Memoirs*. Vols. 1 and 2. The USSR Academy of Sciences. Moscow, USSR AS Press, 1962.

[688]. *Orthodox Art and the Savvino-Storozhevsky Monastery*. Materials of scientific conferences dedicated to the 600th anniversary of the Savvino-Storozhevsky Monastery, 17 December 1997 and 22 September 1998. The Zvenigorod Museum of Architecture, History, and Arts. Zvenigorod, Savva Plus

M, 1998.

[689]. Malinovskaya, N., ed. *Prado. Paintings*. Album. Translated from Spanish. Lunwerg Editores. Barcelona-Madrid, 1994. Russian translation: Moscow, MK-Import, 1999.

[690]. *Reverend Joseph Volotsky. The Illuminator*. Published by the Spaso-Preobrazhensky Monastery of Valaam. Blessed by the Holiest Patriarch of Moscow and the Entire Russia, Alexiy II. Moscow, 1993.

[691]. Priester, E. *A Brief History of Austria*. Moscow, IL, 1952. German edition: *Kurze Geschichte Österreichs*. Vienna, Globus, 1946.

[692]. Prishchepenko, V. N. *The Pages of Russian History*. Vol. 1: 1988. Vol. 2: 2000. Moscow, Profizdat.

[693]. *Problems of Museum Collection*

Formation and Studies of the State Museum of Religious History. Leningrad, The RSFSR Ministry of Culture, published by the State Museum of History of Religions, 1990.

[694]. Procopius of Caesarea. *On the Buildings*. The *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (*Courier of Ancient History*) magazine, No. 4 (1939): 201-298. See also: Procopius of Caesarea. *On the Buildings of Justinian*. London, Palestine Pilgrim Society, 1888.

[695]. Procopius. *The Gothic War*. Moscow, The USSR AS Press, 1950.

[696]. Procopius. *The Gothic War. On the Buildings*. Moscow, Arktos, Vika-Press, 1996. See also: Procopius of Caesarea. *Procopius*. Vol. 7. London, William Heinemann; New York, Macmillan & Co. 1914-1940.

[697]. Procopius of Caesarea. *The Persian War. The War with the Vandals. Arcane History*. St. Petersburg, Aleteya, 1998.

[698]. Proskouriakov, V. M. *Johannes Gutenberg. The Celebrity Biographies* series. Moscow, the Literary Magazine Union, 1933.

[699]. Prokhorov, G. M. *The Tale of Batu-Khan's Invasion in Lavrenty's Chronicle*. Published as part of *The Russian Literary History Research. XI-XVII centuries*. Leningrad, Nauka, 1974.

[700]. *Book of Psalms*. Moscow, 1657.
(Private collection.)

[701]. *The book of Psalms with Appendices*. Published in the *Great City of Moscow in the Year 7160 [1652 AD], in the Month of October, on the 1st Day*. New edition: Moscow, The Vvedenskaya Church of St.

Trinity Coreligionist Typography, 1867.

[702]. Psellus, Michael. *Chronography*.

Moscow, Nauka, 1978. English edition: *The Chronographia of Michael Psellus*.

London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1953.

[703]. Pskovskiy, Y. P. *Novae and*

Supernovae. Moscow, Nauka, 1974.

[704]. Ptolemy, Claudius. *Almagest, or the*

Mathematical Tractate in Thirteen

Volumes. Translated by I. N. Veselovskiy.

Moscow, Nauka, Fizmatlit, 1998.

[705]. Poisson, A., N. A. Morozov, F. Schwarz,

M. Eliade, and K. G. Jung. *The Theory and Symbols of Alchemy. The Great Work*.

Kiev, Novy Akropol, Bront Ltd., 1995.

[706]. Mashkov, I. P., ed. *A Guide to Moscow*.

Moscow, The Muscovite Architectural Society for the Members of the V

Convention of Architects in Moscow, 1913.

- [707]. *The Voyage of Columbus. Diaries, Letters, Documents.* Moscow, The State Geographical Literature Press, 1952.
- [708]. Putilov, Boris. *Ancient Russia in Personae. Gods, Heroes, People.* St. Petersburg, Azbuka, 1999.
- [709]. Pushkin, A. *Collected Works.* Leningrad, The State Fiction Publishers, 1935.
- [710]. *Pushkin A. in the Recollections of Contemporaries.* Two volumes. Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1974.
- [711]. *Pushkin's Memorial Places in Russia. A Guidebook.* Moscow, Profizdat, 1894.
- [711:1]. Pylyayev, M. I. *The Old Petersburg. Accounts of the Capital's Past.* A reprint of A. S. Souvorov's 1889 St. Petersburg edition. Moscow, IKPA, 1990.
- [712]. Lukovich-Pyanovich, Olga. *The Serbs . .*

. *The Oldest of Nations*. Vols. 1-3.
Belgrade, Miroslav, 1993-1994.

[713]. Pietrangeli, Carlo. *Vatican*. From the
Great Museums of the World series.
Moscow, Slovo, 1998. A translation of the
Italian edition by Magnus Editioni, Udine,
1996.

[714]. *Five Centuries of European Drawings*.
The drawings of old masters from the
former collection of Franz König. The
1.10.1995-21.01.1996 exhibition catalogue.
The Russian Federation Ministry of Culture,
The State A. S. Pushkin Museum of Fine Art.
Moscow-Milan, Leonardo Arte (versions in
Russian and in English).

[715]. *The Radzivillovskaya Chronicle*. The
text. The research. A description of the
miniatures. St. Petersburg, Glagol; Moscow,
Iskusstvo, 1994.

- [716]. *The Radzivillovskaya Chronicle*. The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles, Vol. 38. Leningrad, Nauka, 1989.
- [717]. *Radiocarbon*. Collected articles. Vilnius, 1971.
- [718]. *The Imprecision of Radiocarbon Datings*. The *Priroda (Nature)* magazine, No. 3 (1990): 117. (*New Scientist*, Vol. 123, No. 1684 (1989): 26).
- [719]. Radzig, N. *The Origins of Roman Chronicles*. Moscow University Press, 1903.
- [720]. *The Book of Rank. 1457-1598*. Moscow, Nauka, 1966.
- [721]. Razoumov, G. A., and M. F. Khasin. *The Drowning cities*. Moscow, Nauka, 1978.
- [722]. Wright, J. K. *The Geographical Lore of the Time of the Crusades. A Study in the*

History of Medieval Science and Tradition in Western Europe. Moscow, Nauka, 1988. English original published in New York in 1925.

[722:1]. Reizer, V. I. *The Process of Joan of Arc*. Moscow-Leningrad, Nauka, 1964.

[723]. Fomenko, A. T., and S. T. Rachev. *Volume Functions of Historical Texts and the Amplitude Correlation Principle*. Source study methods of Russian social thinking historical studies of the feudal epoch. A collection of academic publications. Moscow, The USSR History Institute, AS, 1989. 161-180.

[724]. Rashid ad-Din. *History of the Mongols*. St. Petersburg, 1858.

[725]. Renan, J. *The Antichrist*. St. Petersburg, 1907. English edition: *Renan's Antichrist*. The Scott Library, 1899.

[726]. *Rome: Echoes of the Imperial Glory.*

Translated from English by T. Azarkovich.

The *Extinct Civilizations* series. Moscow, Terra, 1997. Original by Time-Life Books, 1994.

[727]. Rich, V. *Was there a Dark Age?* The

Khimia i Zhizn (Chemistry and Life)

magazine, No. 9 (1983): 84.

[728]. Riesterer, Peter P., and Roswitha

Lambelet. *The Egyptian Museum in Cairo.*

Cairo, Lehnert & Landrock, Orient Art

Publishers, 1980. Russian edition, 1996.

[729]. Robert of Clari. *The Conquest of*

Constantinople. Moscow, Nauka, 1986.

English edition: McNeal, E. H. *The*

Conquest of Constantinople of Robert of

Clari. Translated with introduction and

notes by E. Holmes McNeal. New York,

1936. Records of Civilization: Sources and

Studies. Vol. XXIII. Reprint: New York, 1964, 1969.

- [730]. Rogozina, Z. A. *The Earliest Days of Egyptian History*. Issue 2. Petrograd, A. F. Marx Typography, n.d.
- [731]. Rozhdestvenskaya, L. A. *The Novgorod Kremlin. A Guide-book*. Lenizdat, 1980.
- [732]. Rozhitsyn, V. S., and M. P. Zhakov. *The Origins of the Holy Books*. Leningrad, 1925.
- [733]. Rozhkov, M. N. A. *Morozov – The Founding Father of the Dimension Number Analysis. The Successes of the Physical Sciences*, Vol. 49, Issue 1 (1953).
- [734]. Rozanov, N. *History of the Temple of Our Lady's Birth in Staroye Simonovo, Moscow, Dedicated to its 500th Anniversary (1370-1870)*. Moscow, Synodal Typography on Nikolskaya Street,

1870.

[735]. Romanyuk, S. *From the History of Small Muscovite Streets*. Moscow, 1988.

[735:1]. Romanyuk, S. *From the History of Small Muscovite Streets*. Moscow, Svarog, 2000.

[735:2]. Romanyuk, S. *The Lands of the Muscovite Villages*. Part I. Moscow, Svarog, 2001.

[735:3]. Romanyuk, S. *The Lands of the Muscovite Villages*. Part II. Moscow, Svarog, 1999.

[736]. *The Russian Academy of Sciences. Personae*. Three books. Book 1: 1724-1917. Book 2: 1918-1973. Book 3: 1974-1999. Moscow, Nauka, 1999.

[737]. Rossovskaya, V. A. *The Calendarian Distance of Ages*. Moscow, Ogiz, 1930.

[738]. *A Guide to the Paschalia for the Seminary Schools*. Moscow, The V. Gautier Typography, 1853. Reprinted in Moscow by Grad Kitezh in 1991.

[739]. Bleskina, O. N., comp. *An Illustrated book of Manuscripts of the USSR AS Library*. Catalogue for an exhibition of illustrated chronicles of the XI-XIX century written with roman letters. Leningrad, The USSR AS Library, 1991.

[740]. *Handwritten and Typeset Books. Collected Articles*. Moscow, Nauka, 1975.

[741]. *Manuscripts of the Late XV – early XVI century*. The Kirillo-Belozersk Collection, 275/532. The M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin Public Library, St. Petersburg.

[742]. Roumyantsev, A. A. *Methods of Historical Analysis in the Works of Nikolai Aleksandrovich Morozov*. The Scientific

Institute of P. F. Lesgaft Notes, Vol. 10.
Leningrad, 1924.

[743]. Roumyantsev, A. A. *The Death and the Resurrection of the Saviour*. Moscow, Atheist, 1930.

[744]. Roumyantsev, N. V. *Orthodox Feasts*. Moscow, Ogiz, 1936.

[745]. *The Russian Bible. The Bible of 1499 and the Synodal Translation of the Bible*. Illustrated. 10 Vols. The Biblical Museum, 1992. Publishing department of the Muscovite Patriarchy, Moscow, 1992 (The Gennadievskaya Bible). Only the following volumes came out before the beginning of 2002: Vol. 4 (Book of Psalms), Vols. 7 and 8 (The New Testament), and Vol. 9 (Appendices, scientific descriptions). Vols. 7 and 8 were published by the Moscow Patriarchy in 1992; Vols. 4 and 9 published

by the Novospassky Monastery, Moscow, 1997 (Vol. 4), 1998 (Vol. 9).

[746]. *The Pioneer of Russian Printing. A Brief Biography. Ivan Fedorov's "Alphabet" Published in 1578.* In collaboration with Translesizdat Ltd. Blessed by the Editing Board of the Muscovite Patriarchy. Moscow, Spolokhi, 2000.

[747]. *Russian Chronographer of 1512.* The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles, Vol. 22. St. Petersburg, 1911.

[748]. Knyazevskaya, T. B., comp. *Russian Spiritual Chivalry.* Collected articles. Moscow, Nauka, 1996.

[749]. Leyn, K., ed. *Russian-German Dictionary.* 11th stereotype edition. Moscow, Russkiy Yazyk, 1991.

[750]. Dmitriev, N. K., ed. *Russian-Tartarian*

Dictionary. The USSR AS, Kazan Affiliate of the Language, Literature and History Institute. Kazan, Tatknigoizdat, 1955.

[750:1]. Mustaioki, A., and E. Nikkilä.

Russian-Finnish Didactic Dictionary. Abt. 12,500 words. Moscow, Russkiy Yazyk, 1982.

[751]. Shcherba, L. V., and M. R. Matousevich. *Russian-French Dictionary*. 9th stereotype edition. Moscow, Sovetskaya Encyclopaedia, 1969.

[752]. Rybakov, B. A. *From the History of Ancient Russia and Its Culture*. Moscow, MSU Press, 1984.

[753]. Rybakov, B. A. *The Kiev Russia and Russian Principalities. The XII-XIII century*. Moscow, Nauka, 1982, 1988.

[754]. Rybakov, B. A. *The Kiev Russia and Russian Principalities*. Moscow, Nauka,

1986.

- [755]. Rybnikov, K. A. *History of Mathematics*. Moscow, MSU Press, 1974.
- [756]. Ryabtsevitch, V. N. *What the Coins Tell Us*. Minsk, Narodnaya Asveta, 1977.
- [757]. Savelyev, E. P. *Cossacks and their History*. Vols. 1 and 2. Vladikavkaz, 1991. A reprint of E. Savelyev's *Ancient History of the Cossacks*. Novocherkassk, 1915.
- [758]. Savelyeva, E. A. *Olaus Magnus and his "History of the Northern Peoples."* Leningrad, Nauka, 1983. [Olaus Magnus. *Historia de gentibus septentrionalibus*, 1555].
- [759]. *Prince Obolensky's Almanach*. Part 1, Sections 1-7. N.p., 1866.
- [760]. Suetonius Caius Tranquillius. *History of the Twelve Caesars*. Moscow, Nauka, 1966.

See also the English edition: New York, AMS Press, 1967; as well as the one titled *The Twelve Caesars*. London, Folio Society, 1964.

[760:1]. *Collected Historical and Cultural Monuments of the Tatarstan Republic. Vol. 1. Administrative regions*. Kazan, Master Line, 1999.

[761]. *The General Catalogue of Slavic and Russian Handwritten Books Kept in USSR: The XI-XIII century*. Moscow, 1984.

[762]. *St. Stephen of Perm. The Old Russian Tales of Famous People, Places and Events* series. Article, text, translation from Old Russian, commentary. St. Petersburg, Glagol, 1995.

[763]. *Holy Relics of Old Moscow*. Russian National Art Library. Moscow, Nikos, Kontakt, 1993.

[763:1]. Stogov, Ilya, comp. *Holy Writings of the Mayans: Popol-Vukh, Rabinal-Achi*. Translated by R. V. Kinzhalov. With *The Report of Yucatan Affairs* by Brother Diego de Landa attached, translated by Y. V. Knorozov. The *Alexandrian Library* series. St. Petersburg, Amphora, 2000.

[764]. Semashko, I. I. *100 Great Women*. Moscow, Veche, 1999.

[765]. Sunderland, I. T. *Holy Books as Regarded by Science*. Gomel, Gomelskiy Rabochiy Western Regional, 1925.

[766]. Sergeyev, V. S. *The History of Ancient Greece*. Moscow-Leningrad, Ogiz, 1934.

[767]. Sergeyev, V. S. *Essays on the History of the Ancient Rome*. Vols. 1 and 2. Moscow, Ogiz, 1938.

[768]. Sizov, S. *Another Account of the Three "Unidentified" Sepulchres of the*

Arkhangelsky Cathedral of the Moscow Kremlin. Materials and Research.
Iskusstvo (Moscow), No. 1 (1973).

[768:1]. Shevchenko, V. F., ed. *Simbirsk and its Past. An Anthology of Texts on Local History*. Oulianovsk, Culture Studies Lab, 1993. The compilation includes the book by M. F. Superanskiy titled *Simbirsk and its Past (1648-1898). A Historical Account*, among others. Simbirsk, The Simbirsk Regional Scientific Archive Commission, The O. V. Mourakhovskaya Typography, 1899.

[769]. Sinelnikov, Vyacheslav (Rev. V. Sinelnikov). *The Shroud of Turin at Dawn of the New Era*. Moscow, Sretensky Friary, 2000.

[769:1]. Sinha, N. K., Banerjee, A. C. *History of India*. Moscow, Inostrannaya Literatura,

1954. English original: Calcutta, 1952.

[770]. Sipovskiy, V. D. *Native Antiquity: History of Russia in Accounts and Pictures*. Vol. 1: IX-XVI century. St. Petersburg, The V. F. Demakov Typography, 1879, 1888. Vol. 2: XIV-XVII century. St. Petersburg, D. D. Poluboyarinov Publishing House, 1904. Reprinted: Moscow, Sovremennik, 1993.

[771]. *The Tale of the Mamay Battle*. Facsimile edition. Moscow, Sovetskaya Rossiya, 1980.

[772]. *A Tale of the Lord's Passion*. Part of the Russian handwritten collection of Christian works in Church Slavonic. Private collection. The XVIII-XIX century.

[772:1]. *The Scythians, the Khazars and the Slavs. Ancient Russia. To the Centennary since the Birth of M. I. Artamonov*. Report

theses for the international scientific conference. St. Petersburg, State Hermitage, the State University of St. Petersburg, the RAS Institute of Material Culture History.

- [773]. Skornyakova, Natalya. *Old Moscow. Engravings and Lithographs of the XVI-XIX Century from the Collection of the State Museum of History*. Moscow, Galart, 1996.
- [774]. Skromnenko, S. (Stroev, S. M.) *The Inveracity of the Ancient Russian History and the Error of the Opinions Deeming Russian Chronicles Ancient*. St. Petersburg, 1834.
- [775]. Skrynnikov, R. G. *The Reign of Terror*. St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1992.
- [776]. Skrynnikov, R. G. *Ivan the Terrible*. Moscow, Nauka, 1975. The 2nd edition came out in 1983.

[777]. Skrynnikov, R. G. *Boris Godunov*.
Moscow, Nauka, 1983.

[778]. Skrynnikov, R. G. *The State and the Church in Russia. The XIV-XVI Century. Eminent Figures in the Russian Church*.
Novosibirsk, Nauka, Siberian Affiliate, 1991.

[779]. Skrynnikov, R. G. *The Tragedy of Novgorod*. Moscow, Sabashnikov, 1994.

[780]. Skrynnikov, R. G. *Russia before the "Age of Turmoil."* Moscow, Mysl, 1981.

[781]. *The Slavic Mythology. An Encyclopaedic Dictionary*. Moscow, Ellis Luck, 1995.

[781:0]. Tsepkov, A., comp. *The Slavic Chronicles*. St. Petersburg, Glagol, 1996.

[781:1]. *A Dictionary of Russian Don Dialects*, Vols. 1 and 2. Rostov-on-Don,

Rostov University Press, 1991.

[782]. *Dictionary of the Russian Language in the XI-XVII centuries*. Edition 1. Moscow, Nauka, 1975.

[783]. *Dictionary of the Russian Language in the XI-XVII centuries*. Edition 2. Moscow, Nauka.

[784]. *Dictionary of the Russian Language in the XI-XVII centuries*. Edition 3. Moscow, Nauka.

[785]. *Dictionary of the Russian Language in the XI-XVII centuries*. Edition 5. Moscow, Nauka.

[786]. *Dictionary of the Russian Language in the XI-XVII centuries*. Edition 6. Moscow, Nauka, 1979.

[787]. *Dictionary of the Russian Language in the XI-XVII centuries*. Edition 7. Moscow,

Nauka, 1980.

[788]. *Dictionary of the Russian Language in the XI-XVII centuries*. Edition 8. Moscow, Nauka.

[789]. *Dictionary of the Russian Language in the XI-XVII centuries*. Edition 11. Moscow, Nauka, 1986.

[790]. *Dictionary of the Russian Language in the XI-XVII centuries*. Edition 13. Moscow, Nauka, 1987.

[791]. *Dictionary of the Russian Language in the XI-XVII centuries*. Edition 19. Moscow, Nauka.

[792]. Smirnov, A. P. *The Scythians*. The USSR AS Institute of Archaeology. Moscow, Nauka, 1966.

[793]. Smirnov, F. *Christian Liturgy in the First Three Centuries*. Kiev, 1874.

[794]. Soboleva, N. A. *Russian Seals*. Moscow, Nauka, 1991.

[795]. *A Collection of State Edicts and Covenants*. Moscow, 1894.

[796]. *The Soviet Encyclopaedic Dictionary*. Moscow, Sovetskaya Encyclopaedia, 1979.

[797]. *The Soviet Encyclopaedic Dictionary*. Moscow, Sovetskaya Encyclopaedia, 1984.

[797:1]. *The Great Treasures of the World*. Gianni Guadalupi, ed. Moscow, Astrel, AST, 2001. Italian original: *I grandi tesori – l'arte orafa dall' antico egitto all XX secolo*. Edizioni White Star, 1998.

[798]. Solovyov, V. *Collected Works*. Vol. 6. St. Petersburg, 1898.

[799]. Solovyov, S. M. *Collected Works*. Book 4, Vols. 7-8. Moscow, Mysl, 1989.

[800]. Solovyov, S. M. *Collected Works*. Book

6. Moscow, Mysl, 1991.

[800:1]. Solovyov, S. M. *The History of the Ancient Russia*. Moscow, Prosveshchenie, 1992.

[801]. Solonar, P. *Most Probably Fiction...* The *Tekhnika i Nauka* magazine, No. 4 (1983): 28-32.

[802]. *The Reports of the Imperial Orthodox Society of Palestine*. April 1894. St. Petersburg, 1894.

[803]. Palamarchuk, Pyotr, comp. *Fourty Times Fourty. A Concise Illustrated History of All the Churches in Moscow*. 4 volumes. Moscow, Kniga i Biznes Ltd., Krom Ltd., 1995.

[804]. Sotnikova, M. P. *The Oldest Russian Coins of the X-XI century. Catalogue and Study*. Moscow, Banki i Birzhi, 1995.

- [805]. *The Spaso-Andronikov Monastery. A scheme. The Central Andrey Roublyov Museum of Ancient Russian Culture and Art.* Moscow, MO Sintez, 1989.
- [806]. Spasskiy, I. G. *The Russian Monetary System.* Leningrad, Avrora, 1970.
- [807]. Spasskiy, I. G. *The Russian "Yefimki." A Study and a Catalogue.* Novosibirsk, Nauka, Siberian Affiliation, 1988.
- [808]. Speranskiy, M. N. *Cryptography in Southern Slavic and Russian Literary Artefacts.* Published in the *Encyclopaedia of Slavic Philology* series. Leningrad, 1929.
- [808:1]. Spiridonov, A. M., and O. A. Yarovoy. *The Valaam Monastery: from Apostle Andrew to Hegumen Innocent (Historical Essays of the Valaam Monastery).* Moscow, Prometei, 1991.
- [809]. Spirina, L. M. *The Treasures of the*

Sergiev Posad State Reserve Museum of Art and History. Ancient Russian Arts and Crafts. Nizhny Novgorod, Nizhpoligraf, n.d.

[810]. *Contentious Issues of Native History of the XI-XVIII century.* Report theses and speeches of the first readings dedicated to the memory of A. A. Zimin. 13-18 May, 1990. Moscow, The USSR AS, Moscow State Institute of Historical and Archival Science, 1990.

[811]. Brouyevich, N. G., ed. *220 Years of the USSR Academy of Sciences. 1725-1945.* Moscow-Leningrad, The USSR AS Press, 1945.

[812]. *Mediaeval Decorative Stitching. Byzantium, the Balkans, Russia.* Catalogue of an exhibition. The XVIII Int'l Congress of Byzantine Scholars. Moscow, 8-15 August, 1991. Moscow, The USSR Ministry of

Culture. State Museums of the Moscow Kremlin, 1991.

- [813]. Sobolev, N. N., ed. *The Old Moscow*. Published by the Commission for the Studies of Old Moscow of the Imperial Archaeological Society of Russia. Issues 1, 2. Moscow, 1914 (Reprinted: Moscow, Stolitsa, 1993).
- [814]. *A Dictionary of Old Slavic (by the X-XI century Manuscripts)*. Moscow, Russkiy Yazyk, 1994.
- [815]. Starostin, E. V. *Russian History in Foreign Archives*. Moscow, Vysshaya Shkola, 1994.
- [815:1]. Stelletsky, I. Y. *In Search of the Library of Ivan the Terrible. The Mysteries of Russian History* series. Moscow, Sampo, 1999.
- [816]. Stepanov, N. V. *The New Style and the*

Orthodox Paschalia. Moscow, 1907.

[817]. Stepanov, N. V. *The Calendarian and Chronological Reference Book (for the Solution of Chronographical Time Problems)*. Moscow, Synodal typography, 1915.

[817:1]. Pletneva, S. A., volume ed. *The Eurasian Steppes in the Middle Ages*. Collected works. In the *USSR Archaeology* series. B. A. Rybakov, general ed. Moscow, Nauka, 1981.

[818]. Stingl, Miloslav. *Mysteries of the Indian Pyramids*. Transl. from Czech by I. O. Malevich. Moscow, Progress, 1982.

[819]. Strabo. *Geography*. Moscow, Ladomir, 1994. English edition: Jones, H.L. *The Geography of Strabo. With an English translation. I-VIII*. London, 1917-1932.

[820]. *Builders of the Burial Mounds and*

Dwellers of the Caves. The Extinct Civilizations encyclopaedia. Moscow, Terra, 1998. Translated from English by E. Krasoulin. Original edition: Time-Life Books BV, 1992.

[821]. Struyck, D. J. *A Brief Account of the History of Mathematics*. Moscow, Nauka, 1969.

[821:1]. Suzdalev, V. E. *Kolomenskoye – “Memory for Ages.”* Moscow, Praktik-A, 1993.

[822]. Sukina, L. B. *History of Esther in the Russian Cultrure of the Second Half of the XVII century*. Part of the compilation: Melnik, A. G., ed. *History and Culture of the land of Rostov*. 1998. Collected essays. Rostov, The Rostov Kremlin State Museum and Reserve, 1999.

[823]. Suleimanov, Olzhas. *Az and Ya*. Alma-

Ata, Zhazushy, 1975.

[823:1]. Sukhoroukov, Alexander. *From the History of Cards. The Cards Don't Lie! The Bridge in Russia* magazine, No.11 (18) (2002), pp. 78-80. Moscow, Minuvsheye.

[824]. Sytin, P. V. *From the History of Russian Streets*. Moscow, Moskovskiy Rabochiy, 1958.

[825]. Sytin, P. V. *The Toponymy of Russian Streets*. Moscow, 1959.

[826]. Samuels, Ruth. *Following the Paths of Hebraic History*. Moscow, Art-Business-Centre, 1993.

[827]. Tabov, Jordan. *The Decline of Old Bulgaria*. Sofia, Morang, 1997. Russian transl.: Moscow, Kraft and Lean, 2000.

[828]. Tabov, Jordan. *The New Chronology of the Balkans. The Old Bulgaria*. Sofia,

PCM-1, 2000.

[828:1]. Tabov, Jordan. *When did the Kiev Russia Become Baptized?* St. Petersburg, Neva. Moscow, Olma, 2003.

[829]. Rakhmanliev, R., comp. *Tamerlane. The Epoch. The Person. The Actions.* Collected works. Moscow, Gourash, 1992.

[830]. Tantlevskiy, I. R. *History and Ideology of the Qumran Community.* St. Petersburg, the RAS Institute of Oriental Studies, 1994.

[830:1]. Tate, Georges. *The Crusades.* Moscow, Olimp, Astrel, Ast, 2003.

[831]. *Tartarian-Russian Didactic Dictionary.* Moscow, Russkiy Yazyk, 1992.

[832]. Tatishchev, V. N. *Collected Works in Eight Volumes.* Moscow, Ladomir, 1994-1996.

[833]. Tacitus, Cornelius. *Collected Works.*

Vols. I, II. Leningrad, Nauka, 1969. English ed.: *The Works of Tacitus*. London, Corneli Taciti Historiarum libri qui supersunt. Published by Dr. Carl Heraeus. 4th ed.: Leipzig, G. Teubner, 1885.

- [834]. *The Works of Maxim the Confessor*. The œuvres of the Holy Fathers in Russian translation. Vol. 69. The Moscow Seminary Academy, 1915.
- [835]. *The Works of Nicephor, the Archbishop of Constantinople*. Moscow, 1904.
- [836]. *The Works of Nile, the Holy Pilgrim of Sinai*. The œuvres of the Holy Fathers in Russian translation. Vols. 31-33. The Moscow Seminary Academy, 1858-1859.
- [837]. *The Works of St. Isidore the Pelusiote*. The œuvres of the Holy Fathers in Russian translation. Vols. 34-36. The Moscow

Seminary Academy, 1859-1860.

[838]. Tvorogov, O. V. *Ancient Russia: Events and People*. St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1994.

[839]. Tvorogov, O. V. *The Ryurikovichi Princes. Short Biographies*. Moscow, Russkiy Mir, 1992.

[840]. Tereshchenko, Alexander. *A Final Study of the Saray Region, with a Description of the Relics of the Desht-Kipchak Kingdom*. Scientific Notes of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, the 1st and 3rd Department. Vol. 2. St. Petersburg, 1854. 89-105.

[841]. Tikhomirov, M. N. *Old Moscow. The XII-XV century. Mediaeval Russia as the International Crossroads. XIV-XV century*. Moscow, Moskovskiy Rabochiy, 1992.

[842]. Tikhomirov, M. N. *Russian Culture of the X-XIII century*. Moscow, 1968.

- [843]. Tikhomirov, M. N. *Mediaeval Moscow in the XIV-XV century*. Moscow, 1957.
- [844]. Tokmakov, I. F. *A Historical and Archaeological Description of the Moscow Stauropeigial Monastery of St. Simon*. Issues 1 and 2, Moscow, 1892-1896.
- [845]. Lopukhin, A. P., ed. *Explanatory Bible, or the Commentary to all of the Books of the Holy Writ, from both the Old and the New Covenant*. Vols. 1-12. Petersburg, published by the heirs of A. P. Lopukhin, 1904-1913. (2nd edition: Stockholm, the Bible Translation Institute, 1987).
- [846]. Toll, N. P. *The Saviour's Icon from K. T. Soldatenkov's Collection*. Moscow, 1933.
- [847]. Tolochko, P. P. *The Ancient Kiev*. Kiev, Naukova Dumka, 1976.
- [848]. Tolstaya, Tatyana. *The River Okkerville*.

Short Stories. Moscow, Podkova, 1999.

[849]. Troels-Lund, T. *The Sky and the Weltanschauung in the Flux of Time*. Odessa, 1912. German edition: Troels-Lund, T. *Himmelsbild und Weltanschauung im Wandel der Zeiten*. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1929.

[850]. Tronskiy, I. M. *The History of Ancient Literature*. Leningrad, Uchpedgiz, 1947.

[850:1]. Trofimov, Zhores. *The N. M. Karamzin Memorial in Simbirsk. Known and Unknown Facts*. Moscow, Rossia Molodaya, 1992.

[851]. *Trojan Tales. Mediaeval Courteous Novels on the Trojan War by the Russian Chronicles of the XVI and XVII century*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1972.

[851:1]. Thulsi Das. *The Ramayana, or Ramacharitamanasa. The Multitude of*

Rama's Heroic Deeds. Translated from Hindi by Academician A. P. Barannikov. Moscow-Leningrad, The USSR AS, Institute of Oriental Studies. Published by the USSR Academy of Sciences in 1948.

[852]. Tunmann. *The Khans of Crimea*. Simferopol, Tavria, 1991.

[853]. Turaev, B. A. *The History of the Ancient Orient*. Moscow, Ogiz, 1936.

[854]. Shcheka, Y. V. *The Turkish-Russian Dictionary*. Abt. 18,000 words. 3rd stereotype edition. Moscow, Citadel, 2000.

[855]. Turkhan, Gian. Istanbul. Gate to the Orient. Istanbul, Orient, 1996 (in Russian).

[855:1]. Turkey. *The Book of Wanderings. A Historical Guide-book*. Moscow, Veche, Khartia, 2000.

[856]. *A Millennium since the Baptism of*

Russia. The materials of the International Ecclesian and Historical Conference (Kiev, 21-28 July, 1986). Moscow, Moscow Patriarchy, 1988.

[857]. Ouzdennikov, V. V. *Russian Coins. 1700-1917*. Moscow, Finances and Statistics, 1986.

[857:1]. *The Ukrainian Books Printed in Cyrillics in the XVI-XVII century*. A catalogue of editions kept in the V. I. Lenin State Library of USSR. Issue I. 1574 – 2nd half of the XVII century. Moscow, The State V. I. Lenin Library of the Lenin Order. Rare books department. 1976.

[858]. *The Streets of Moscow. A Reference Book*. Moscow, Moskovskiy Rabochiy, 1980.

[859]. *The Ural Meridian. Topical Itineraries. A Reference Guide-book*. Chelyabinsk, The

Southern Ural Press, 1986.

- [860]. Ousanovich, M. I. *The Scientific Foresight of N. A. Morozov. The Successes of Chemistry*, Vol. 16, Issue 3 (1947).
- [861]. Ouspensky, D. N. *Modern Problems of Orthodox Theology*. The Moscow Patriarchy magazine, No. 9 (1962): 64-70.
- [862]. *The Writ. The Pentateuch of Moses (from the Genesis to the Revelation)*. Translation, introduction, and comments by I. S. Shifman. Moscow, Respublika, 1993.
- [863]. Fyson, Nance. *The Greatest Treasures of the World. An Atlas of the World's Wonders*. Moscow, Bertelsmann Media Moskau, 1996. Mondruck Graphische Betriebe GmbH, Güntherslau (Germany), 1996. Translated from the English edition published by AA Publishing (a trading name of Automobile Association Development

Limited, whose registered office is Norfolk House, Priestly Road, Basing-stoke, Hampshire RG24 9NY).

[864]. Falkovich, S. I. *Nikolai Alexandrovich Morozov, His Life and Works on Chemistry*. The *Priroda (Nature)* magazine, No. 11 (1947).

[865]. Falkovich, S. I. *Nikolai Alexandrovich Morozov as a Chemist (1854-1946)*. The *USSR AS Courier*, Chemical Studies Department, No. 5 (1947).

[866]. Fasmer, M. *An Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language*. Vols. 1-4. Translated from German. Moscow, Progress, 1986-1987.

[867]. [Fedorov]. *Ivan Fedorov [The Alphabet]*. A facsimile edition. Moscow, Prosveshchenie, 1974.

[868]. Fedorov, V. V., and A. T. Fomenko.

Statistical Estimation of Chronological Nearness of Historical Texts. A collection of articles for the *Problems of stochastic model stability* magazine. Seminar works. The National System Research Institute, 1983. 101-107. English translation published in the *Journal of Soviet Mathematics*, Vol. 32, No. 6 (1986): 668-675.

[869]. Fedorov-Davydov, G. A. *The Coins of the Muscovite Russia*. Moscow, MSU Press, 1981.

[870]. Fedorov-Davydov, G. A. *The Coins of the Nizhny Novgorod Principality*. Moscow, MSU Press, 1989.

[870:1]. Fedorov-Davydov, G. A. *Burial Mounds, Idols and Coins*. Moscow, Nauka, 1968.

[871]. Fedorov-Davydov, G. A. *Eight Centuries*

of Taciturnity. The Nauka i Zhizn (Science and Life) magazine, No. 9 (1966): 74-76.

[872]. Fedorova, E. V. *Latin Epigraphics*. Moscow University Press, 1969.

[873]. Fedorova, E. V. *Latin Graffiti*. Moscow University Press, 1976.

[874]. Fedorova, E. V. *Imperial Rome in Faces*. Moscow University Press, 1979.

[875]. Fedorova, E. V. *Rome, Florence, Venice. Historical and Cultural Monuments*. Moscow University Press, 1985.

[876]. Theophilactus Simocattas. *History*. Moscow, Arktos, 1996.

[876:1]. Fersman, A. E. *Tales of Gemstones*. Moscow, Nauka, 1974.

[877]. Flavius, Joseph. *The Judean War*. Minsk, Belarus, 1991.

[878]. Flavius, Joseph. *Judean Antiquities*.

Vols. 1, 2. Minsk, Belarus, 1994.

[879]. *Florentine Readings: The Life and Culture of Italy. Summer Lightnings.* Collected essays, translated by I. A. Mayevsky. Moscow, 1914.

[880]. Florinsky, V. M. *Primeval Slavs according to the Monuments of their Pre-Historic Life.* Tomsk, 1894.

[881]. Voigt, G. *The Renaissance of the Classical Literature.* Vols. I and II. Moscow, 1885. German edition: *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Altertums oder das erste Jahrhundert des Humanismus.* Berlin, G. Reimer, 1893.

[882]. Foley, John. *The Guinness Encyclopaedia of Signs and Symbols.* Moscow, Veche, 1996. Original by Guinness Publishing Ltd., 1993.

[883]. Fomenko, A. T. "On the Calculations of

the Second Derivative of Lunar Elongation.” The problems of the mechanics of navigated movement. *Hierarchic systems*. The Inter-University Collection of Scientific Works. Perm, 1980. 161-166.

[884]. Fomenko, A. T. “Several Statistical Regularities of Information Density Distribution in Texts with Scales.” *Semiotics and Informatics*. Moscow, The National Scientific and Technical Information Institute Publication, Issue 15 (1980): 99-124.

[885]. Fomenko, A. T. *Informative Functions and Related Statistical Regularities*. Report theses of the 3rd International Probability Theory and Mathematical Statistics Conference in Vilnius, the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences Institute of Mathematics and Cybernetics, 1981, Volume 2, pages 211-212.

[886]. Fomenko, A. T. *Duplicate Identification Methods and some of their Applications*. In *Doklady AN SSSR* (The USSR Academy of Sciences), Vol. 256, No. 6 (1981): 1326-1330.

[887]. Fomenko, A. T. *On the Qualities of the Second Derivative of Lunar Elongation and Related Statistical Regularities*. The Issues of Computational and Applied Mathematics. A collection of academic works. The Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Republic of Uzbekistan. Tashkent, Issue 63 (1981): 136-150.

[888]. Fomenko, A. T. *New Experimental Statistical Methods of Dating the Ancient Events and their Applications to the Global Chronology of the Ancient and Mediaeval World*. Pre-print. Order No. 3672, No. BO7201. Moscow, State

Committee for Radio and TV Broadcasting, 1981. 1-100. English translation: Fomenko, A. T. *Some new empirical-statistical methods of dating and the analysis of present global chronology*. London, The British Library, Department of Printed Books. 1981. Cup. 918/87.

[889]. Fomenko, A. T. *Calculating the Second Derivative of Lunar Elongation and Related Statistical Regularities in the Distribution of Some Astronomical Data*. In *Operational and Automatic System Research*, Issue 20 (1982): 98-113. Kiev University Press.

[890]. Fomenko, A. T. *Concerning the Mystification Issue*. In *Science and Technology*, No. 11 (1982): 26-29.

[891]. Fomenko, A. T. *New Empirico-Statistical Method of Ordering Texts and*

Applications to Dating Problems. In *Doklady AN SSSR* (The USSR Academy of Sciences Publications), Vol. 268, No. 6 (1983): 1322-1327.

[892]. Fomenko, A. T. *Distribution Geometry for Entire Points in Hyperregions*. The Vector and Tensor Analysis Seminar works (Moscow, MSU Press), Issue 21 (1983): 106-152.

[893]. Fomenko, A. T. *The Author's Invariant of Russian Literary Texts*. Methods of Qualitative Analysis of Narrative Source Texts. Moscow, The USSR History Institute (The USSR Academy of Sciences), 1983. 86-109.

[894]. Fomenko, A. T. *The Global Chronological Map*. In *Chemistry and Life*, No. 11 (1983): 85-92.

[895]. Fomenko, A. T. *New Methods of the*

Chronologically Correct Ordering of Texts and their Applications to the Problems of Dating the Ancient Events. Operational and Automatic System Research (Kiev University Press), Issue 21 (1983): 40-59.

[896]. Fomenko, A. T. *Methods of Statistical Processing of Parallels in Chronological Text and the Global Chronological Map.* Operational and Automatic System Research (Kiev University Press), Issue 22 (1983): 40-55.

[897]. Fomenko, A. T. *Statistical Frequency Damping Analysis of Chronological Texts and Global Chronological Applications.* Operational and Automatic System Research (Kiev University Press), Issue 24 (1984): 49-66.

[898]. Fomenko, A. T. *New Empirico-Statistical Method of Parallelism*

Determination and Duplicate Dating.
Problems of stochastic model stability.
Seminar works. The National System
Research Institute, Moscow, 1984. 154-
177.

[899]. Fomenko, A. T. *Frequency Matrices and their Applications to Statistical Processing of Narrative Sources.* Report theses of the “Complex Methods of Historical Studies from Antiquity to Contemporaneity” conference. The Commission for Applying Natural Scientific Methods to Archaeology. Moscow, The USSR History Institute (The USSR Academy of Sciences), 1984. 135-136.

[900]. Fomenko, A. T. *Informative Functions and Related Statistical Regularities.* Statistics. Probability. Economics. The *Academic Statistical Notes* series. Vol. 49. Moscow, Nauka, 1985. 335-342.

[901]. Fomenko, A. T. *Duplicates in Mixed Sequences and the Frequency Damping Principle*. Report theses of the 4th Int'l Probability Theory and Mathematical Statistics Conference in Vilnius, the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences Institute of Mathematics and Cybernetics, Vol. 3. 1985. 246-248.

[902]. Fomenko, A. T., and L. E. Morozova. *Several Issues of Statistical Annual Account Source Processing Methods*. Mathematics in mediaeval narrative source studies. Moscow, Nauka, 1986. 107-129.

[903]. Fomenko, A. T. *Identifying Dependencies and Layered Structures in Narrative Texts*. Problems of stochastic model stability. Seminar works. The National System Research Institute, 1987. 33-45.

[904]. Fomenko, A. T. *Methods of Statistical Analysis of Narrative Texts and Chronological Applications. (The Identification and the Dating of Derivative Texts, Statistical Ancient Chronology, Statistics of the Ancient Astronomical Reports)*. Moscow, Moscow University Press, 1990.

[905]. Fomenko, A. T. *Statistical Chronology*. New facts in life, science and technology. The *Mathematics and Cybernetics*” series, No. 7. Moscow, Znanie, 1990.

[906]. Fomenko, A. T. *Global Chronology. (A Research of Classical and Mediaeval History. Mathematical Methods of Source Analysis.)* Moscow, MSU Department of Mathematics and Mechanics, 1993.

[907]. Fomenko, A. T. *A Criticism of the Traditional Chronology of Antiquity and*

the Middle Ages (What Century is it Now?). A précis. Moscow, MSU Department of Mathematics and Mechanics, 1993.

[908]. Fomenko, A. T. *Methods of Mathematical Analysis of Historical Texts. Chronological Applications.* Moscow, Nauka, 1996.

[909]. Fomenko, A. T. *The New Chronology of Greece. Antiquity in the Middle Ages.* Vols. 1 and 2. Moscow, MSU Centre of Research and Pre-University Education, 1996.

[910]. Fomenko, A. T. *Statistical Chronology. A Mathematical View of History. What Century is it Now?* Belgrade, Margo-Art, 1997.

[911]. Fomenko, A. T. *Methods of Statistical Analysis of Historical Texts. Chronological Applications.* Vols. 1 and 2.

Moscow, Kraft and Lean, 1999.

[912]. Fomenko, A. T. *New Methods of Statistical Analysis of Historical Texts. Applications to Chronology*. Vol. 1, Vol. 2. Vol. 3: Fomenko, A. T. *Antiquity in the Middle Ages. (Greek and Bible History)*. Published in the series *Russian Studies in Mathematics and Sciences*. Scholarly Monographs in Russian. Vol. 6-7. Lewiston-Queenston-Lampeter, The Edwin Mellen Press, 1999.

[912:1]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *Demagogism instead of Scientific Analysis*. The RAS Courier, Vol. 9, No. 19 (2000): 797-800.

[912:2]. Fomenko, A. T., and G. V. Nosovskiy. *In Re the "Novgorod Datings" of A. A. Zaliznyak and V. L. Yanin*. The RAS Courier, Vol. 72, No. 2 (2002): 134-140.

[912:3]. Fomenko, T. N. *The Astronomical Datings of the "Ancient" Egyptian Zodiacs of Dendera and Esne (Latopolis)*. In: Kalashnikov, V. V., G. V. Nosovskiy, and A. T. Fomenko. *The Astronomical Analysis of Chronology. The Almagest. Zodiacs*. Moscow, The Delovoi Express Financial, 2000. 635-810.

[913]. *The Epistle of Photius, the Holy Patriarch of Constantinople, to Michael, Prince of Bulgaria, on the Princely Incumbencies*. Moscow, 1779. See also: Photius. *Patriarch of Constantinople, Epistola ad Michaellem Bulgarorum Regem*. In: *Roman Spicilegium*. Rome, 1839-1844.

[914]. Cardini, Franco. *Origins of the Mediaeval Knightage*. A condensed translation from Italian by V. P. Gaiduk. La

Nuova Italia, 1982. Moscow, Progress Publications, 1987.

[914:1]. France, Anatole. *Selected Short Stories*. Leningrad, Lenizdat, 1959.

[915]. Pototskaya, V. V., and N. P. Pototskaya. *French-Russian Dictionary*. 12th stereotype edition. Moscow, Sovetskaya Encyclopaedia. 1967.

[916]. Godfrey, Fr. O. F. M. *Following Christ*. Israel, Palphot Ltd., Millennium 2000, 2000.

[917]. Frazer, J. *Attis*. Moscow, Novaya Moskva, 1924. English ed.: *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*. London, Macmillan & Co, 1907.

[918]. Frazer, J. *Golden Bough*. Release 1. Moscow-Leningrad, Ogiz, 1931.

[919]. Frazer, J. *Golden Bough*. Releases 3, 4. Moscow, Atheist, 1928.

- [920]. Frazer, J. *The Folklore in the Old Testament. Studies in Comparative Religion*. Moscow-Leningrad, Ogiz, The State Social Economics, 1931. English original: London, Macmillan & Co., 1918.
- [921]. Fren, H. M. *Coins of the Khans of Juchiev Ulus of the Golden Horde*. St. Petersburg, 1832.
- [922]. Frumkina, R. M. *Statistical Methods of Lexical Studies*. Moscow, 1964.
- [923]. Thucydides. *The History of the Peloponnesian War*. Eight books. Translated by F. G. Mishchenko. Vols. 1, 2. Vol. 1: books 1-4. Vol. 2: books 5-8. Moscow, 1887-1888. English edition published in the series “*Great Books of the Western World*”. Vol. 5. Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. Chicago, The University of Chicago, 1952 (2nd edition 1990). See also

the Penguin Books edition. London, 1954.

[924]. Thucydides. *History*. Leningrad, Nauka, 1981.

[925]. von Senger, Harro. *Stratagems. On the Chinese Art of Life and Survival*. Moscow, Progress, 1995.

[926]. Herrmann, D. *The Pioneers of the Skies*. Translated from German by K. B. Shingareva and A. A. Konopikhin. Moscow, Mir, 1981. German edition: Herrmann, Dieter B. *Entdecker des Himmels*. Leipzig-Jena-Berlin, Urania-Verlag, 1979.

[927]. Chlodowski, R. I. *Francesco Petrarch*. Moscow, Nauka, 1974.

[928]. *The Pilgrimage of Hegumen Daniel*. Literary Monuments of Ancient Russia. XII Century. Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1980. 25-115.

[929]. *Afanasy Nikitin's Voyage over the Three Seas. 1466-1472*. Moscow-Leningrad, the Academy of Sciences, Literary Masterpieces, The USSR AS Publications, 1948.

[930]. Hollingsworth, Mary. *Art in the History of Humanity*. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1989. Russian translation of the edition titled *L'Arte Nella Storia Dell'Uomo*. Saggio introduttivo di Giulio Carlo Argan. Firenze, Giunti Gruppo Editoriale, 1989.

[931]. *The Kholmogory Chronicle. The Dvina Chronicler*. The Complete Collection of Russian Chronicles, Vol. 33. Leningrad, Nauka, 1977.

[932]. Khomyakov, A. S. *Collected Works in Two Volumes*. A supplement to the *Issues of Philosophy*. Vol. 1. Works on historiosophy. Moscow, the Moscow Fund

of Philosophy, Medium Press, 1994.

[933]. Aconiatius, Nicetas. *History Beginning with the Reign of John Comnenus*. St. Petersburg, 1860. Also see the *Historia* by Nicetas Aconiatius in J. P. Migne's *Patrologiae cursus completes. Series graeca*. Vol. 140. Paris, 1857-1886.

[934]. Aconiatius, Nicetas. *History Beginning with the Reign of John Comnenus (1186-1206)*. The *Byzantine Historians* series, Vol. 5. St. Petersburg, 1862. Also see the *Historia* by Nicetas Aconiatius in J. P. Migne's *Patrologiae cursus completes. Series graeca*. Vol. 140. Paris, 1857-1886

[935]. Hogue, John. *Nostradamus. The Complete Prophecies*. First published in Great Britain in 1996 by Element Books Ltd., Shaftesbury, Dorset. Moscow, Fair-Press, The Grand Publishing and Trading

House, 1999.

[935:1]. Boutenev, Khreptovich. *Florence and Rome in Relation to Two XV-century Events in Russian History. A Concise Illustrated Account Compiled by Khreptovich Boutenev, Esq.* Moscow, 1909.

[936]. *Christianity. An Encyclopaedic Dictionary.* The Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Brockhaus and Efron. New Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Brockhaus and Efron. The Orthodox Encyclopaedia of Theology. Vols. 1-3. Moscow, The Great Russian Encyclopaedia, 1993.

[937]. Pokrovskiy, N. N., ed. *Christianity and the Russian Church of the Feudal Period (Materials).* Novosibirsk, Nauka, Siberian Affiliation, 1989.

[938]. Istrin, V. M., ed. *The Chronicle of John*

Malalas (A Slavic Translation). St.
Petersburg, 1911.

[939]. *The Chronographer*. Russian National
Library, the Manuscript Section.
Rumyantsevsky Fund, 457.

[940]. *The Lutheran Chronographer*. Private
collection, 1680.

[941]. Rantsov, V. L., comp. *The Chronology
of Global and Russian History*. St.
Petersburg, Brockhaus-Efron, 1905.
Reprinted in Kaliningrad: Argument,
Yantarny Skaz, 1995.

[942]. *The Chronology of Russian History. An
Encyclopaedic Reference Book*. Moscow,
Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya, 1994.

[943]. Prakhov, Adrian, ed. *The Treasures of
Russian Art*. A Monthly Almanac of the
Imperial Society for Supporting Fine Arts.
Year IV, No. 2-4, No. 5 (1904). Issue 5: The

Relics of the Savvino-Storozhevsky monastery. Historical review by Alexander Ouspensky. Reprinted in Moscow, Severo-Print Typography, 1998. To the 600th anniversary of the Savvino-Storozhevsky stauropegial friary.

[944]. Khoudyakov, M. G. *Accounts of the History of the Kazan Khanate*. Kazan, State Publishing House, 1923. Reprinted in: *On the Junction of Continents and Civilizations*. Moscow, Insan, 1996. Published separately: Moscow, Insan, SFK, 1991.

[945]. Kjetsaa, G., S. Gustavsson, B. Beckman, and S. Gil. *The Problems of the "Quiet flows the Don's" Authorship. Who Wrote the "Quiet flows the Don"?* Moscow, Kniga, 1989. Translated from the Solum Forlag edition. Oslo-New Jersey, Humanities Press.

- [946]. Zeitlin, Z. *Galileo*. The *Celebrity Biographies* series, Issue 5-6. The Literary Magazine Association, Moscow, 1935.
- [947]. Petrov, Leonid, comp. *The Dictionary of Ecclesial History. (A Referential Theological Dictionary, Predominantly Oriented At Ecclesial History)*. St. Petersburg, the Province Department Typography, 1889. Reprinted: the Sretenskiy Monastery, 1996.
- [948]. Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Dialogues. On the State. On the Laws*. Moscow, Nauka, 1966. English edition: Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Works*. Cambridge, Mass; Harvard University Press; London, Heinemann, 1977.
- [949]. Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Three Tractates on the Art of Rhetoric*. Moscow, Nauka, 1972. English edition: Cicero, Marcus

Tullius. *Works*. Cambridge, Mass; Harvard University Press; London, Heinemann, 1977.

[950]. Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *On the Old Age. On Friendship. On Responsibilities*. Moscow, Nauka, 1972. English edition: Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Old Age and Friendship...* London, Cassel's National Library, 1889.

[951]. Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Philosophical Tractates*. Moscow, Nauka, 1985. English edition: Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Works*. Cambridge, Mass; Harvard University Press; London, Heinemann, 1977.

[952]. Chagin, G. N. *The Ancient Land of Perm*. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1988.

[953]. Chekin, L. S. *The Cartography of the Christian Middle Ages in the VIII-XIII century*. Moscow, Oriental Literature, RAS,

1999.

[953:1]. Chernetsov, A. V. *The Gilded Doors of the XVI century. The Cathedrals of the Moscow Kremlin and the Trinity Cathedral of the Ipatyevsky Monastery in Kostroma.* Moscow, The RAS, Nauka, 1992.

[954]. Chernin, A. D. *The Physics of Time.* Moscow, Nauka, 1987.

[955]. Chernykh, P. Y. *A Historical and Etymological Dictionary of the Modern Russian Language.* Vols. 1, 2. Moscow, Russkiy Yazyk, 1993.

[955:1]. Chernyak, E. B. *The Mysteries of France. Conspiracy, Intrigue, Mystification.* Moscow, Ostozhye Press, 1996.

[955:2]. Chernyak, E. B. *The Time of the Conspiracies Long Forgotten.* Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye Otnosheniya, 1994.

[956]. Chertkov, A. D. *On the Language of the Pelasgians that used to Inhabit Italy, and its Comparison to Ancient Slavic*. The periodical edition of the Moscow Society for the Historical Studies of Russian Antiquities, Book 23. Moscow, 1855.

[957]. Chertkov, A. D. *A Description of Ancient Russian Coins*. Moscow, Selivanovsky Typography, 1834.

[958]. Cinzia, Valigi. *Rome and the Vatican*. Narni-Terni, Italy, Plurigraf, 1995.

[959]. Chistovich, I. *Textual Corrections of the Slavic Bible Before the 1751 Edition*. (Article 2). The Orthodox Review, Vol. 12 (May Book, 1860): 41-72.

[960]. Chistyakov, A. S. *The Story of Peter the Great*. Reprint. Moscow, Buklet, Dvoynaya Raduga, 1992.

[961]. Chistyakova, N. A., and N. V. Voulikh.

The History of Ancient Literature.

Moscow, Vyshaya Shkola, 1972.

[962]. *Imperial Society for History and Russian Antiquities Readings*. Book I, Part 5. 1858.

[963]. *The Miraculous Icons of Our Lady*. Sisterhood of the Holy Martyr Elizabeth, the Great Princess. 103287. Moscow, 40, 2nd Khutorskaya St., 1998.

[964]. [Champollion] *J. F. Champollion and Egyptian Hieroglyphs Deciphered*. Collected works under the general editorship of I. S. Katznelson. Moscow, Nauka, 1979.

[965]. Chantepie de la Saussaye, D. P. *Illustrated History of Religions*. Moscow, 1899. English edition: *Manual of the Science of Religion*. London-New York, Longmans, Green and Co., 1891.

[966]. Chantepie de la Saussaye, D. P.
Illustrated History of Religions. Vols. 1
and 2. Moscow, Spaso-Preobrazhensky
Stauropigial Monastery of Valaam, reprinted
in 1992.

[967]. Shakhmatov, A. A. *Manuscript
Description. The Radzivilovskaya
Chronicle, or the Chronicle of Königsberg*.
Vol. 12. Articles on the text and the
miniatures of the manuscript. St. Petersburg,
Imperial Antiquarian Bibliophile Society,
CXVIII, 1902.

[968]. Shevchenko, M. Y. *The Star Catalogue
of Claudius Ptolemy: Special
Characteristics of Ancient Astronomical
Observations*. Historico-Astronomical
Research. Issue 17. Moscow, Nauka, 1988.
167-186.

[969]. *Masterpieces among the Paintings in*

the Museums of the USSR. The Art of Ancient Russia. The Renaissance Art. Issue 1. Moscow, Goznak, 1974.

[970]. Sheynman, M. M. *Belief in the Devil in the History of Religion.* Moscow, Nauka, 1977.

[971]. Shakespeare. *Collected Works in Five Volumes.* From the *Library of Great Writers* series under the editorship of S. A. Vengerov. St. Petersburg, Brockhaus-Efron, 1902-1904.

[972]. Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works in Eight Volumes.* Under the editorship of A. Smirnov and A. Anixt. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1960.

[973]. Shakespeare, William. *King Richard III. Tragedy in Five Acts.* Translated by Georgy Ben. St. Petersburg, Zvezda, 1997.

[974]. *600th Anniversary of the Kulikovo*

Battle. Brochure. Vneshtorgizdat, Moscow State Museum of History. 1980.

[975]. Shilov, Y. A. *The Proto-Homeland of the Aryans. History, Tradition, Mythology*. Kiev, Sinto, 1995.

[976]. Shiryaev, A. N. *Consecutive Statistical Analysis*. Moscow, Nauka, 1976.

[977]. Shiryaev, E. E. *Belarus: White Russia, Black Russia and Lithuania on the Maps*. Minsk, Science & Technology, 1991.

[978]. Shklovsky, I. S. *Supernovae*. Moscow, 1968 (1st edition). Moscow, Nauka, 1976 (2nd edition). English edition: London-New York, Wiley, 1968.

[979]. Schlezer, A. L. *Public and Private Life of Augustus Ludwig Schlezer as Related by Himself*. In the *Imperial Academy of Sciences, Russian Language and Literature Department* series, Vol. 13. St.

Petersburg, 1875.

[980]. Shlyapkin I. A. *Description of the Manuscripts of the Spaso-Yefimiev Monastery in Suzdal*. The Masterpieces of Ancient Literature, Issue 4, No. 16. St. Petersburg, 1881.

[981]. Spilevskiy A. V. *The Almagest and Chronology*. The Ancient History Courier, No. 3 (1988): 134-160.

[982]. Schulmann, Eliezer. *The Sequence of Biblical Events*. Translated from Hebrew. Moscow, the Ministry of Defence Publications, 1990.

[983]. Shchepkin, V. N. *Russian Palaeography*. Moscow, Nauka, 1967.

[984]. Shcherbatov, M. M. *Russian History from the Dawn of Time*. St. Petersburg, 1901.

[985]. Eulia, Chelebi. *The Book of Travels. Campaigns of the Tatars and Voyages through the Crimea (1641-1667)*. Simferopol, Tavria, 1996.

[985:1]. Eisler, Colin (Leman, Robert). *The Museums of Berlin*. Moscow, Colin Eisler and Little, Brown and Company, Inc. Compilation. Slovo, the *World's Greatest Museums* series, 2002 (1996).

[985:2]. Eisler, Colin. *The Art of the Hermitage*. Moscow, Biblion, 2001.

[986]. Aitken, M. J. *Physics and Archaeology*. Moscow, IL, 1964. English original: New York, Interscience Publishers, 1961.

[987]. Ehlebracht, Peter. *Tragedy of the Pyramids. Egyptian Shrines Plundered for 5000 Years*. Moscow, Progress, 1984. German original: *Haltet die Pyramiden Fest! 5000 Jahre Grabraub in Ägypten*.

Düsseldorf-Vienna, Econ, 1980.

[1987:1]. Englund, Peter. *Poltava. How an Army Perished*. Moscow, Novoye Literaturnoye Obozrenie, 1995. Original: Stockholm, Bokförlaget Atlantis, 1988.

[1988]. *The Encyclopaedic Dictionary*. Vols. 1-82; supplementary volumes 1-4. St. Petersburg, Brockhaus and Efron, 1890-1907.

[1988:0]. Brockhaus, F. A., and I. A. Efron. *The Encyclopaedic Dictionary*. St. Petersburg, 1898. Reprinted: St. Petersburg, Polradis, 1994.

[1988:1]. *Encyclopaedia for Children*. Vol. 7: *Art*. Moscow, Avanta-plus, 1997.

[1989]. *The Encyclopaedia of Elementary Mathematics. Book 1. Arithmetics*. Moscow-Leningrad, the State Publishing House of Theoretical Technical Literature,

1951.

[1990]. Artamonov, M. I., ed. *The Hermitage*.
Album. Leningrad, Sovetskiy Khudozhnik,
1964.

[1991]. Ern, V. *The Revelation in Thunder and
Storm. Anatomy of N. A. Morozov's Book*.
Moscow, 1907.

[1991:1]. *The Art of Goldsmithery in Russia*.
Album. Moscow, Interbook-Business, Yural
Ltd, 2002.

[1992]. Yuvalova, E. P. *German Sculpture of
1200-1270*. Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1983.

[1993]. Yanin, V. L. *I Sent You a Birch-Rind
Epistle*. Moscow, MSU Press, 1965. A
revised edition: Moscow, 1998.

[1993:1]. Jannella, Cecilia. *Simone Martini*.
Album. Moscow, Slovo, 1996. Scala, 1995,
Istituto Forografico Editoriale.

- [994]. Ponomaryov, A. M., ed. *Yaroslavl. History of the City in Documents and First-Hand Materials from First References to 1917*. Yaroslavl, Upper Volga Publications, 1990.
- [995]. *Yaroslavl. Map 0-37 (1:1,000,000)*. The General Council of Ministers, Department of Geodetics and Cartography, 1980.
- [996]. *Yaroslavl. Monuments of Art and Architecture*. Yaroslavl: Upper Volga Publications, 1994.

Sources in foriegn languages

- [997]. Chrysostomos, Abbot. *The Holy Royal Monastery of Kykko Founded with a Cross*. Limassol, Cyprus, Kykko Monastery, printed by D. Couvas & Sons, Ltd., 1969.
- [998]. *ABC kulturnich pamatek Ceskoslovenska*. Prague, Panorama, 1985.
- [999]. Abulafia, David. *Frederick II. A Medieval Emperor*. New York-Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1988.
- [1000]. Abu Mashar. *De magnis coinctiombus*. Augsburg, Erhard Ratdolt (The Pulkovo Observatory Library), 1489.
- [1001]. Adam, L. *North-West American Indian Art and its Early Chinese Parallels*. Man, Volume 36, No. 2-3 (1936): 45.
- [1002]. Puech, Aime. *St. Jean Chrisostome et les mœurs de son temps*. Paris, 1891.

- [1003]. Albright, W. F. *From the Stone Age to Christianity*. 7th edition. New York, 1957.
- [1004]. Albumasar. *De Astrú Scientia*. 1515.
(The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)
- [1005]. Alibert, Louis. *Dictionnaire Occitan-Francais. Selon les parles languedociens*. Toulouse, Institut d'études Occitanes, 1996.
- [1006]. *A List of Books on the History of Science*. 2nd supplement, Part 3.
Astronomy. Chicago, The J. Crerar Library, 1944.
- [1007]. Allen, Phillip. *L'Atlas des Atlas. Le monde vu par les cartographes*. Brepols, 1993.
- [1008]. *Almagestu Cl. Ptolemaei Phelusiensis Alexandrini*. Anno Virginei Partus, 1515.
- [1009]. *America. Das frühe Bild der Neuen Welt. Ausstellung der Bayerischen*

Staatsbibliothek München. Munich, Prestel Verlag, 1992.

[1009:1]. Silverman, David P., ed. *Ancient Egypt*. New York, Oxford University Press, 1977.

[1010]. Thorpe, B., ed. *Ancient Laws and Institutes of England...* Volume 1. London, 1840. 198.

[1011]. Anke, Victor. *The Life of Charlemagne*. Aachen, Einhard Verlag, 1995.

[1012]. *Annales de la Société Royale d'Archéologie de Bruxelles. Fondée a Bruxelles en 1887. Mémoires, rapports et documents*. Publication périodique. Tome 41e. Secrétariat Général. Musée de la Porte de Hal Bruxelles. 1937.

[1013]. Apianus, P. *Cosmographicus Liber Petri Apiani mathematici studiose*

collectus. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library). Landshutae, impensis P. Apiani, 1524.

[1013:1]. Arellano, Alexandra. *All Cuzco. Peru*. Fisa Escudo de Oro. Centre of Regional Studies of the Andes Bartolomé de las Casas, Lima, Peru. Instituto de Investigacion de la Facultad de Turismo y Hotelria, Universidad San Martin de Porres. 1999.

[1014]. Arnim, H. *Sprachliche Forschungen zur Chronologie der platonischen Dialoge*. Volume 269. Appendix 3. Sitzungen Wiener Akademie, 1912.

[1015]. Wolff, Arnold. *Cologne Cathedral. Its history – Its Works of Art*. Greven Verlag Köln GmbH, 1995.

[1016]. Wolff, Arnold, Rainer Gaertner, and Karl-Heinz Schmitz. *Cologne on the Rhine*

with City Map. Cologne,
Verlagsgesellschaft GmbH, 1995.

[1017]. Wolff, Arnold. *The Cologne Cathedral*. Cologne, Vista Point Verlag, 1990.

[1017:0]. Sachs, Abraham J. *Astronomical Diaries and Related Texts from Babylonia*. Compiled and edited by Hermann Hunger. Volume 1: Diaries from 652 BC to 262 BC. Volume 2: Diaries from 261 BC to 165 BC. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften Philosophisch-Historische Klasse Denkschriften, 195. Bad. Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vienna, 1988.

[1017:1]. Walker, Christopher, ed. *Astronomy before the Telescope*. Foreword by P. Moore. British Museum Press, 1996.

[1018]. Palairer, Jean. *Atlas Méthodique*,

Composé pour l'usage de son altesse sérénissime monseigneur le prince d'Orange et de Nassau stadhouder des sept provinces unies, etc. etc. etc. Se trouve à Londres, chez Mess. J. Nourse & P. Vaillant dans le Strand; J. Neaulme à Amsterdam & à Berlin; & P. Gosse à La Haye. 1755.

[1019]. *Atlas Minor sive Geographia compendiosa in q.v. a Orbis Terrarum paucis attamen novissimis Tabvlis ostenditvr. // Atlas Nouveau, contenant toutes les parties du monde, Où font Exactly Remarquees les Empires Monarchies, Royaumes, Etats, Republiques, &c, &c, &c. Receuillies des Meilleurs Auteurs. Amsterdam: Regner & Josue Ottens, n.d.*

[1020]. Auè, Michèlé. *Discover Cathar country. Le Pays Cathare. Toulouse, MSM,*

1992.

[1021]. Bacharach. *Astronomia*. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library), 1545.

[1022]. Bailly, J. S. *Histoire de l'astronomie ancienne depuis son origine jusqu'à l'établissement de l'école d'Alexandrie*. Paris, 1st edition 1775, 2nd edition 1781.

[1023]. Baily, F. *An account of the life of Sir John Flaemsted*. London, 1835.

[1024]. Baily, F. *The Catalogues of Ptolemy, Ulugh Beigh, Tycho Brahe, Halley and Hevelins, deduced from the best authorities*. Royal Astr. Soc. Memoirs, XIII (1843): 1-248.

[1025]. Bakker, I., I. Vogel, and T. Wislanski. *TRB and other C-14 Dates from Poland*. *Helinium*, IX, 1969.

[1025:1]. Baldauf, Robert. *Historie und Kritik*.

(*Einige kritische Bemerkungen.*). Basel:
Friedrich Reinhardt, Universitäts-
buchdruckerei, 1902.

[1026]. Bartholomaeus, Angicus. *De proprietatibus rerum*. lib. XV, cap. CXXXI. Apud A. Koburger. Nurenbergi, 1492,

[1027]. Barron, Roderick. *Decorative Maps. With Forty Full Colour Plates*. London, Bracken Books, 1989.

[1028]. Basilica, Sainte Cécile. *Albi. As de Cœur Collection. Guided Visit*. Albi, France: Apa-Poux S. A. Albi, 1992.

[1028:1]. Bély, Lucien. *Discovering the Cathars*. France, Éditions Sud Ouest, 2001.

[1029]. Bennet, J.A. *The Divided Circle. A History of Instruments for Astronomy Navigation and Surveying*. Christie's, Oxford, Phaidon, 1987.

- [1030]. de Sainte-Maure, Benoit. *Chronique des ducs de Normandie par Benoit*. Publee... par C. Fahlin, t. I. In: Bibliotheca Ekmaniana universitatis regiae Upsaliensis, Uppsala, 1951. 8-11.
- [1031]. del Castillo, Conquistador Bernal Días. *The Discovery and Conquest of Mexico*. New Introduction by Hugh Thomas. New York, Da Capo Press. 1996.
- [1032]. Bernard, Lewis. *The Middle East. A brief History of the Last 2000 Years*. New York, Simon & Schuster, 1997.
- [1033]. *Bibliography of books and papers published in 1963 on the History of Astronomy*. Moscow: Nauka, 1964.
- [1034]. Binding, Rudolf G. *Der Goldene Schrein. Bilder deutschen Meister auf Goldgrund*. Leipzig, 1934.
- [1035]. Blaeu, Joan. *Novus Atlas Sinensis*,

1655. Faksimiles nach der Prachtausgabe der Herzog von der August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel. Herausgegeben von der Stiftung Volkswagenwerk Hannover. Mit Beiträgen von Hans Kauffmann und Yorck Alexander Haase, und einem Geleitwort von Gotthard Gambke. Verlag Müller und Schindler, 1973.

[1036]. *Le Grand Atlas de Blaeu. Le Monde au XVIIe siècle*. Introduction, descriptions et choix des cartes par John Goss. Ancien conseiller-expert cartographe chez Sotheby's. Avant-propos de Peter Clark. Conservateur à la Royal Geographical Society. Adaptation Française de Irmina Spinner. Publié avec le concours de la Royal Geographical Society. Paris: Gründ, 1992. Les cartes originales de *Grand Atlas de Blaeu. Le monde au XVIIe siècle* ont été publiées par Blaeu dans son *Atlas Major*

publié à Amsterdam en 1662. L'édition originale 1990 par Studio Editions sous le titre original *Blaeu's Grand Atlas of the 17th Century World*. Première édition française 1992 par Librairie Gründ, Paris.

[1037]. Bloch, M. *La société féodale*. Paris, 1968.

[1038]. Blöss, Christian, and Hans-Ulrich Niemitz. *C14-Crash. (Das Ende der Illusion mit Radiokarbonmethode und Dendrochronologie datieren zu können)*. Gräfelfing, Mantis Verlag, 1997.

[1039]. Blöss, Christian, and Hans-Ulrich Niemitz. *The Self-Deception of the C14 Method and Dendrochronology*. *ZeitenSprünge* 8 (1996) 3 361-389. Mantis Verlag, January 1997.

[1040]. Bode, J.E. *Claudius Ptolemæus, Astronom zu Alexandrien im zweyten*

Jahrhundert. Beobachtung und Beschreibung der Gestirne und der Bewegung. Vergleichnungen der neuern Beobachtungen von J.E.Bode. With a historical review and commentary. Berlin und Stettin, 1795.

[1041]. Boll, F. *Studien über Claudius Ptolemäus.* Leipzig, 1894.

[1042]. Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Das Geheimnis der Heiligen Nacht.* Kiefel Verlag, Wuppertal/Gütersloh, Germany, 1995.

[1043]. Bonnet, C. *Geneva in Early Christian times.* Geneva, Foundation des Clefs de Saint-Pierre, 1986.

[1044]. Boquet, F. J. C. J. *Historie de l'Astronomie.* Paris, Payot, 1925.

[1045]. Borman, Z. *Astra.* (The Pulkovo Observatory Library). 1596.

[1045:1]. [Bosch] *Tout l'œuvre peint de Jérôme Bosch*. Introduction par Max J.Friedländer. Documentation par Mia Cinotti. Paris, Flammarion, 1967.

1045:2 [Bosch] Fraenger, Wilhelm. *Hieronymus Bosch*. VEB Verlag der Kunst Dresden, 1975.

[1046]. Boszkowska, Anna. *Tryumf Luni i Wenus. Pasja Hieronima Boscha*. Wydawnictwo Literackie, Krakow, 1980.

[1047]. Bourbon, Fabio. *Lithographien von Frederick Catherwood. Die Mayas. Auf den Spuren einer versunkenen Kultur*. White Star, Via Candido Sassone, 22/24 13100, Vercelli, Italien, 1999.
Deutschsprachige Ausgabe: Karl Mükker Verlag, Danziger Strasse 6, 91052 Erlangen.

[1048]. Brahe, T. *Tychonis Brahe Dani Opera omnia*. Ed. J. L. E. Dreyer. 15 Volumes.

Copenhagen, 1913-1929.

[1049]. Brahe, T. *Equitis Dani Astronomorum Coryhaei Vita*. Authore Petro Gassendo. Regio ex Typographia Adriani Vlac. MDCLV.

[1049:1]. Lehane, Brendan (texte), Richard Novitz (photographies). *Irlande*. London, Flint River, 1997; Paris, Booking Int'l, 1997.

[1050]. Brenon, Anne. *Le vrai visage du Catharisme*. Toulouse, Ed. Loubatières, 1988.

[1050:1]. *British Museum. A Guide to the First, Second and Third Egyptian Rooms. Predynastic Human Remains, Mummies, Wooden Sarcophagi, Coffins and Cartonnage Mummy Cases, Chests and Coffers, and other Objects connected with the Funerary Rites of the Ancient*

Egyptians. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. With 3 coloured and 32 half-tone plates. British Museum, 1924.

[1050:2]. *British Museum. A Guide to the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Egyptian Rooms and the Coptic Room. A series of Collections of Small Egyptian Antiquities, which illustrate the Manners and Customs, the Arts and Crafts, the Religion and Literature, and the Funeral Rites and Ceremonies of the Ancient Egyptians and their Descendants, the Copts, from about B.C. 4500 to A.D. 1000*. With 7 plates and 157 illustrations in the text. British Museum, 1922.

[1050:3]. *British Museum. A Guide to the Egyptian Collections in the British Museum*. With 53 plates and 180 illustrations in the text. British Museum, 1909.

[1051]. Brodsky, B. E., and B. S. Darkhovsky. *Nonparametric Methods in Change-Point Problems*. The Netherlands, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1993.

[1051:1]. Brodrick, M., and A. A. Morton. *A Concise Dictionary of Egyptian Archaeology. A handbook for students and travellers*. London, 1902. 2nd edition 1923, 3rd edition 1924. Reprint: Chicago, Aries, 1980.

[1052]. Brooke, Christopher. *From Alfred to Henry III. 871-1272*. The Norton Library History of England. New York, London, W. W. Norton & Company, 1961, 1968, 1969.

[1053]. Broughton, T. R. S. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. Volumes 1, 2. London, 1951-1960.

[1053:1]. [Bruegel] Gerhard W. Menzel. *Pieter Bruegel der Ältere*. Leipzig, VEB E. A.

Seemann, Buch- und Kunstverlag, 1966; 2 Auflage, 1974.

[1053:2]. Bovi, Arturo. *Bruegel. The life and work of the artist illustrated with 80 colour plates*. A Dolphin Art Book. London, Thames and Hudson, 1971. Reprinted 1974.

[1054]. Brugsch, H. *Recueil de Monuments Egyptiens, dessinés sur lieux*. Leipzig, 1862-1865.

[1055]. Buck, C. E., W. G. Gavanagh, and C. D. Litton. *Bayesian Approach to Interpreting Archaeological Data*. Series: Statistics in Practice. John Wiley & Sons, 1996.

[1056]. Bustos, Gerardo. *Yucatan and its Archaeological Sites*. Mexico, Monclém; Florence, Casa Editrice Bonechi, 1992.

[1057]. Cagnat, R. *Cours d'épigraphie latine*. 4e éd. Paris, 1914.

[1058]. Campbell, Tony. *Early Maps*. New York, Abbeville Press Publishers, 1981.

[1059]. Campos, José Guerra, and Jesús Precedo Lafuente. *Guide to the Cathedral of Santiago de Compostela*. Spain, Aldeasa, División Palacios y Museos, 1993.

[1060]. Cantacuzeny, Ioannis. *Opera Omnia. Patrologiae curcus completus. Series graeca*. T. CLIII, CLIV. J.-P. Migne, 1866.

[1060:1]. *Carcassonne (The City of Carcassonne. Cathar Castles)*. Production Leconte. Editions Estel-Blois. B. P. 45 - 41260 La Chaussée-Saint-Victor. Printed in E.E.C.

[1060:2]. *Cathares. Les ombres de l'Histoire. Carcassonne: Histoire d'une Cité unique*. In: Pyrénées (Magazine). Une publication de Milan Presse. 2001. Éditions Milan et les auteurs. Ariège Pyrénées. (A special edition

of the magazine dedicated to Cathar history).

[1061]. *Cathedral and Metropolitan Church of St. Stephen in Vienna*. Germany, Verlag Schnell & Steiner Regensburg, 1995.

[1061:1]. *Cathédrale de l'Annonciation. Le Kremlin de Moscou*. Les Musées d'Etat du Kremlin de Moscou, 1990.

[1062]. Cauville, S. *Le Zodiaque d'Osiris*. Peeters, Uitgeverij Peeters, Bondgenotenlaan 153, B-3000 Leuven.

[1062:1]. Cauville, S. *Dendara. Les chapelles osiriennes*. (5 vols.) Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, 1977.

[1063]. Chabas, F. *Mélanges égyptologiques. Deuxième série*. Ägyptolog. Zeitschrift. 1868. S. 49.

[1064]. Champfleury. *Historie de la*

Caricature au Moyen Age. Paris, 1867-1871.

[1064:0]. Chapront-Touze, M., and J. Chapront. Lunar ephemeride des computation software. (Program ELP2000-85, version 1.0, Fortran 77). Bureau des Longitudes, URA 707. 1988. Available online.

[1064:1]. *Château de Chillon*. Booklet. Château de Chillon, Veytaux (www.chillon.ch), 2000.

[1065]. Childress, David Hatcher. *Lost Cities of Atlantis, Ancient Europe & the Mediterranean*. Stelle, Illinois 60919 USA, Adventures Unlimited Press, 1996.

[1066]. Chirikov, B. V., and V. V. Vecheslavov. *Chaotic dynamics of comet Halley*. Astronomy and Astrophysics, Volume 221, No. 1 (1989): 146-154.

[1067]. Chmelarz, Eduard. *Die Ehrepforte des*

Kaisers Maximilian I. Unterscheidheim
1972. Verlag Walter Uhl. Jahrbuch der
Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des
Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses. Herausgegeben
unter Leitung des Oberstkämmerers seiner
Kaiserlichen und Königlichen
Apostolischen Majestät. Ferdinand Grafen
zu Trauttmansdorff-Weinsberg vom K. K.
Oberstkämmerer-Amte. Vierter Band. Mit
39 Kupfertafeln in Heliogravure und
Radierung, 100 Holzschnittafeln und 56
Text-Illustrationen in Heliogravure,
Holzschnitt und Zinkographie. Als Beilage:
16 Holzschnitte der Ehrenpforte des
Kaisers Maximilian I. Wien, Druck und
Verlag von Adolf Holzhausen, K. K.
Hofbuchdrucker, 1886.

[1068]. Stubbs, W., ed. *Chronica magistri
Rogerii de Houedone*. RS, N 51, Volume II.
London, 1869, page 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, Volumes 1-2. London, Bohn's Antiquarian Library, 1853.

[1069]. Pestman, P.W. *Chronologie égyptienne d'après les textes démotiques*. Papyrologia Lugduno-Batava edidit Institutum Papyrologicum Universitatis Lugduno-Batavae Moderantibus M. David et B. A. von Groningen. Volume 15. Lugdunum Batavorum, 1967.

[1070]. Cipolla, Carlo M. *Money, Prices and Civilization in the Mediterranean World. 5-17 century*. Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press, 1956.

[1071]. *Claudii Ptolemaei Magnae Constructionis, id est perfectae coelestium*

*motuum pertractationis. Lib. XIII. Theonis
Alexanrini in eosdem Commentariorum
Libri XI; Basileal apud Ioannem Waledrum.
C. priv. Caes. ad Quinquennium. 1538.*

[1072]. *Claudii Ptolemaei Phelusiensis
Alexandrini. Anno Salutis, 1528.*

[1073]. *Claudii Ptolemaei Pelusiensis
Alexandrini omnia quac extant opera.
1551.*

[1074]. Clemens, Jöcle. *Speyer Cathedral.*
Regensburg, Verlag Scgnell & Steiner
GmbH Regensburg, 1997.

[1075]. Clinton, H.F. *Fasti Hellenici, a Civil
and Literary Chronology from the Earliest
Times to the Death of Augustus.* Oxford,
1830-1841.

[1076]. Copernici, N. *Revolutionibus Orbium
Caelestium. Lib. VI. Ed. by G. Loachimi.
Thoruni, 1873.*

- [1077]. Corbinianus. *Firmamentum Firmianum*. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library). 1731.
- [1078]. Cordier, H. *Marco Polo and His Book*. Introductory notices. In: *The Travels of Marco Polo*. The complete Yule-Cordier. Volumes 1 and 2. New York, Dover, 1993.
- [1078:1]. Wytfliet, Cornelius. *Descriptionis Ptolemaicae Augmentum sive Occidentis notitia brevis commentario*. Louvain 1597. With an introduction by R. A. Skelton. *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*. A Series of Atlases in Facsimile. 1st Series, Vol. V. Amsterdam, N. Israel, Meridian, 1964.
- [1079]. Costard, G. *The History of Astronomy with its Application to Geography, History and Chronology*. London, J. Lister, 1967.
- [1080]. Harmon, Craig. *The Natural Distribution of Radiocarbon and the*

Exchange Time of Carbon Dioxides between Atmosphere and Sea. Volume 9. Tellus. 1957. 1-17.

[1081]. Harmon, Craig. *Carbon-13 in Plants and the Relationships between Carbon-13 and Carbon-14 Variations in Nature*. J. Geol., 62 (1954): 115-149.

[1081:1]. El Mahdy, Christine. *Mummies, Myths and Magic in Ancient Egypt*. Thames and Hudson, 1989.

[1082]. Crowe, C. *Carbon-14 activity during the past 5000 years*. *Nature*, Volume 182 (1958): 470.

[1083]. Danit Hadary-Salomon, ed. *2000 Years of Pilgrimage to the Holy Land*. Israel, AC Alfa Communication Ltd., 1999.

[1084]. *Das Münster zu Bonn. The Bonn Minster*. Former Collegiate Church of SS. Cassius and Florentius. Series: Kleine

Kunstführer. Achnell, Art Guide No. 593 (of 1954). Second English edition 1997. Regensburg, Germany, Verlag Schnell & Steiner GmbH Regensburg, 1997.

[1085]. David, Daniel. *Let There be Light. William Tyndale and the Making of the English Bible*. A British Library Exhibition at The Huntington. 19 November, 1996 - 7 February, 1997. London, The British Library, 1994.

[1086]. Davidovits, Joseph. *Alchemy and Pyramids. The Book of Stone*. Vol. 1. France-USA, Geopolymer Institute, 1983.

[1087]. Davidovits, Joseph. *Alchemy and Pyramids*. Translated from French by A. C. James and J. James. Rev. ed. *Que le Khnoum protège Khéops constructeur de pyramide*. Saint Quentin, France, 1983; Miami Shores, Fla., USA, Institute for

Applied Archaeological Science, Barry University, 1984.

[1088]. Davidovits, Joseph. *Amenhotep, Joseph and Solomon*. 1st ed. Miami Shores, Fla., U.S.A., Geopolymer Institute, Institute for Applied Archaeological Science, Barry University, 1984.

[1089]. Davidovits, Joseph. *Que le dieu Khnoum protège Khéops constructeur de pyramide: histoire de la civilisation Égyptienne de 3500 é 1500 ans avant J.-C.* Saint-Quentin, 1978.

[1090]. Davidovits, Joseph. *Le calcaire des pierres des Grandes Pyramides d'Égypte serait un béton géopolymère vieux de 4.600 ans*. Résumé des cours-conférences tenus en 1983 et 1984. *Revue des Questions Scientifiques*, Volume 156(2) (1986): 199-225.

- [1091]. Davidovits, Joseph. *No more than 1,400 workers to build the Pyramid of Cheops with manmade stone*. 3rd Int. Congress of Egyptologists. Toronto, Canada: paper AA-126, publié dans Appendix 3 de Davidovits, 1983.
- [1092]. Davidovits, Joseph, and Margie Morris. *The Pyramids: an Enigma Solved*. New York, Hippocrene Books, 1988. New York, Dorset Press, 1989, 1990.
- [1093]. Davidovits J., J. Thodez, and Gaber M Hisham. *Pyramids of Egypt Made of Man-Made Stone, Myth or Fact?* Symposium on Archeometry 1984, Smithsonian Institution, abstract 26-27. Washington, D.C., USA, 1984.
- [1094]. Davies, Nartin. *The Gutenberg Bible*. London, The British Library, 1996.
- [1095]. Degrassi, A. *Fasti Capitolini*. 1954; I

Fasti consolari dell'impero romano, 1952.

[1096]. Delambre, J. B. *Histoire de l'Astronomie*. 2 Volumes. Paris, 1817.

[1097]. Delambre, J. *Histoire de l'Astronomie moderne*. 2 Volumes. Paris, 1821.

[1098]. *Della origine et ruccessi degli Slavi, oratione di M. V. Pribevo, Dalmatino da Lesena, etc. et hora tradotta della lingua Latina nell'Italiana da Bellisario Malaspalli, da Spalato*. Venetia, 1595.

[1099]. *Der Marienschrein im Dom zu Aachen*. Die Publikation dieses Sonderheftes erfolgt durch die Grünenthal GmbH, Aachen. Domkapitel, 2000.

[1100]. *Description de l'Égypte. Publiée sous les ordres de Napoléon de Bonaparte. Description de l'Égypte ou recueil des observations et des recherches qui ont été faites en Égypte pendant l'expédition de*

l'Armée française publié sous les ordres de Napoléon Bonaparte. Bibliothèque de l'Image. Inter-Livres. 1995.

[1101]. Desroches-Noblecourt, Christiane. *Life and Death of Pharaoh Tutankhamen.* London, Penguin Books, 1963.

[1101:1]. *Deutschland. Germany. Allemagne. Germania.* Euro Map. Halwag AG, Bern, Printed in Switzerland-Germany 4-26 AK.

[1102]. Dheily, J. *Dictionnaire Biblique.* Ed. Desclec. Tournai, 1964. 193.

[1103]. *Dialogus Historicus Palladii episcopi Helenopolis cum Theodoro.* Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Patrologiae Graecae. T. LVII. J.-P. Migne, 1858.

[1104]. *Die Bibel. Oder die Ganze Heilige Schrift des Alten and Neuen Testaments.* Nach der Überzetzung Martin Luthers. Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart.

1967.

1105. *Die Weihnachtsgeschichte. Nacherzählt in Bildern aus der Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*. Stuttgart, Zürich, Belser Verlag, 1993.

[1106]. *Dom Betrachtung*. Die Hochgräber im Kölner Dom. 4. Herausgeber, Dompfarramt – Dompfarrer Rolf Breitenbruch, Domkloster 3, 50667, Köln.

[1107]. Douais, C. *L'Inquisition, ses origines, sa procédure*. Paris, 1906.

[1108]. Dreyer, J. L. E. *On the Origin of Ptolemy's Catalogue of Stars*. Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, No. 77 (1917): 528-539.

[1109]. Dreyer, J. L. E. *On the Origin of Ptolemy's Catalogue of Stars*. Second Paper. Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, No. 78 (1918): 343-

- [1110]. Duden. *Ethymologie: Herkunftswörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Mannheim, Wien; Dudenverlag, Zürich, 1989.
- [1111]. Duncan, A.J. *Quality Control and Industrial Statistics*. NY, Irwin, 1974.
- [1112]. Dupont-Sommer, A. *Les écrits essentiels découverts près de la Mer Morte*. Paris, 1957.
- [1113]. Dupuis, C. *The Origin of All Religious Worship*. New Orleans, 1872.
- [1114]. Duvernoy, Jean. *Le catharisme*.
Volume I: *La religion des Cathares*.
Volume II: *Histoire des Cathares*.
Toulouse, Private, 1976 and 1979. Republished 1986.
- [1115]. Duvernoy, Jean, Paul Labal, Robert

Lafont, Philippe Martell, and Michel Roquebert. *Les Cathares en Occitanie*. Fayard, 1981.

[1116]. Van Ermen, Eduard. *The United States in Old Maps and Prints*. Wilmington USA, Atomium Books, 1990.

[1116:1]. *Égypte*. Large album with photographs. Paris, Molière, Art Image, 1998.

[1117]. Eichler, Anja-Franziska. *Albrecht Dürer. 1471-1528*. Cologne, Könemann Verlagsgesellschaft GmbH, 1999.

[1118]. *Encyclopaedia Britannica; or, a Dictionary of Arts and Sciences, compiled upon a new Plan. In which the different Sciences and Arts are digested into distinct Treatises or Systems; and the various Technical Terms, etc. are explained as they occur in the order of the*

Alphabet. Illustrated with one hundred and sixty copperplates. By a Society of Gentlemen in Scotland. In 3 volumes.
Edinburgh, A. Bell and C. Macfarquhar,
1771.

[1118:1]. *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. On-line version, 2001.

[1119]. Evans, James. *On the Origin of the Ptolemaic Star Catalogue*. Part 1. *Journal for the History of Astronomy*, Volume 18, Part 3, No. 54 (August 1987): 155-172.

[1120]. Evans, James. *On the Origin of the Ptolemaic Star Catalogue*. Part 2. *Journal for the History of Astronomy*, Volume 18, Part 4, No. 55 (November 1987): 235-277.

[1121]. Liebermann, F., and R. Pauli, Eds. *Ex Annalibus Melrosensibus*. MGH SS, T.XXVII. Hannoverae, 1885. 439.

[1121:1]. Winship, Betsy, and Sheila

Stoneham, eds. *Explosives and Rock Blasting*. Field Technical Operations. Atlas Rowder Company. Dallas, Texas, Marple Press, 1987.

[1122]. Fatih, Cimok. *Hagia Sophia*. Istanbul, A turizm yayinlari, 1995.

[1123]. Fatih, Cimok. *Hagia Sophia*. Istanbul, A turizm yayinlari, 1985.

[1124]. Fergusson, G. I. *Reduction of Atmospheric Radiocarbon Concentration by Fossil Fuel Carbon Dioxide and the Mean Life of Carbon Dioxide in the Atmosphere*. London, Proc. Royal Soc., 243 A, pages 561-574. 1958.

[1125]. Filarete, Antonio Averlino. *Tractat über die Baukunst*. Vienna, 1890.

[1126]. Fischer, Fr. *Thucydides reliquiae in papyris et membranis aegyptiacis servatae*. Lipsiae, 1913.

[1127]. Verlag, Dr. Ludwig Reichert. *Flüsse im Herzen Europas. Rhein-Elbe-Donau*. Kartenabteilung der Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. Preussischer Kulturbesitz. Wiesbaden, 1993.

[1128]. Fomenko, A.T. *The Jump of the Second Derivative of the Moon's Elongation. Celestial Mechanics*, Volume 29 (1981): 33-40.

[1129]. Fomenko, A. T. *Some New Empirico-Statistical Methods of Dating and the Analysis of Present Global Chronology*. The British Library. Department of Printed Books. Cup. 918/87. 1981.

[1130]. Fomenko, A.T. *New Empirico-Statistical Dating Methods and Statistics of Certain Astronomical Data*. The theses of the First International Congress of the International Bernoulli Society for

Mathematical Statistics and Probability Theory. Volume 2. Moscow, Nauka, 1986. 892.

[1131]. Fomenko, A.T. *Duplicates in Mixed Sequences and a Frequency Duplication Principle. Methods and Applications*. Probability theory and mathematical statistics. Proceeding of the 4th Vilnius Conference (24-29 June 1985). Volume 16. Utrecht, Netherlands, VNU Science, 1987. 439-465.

[1132]. Fomenko, A.T. *Empirico-Statistical Methods in Ordering Narrative Texts*. *International Statistical Review*, Volume 566, No. 3 (1988): 279-301.

[1133]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G.V. Nosovskiy. *When was Ptolemy's Star Catalogue in "Almagest" Compiled in Reality?* Preprint. No. 1989-04, ISSN

0347-2809. Dept. of Math., Chalmers Univ. of Technology, The University of Goteborg. Sweden.

[1134]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G.V. Nosovskiy. *When was Ptolemy's Star Catalogue in "Almagest" Compiled in Reality? Statistical Analysis*. Acta Applicandae Mathematical. Volume 17. 1989. 203-229.

[1135]. Fomenko, A. T. *Mathematical Statistics and Problems of Ancient Chronology. A New Approach*. Acta Applicandae Mathematical. Volume 17. 1989. 231-256.

[1136]. Fomenko, A. T., Kalashnikov V. V., Nosovskiy G. V. *Geometrical and Statistical Methods of Analysis of Star Configurations. Dating Ptolemy's Almagest*. USA, CRC Press, 1993.

[1137]. Fomenko, A. T. *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*. The Netherlands, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994.

[1138]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G.V. Nosovskiy. *The dating of Ptolemy's Almagest based on the coverings of the stars and on lunar eclipses*. Acta Applicandae Mathematicae. Volume 29. 1992. 281-298.

[1139]. Fomenko, A. T., V. V. Kalashnikov, and G.V. Nosovskiy. *Statistical analysis and dating of the observations on which Ptolemy's "Almagest" star catalogue is based*. In: *Probability theory and mathematical statistics*. Proc. of the Fifth

Vilnius Conference. Volume 1. Moklas, Vilnius, Lithuania. VSP, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 1990. 360-374.

[1140]. Fomenko, A. T., and S. T. Rachev. *Volume Functions of Historical Texts and the Amplitude Correlation Principle*. Computers and the Humanities. Vol. 24. 1990. 187-206.

[1141]. Manuel, Frank E. *Isaac Newton, the Historian*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, The Belknap Press, 1963.

[1142]. Franke, Peter Robert, and Ilse Paar. *Die Antiken Münzen der Sammlung Heynen. Katalog mit Historischen Erläuterungen*. Landschaftsmuseum Krefeld-Burglinn. Rheinland-Verlag, Köln, in Kommission bei Rudolf Habelt Verlag, Bonn. 1976.

[1143]. de Landa, Friar Diego. *Yucatan before and after the Conquest*. Translated with

notes by William Gates. San Fernando, Atrio de San Francisco, 1993.

[1144]. Fricke, W., and A. Koff *FK4*. No.10. Heidelberg, Veröf. Astr. Inst., 1963.

[1145]. Fuchs, W. *Nach allen Regeln der Kunst. Diagnosen über Literatur, Musik, bildende Kunst. Die Werke, ihre Autoren und Schöpfer*. Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt., 1968.

[1146]. Fuchs, W. *Mathematical Theory of Word-Formation*. London, 1955.

[1147]. Fulton, Alexander. *Scotland and her Tartans. The Romantic Heritage of the Scottish Clans and Families*. Colour Library Books Ltd., Sandbach, Cheshire; Godalming, Surrey, 1991.

[1148]. Fussbroich, Helmut. *St. Maria Lyskirchen in Köln*. Rheinische Kunststätten. Heft 60. Rheinischer Verein

für Denkmalpflege und Landschaftsschutz.
Köln, Neusser Druckerei und Verlag GmbH,
1992.

[1149]. Gabovitsch, Eugen. *Newton als geistiger Vater der Chronologiekritik und Geschichtsrekonstruktion (neben Hardoin)*. Bemerkungen zum Artikel von Uwe Topper in Synesis Nr. 4/1999. Efodon-Synesis (Germany) Nov/Dez. 1999, Nr. 6/1999, S. 29-33.

[1150]. Gabovitsch, Eugen. *Die Grosse Mauer als ein Mythos: Die Errichtungsgeschichte der Chinesischen Mauer und ihre Mythologisierung*. Efodon-Synesis (Germany), Nov/Dez. 1999, Nr.6/1999, S. 9-21.

[1151]. Gadol, J. *Leon Battista Alberti*.
Chicago, London, 1969.

[1152]. Gassendi. *Nicolai Copernici vita*. A

supplement to the edition titled *Tychonis Brahei, equitis Mani, astronomorum copyrhaei vita*. XDCLV.

[1152:1]. El Gayar, El Sayed, and M. P. Jones. *Metallurgical Investigation of the Iron plate found in 1837 in the Great Pyramid at Gizeh, Egypt*. In: *Journal of the Historical Metallurgy Society*, Volume 1 (1989): 75-83.

[1153]. Gingerich, O. *Ptolemy Revisited: A Reply to R. R. Newton*. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society*, No.22 (1981): 40-44.

[1154]. Ginzel, F. K. *Spezieller Kanon der Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse für das Ländergebiet der klassischen Altertumswissenschaften und den Zeitraum von 900 vor Chr. bis 600 nach Chr.* Berlin, Mayer & Müller, 1899.

- [1155]. Ginzel, F.K. *Handbuch der Mathematischen und Technischen Chronologie*. Bd. I-III. Leipzig, 1906, 1911, 1914.
- [1156]. Ginzel, F. K., and A. Wilkens. *Theorie der Finsternisse*. Encykl. der Wissenschaftten. Bd. VI, 2. S. 335. 1908.
- [1157]. Girou, Jean. *Simon de Monfort*. Paris: La Colombe, 1953.
- [1158]. Della Fina, Giuseppe M., *Luoghi e tempi Etruschi schede di ricerca*. Firenze: Fatatrac, 1989.
- [1159]. Gladwin, H. *Men out of Asia*. NY, 1949.
- [1160]. Goss, John. *Kartenkunst: Die Geschichte der Kartographie*. Deutsche Ausgabe: Georg Westermann Verlag, Braunschweig, 1994. German translation of the English edition: Goss, John. *The*

Mapmaker's Art. A History of Cartography. London, Studio Editions Ltd.

[1160:1]. Granier, J., and S. Gagnière.

Avignon. (The city at Sunset. The Popes' Palace. The Saint Benezet bridge). English edition. Éditions du Boumian, Monaco.

[1161]. Grasshoff, Gerd. *The History of Ptolemy's Star Catalogue.* New York, Springer Verlag, 1990.

[1162]. Grienberger, C. *Catalogus Veteres affixarum longitudines et latitudines cum novis conferens.* Romae apud B. Zannetum, 1612. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)

[1163]. Grierson, Philip. *Coinage and Money in Byzantine Empire.* Spoleto, 1961.

[1164]. Grierson, Philip. *Monnaies du Moyen Âge.* Fribourg, 1976.

[1165]. Grimme, Ernst Günther. *Der Dom zu*

Aachen. Architektur und Ausstattung.
Aachen, Einhard-Verlag, 1994.

[1166]. Grollenberg, L. N. *Atlas of the Bible.*
NY, 1956.

[1167]. Gualberto, Zapata Alonzo. *An Overview of the Mayan World. With a Synthesis of the Olmec, Totonac Zapotec, Mixtec, Teotihuacan, Toltec and Aztec Civilizations.* Mexico, Merida, 1993.

[1167:1]. *Guide to Edo-Tokyo Museum*
(English edition). Edited by Edo-Tokyo
Museum. Japan Broadcast Publishing Co.,
Ltd. Printed in Japan by Toppan Printing Co.,
Ltd.

[1168]. *Gutenberg-Bibel. Geschichtliche Bücher des Alten Testaments.* Die bibliophilen Taschenbücher. Dortmund, Harenberg Kommunikation, 1977.

[1169]. *Gutenberg Bibel (1452-1455).*

Reprinted 1968 by Verlag Konrad Köbl.
8022 Grünwald bei München,
Huberttusstasse 13. Firma Elektra,
Reprografischer Betrieb, Kjeld Höjring,
Niedernhausen/Ts. Printed in Germany.

[1170]. Schneider, Dr. Cornelia. *Gutenberg-Dokumentation. Information Mittelalter. Das Buch vor Gutenberg (I)*. Gutenberg-Museum Mainz, 1990.

[1171]. Schneider, Dr. Cornelia. *Gutenberg-Dokumentation. Information Mittelalter. Das Buch vor Gutenberg (II)*. Gutenberg-Museum Mainz, 1990.

[1172]. *Haack Geographisch-Kartographischer Kalender*. Germany, Haack Gotha, VEB Hermann Haack Geographisch-Kartographische Anstalt Gotha, 1983.

[1172:1]. *Haack Geographisch-*

Kartographischer Kalender. Germany,
Haack Gotha, VEB Hermann Haack
Geographisch-Kartographische Anstalt
Gotha, 1988.

[1173]. Hagek, W. *Kronyka Czeska*. Prague,
1541.

[1174]. Hans, Peter. *Der Dom zu Köln. 1248-
1948*. Düsseldorf, Verlag L. Schwann, 1948.

[1175]. Hansen, P. *Ecliptische Tafeln für die
Konjunktionen des Mondes und der
Sonne*. Leipzig, 1857.

[1176]. Hansen, P. *Theorie der
Sonnenfinsternisse und verwandten
Erscheinungen*. Leipzig, 1859.

[1177]. Harley, J. B., and David Woodward.
*The History of Cartography. Volume 1.
Cartography in Prehistoric, Ancient and
Medieval Europe and the Mediterranean*.
Chicago & London, The University of

Chicago Press, 1987.

[1178]. Harvey, Arden. *Who Owns Our Past?* *National Geographic*, Volume 175, No.3 (March 1989): 376-393.

[1179]. Hauvette, A. *Herodote historien des guerres midiques*. Paris, 1894.

[1180]. Haveta, E. *La modernité des prophètes*. Paris, 1891.

[1181]. Hazirlayan, H. H. Aliy Yalcin (Hz. Yusa Camii Imam-Hatibi). *Hazreti Yusa (Aleyhisselam)*. Istanbul. Brochure written by the prior of the temple at the grave of St. Iusha at the outskirts of Istanbul.

[1182]. Hearnshaw, J .B., and D. Khan. *An Analysis of the Magnitude Data in Ptolemy's Almagest*. Southern Stars. Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society of New Zealand (Wellington), Volume 36, Nos. 5-6 (December 1955): 169-177.

[1183]. Heath, T. L. *Aristarchus of Samos, the Ancient Copernicus; a History of Greek Astronomy to Aristarchus, together with Aristarchus' Treatise on the Sizes and Distances of the Sun and Moon*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1913.

[1184]. Heine-Geldern, R., and G.Ekholm. *Significant parallels in the symbolic arts of Southern Asia and Middle America*. In: *Selected Papers of the 29th International Congress of Americanists*, Volume 1. Chicago, 1951. 306.

[1185]. Heinsohn, Gunnar. *Assyrerkönige gleich Perserherrscher! (Die Assyrienfunde bestätigen das Achämenidenreich)*. Gräfelfing, Mantis Verlag, 1996.

[1186]. Heinsohn, Gunnar, and Heribert Illig. *Wann lebten die Pharaonen?*

(*Archäologische und technologische Grundlagen für eine Neuschreibung der Geschichte Ägyptens and der übrigen Welt.*) Gräfelfing, Mantis Verlag, 1997.

[1187]. Heintze, C. *Objects rituels, croyances et dieux de la Chine antique et de l'Amérique*. Antwerpen, 1936.

[1188]. Heis. *Die Finsternisse während des pelop. Krieges*. Progr. d. Fried. Wilh. Gimn. Köln, 1834.

[1189]. Herbert, Ewe. *Abbild oder Phantasie? Schiffe auf historischen Karten*. Rostock, VEB Hinstorff Verlag, 1978.

[1190]. [Herodotus]. *The History of Herodotus*. London, 1858.

[1191]. Hignett, C. *Xerxes Invasion of Greece*. Oxford, 1963.

[1192]. Hincks, E. *The Egyptian Dynasties of*

Manetho. The Journal of Sacred Literature.
London, 1864.

[1193]. Hipparchus. *Hipparchi in Arati et Eudoxi Phenomena Commentarium*. Ed. and German trans. C. Manitius. Leipzig, 1894.

[1194]. *Historiae bysantinae scriptores post Theophanem. Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca posterior*. T.CIX. J.-P. Migne, 1863.

[1195]. Hochart. *De l'authenticité des Annales et des Histoires de Tacite*. Paris, 1890.

[1196]. Hodge, K.C., and G.W.A. Newton. *Radiocarbon Dating. Manchester Museum Mummy Project. Multidisciplinary Research on Ancient Egyptian Mummified Remains*. Edited by A. Rosalie David. Published by Manchester Museum.

Manchester, England, 1979. 137-147.

[1197]. Hofflit, D. *The Bright Star Catalogue*. New Haven Connecticut, USA, Yale Univ. Obs., 1982.

[1198]. Hoffman. *Sämtliche bei griechischen und lateinschen Schriftstellern des Altertums erwähnte Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse*. Trieste, 1885.

[1199]. Horster, M. *Brunelleschi und Alberti in ihrer Stellung zur römischen Antike*. Florence, 1973.

[1200]. Horus. *The Enigma Surrounding the Sphinx*. An Egyptian Magazine, April/June 1999.

[1201]. Hoster, Joseph. *Der Dom zu Köln*. Köln, Greven Verlag, 1965.

[1202]. Huddleston, L.E. *Origin of the American Indian. European Concepts*,

1492-1729. Austin, 1967.

[1203]. Hütt, Wolfgang. Altdorfer. *Maler und Werk*. Eine Kunsthftreihe aus dem VEB Verlag der Kunst. Dresden, 1976.

[1204]. Hugot, Leo. *Aachen Cathedral*. Aachen, Germany, Einhard Verlag, 1988.

[1205]. Ideler, L. *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*. Band 1-2. Berlin, 1825-1826.

[1206]. Ilhan Aksit. *The Topkapi Palace*. Istanbul, Aksit Kultur Turism Sanat Ajans Ltd., 1995.

[1207]. Ilhan Aksit. *The Museum of Chora. Mosaics and Frescoes*. Istanbul, Aksit Kultur Turism Sanat Ajans Ltd., 1995.

[1208]. Illig, Heribert. *Hat Karl der Große je gelebt? (Bauten, Funde und Schriften im Widerstreit)*. Gräfelfing, Mantis Verlag,

1996.

- [1208:1]. *Irish Dictionary*. Collins Gem. English-Irish. Irish-English. Seamus Mac Mathuna and O Corrain (University of Ulster). Harper Collins, 1999.
- [1209]. Isidori Junioris. *Hispalensis episcopi: De responsione mundi*. 1472. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)
- [1210]. Islam. *Kunst und Architektur*. Herausgegeben von Markus Hattstein und Peter Delis. Köln, Könemann, 2000.
- [1211]. *Istanbul and the Marmara Region. A Tale of two Continents*. Turkey, The Ministry of Tourism, Istanbul, 1994.
- [1212]. Janin, R. *Constantinople Byzantine*. Paris, 1950.
- [1213]. Jirku, A. (Jurku, A.) *Ausgrabungen in Palästina-Syrien*. Halle, 1956.

[1214]. Johnson, Edwin. *The Rise of English Culture*. Williams and Norgate. London-New York, Putnam, 1904.

[1215]. Johnson, Edwin. *The Rise of Christendom*. London, Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, & Co. Ltd., 1890.

[1215:1]. Johnson, Paul. *The civilization of Ancient Egypt*. London, Seven Dials, Cassel & Co., 2000.

[1216]. Joubert, Pierre. *L'Heraldique. Les guides pratiques*. Editions Ouest-France, 1984.

[1217]. Keegan, John. *A History of Warfare*. New York, Vintage Books, 1994.

[1218]. *Katalog dawnych map Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej w kolekcji Emeryka Hutten Czapskiego i w innych zbiorach*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków, Gdańsk: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich,

Wyd. Polskiej Akademii Nauk. Instytut
Geografii i Przestrzennego
Zagospodarowania. Ossolineum. N.1. Mapy
XV-XVI wieku. 1978.

[1219]. Keller, W. *Und die Bibel hat doch
Recht*. Düsseldorf, 1958.

[1220]. Kenyon, K. M. *Digging in Jericho*.
London, 1957.

[1221]. *Kings & Queens of England. A set of
picture cards*. Great Britain, Fax Pax Ltd.,
1988.

[1222]. Kinoshita, H. *Formulas for
Precession*. Smithsonian Inst. Astrophys.
Observatory. Cambridge, Massachussets,
1975.

[1223]. Sale, Kirkpatrick. *The Conquest of
Paradise. Christopher Columbus and the
Columbian Legacy*. New York, Penguin
Books, 1990.

- [1224]. Knobel, E.B. *British School of Archaeology in Egypt and Egyptian Research Account*. London, 1908.
- [1225]. Knobel, E.B. *The Chronology of Star Catalogues*. Memoirs of the Royal Astronomical Society. No.43 (1877): 1-74.
- [1226]. Kobold, H. *Finsternisse*. *Handwörterbuch der Astronomie*. Herausg. von W. Valentiner. Bd. I. Breslau, 1897.
- [1227]. Koeva, Margarita. *Rila Monastery*. Sofia, Borina, 1995.
- [1228]. *Köln in historischen Stadtplänen. Die Entwicklung der Stadt seit dem XVI Jahrhundert*. Berlin, Argon, 1995.
- [1229]. *Kostbarkeiten der Buchkunst. Illuminationen klassischer Werke von Archimedes bis Vergil*. Herausgegeben von Giovanni Morello. Stuttgart-Zürich, Belser Verlag, 1997.

[1230]. Krishnaiah, P. and B. Miao. *Review about Estimation of Change-Points*. In: *Handbook of Statistics*, Volume 7. 1988. 375-402.

[1231]. *Krönungen, Könige in Aachen. Geschichte und Mythos*. Vom 12. Juni bis 3. Oktober 2000 in Rathaus, Domschatzkammer und Dom, Aachen. (Annette Fusenig M. A. und Barbara Jacobs M. A.). From 12th of June to 3rd October 2000 in Town Hall, Cathedral Treasury and Cathedral, Aachen. Kurzfürer zur Ausstellung. Guide to the exhibition. Printed in Germany by Verein Aachener Krönungsgeschichte e. V.

[1232]. Mittelstädt, Kuno. *Albrecht Dürer*. Henschelverlag Kunst und Gesellschaft. Arkady, Warszawa-Berlin, 1977.

[1232:1]. *Kunst des Mittelalters in Armenien*.

Burchard Brentjes, Stepan Mnazakanjan,
Nina Stepanjan. (Kultur. Architektur.
Plastik. Wandmalerei. Buchmalerei.
Angewandte Kunst). Union Verlag, Berlin,
1981

[1233]. Lafuente, Jesús Precedo. *Visitor's
Guide. The Cathedral of Santiago de
Compostela*. Spain: Aldeasa, División
Palacios y Museos, Estudios Gra'ficos
Europeos, 1998.

[1234]. Kurth, Willi. *The Complete Woodcuts
of Albrecht Dürer*. With an introduction by
Campbell Dodgson, M.A., C.B.E. New York,
Dover Publications, Inc., 1963.

[1235]. Lajta, Edit. *Malarstwo Francuskie od
Gotyku do Renesansu*. Wydawnictwa
Artystyczne i Filmowe-Warszawa.
Drukowano na Wegrezech, 1979. Drukarnia
Kossuth, Budapeszt. Wspolne wydanie

wydawnictw Corvina, Budapest i WAiF,
Warszawa.

[1236]. *L'art de vérifier les dates faites historiques*. Ed. par des Bénédictines. 1 ed., Paris, 1750; 2 ed., Paris, 1770; 3 ed., Paris, 1783, 1784, 1787.

[1237]. Laclotte, Michel (Director, Musée du Louvre). *Treasures of the Louvre*. New York, London-Paris, Abbeville, 1993.

[1238]. Langeteau, C. *Tables pour le calcul des syzygies ecliptiques, Connaissanse des Temps pour 1846*. Paris, 1843, 1850.

[1239]. Layamon. *Brut, or the Chronicle of Britain*. Ed. F. Madden. Volume II. London, 1847. 525-526, vv. 22589-22602.

[1240]. Stegena, Lajos, ed. *Lazarus Secretarius. The First Hungarian Mapmaker and His Work*. Budapest, Akademiai Kiado, 1982.

[1240:1]. Lecoq-Ramond, Sylvie, and Béguerie Pantxika. *Le Musée d'Unterlinden de Colmar*. Musées et Monuments de France. Paris, Schongauer & Albin Michel, 1991.

[1241]. Leland, C. *Fusang or discovery of America by Chinese Buddhist priests in the 5th century*. London, 1875.

[1242]. Dal Maso, Leonardo B.. *Rome of the Caesars*. Firenze, Bonechi Editioni Il Turismo, 1974, 1992.

[1243]. *Le Saint voyage de Jérusalem de seigneur d'Anglure*. Paris, F. Bonnardot and A. Longnon, 1878.

[1244]. *Le Wallraf-Richartz Museum de Cologne*. Munich, Scala, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagbuchhandlung (Oscar Beck), 1992.

[1245]. Lehmann, P. *Tafeln zur Berechnung der Mondphasen und Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse*. Berlin, 1882.

- [1245:1]. *Les Grandes Civilisations Disparues*. Sélection du Reader's Digest. Paris-Bruxelles-Montréal-Zurich, 1980.
- [1246]. *Les Manuscripts de la Mer Morte. Aux origines du christianisme*. Les Dossiers d'Archéologie, No. 189 (Janv. 1994).
- [1247]. de Austria, Leupoldus. *Compilatio de Astrorum Scientia*, cuts. 1489. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)
- [1248]. Lhotsky, A. *Auf Satze und Vortrage*. Halle, 1970-1972.
- [1249]. Lichtheim, Miriam. *Ancient Egyptian Literature*. Volumes 1-3. USA, University of California Press, 1975.
- [1250]. Libby, W.F. *Radiocarbon dating*. 2nd edition. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1955.

- [1251]. Lilly, W. *An Introduction to Astrology*. London, G. Bell, 1939.
- [1252]. Linde, A. v. d. *Gutenberg. Geschichte und Erdichtung*. Stuttgart, 1878.
- [1253]. Linde, A. v. d. *Geschichte der Buchdruckerkunst*. Berlin, 1886.
- [1254]. Lokotsch, K. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der europäischen Wörter*. Heidelberg, 1927.
- [1255]. Longhi, Roberto. *Caravaggio*. Die Italienische Malerei. Dresden: Editori Riuniti Rom, VEB Verlag der Kunst, 1968
- [1256]. Lubienietski, S. *Theatrum Cometicum, etc.* Amstelodami, 1666-1668. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)
- [1257]. Lubienietski, S. *Historia universalis omnium Cometarum*. Lugduni Batavorum, 1681. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)

- [1258]. *Lucas Cranach d. Ä.* Herausgegeben von Heinz Lüdecke. Welt der Kunst. Henschelvarlag Kunst und Gesellschaft. Berlin, 1972.
- [1259]. Magi, Giovanna, and Giuliano Valdes. *All of Turkey*. Firenze, Casa Editrice Bonechi, 1990.
- [1260]. Manuel, Chrisoloras. *Manuels Chrisolorae Vita et scripta*. Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca posterior. T.CLVI. J.-P. Migne, 1866.
- [1261]. Manuel II Palaeologus. *Laudatio funebris fratris sui Theodori Palaeologi Despotae*. Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca posterior. T. CLVI. J.-P. Migne, 1866.
- [1261:1]. *Maps of the Ancient World. 2002 Calendar*. From The Huntington Library. Avalanche Publishing, Inc., 2001.

[1262]. *Mapy severní a jižní hvězdné oblohy*.
Praha, Kartografie Praha, 1971.

[1263]. Marco Polo. *Le Livre des Merveilles*.
La Renaissance du Livre. Collection
Références. Extrait du Livre des Merveilles
du Monde (Ms. fr. 2810) de la Bibliothèque
nationale de France. 1999 Ultreya srl,
Milan. 1996 Faksimile Verlag Luzern pour
les textes et les images. 1999 La
Renaissance du Livre, Tournai pour l'édition
française. Belgique.

[1264]. Marco Polo. *The Travels of Marco
Polo*. The Complete Yule-Cordier Edition.
With a Total of 198 Illustrations and 32
Maps and Site Plans. Three Volumes Bound
as Two. Volumes 1,2. Including the
unabridged third edition (1903) of Henry
Yule's annotated translation, as revised by
Henry Cordier; together with Cordier's later
volume of notes and addenda (1920). New

York, Dover Publications, Inc., 1993.

[1265]. Maria Da Villa Urbani. *Basilica of San Marco*. Milan, Editions KINA, 1993.

[1266]. Martin Behaim's 1492 *Erdapfel*. A paper version of our earliest surviving terrestrial Globe. First made in Nuremberg in 1492. Follow Marco Polo and the quest for spice on this unique medieval relic. Greaves & Thomas, London, England. Registered design & Patents Pending. Artwork & Globe Gores, 1997. (A selection of facsimile globes from the Greaves & Thomas collection. Spanning cartographic history from 1492 to the present day.)

[1267]. Maso Finiguerra. *A Florentine Picture-Chronicle*. Reproduced from the originals in the British Museum by the Imperial Press, Berlin. A critical and descriptive text by Sidney Colvin, M. A.

Keeper of the prints and drawings of the British Museum. New York, Benjamin Blom, 1970.

[1268]. [Paris, Matthew] *The Illustrated Chronicles of Matthew Paris*. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 1993.

[1268:1]. McKenzie, John L., S. J. *Dictionary of the Bible*. G. Chapman, London, 1985 (1965 by Macmillan Publishing).

[1269]. Meier, H. *Deutsche Sprachstatistik*. Hildesheim, 1964.

[1270]. de la Garza, Mercedes. *The Mayas. 3000 years of civilization*. Mexico, Monclém Ediciones; Florence, Casa Editrice Bonechi, 1994.

[1271]. *Germany*. Michelin et Cie, 1996.

[1272]. *Paris*. Michelin et Cie, 1996.

[1273]. Michell, J. A. *Little History of Astro-*

Archaeology: Stages in the Transformation of a Heresy. London, 1977.

[1273:0]. Michov, H. *Weitere Beiträge zur älteren Kartographie Russlands*. Mit 1 Textabbildung und 5 Karten. Sonderabzug aus den Mitteilungen der Geographischen Gesellschaft in Hamburg, Band XXII. Hamburg: L.Friederichsen & Co. Inhaber: Dr. L. Friederichsen, 1907.

[1273:1]. Migne, J.-P. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus etc.* Paris: Petit-Montrouge, 1800-1875.

[1274]. Miller, W. *The Latins in the Levant. A History of Frankish Greece in 1204-1566*. London, 1908.

[1275]. Mommsen, T. *Die Römische Chronologie bis auf Caesar*. Berlin, 1859, 2 Aufl.

- [1276]. Montucla, J. E. *Histoire des Mathématiques*. T.IV. Paris, 1802.
- [1277]. Montucla, J. E. *Histoire des Mathématiques*. 4 vols. Paris. 1799-1802.
- [1278]. *Musée Royal de Naples: Peintures, bronzes et statues érotiques du cabinet secret, avec les explanations de M. C. F. (César Famin)*. Paris, 1857.
- [1279]. *Museum. Gutenberg Museum Mainz*. Braunschweig, Georg Westermann Verlag, 1980. (3 Auflage 1994.)
- [1280]. Myres, J. *Herodotus. Father of History*. Oxford, 1953.
- [1281]. Ahmed Kardy. *Finding a Pharaoh's Funeral Bark*. *National Geographic*, Vol. 173, No. 4 (April 1988): 513-546.
- [1282]. Peter Miller. *Riddle of the Pyramid Boats*. *National Geographic*, Vol. 173, No.

4 (April 1988): 534-546.

[1282:1]. Rick Gore. *The Eternal Etruscans*.
National Geographic, Volume 173, No. 6
(June 1988): 696-743.

[1283]. *National Geographic*, Volume 176,
No. 4 (October 1989).

[1284]. Nelli René. *Ecritures cathares*.
Complete Cathar writings translated into
French. Planete, 1968.

[1285]. Neugebauer, O. *Astronomische
Chronologie*. Berlin and Leipzig, 1929.

[1286]. Neugebauer, O. *Spezieller Kanon der
Sonnenfinsternisse*. Ergänzungsheft,
Astron. Nachr. 8, 4. Kiel, Verlag der
Astronomischen Nachrichten, 1931.

[1287]. Neugebauer, O. *A History of Ancient
Mathematical Astronomy*. 3 Vols. New
York-Berlin, Springer-Verlag, 1975.

[1288]. Neugebauer, O. *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity*. 2nd edition. Providence, Rhode Island, Brown University Press, 1957.

[1289]. Neugebauer, Otto and Richard A. Parker. *Egyptian Astronomical Texts*. 3 vols. Providence and London: Lund Humphries for Brown University Press, 1960-1969.

[1290]. Neugebauer, O., and H. B. Van Hoesen. *Greek Horoscopes*. Philadelphia, The American Philosophical Society, 1959.

[1290:1]. Neugebauer, O., and R. A. Parker. *Egyptian Astronomical Texts*. Vols. 1-3. London, Brown University Press, 1964.

[1291]. Neugebauer, O., R. A. Parker, and D. Pingree. *The Zodiac Ceilings of Petosiris and Petubastis. Denkmäler der Oase Dachla. Aus dem Nachlass von Ahmed Fakhry*. Bearbeitet von J. Osing, M. Moursi,

Do. Arnold, O. Neugebauer, R. A. Parker, D. Pengree und M. A. Nur-el-Din.

Archäologische Veröffentlichungen 28

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut.

Abteilung Kairo. Mainz am Rhein, Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1982.

[1292]. Neugebauer, P. V. *Tafeln zur astronomischen Chronologie*. 3 Volumes. Leipzig, 1912.

[1293]. Neugebauer, P. V. *Abgekürzte Tafeln der Sonne und großen Planeten*. Berlin, 1904.

[1294]. Newcomb, S. *On the recurrence of solar eclipses with tables of eclipses*. Astronomical Papers (Washington). Vol. 1, No. 1 (1882).

[1295]. Newcomb, S. *Tables of the Motion of the Earth on its Axis and around the Sun*. Astronomical Paper. V.VI, Pt.1. 1898.

[1296]. Newmann, Dianne. *The Pergamon Altar*. Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preussischer Kulturbesitz, 1993.

[1297]. Newton, Isaac. *Abregé de la chronologie de I. Newton* fait par lui-même, et traduit sur le manuscrit Angloise [par Nicolas Freret]. Paris: Gavelier, 1725.

[1298]. Newton, Isaac. *The Chronology of Ancient Kingdoms Amended. To which is Prefix'd, A Short Chronicle from the First Memory of Things in Europe, to the Conquest of Persia by Alexander the Great*. London: J. Tonson, 1728. Re-edited in 1988 by Histories and Mysteries of Man Ltd.

[1299]. Newton, Isaac. *La Chronologie des Ancien Royalmes Corrigée*, Martin u.a. Translation F. Granet. Paris, 1728.

[1300]. Newton, Isaac. *Kurzer Auszug aus der*

*weltberühmten Isaac Newtons
Chronologie derer alten Königreiche:
worinnen 4 Haupt-Periodi veste gestellt u.
aus d. Antiquität eruiert werden...; wobei
zugl. gezeiget wird, wie d. dunckle Histoire
d. alten verfallenen Königreiche... in e.
richtige chronolog. Ordnung zu bringen
sei... Aus d. Engl. Von Philipp Georg
Hübner. Meiningen, 1741.*

[1301]. Newton, Isaac. *Abrégé de la
chronologie des ancien royaumes*. Trad.
Deel Anglois de Mr. [Andrew] Reid.
Geneve, 1743.

[1302]. Newton, Isaac. *Kurzer Auszug aus der
I.Newtons Chronologie*. Von Pf. Georg
Hübner, Hilburgshausen u. a. 1745.

[1303]. Newton, R. R. "Astronomical evidence
concerning non-gravitational forces in the
Earth-Moon system." *Astrophysics and*

Space Science, Volume 16 (1972): 179-200.

[1304]. Newton, R. "Two Uses of Ancient Astronomy." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, Series A., 276 (2 May 1974): 99-115. DOI: 10.1098/rsta.1974.0012.

[1305]. Newton, Robert R. *The Origins of Ptolemy's Astronomical Tables*. The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory. The Center for Archaeoastronomy, University of Maryland. USA, 1985.

[1306]. Newton, R. R. *Ancient Astronomical Observations and the Accelerations of the Earth and Moon*. Baltimore and London, John Hopkins University Press, 1970.

[1306:1]. Newton, R. R. *The Moon's Acceleration and Its Physical Origin*.

Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press,
1979.

[1307]. Newton, Robert R. *On the fractions of degrees in an ancient star catalogue.*

Quarterly Journal of the Royal
Astronomical Society, Volume XX (1979):
383-394.

[1308]. Newton, Robert R. *The origins of Ptolemy's planetary parameters.* The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Lab. The Center for Archaeoastronomy. 1982. 86-90.

[1309]. *Nicolai Copernici Thorunensis de Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium Libri VI.* Ex. auctoris autographio recudi curavit Societas Copernicana Thorunensis. Berolini, 1873.

[1310]. Nikulin, N. *Lucas Cranach. Masters of World Painting.* Leningrad, Aurora Art,

1976.

- [1311]. Nilsson, M. P. *Primitive Time-Reckoning. A Study in the Origins and the First Development of the Art of Counting Time among the Primitive and Early Culture Peoples*. Lund, Gleerup, 1920.
- [1312]. Noth, M. *Die Welt des Alten Testaments*. Berlin, 1957.
- [1313]. Oertel, F. *Herodots ägyptischen Logos und die Glaubwürdigkeit Herodots*. Berlin, 1970.
- [1314]. Olston, A. B. *The Story of Time*. Chicago, Jarvis Universal Clock Co., 1915.
- [1315]. Oppolzer, Th. *Kanon der Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse*. Wien: K. K. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1887.
- [1316]. Oppolzer, Th. *Tafeln zur Berechnung der Mondfinsternisse*. Wien, 1883.

- [1317]. Oppolzer, Th. *Syzygientafeln für den Mond*. Leipzig, Astronomische Gesellschaft, 1881.
- [1318]. Orbini, Mauro. *Origine de gli Slavi & progresso dell'Imperio loro*. Pesaro, 1606.
- [1319]. Orontij, Finai Delphinatus. *Canonum Astronomicum*. 1553. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)
- [1320]. Orontii, Finaei Delphinatis. *Fine Oronce, etc.* 1551. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)
- [1321]. Orr, M. A. *Dante and the Early Astronomers*. London, Gall and Inglis, 1913.
- [1321:1]. Otero, Gloria. *El Arte Romanico en España. Romanesque Art in Spain*. Subdireccion General de Promocion Exterior del Turismo. Turespaña, Spain, 1995.

- [1322]. Otero, José Carro. *Santiago de Compostela*. Second edition. Leon, Spain, Editorial Everest S.A., 1999.
- [1323]. Ostrowski, W. *The ancient names and early cartography of Byelorussia*. London, 1971.
- [1324]. Owen, G. F. *Archaeology and the Bible*. NY, 1961.
- [1325]. Page, E. S. *Continuous inspection schemes*. *Biometrika*, Volume 41, No.1 (1954): 100-115.
- [1326]. Page, E. S. *A test for a change in a parameter occurring at an unknown point*. *Biometrika*, Vol. 42, No.4 (1955): 523-527.
- [1327]. Paladilhe, Dominique. *Simon de Monfort et le Drame Cathare*. France: Librairie Académique Perrin, 1997.
- [1328]. Pannekoek, A. *A History of*

Astronomy. New York, 1961.

[1329]. *Paris. Tourist Guide*. Paris: Guide Michelin, 1992.

[1330]. Parker, Richard A. *Ancient Egyptian Astronomy*. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Ser. A, 276 (1974): 51-65.

[1331]. Pastoureau, Michel. *Traité d'Héraldique*. Bibliothèque de la Sauvegarde de l'Art Français. 3e éd. Paris, Grands manuels Picard, 1997.

[1332]. Venetus, Paulus. *Philisiphiae naturalis compendium clarissimi philosophi Pauli Veneti: una libro de compositione mundi, etc*. Paris, J. Lambert (s. d.), n.d.

[1333]. Pearce, A. *The science of the stars*. London, Glen & Co., 1898.

[1334]. Pearce, A. *The text-book of Astrology*.
London, Glen & Co., 1911.

[1335]. Pedersen, O. *A survey of the Almagest*.
Odense, 1974.

[1335:1]. Pelloutier, S. *Histoire des Celtes*.
Paris: Quillan, 1771.

[1336]. Perrier, Jacques. *Notre-Dame de Paris*. Association Maurice de Sully, Paris, 1996.

[1337]. Petavius, D. *De doctrina temporum*.
Vol. 1. Paris, 1627. (Petau, D. *Opus de doctrina temporum, etc*. Volume 1. Antwerpiae, M. DCCV.)

[1338]. Petavius, D. *Petavii Avrelianensis e Societate Iesu, Rationarium Temporum in Partes Dvas, Libros tredecim distributum*. Editio Ultima. Parisiis, Apud Sebastianum Cramoisy, Regis, & Reginae Architypographum: Gabrielem Cramoisy.

M.DC.LII. Cvm Privilegio Regis.

- [1339]. Peters, C. H. F., and E. B. Knobel
*Ptolemy's Catalogue of Stars. A Revision
of the Almagest*. Publ. No. 86. Washington,
The Carnegie Inst. of Washington, 1915.
- [1340]. Petrarca, Francesco. *Familiarum
rerum libri*. Editione critica per cura di
Vittorio Rossi. Firenze, 1968.
- [1340:1]. Petrie, Flinders W. M. *Athribi* Mem.
of British School of Archaeology in Egypt.
Volume 14. 1902.
- [1340:2]. Petrie, Flinders. *Wisdom of the
Egyptians*. London, British School of
Archaeology in Egypt and Bernard Quaritch
Ltd., 1940.
- [1341]. Pfeil, Ulrich. *Trier. A tour of the most
famous sights*. Kunstverlag Weick. Passau,
1996.

[1342]. Philip, A. *The Calendar: Its History, Structure and Improvement*. Cambridge University Press, 1921.

[1343]. *Philipp Apian und die Kartographie der Renaissance*. Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. Anton H. München, Konrad Verlag, 1989.

[1344]. [Phrantzae, Georgius] *De Vita et Acriptus Georgii Phrantzae*. Patrologiae cursus completus. Series graeca posterior. T. CLVI. J.-P. Migne, 1866.

[1345]. Pingre, A. *Chronologie des eclipses qui ont été visibles depuis le pole boréal jusque vers l'equateur pendant les dix siècles qui ont précédé l'ère Chrétienne*. Paris, 1787.

[1346]. Pogo, A. *Additions and corrections to Oppolzer's Kanon der Mondfinsternisse*. *Astron. Journal*, V. 43 (1937): 45-48.

- [1347]. Pokorny, J. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. In 2 Bd. Tübingen. Basel: Francke Verlag, 1994 (3. Aufl.).
- [1348]. Goetz, Delia and Sylvanus G. Morley. *Popol Vuh. The Sacred Book of the Ancient Quiché Maya*. From the translation of Adrian Recinos. Volume 29 in the “Civilization of the American Indian” series. Norman and London, Univ. of Oklahoma Press, 1950. (13th edition in 1991).
- [1349]. Portal, Charles. *Histoire de la ville de Cordes (Tarn), 1222-1799*. Toulouse, 1902.
- [1350]. Priese, Karl-Heinz. *The Gold of Meroe*. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Mainz, Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1993.
- [1351]. Prowe, L. *Nicolaus Copernicus*. 3 Bde.

Berlin, 1883-1884.

[1352]. [Ptolemaeus, Claudius]. *Phelusiensis Alexandrini philosophi et mathematici excellentissimi Phaenomena stellarum 1022 fixarum ad hanc aetatem reducta, atque seorsum in studiosorum gratiam. Nunc primum edita, Interprete Georgio Trapezuntio*. Excessum Coloniae Agrippinae. Anno 1537, octavo Calendas 5 Septembers.

[1353]. [Ptolemaeus, Claudius]. *Geographia*. Ed. Sebastian Münster. Basel, 1540.
Reprint: Series of Atlases in Facsimile.
Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum Ltd., 1966.

[1354]. [Ptolemaeus, Claudius]. *Clavdii Ptolemaei Pelusiensis Alexandrini omnia quae extant opera, praeter Geographiam, etc.* Baseliae, 1551.

- [1355]. Ptolemy. *The Almagest*. (Great Books of Western World, V. 16). Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1952.
- [1356]. Ptolemy, C. *Claudii Ptolemaei opera quae exstant omnia*. Ed. J. L. Heiberg et al. 3 volumes. Leipzig, 1898-1903,.
- [1357]. Ptolemy. *Tetrabiblos*. Ed. and trans. F. E. Robbins. Harvard, 1940.
- [1358]. *Ptolemy's Almagest*. Transl. and annot. by G. J. Toomer. London, 1984.
- [1359]. Putnam, James. *Mummy*. London, New York, Eyewitness Books. 1993.
- [1360]. Putnam, James. *Pyramid*. London, New York, Eyewitness Books. 1994.
- [1361]. Radini (Radinus), Tedeschi. *Sideralis abyssus*. Luteciae, Impressum opa T. Kees. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library). 1514 (1511 ?).

- [1362]. Ramet, Henri. *Histoire de Toulouse*. Toulouse, Le Pérégrinateur Editeur, Queray, 1994.
- [1363]. Ranson, C. L. *A Late Egyptian Sarcophagus*. Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. 9 (1914): 112-120.
- [1364]. Raska. *Chronologie der Bibel*. Berlin, 1878.
- [1365]. Rawlins, Dennis. *An investigation of the ancient star catalog*. Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific. Volume XCIV. 1982. 359-373.
- [1365:1]. Reade, Julian. *Assyrian Sculpture*. British Museum. British Museum Press, London, 1983, 1988.
- [1366]. Reeves, Nicholas. *The Complete Tutankhamun. The King. The Tomb. The Royal Treasure*. New York, Thames and Hudson, 1990, 1995.

- [1367]. Reeves, Nicholas, and Nan Froman. *Into the Mummy's Tomb. The Real-Life Discovery of Tutankhamun's Treasures*. Toronto: A Scholastic/Madison Press Book, 1993, 1994. 1st published in the United States by Scholastic, 1992.
- [1368]. *Rembrandt Harmensz van Rijn*. Tableaux dans les musées de l'Union Soviétique. Leningrad, Aurora, 1981, 1987.
- [1369]. Robert, C. *Archäologische Hermeneutik*. Berlin, 1919.
- [1370]. Roberts, J. M. *The Pelican History of the World*. England, Penguin Books, 1984.
- [1371]. Robertson, J. M. *Pagan christs; studies in comparative hierology*. London, Watts & Co, 1911.
- [1372]. Roche, Déodar. *Le Catharisme*. 2 Volumes. Narbonne, Cahiers d'Études Cathares, 1973 and 1976.

- [1373]. Rogov, Alexander. *Alexandrov*.
(*Alexandrovskaya Sloboda, or, literally,
“The Freeman’s Village of Alexander”*).
Museum Cities. Leningrad, Avrora, 1979.
- [1374]. Grafton, Anthony, ed. *Rome Reborn*.
The Vatican Library and Renaissance
Culture. Washington: Library of Congress;
New Haven, London: Yale University Press;
Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica
Vaticana, 1993.
- [1375]. Romero, Anne-Marie. *Saint-Denis. La
montée des pouvoirs*. Caisse Nationale des
Monuments Historiques et des Sites. Paris,
CNRS, 1992, 1993.
- [1376]. Roquebert, Michel. *Cathar Religion*.
Toulouse, Editions Loubatières, 1994.
- [1377]. Roquebert, Michel. *L’épopée Cathare,
1209-1229. (On the Crusade against the
Albigois)*. 3 volumes. Toulouse: Private,

1970, 1977 and 1986.

[1378]. Rosalba, Manzo. *New Castle Museum. Naples City Hall. Joint to the major for culture*. D. E. C. Artistical and Museums Patrimony Service. Naples, n.d.

[1378:1]. Rose-Marie, Rainer Hagen. *Egypt. People, Gods, Pharaohs*. Köln: Benedikt Taschen Verlag GmbH, 1999.

[1379]. Ross. *Tacitus and Bracciolini. The Annals forged in the XVth century*. London, 1878.

[1380]. Rostovzeff, M. *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*. Paris, 1957.

[1381]. Rowley, H. H. *The Old Testament and Modern Study*. Oxford, 1961.

[1382]. *Rundsicht der Stadt Wien zur Zeit der Türkenbelagerung, 1529, Niklas Meldemann, Nürnberg 1530*. HM Inv. Nr.

48068. Faksimile 1994, Museen der Stadt
Wien Druckerei Gert Herzig, Wien.
(Mediaeval plan of Vienna of the XVI c.
depicting the siege of Vienna by the Turks in
1529.)

[1383]. Sacro, Bosco J. de. *Opusculum
Johannis de Sacro busto spericum, cu
figuris optimus ei novis textu in se, sive
ambiguitate declarantibus*. Leipzig, 1494.
(The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)

[1384]. Sacro, Bosco J. de. *Sphaera materialis*.
(The Pulkovo Observatory Library).
Nürnberg, Gedruckt durch J. Getkneckt,
1516.

[1385]. Sacro, Bosco J. de. *Opusculu de
Sphaera . . . clarissimi philosophi Ioannis
de Sacro busto*. (The Pulkovo Observatory
Library). Viennae Pannoniae, 1518.

[1386]. Sayce. *Herodotus I-III. The ancient*

empire of the East. London, 1883.

[1387]. Scaliger, I. *Opus novum de emendatione temporum*. Lutetiac. Paris, 1583. (Thesaurum temporum, 1606).

[1388]. Schaarschmidt, K. *Die Sammlung der Platos Schriften zur Schreidung der echten von den unechten untersucht*. Bonn, 1866.

[1389]. Schäfer, Heinrich. *Ägyptische und heutige Kunst und Weltgebäude der alten Ägypter. Zwei Aufsätze*. Berlin, Walter de Greyter, 1928.

[1390]. Schlafke, Jakob. *La Cattedrale di Colonia*. Editione Italiana. Bonechi Verlag Styria, Casa Editrice Bonechi, Graz, Lahn Verlag, Limburg/Lahn, 1990.

[1391]. Schliemann, Heinrich. *Ilios. Stadt und Land der Trojaner. Forschungen und Entdeckungen in der Trojas und besonders auf der Baustelle von Troja*.

Leipzig, 1881.

[1392]. Schliemann, Heinrich. *Troja*.

*Ergebnisse meiner neuesten
Ausgrabungen auf der Baustelle von
Troja, in der Heldengräbern Bunarbaschi
and an anderen Orten in der Trojas im
Jahre 1882.* Leipzig, 1884.

[1393]. Schilgen, Jost, and Martina Wengierek.

So schön ist Trier. Grasberg,
Sachbuchverlag Karin Mader, 1994.

[1394]. Schjellerup, H. C. F. G. *Description*

*des étoiles fixes composée au milieu du Xe
siècle de notre ère par l'astronome persan
abd-Al-Rahman Al-Sufi.* St. Petersburg,
1874.

[1395]. Schram, R. *Tafeln zur Berechnung der*

*naheren Umstände der
Sonnenfinsternisse.* Wien, 1886.

[1396]. Schram, R. *Reductionstafeln für den*

*Oppolzerischen Finsternis Kanon zum
Übergang auf die Ginzelschen
Correctionen.* Wien, 1889.

[1396:1]. Schedel, Hartmann. *La chronique
universelle de Nuremberg*. L'édition de
Nuremberg, colorée et commentée.
(L'édition 1493, colorée et commentée).
Introduction et Appendice par Stephan
Füssel. Taschen GmbH. (Köln). Köln,
London, Madrid, New York, Paris, Tokyo,
2001.

[1397]. Schram, R. *Kalendariographische und
chronologische Tafeln*. Leipzig, 1908.

1398 Schroter, J. *Spezieller Kanon der
zentralen Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse*.
Kristiania, 1923.

[1399]. Schulten, Walter. *Der Schrein der
Heiligen drei Könige im Kölner Dom*.
Luthe-Druck Köln, 1995.

- [1400]. Schwahn, P. *Mathematische Theorie der astronomischen Finsternisse*. Leipzig, 1910.
- [1401]. Schwegler, T. *Die Biblische Urgeschichte*. München, 1960.
- [1402]. Serrus, Georges. *Montségur*. Toulouse, Editions Loubatières, 1994.
- [1403]. Serrus, Georges, and Michel Roquebert. *Cathare Castles*. Toulouse, Editions Loubatières, 1993.
- [1404]. Severy, Merle. *The world of Suleyman the Magnificent*. *National Geographic*, Volume 172, No.5 (1987): 552-601.
- [1405]. Siebeck, H. *Zur Chronologie der platonischen Dialoge*. Halle, 1873.
- [1405:1]. Simon, J. L., P. Bretagnon, J. Chapront, M., Chapront-Touze, G. Francou, and J. Laskar. Software for the calculation

of heliocentric coordinates, radial vectors and immediate speeds for the 8 main planets of the Solar System (the PLANETAP program, Fortran 77) *Astron. Astrophys.*, 282, 663 (1994).

1405:2 Sivaramamurti, Calambur. *The Art of India*. India Book House, Bombay, 1977. Published by Harry N. Abrams, Inc., New York.

[1406]. Shaban, S. *Change-point problem and two-phase regression: annotated bibliography. International Statistical Review*, Volume 48 (1980): 83-86.

[1407]. *Speyer. Die Kaiserstadt am Rhein*. KINA Italia Mailand, Kaiserdom-Pavillon Renate Hahn am Domplatz, ATD Mailand, 1994.

[1408]. *Speyer Cathedral*. Regensburg, Verlag Schnell & Steiner GmbH Regensburg, 1997.

[1409]. Spielberg, W. *Die Glaubwürdigkeit von Herodots Bericht über Ägypten*. Berlin, 1926.

[1410]. Staccioli, Romolo A. *Storia e cività degli Etruschi. Origine apogeo decadenza di un grande popolo dell'Italia antica*. Rome, Newton Compton editori, 1981.

[1411]. Stancheva, Magdalina. *Veliki Preslav*. Sofia, Zlatostrouy, 1993.

[1412]. Steeb, J. *Coelum sephiroticum Hebraeorum, etc.* (The Pulkovo Observatory Library). Mainz, 1679.

[1413]. Stephan, Beissel S. J. *Kunstschatze des Aachener Kaiserdomes. Werke der Goldschmiedekunst, Elfenbeinschnitzerei und Textilkunst*. M. Gladbach. Druck und Verlag von B. Kühlen. Anstalt für Christliche Kunst. 1904.

[1414]. Stevens, Henry N. *Ptolemy's*

Geography. A brief account of all printed editions down to 1730. Amsterdam, Theatrum Orbis Terrarum Ltd. Meridian Publishing Company, 1972.

[1415]. Stierlin, Henri. *The Pharaohs Master-Builders*. Paris, Finest S.A./Éditions Pierre Terrail, 1992.

[1416]. *St. Lorenz. Sagen + Geschichten*. 73. Verein zur Erhaltung der St. Lorenzkirche in Nürnberg (E.V.). Herausgegeben von Gerhard Althaus und Georg Stolz. Nürnberg. Nr. 15/3, unveränderte Auflage, 1998.

[1417]. *St.Lorenz. Türme + Glocken*. 81. Verein zur Erhaltung der St. Lorenzkirche in Nürnberg (E. V.). Herausgegeben von Gerhard Althaus und Georg Stolz. Nürnberg. Nr.25/2, verbesserte Auflage, 1998.

[1418]. *St. Lorenz. Wappen in Fülle. Wappenkunde. Wappenkunst und*

Wappenrecht. 86. Verein zur Erhaltung der St. Lorenz-kirche in Nürnberg (E.V.).

Herausgegeben von Gerhard Althaus und Georg Stolz. Nürnberg. NF.Nr.31, 1986.

[1419]. *St. Lorenz. Ich bin das Licht der Welt. Grosse und kleine Lichter.* 90. Verein zur Erhaltung der St. Lorenzkirche in Nürnberg (E.V.). Herausgegeben von Gerhard Althaus und Georg Stolz. Nürnberg. NF.Nr.35, 1990.

[1420]. *St. Lorenz. Sand-Sandstein. Steinsand-Sand.* 91. Verein zur Erhaltung der St. Lorenzkirche in Nürnberg (E. V.). Herausgegeben von Gerhard Althaus und Georg Stolz. Nürnberg. NF. Nr. 36, 1991.

[1421]. *St. Lorenz. Behelmt, behütet und bedacht.* 92. Verein zur Erhaltung der St. Lorenzkirche in Nürnberg (E. V.). Herausgegeben von Gerhard Althaus und Georg Stolz. Nürnberg. NF. Nr. 37, 1992.

[1422]. *St. Lorenz. Mein Auge schauet was Gott gebauet.* 93. Was Verein zur Erhaltung der St. Lorenzkirche in Nürnberg (E. IV.). Herausgegeben von Gerhard Althaus und Georg Stolz. Nürnberg. NF. Nr. 38, 1993.

[1423]. *St. Lorenz. Ecce Panis Angelorum. Das Sakramentshaus des Adam Kraft.* Verein zur Erhaltung der St. Lorenzkirche in Nürnberg (E. V.). Herausgegeben von Gerhard Althaus und Georg Stolz. Nürnberg. NF. Nr. 39, 1994.

[1424]. *St. Lorenz. 500 Jahre Sakramentshaus: Erklärung – Verklärung, Deutung – Umdeutung.* 96. Verein zur Erhaltung der St. Lorenzkirche in Nürnberg (E. V.). Herausgegeben von Gerhard Althaus und Georg Stolz. Nürnberg. NF. Nr. 41, 1996.

[1425]. *St. Lorenz. Türen. Tore. Portale.* 97.

Verein zur Erhaltung der St. Lorenzkirche in
Nürnberg (E.V.). Herausgegeben von
Gerhard Althaus und Georg Stolz. Nürnberg.
NF. Nr. 41, 1997.

[1426]. *St. Lorenz. Wandfresken. Bestand.
Restaurierung. Erhaltung.* 98. Verein zur
Erhaltung der St. Lorenzkirche in Nürnberg
(E. V.). Herausgegeben von Gerhard Althaus
und Georg Stolz. Nürnberg. NF. Nr. 43,
1998.

[1427]. *St. Lorenz. Im Blickpunkt das Kreuz.
Kruzifix-Darstellungen.* 99. Verein zur
Erhaltung der St. Lorenz-kirche in Nürnberg
(E. V.). Herausgegeben von Gerhard Althaus
und Georg Stolz. Nürnberg. NF. Nr. 44,
1999.

[1428]. Struve, O. *Librorum in biblioteca
Speculae Pulcovensis catalogus
systematicus.* Petropoli, 1860.

- [1429]. Strykowski, Maciej. *O Początkach, wywodach.... Of the Beginnings, Sources, the Deeds of the Knights and the Home Affairs of the Glorious Peoples of Lithuania, Zhmuda, and Russia, an Original Tale Inspired by the Lord and the Author's Own Experience.* Warszawa, 1978.
- [1430]. Suckow, Hähel. *Stadtführer Halle. Sehenswertes in Halle.* Halle, Druckhaus Schütze, 1998.
- [1431]. Suess, H. *Secular variations. Journal of Geophysical Research*, Volume 70, No. 23 (1965).
- [1432]. Suess, H. *Bristlecone Pine. Radioactive Dating and Methods.* Vienna, 1968.
- [1433]. Suess, H. *Bristlecone Pine Calibration of the Radiocarbon.* XII Nobel Symposium on Radiocarbon Variations and

Absolute Chronology. Uppsala, 1969.

[1434]. Sueton. *Die zwölf Caesaren, nach der Übersetzung v. A. Stahr neu hrsg.*

München, Leipzig, 1912.

[1435]. Suhle, A. *Mittelalterliche Brakteaten*. Leipzig, 1965.

[1436]. Swerdlow, N. M., and O. Neugebauer. *Mathematical Astronomy in Copernicus' De Revolutionibus*. 2 vols. Berlin, 1984.

[1437]. *Sztuka Egipska. Piramidy i mastaby*. Mala Encyklopedia Sztuki. 23. Warszawa, Arkady, 1976.

[1438]. *Sztuka Egipska. Luksor*. Opracował Kazimierz Michalowski. Mala Encyklopedia Sztuki. 25. Warszawa, Arkady, 1976.

[1438:1]. Tabov, Jordan. *Chronological Distribution of Information in Historical Texts*. Computers and the Humanities, 2003,

Volume 37, pages 235-240.

- [1439]. Targuebayre, Claire. *Cordes en Albigeois*. Toulouse, Editions Privat, 1988.
- [1440]. Tesnierio, Ioanne. *Opus Mathematicum octolibrum*. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.) Coloniae Agrippinae, apud J. Birckmannum & W. Richwinum, 1562.
- [1441]. Teutsch Astronomei. *Astronomia*. Woodcuts, 1545. (The Pulkovo Observatory Library.)
- [1442]. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. London: Everyman's library, J. M. Dent. Sons Ltd., 1990.
- [1443]. Wright, G. E., ed. *The Bible and the Ancient Near East. Essays in Honour of W.F.Albright*. NY, 1961.
- [1444]. *The Cambridge medieval history. IV. The Byzantine Empire*. Cambridge Univ.

Press, 1966-1967.

[1445]. *The Cathedral of St. Stephen in Vienna*. Graz, Verlag Styria, Casa Editrice Bonechi, 1992.

[1446]. Gransden, A., ed. *The Chronicle of Bury St. Edmunds, 1212-1301*. London-Edinburgh, 1964.

[1447]. *The Concise Columbia Encyclopedia*. USA, Columbia University Press, 1983.

[1448]. *The Egyptian Book of the Dead. The Book of Going Forth by Day*. The first authentic presentation of the complete papyrus of Ani. Featuring full color images. Transl. by Dr. R. Faulkner. San Francisco, Chronicle Books, 1994.

[1449]. *The English version of the polyglot Bible with a copies and original selection of references to parallel and illustrative passages*. London, S. Bagster and Sons.

[1450]. *The Holy Bible, containing Old and New Testaments: Translated out of the original tongues; and with the former translations diligently compared and revised, by His Majesty's special command. Appointed to be read in Churches.* London, British and Foreign Bible Society, Instituted in London in the Year 1804.

[1451]. *The Holy Bible, containing Old and New Testaments: Translated out of the original tongues; and with the former translations diligently compared and revised, by His Majesty's special command. Authorized King James version.* Salt Lake City, Utah, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, 1992.

[1452]. *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica.* Volume 16. 1987.

[1453]. *The place of astronomy in the ancient world*. A discussion organized jointly for the Royal Society and the British Academy. Philos. Trans. of the Royal. Soc. of London, Ser. A., Volume 276 (1974): 1-276.

[1454]. Farid, Shafik, ed. *The Pyramids of Giza*. Book 1. Simpkins Splendor of Egypt. Salt Lake City, Utah, Simpkins Souvenirs, 1982.

[1455]. *The R. C. Church of St. Karl. Vienna*. Salzburg, Christiche Kunststätten Österreichs, Nr.20 E. Verlag St. Peter, 1994.

[1456]. Werber, Eugen. *The Sarajevo Haggadah*. Svjetlost, Sarajevo. Printed by Mladinska Knjiga, Ljubljana, 1999.

[1457]. *The Shrine of Torreciudad. Guide*. Oficina de Información, 22391 Torreciudad (Huesca), España.

[1458]. Farid, Shafik, ed. *The Temple of Luxor*. Book 3. Simpkins Splendor of Egypt. Salt Lake City, Utah, Simpkins Souvenirs, 1982.

[1458:1]. *The Treasures of the Valley of the Kings. Tombs and Temples of the Theban West Bank in Luxor*. Edited by Kent R. Weeks. The American University in Cairo Press. Cairo, Egypt, 2001. White Star, S. r. l. Vercelli, Italy.

[1459]. *The World Encompassed*. An exhibition of the history of maps held at the Baltimore Museum of Art October 1 to November 23, 1952. Baltimore, Maryland, The Trustees of the Walters Art Gallery, 1952.

[1460]. Thierry, Amedee. *St. Jean Chrysostome et l'impératrice Eudoxie*. Paris, 1872.

[1460:1]. Thoren, Victor E. *The Lord of*

Uraniborg. A Biography of Tycho Brahe.
With contributions by John R. Christianson.
Cambridge, New York, Port Chester,
Melbourne, Sydney, Cambridge University
Press (1994 ?).

[1461]. Thorndike, L. H. D. *A History of Magic and Experimental Science. (During the first thirteen centuries of our era).*
Volumes 1,2. NY, 1923., New York,
Columbia University Press, 1943, 1947,
1958.

[1462]. Topper, Uwe. *Die Große Aktion. Europas Erfundene Geschichte. Die planmäßige Fälschung unserer Vergangenheit von der Antike bis zur Aufklärung.* Tübingen, Grabert-Verlag, n.d.

[1463]. Topper, Uwe. *Erfundene Geschichte. Unsere Zeitrechnung ist falsch. Leben wir im Jahr 1702?* München, F. A. Herbig

Verlagsbuchhandlung GmbH, 1999.

[1464]. Turhan, Can. *Istanbul, Gate to the Orient*. Istanbul, Orient, 1995.

[1465]. Turhan, Can. *Topkapi Palace*. Istanbul, Orient, 1995.

[1466]. Eco, Umberto. *Serendipities. Language and Lunacy*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson (UK). NY, Orion/Columbia Univ. Press. 1999.

[1467]. *Venice*. Venezia, Storti Edizioni, 1993.

[1468]. Vesconte, Pietro. *Seekarten*. Mit einem Geleitwort von Otto Mazal. Einführung von Lelio Pagani. Edition Georg Popp Würzburg. 1978. Grafica Gutenberg, Bergamo, 1977.

[1469]. Vidal-Quadras, José A. *Torreciudad*. Imprenta Moises Barbasto, Spain, 1987.

[1470]. Vidal-Quadras, José A. *Torreciudad*. A

shrine to Our Lady. Office of Information
Torreciudad, Spain, n.d.

[1471]. Villehardouin, Geoffroy de. *La conquête de Constantinople*. Historiens et chroniqueurs du Moyen Âge. Ed. A. Pauphilet. Paris, 1963.

[1472]. Virgil, Mocanu. *Tintoretto*. Clasicii Picturii Universale. Bucuresti, Editura Meridiane, 1977.

[1473]. Vries, Hesselde. *Variation in concentration of radiocarbon with time and location on Earth*. Koninkl. Nederlandse Akad. Wetensch. Proc. 1958, ser. B. 61, pages 1-9.

[1474]. *Wallraf-Rischartz-Museum der Stadt Köln. Vollständiges Verzeichnis der Gemäldesammlung*. Köln/Mailand, 1986.

[1475]. Waterfield, R. L. *A Hundred Years of Astronomy*. NY, Macmillan, 1938.

- [1476]. Wehli, Tünde. *A Középkori Spanyolország Festészete*. Budapest, Corvina Kiadó, 1980.
- [1477]. Wenzler, Claude. *L'Héraldique*. Rennes, Editions Ouest-France, 1997.
- [1478]. Werner, H., and F. Schmeidler. *Synopsis der Nomenklatur der Fixsterne*. Wissensch. Stuttgart, Verlags-Gesellschaft 1986.
- [1478:1]. Wigal, Donald. *Anciennes Cartes Marines. A la Découverte des Nouveaux Mondes. 1290-1699*. New York, Parkstone Press, 2000.
- [1479]. Williams, John. *Observations of Comets from B.C.611 A.D. to 1640, extracted from the Chinese Annals*. 1871.
- [1480]. Willis, E. H., H. Tauber, and K. O. Münnich. *Variations in the atmospheric radiocarbon concentration over the past*

1300 years. Radiocarbon, Volume 2
(1960): 1.

- [1481]. Wissowa, Pauly. *Real-Encyclopädie der Klassischen Altertumwissenschaft in alphabetischer Ordnung*. Hrsg. von Kroll. Stuttgart, 1839-1852.
- [1482]. Wittkower, R. *Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism*. Paris, 1960.
- [1483]. Wolf, R. *Handbuch der Astronomie, ihrer Geschichte und Literatur*. Bd. II. Zürich, 1892.
- [1484]. Wooley, L. *Excavation at Ur*. NY, 1955.
- [1485]. Woronowa, Tamara, and Andrej Sterligov. *Westeuropäische Buchmalerei des 8. bis 16. Jahrhunderts in der Russischen Nationalbibliothek, Sankt Petersburg. (Frankreich. Spanien. England. Deutschland. Italien.*

Niederlande). Augsburg: Bechtermünz.
Genehmigte Lizenzausgabe für Weltbild
Verlag, 2000. England, Parkstone/Aurora,
1996.

[1486]. Wright, G. E. *Biblical Archaeology*.
Philadelphia, London, 1957.

[1487]. Altet, Xavier Barral. *Compostelle de
Grand Chemin*. Découvertes Gallimard
Réligions. Gallimard, 1993.

[1488]. Zadkiel. *The Grammar of Astrology*.
London, J. Cornish, 1849.

[1489]. Zarnecki, George, Florence Deucher,
and Irmgard Hutter. *Neue Belser
Stilgeschichte. Band IV. Romantik, Gotik,
Byzanz*. Stuttgart, Zürich, Belser Verlag,
1986.

[1490]. Zech, J. *Astronomische
Untersuchungen über die wichtigeren
Finsternisse, welche von den*

Schriftstellern des klassischen Altertums erwähnt werden. Leipzig, 1853.

[1491]. *Zeitensprünge*. Interdisziplinäres Bulletin. Sonderdruck. September 1996. Thema Absolutdatierung. Mantis Verlag, Germany.

[1492]. Zevi, B., E. Battisti, E. Garin, and L. Malle. *Alberti. Enciclopedia universale dell'arte*. Vol. I. Venezia, Roma, 1958.