FROM HARUN AL-RASHID UP TO THE TIMES OF SALADIN

 Chronological corrections

After the publication of my Hungarian Calendar and my solution for the Seleucid Code I feel my obligation to answer the questions of the Arabic chronological order which is in frequent use as a proof against the statement of my Hungarian calendar.

The Islamic (Hijri) calendar (with dates that fall within the Muslim Era) is usually abbreviated A.H. in Western languages from the Latinized Anno Hegirae, „in the year of the Hegira”.

According to the academical science MuHarram 1, 1 AH corresponds to July 16, 622 CE.

 In 2004 I published my firm statement in connection with the above important starting date, 1 AH: the year of AD 622 corresponds to the year of 816 CE which is identified astronomically.

Or to be more specific: the first day of the 1 AH year corresponds to July 30, 816 CE of the Julian calendar!

The history of the Abbasid Caliphate starts from the reign of Caliph Abu al-’Abbas as-Saffah (132 AH-136 AH).According to the traditional chronology he ruled between the years of AD 750 and AD 754, which period of time corresponds to the 944-948 CE years according to my Hungarian Calendar.

After his death his successor was his brother Abu Ja’far. He was a son of a Berber woman, and he gain the title of al-Mansur (the victorious or the divinely aided) for his deeds. In fact he was the founder of the Abbasid dynasty, all the following caliphs were from his direct lineage. He reigned from 136 AH until 158 AH. In 144 AH he moved his capital from Damascus to the new city of Baghdad which was built on the site of the old Baghdad village nearby to Ctesiphon, the old capital of the Sassanids.

In AD 775 al-Mansur was followed by his son al-Mahdi (the Redeemer).

In 170 AH, in the traditional year of AD 786, that is in 980 CE al-Mahdi’s second son, Harun al-Rashid became the new Caliph.The period of his reign was the golden age of the Caliphate.

After the death of Harun al-Rashid (193 AH = AD 809 = 1003 CE) errupted a longlasting civil war between his two sons.The war finally ended with the victory of al-Ma’mun. The reign of al-Ma’mun (198-218 AH) once again brought back the greatness of the Caliphate in sciences and arts.

The eighth Caliph of the Abbasid dynasty al-Mu’tasim was a son of Harun al-Rashid and a Turkic woman.He reigned between 218-227 AH which period corresponds to the astronomical time period between 1027-1036 CE.In his army which was inherited by him from his brother the Khurasanians were already very influentials and based on them the Tahirids became dangerously strong not only in the Iranian territorries but in Baghdad too.

Al-Mu’tasim organized an army of slave-soldiers (ghilas) who were supposed to be unconditionally faithful to the Caliph.These new soldiers mainly were Turkish and originated from Central-Asia.Al-Mu’tasim had also founded Samarra as his new capital, and he was the one who went on the very last campaign against Byzantium.

In the autumn of 1035 CE (227 AH) al-Mu’tasim fell ill, his new physician could not treat him and he passed away in January of 1036 CE (227 AH). He was succeeded by his son al-Vathiq.

Al-Vathiq showed an interest in learning similar to that of his father. He was a great patron of scholars, as well as artists. He fell ill in 1041 CE (232 AH) and died of high fever. He was succeeded by his brother, al-Mutawakkil.

Al-Mutawakkil was the tenth caliph of the Abbasid dynasty,and he was the third caliph who ruled from Samarra. He had ahunger to build. The Great Mosque of Samarra is one of his many building schemes, its minaret is a vast spiralling cone 55m high with a spiral ramp.

He had extreme attitudes towards the Shia, and he was devoted to Sunni Islam.

During his reign he could experience all the disadvantages of the army of slave-soldiers (organized earlier by his father mainly from Turkish mounted warriors of archers). The Caliphate’s rule was limited just to Samarra itself.

The historians explain that the strange situation was the result of conflicts within the army.

Our historians could not find another explanation because of the general misunderstanding of the chronological order.

In fact the cause of the Caliphate’s limited rule mainly was an outside event, that is the appaerance of the Seljuqs.

Seljuq (Seljuk) is a ruling family of Oguz Turkmen tribes. One group of nomadic tribes led by a chief named Seljuq moved from the steppes of Turkestan, settled nearby Bukhara and later converted to Sunnite form of islam. Seljuq played a part int he frontier defence forces of the Samanids. In 1037 his sons were already in Khorasan.They had controlled Merv Nishapur.

Seljuq’s grandson, Tugril (Toghril) Beg leading his Turkmen troops had entered the once very powerful capital of the Abbasids.

In those day (December,1055), when Tugril beg reached Baghdad, al-Mutawakkil was murdered by a Turkish soldier. Some have speculated that his murder was part of a plot hatched by his son al-Muntasir and certain Turkish officers.

We do not know much about al-Muntasir.His mother was a Greek slave-girl. His reign lasted less than half a year, but he could remove his brothers from succession and could remove the ban on pilgrimage to the tombs of Hassan and Hussayn at Kerbala. He died on 7/8 June, 1056 CE.

Al-Musta’in, another grandson of al-Mu’tasim (the son of Muhammad) was selected by the Turkish chiefs of the slave-soldiers army as the new Caliph, the twelfth in the line of the Abbasid Caliphs.

As we are aware that this time Tugril Beg was in Baghdad we can understand why was it that al-Musta’in, the „puppet” of the Turks from Samarra left his capital in a haste.

In 1057/58 CE al-Musta’in acknowledged Tugril Beg as his Sultan. He was very generous with title-giving, Tugril got the title of the „Regent of the Empire” and the „King of East and West”.

(In contrary of my above interpretation the mainstream science insists today that all these titles were given to Tugril Beg by the Caliph al-Qa’im who allegedly followed our al-Musta’in 200 years later as a Caliph.)

Al-Musta’in could rightly believe that his powerful Sultan can protect him against his hostile own army from Samarra. Our historians could not find any reasonable explanation about his stay in Baghdad, that is why they started to tell stories about an escape and hiding.

Based on my new chronological order we can see in completely different way the role of the Islamic military leader, al-Basasiri (Arslan al-Muzzafar) in the development of the events.

His death on January 15, 1060 CE makes it certain that he was fighting on the side of al-Musta’in against the „new” usurper Caliph, al-Mutazz, since we know that al-Musta’in was capitulated on January 11.

Two years earlier, in 1058 CE Tugril Beg went on to fight against his brother Ibrahim, so he left Baghdad. Of course al-Musta’in did not go back home to Samarra, thus his former „electors” were not pleased by him.

The above new interpretation of the historical events makes void this earlier general opinion that „al-Basasiri forced al-Qa’im,the Abbasid caliph to hand over to his Fatimid counterpart, al-Mustansir all the signs of the Caliphate”.

(In my opinion al-Qa’im {422-467 AH} is simply an invented caliph, while al-Mustansir reigns in Egypt in the 13th century.)

In 1059 CE the Turkish military leaders in Samarra in respond to the latest events selected al-Mutazz as Caliph, who was al-Muntasir’s brother and lived in house-arrest before the election.At the absence of Tugril Beg the fight between the two caliphs from Baghdad and Samarra had ended with the victory of al-Mutazz. Al- Musta’in still had a hope that his powerful Sultan’s support is enough to spare his life despite of the victory of his cousin. He hoped in vain, he was killed in exile in Vasit on October 17, 1060 CE.

From the flow of the events it is clear that in 1061 CE the returning Tugril Beg was not forced to kill al-Basasiri since he was already dead. Next year he demanded strongly the daughter of the new Caliph as one of his wives. After a hesitation his demand was accepted.

He had his wedding with the daughter of the caliph, but could not enjoy much his married life.

Sultan Tugril, the „King of East and West” died at Rai on September 4, 1063 CE (Ramadan 455 AH) at his age of more than seventy years.The next sultan of the Seljuq dynasty was Alp- Arslan,the „victor of Manzikert” during the period of 1063-1072 CE.

Turning back to the caliphs, al-Mutazz did not finish on a better way than his predecessors.

In 1063 CE his rioting Turkish soldiers killed him.After his death the Turks chose his cousin al-Muktadi, son of al-Wathiq. His reign, however, lasted less than a year, he was killed also by the Turks.

Al-Mu’tamid was the third son of al-Mutawakkil who got the throne and became the fifteenth Caliph.Now we cannot speak about any empire, Egypt is already ruled by the Emir,Ahmad ibn Tulun, there is a bursting Zanj rebellion in the south of the country, and in general, ont he East, Alp-Arslan is the powerful Sultan who can control the events.Anyhow the 22 year long reign of al-Mu’tamid during those turbulent times asks for some respect.

Al-Mu’tamid made peace with his brother al-Muwaffaq who wanted the throne, and who ruled the Caliphate in fact from 1069 CE. He curbed the power of the Turkish soldiers and tried to bring back Ahmad ibn Tulun to his Caliphate, but his attempt was not successful. The Tulunids took under their influence a part of Syria too.

Sultan-Alp Arslan die din 1072 CE and he was followed by his son Malik-Shah. Contrary of the general believe Alp-Arslan and Malik-Shah never stayed for long in Baghdad, they always changed the location of their governing place according to their movements, depending on their activities when they tried with their troops to increase the „empire of the Caliph”.

Al-Mutamid died in 1086 CE (279 AH) and was followed by al-Mutadid (279-289 AH) who was the son of his brother, al-Muwaffaq actually governing the Caliphate during al-Mutamid’s reign.

According to the mainstream science, even before he was appointed Caliph, he was alreaqdy in possession of supreme power in Baghdad, and continued as Caliph to ably administer the Government.

Consequently, in 1091 CE Malik-Shah could not have Baghdad as his governing capital since the political situation had changed. He could visit Baghdad of course, there are sources relating to his visit and about the event that in 1086 CE the Caliph received him.

After the death of Malik-Shah in 1092 CE a civil war began between his sons.It makes understandable the fact that in the following year the Caliph tried to influence the happenings in Khorasan and Transoxania.

Al-Mutadid died on April 5, 1096 CE, supposedly he was poisoned.He was followed on the throne by his son, al-Muktafi.

During al-Muktafi’s reign, in 1099 CE the Tulunids lost their control of Egypt. If the Crusaders really sent envoys to Baghdad, they could only meet al-Muktafi there.

In 1102 CE he was followed on the throne by his older brother al-Muqtadir (295-320).

His reign usually connected with the quick internal decay of Caliphate.The real power was in the hands of an eunuch, named al-Munis, who controlled the army and led the Government as well.

The year of 1103 CE (297 AH) witnessed the rise to power of the Shiite Fatimids in North-Africa. The founder of the dynasty was Said ibn Husayn who claimed that he is a descendant of Ismail. Said was proclaimed as ruler in Tunis under the name of Imam Obaidallah al-Mahdi (297-322 AH). He established his capital in the Rakkadah suburb of al-Qahira (Cairo).

He made considerable conquests of African territories from Morocco to the borders of Egypt.

His successors continued his aggressive and expansionist politics.

In 1126 CE (320 AH) al-Muqtadir was eventually slained by his soldiers near Mosul. His older brother, al-Qahir became the new Caliph for only two years (320-322 AH). When he refused to abdicate, his eyes were blinded, and he was cast into prison by his follower ar-Radi who was the son of al-Muqtadir.

Ar-Radi is commonly spoken as the last of the real Caliphs, during his reign (1128-1134 CE) he had a slight influence on the government.

He was followed on the throne by his brother, al-Muttaqi (329-333 AH) who did not possess any real power. Those days the Zangids had already ruled in Northern-Mesopotamia, and al-Muttaqi was forced to escape to Mosul to find some help from them.

The Zangid (Zengid) dynasty was founded by Imad ad-Din Zangi, who became the Seljuq Atabeg (Governor) of Mosul in 1127.

Returning with his troops al-Muttaqi occupied Baghdad, but the local Turkish and Iranian military leaders did not accept their rule. Finally, on October 12, 1138 CE al-Muttaqi had his sight destroyed in Baghdad and was deposed from the Caliphate.

In my opinion it is completely impossible that 50 years later his son, al-Kadir would follow him on the throne of the Caliph and would reign 40 long years. Their must be another historical explanation.

Anyhow, al-Muttaqi’s immediate follower was al-Mustakfi. He had given the title of “amir al-umara” (the emir of the emirs) to Ahmad ibn Buwayhid who was the victorious leader of the shi’ite Buwayhids. From the Caliph Ahmad got also the name of Muizz al-Daula or Muiz ud Daula (the strength of the empire). He introduced the shi’ite rule in Baghdad which was too much not only for the “… Caliphs” but for the entire sunite world. Al-Mustakfi was blinded on January 29, 1140 CE.

The new Caliph, al-Muti (334-363 AH) was his brother.

Our scholars can properly understand that instead of Baghdad the city of Shiraz becomes the place where the great events are controlled, and Baghdad pays a role as a small residency.

Consequently we can now ignore such opinions that in the following one hundred years the Buwayhids ruled from Baghdad together with Caliphs who usually lived a long life.

Now it is also uncertain that al-Muti, the 23rd Caliph died in Baghdad, since we know that in Baghdad in 1168 CE the son of al-Muktafi, al-Mustanjid (1160-1170) is already the Caliph, and he is quite an independent ruler.

It is my firm opinion that around 1150 the Buwayhids were forced to run away from Baghdad back to Shiraz and they took with them the caliph too, who favoured the shi’ite religion.

It is not at all important that al-Muti’s son, al-Ta’i was or was not a Caliph in Shiraz, because of the fact that the Seljuqs had already proclaimed a new sunite Caliph, al-Muqtafi in Baghdad, since the Seljuqs were in full control in Baghdad.

Sorry to mention it, but the TIME is number one chief in history, thus I can declare that the caliphs of Baghdad numbered between 24-30 were not real persons, they are only the inventions of later historians.

For easy reference let us have here the list of these imaginary caliphs:

24. al-Ta’I ibn al-Muti

25. al-Qadir

26. al-Qa’im

27. al-Muqtadi

28. al-Mustazhir

29. al-Mustarshid

30. ar-Rashid

Based on my statement the 24th Caliph of Baghdad was in fact al-Muqtafi who was listed in the official list under number 31. Al-Muqtafi and his successors in reality had controlled the territory of today’s Iraq.

Let us see the power balance around 1150:

The Ikhshid ruler Ungur controls Egypt under the growing pressure from the Western Fatimid al-Muizz. In this period (from 1146) we can witness the rise of Nur ad-Din, the Turkish Atabeg of Aleppo who became the hatred enemy of the Palestinian Christians. Another important leader was in this period the Seljuq Mas’ud Sultan.

The Countship of Edessa was ended in 1151 and the Arab attacks on the Christian fortresses became permanent.

In Egypt the Ikhshid rule was weakening. Using the opportunity the Kingdom of Jerusalem in January 1153 attacked the fortress of Escalon and in August took it. Major who controlled Damascus did not wish to be involved. The victory caused him to reaffirm his friendship to the victorious Baldwin and he also agreed to pay the yearly tax.

But Nur ad-Din had another opinion, he thought that the expansion of the Christians is dangerous. In the following year he annexed Damascus, then he returned to Aleppo leaving the city and its vicinity to be controlled by his military commandor, a certain Ajubb of Kurdish origin.

In 1156 Sultan Mas’ud of Rum died and his sons Kilij Arslan II. and Shahinshah were in dispute about his patrimony.

In 1160 Caliph al-Muqtafi died in Baghdad and was followed on the throne by his son, al-Mustanjid (1160-1170).

In 1162 the King of Jerusalem, Baldwin III. Died in Beirut and he was succeeded by his brother, Amalrik. In September of 1163 Amalrik led his first expedition into Egypt, claiming that the Fatimids had not paid the yearly tribute.

Recently it is still taught to us that the vizier Dirgham and some opened up dams of the Nile made Amarlik to retreat.

I do not think so. Based on my revelation of the shift in the traditional chronology and setting to rights our chronology I dare to state with certainty that the main cause of Amarlik’s retreat was the appearance of the Fatimid military leader, Djawar al-Sikilli.

When Djawar took al-Fustat he started to build a new quarter in the city for the memory of his victory, and he named that place as al-Kahira.(Cairo). In the following years al-Muizz was not yet ready to move there the capital of his waste empire.

However let us see the events of the coming years:

The ex-vizier, Shawar who was driven out by Dirgham from Egypt, appealed to Nur ad-Din for military assistance to reinstate him and the sunite rule.

An army led by Shirkuh (accompanied by his nephew Saladin) set out in late April 1164, and Dirgham was killed and Shawar was reinstated in the delta of the Nile.

Shawar’s failure to observe his engagement led Shirkuh to occupy the province of Sharqiya and he stationed himself in Bilbais. But not for long, after three months siege of the town he was forced by the Fatimids and the Latins to go back to Syria.

In 1166 Shirkuh could convince the caliph in Baghdad that the retaking of Egypt is a Holly War which is aimed against the heretic shi’ite Fatimid Caliphate.

In January 1167 Shirkuh started from Damascus (taking with him again his nephew Saladin).

After he crossed the Sinai desert he realized that Amalrik also sent an army into Egypt. The fights were going on with changing successes, and with mutual withdrawal from Egypt, Amalrik returned home in August.

In 1169 during January within two weeks Shirkuh took control of both Cairo city and Egypt.

Vizier Shirkuh died on March 23, and all his titles and power went to his nephew Saladin, also known as al-Malik an-Nasir Salah ad-Din Yusuf I. In November the Christians supported with a Byzantine fleet and army attacked Damietta, but they were forced to withdraw without accomplishing anything.

In December of 1170 Saladin’s forces had already attacked Daron near to Ascalon.

In 1170 in Baghdad the Caliph al-Mustanjid died, he was followed by his son al-Mustadi (1170-1180).

In 1171 Nur ad-Din sent a letter to Saladin asking that in the Egyptian Mosques the prayers should be changed for the Caliph in Baghdad instead of the Fatimid Caliph. Saladin was aware of the fact that his master was Nur ad-Din, but his power in Egypt had already originated from the Fatimid Caliph, not from his master.

If we take as granted the legend about a holy man who arrived from Mosul in Cairo and on the first Friday of 567th year in the Arabic (Seljuq) chronology system was praying for the caliph al-Mustadi, then we can connect to this year the death of the Fatimid caliph, al-Muizz.

Al-Muizz was followed by al-Aziz, the fifth member of the Fatimids, and the first one who began his rule in Egypt.

Consequently this widely accepted view that in 1171 the last Fatimid Caliph was removed from power by Saladin and the Fatimid dynasty was finished is completely mistaken.

It is just the beginning, during the rule of al-Aziz begins the brightest period of the Egyptian Fatimids.

Saladin was permanently in a weak position when he tried to satisfy his sunite master Nur ad-Din and his shi’ite Fatimid Caliph at the same time. As a good war leader he tried to compensate and strengthen his position with military actions. He attacked the fortress of Montreal south of the Dead Sea, but he withdrew when Nur ad-Din appeared on the site, and moved back into Egypt.

Saladin’s power was not very firm in Egypt since the Caliph would know about the conflict between his military commander and Nur ad-Din.

The year of 1174 brought basic changes which strengthened finally the position of Saladin.

Nur ad-Din in the spring went to Damascus to plan a campaign against Egypt, but in the middle of may he died of sickness, leaving behind an 11 year old boy as his heir. On July 11 Amalric I., king of Jerusalem died of dysentery. Saladin successfully liquidated the assassins who wanted to kill him. He dislodged the great Sicilian fleet from the shores of Alexandria, then in November took Damascus with his cavalry of 700 men.

Having some reinforcement from Egypt he went to conquer Aleppo. This time he was not successful, but it was an opportunity to refuse the nominal supremacy of as-Salih (the heir of Nur ad-Din).

Saladin took the title of “King of Egypt and Syria” and minted coins with only his own name on them.

He had never taken the title of Sultan, only the historians of later times decided to give him this title.

The Zangi dynasty did not accept easily the independence of Saladin. In 1176 at Aleppo Sayf ad-Din joined to the troops of Gümüstekin, but they could not defeat Saladin. In the same year the Byzantines under Emperor Manuel I Comnenus Megas suffered a fatal defeat from the Muslims (Anatolian Seljuq Turks). It was the end to reach the Holy Land through Christian territories on land.

In 1178-79 there were smaller battles between Saladin and the Crusaders. Saladin mainly stayed in Damascus.

Al-Aziz, the Fatimid Caliph could develop Cairo and the entire Egypt in perfect peace.

After ten years of peaceful rule the Caliph in Baghdad, al-Mustadi died on March 30, 1180, and he was followed by his son, an-Nasir who stayed in office until 1225!

The Byzantine Emperor, Manuel I Comnenus Megas died in September, he was succeeded by his son Alexius II, just eleven years old. The following anarchy and decline in the Empire disturbed the balance of power on the East.

Saladin was a fine strategist. He felt that in the recent situation he can defeat the Palestinian Christians, and he can stop the duty payment for the large caravans moving between Egypt and Damascus.

The Fatimid Caliph, al-Aziz provided him with an army, and he moved on May 11, 1182. He never ever saw Egypt again. But from this moment his fame was growing more and more frightening.

Saladin used ably the Caliph’s army to strengthen his position everywhere and he made Damascus as his official capital.

In 1183 Aleppo submits to Saladin, consequently the Zangi dynasty had lost its political role.

He was supported by the Caliph in Baghdad, the Anatolian Seljuq Sultan was looking for his friendship, so he felt that the moment was right to drive away the foreign invaders from Palestina and the Syrian sea-shore.

On September 17, 1183 Saladin left Damascus with a large Muslim army and headed for the Crusader states to realize his plan and to occupy Palestina.

His task was not a simple one, since the Crusaders had many very well established fortresses and they were defending themselves ably.

It is not my subject to follow the developments of the fight. However we have one very certain astronomical event to lead us chronologically. There was a total solar eclipse on the day (September 4, 1187) when Saladin’s troops had taken Ascalon.

On October 2, 1187 the muslim forces under the command of Saladin officially took control of Jerusalem from the Crusaders.

Now for the Christians Tyre was the only one fortress which remained, Saladin could not take it.

In response to the recapture of Jerusalem by Saladin, the Pope called the Third Crusade (1189-1192). Although it was led by Frederick I Barbarossa of Germany, Philip II Augustus of France and Richard I the Lionheart of England, the three greatest monarch of Western Europe at the time, the outcome of it was almost nothing.

In 1192 (386 AH) the fifth Fatimid Caliph al-Aziz died. He was in office 21 years and for this period he worked on the great development of the economy. Everywhere in Egypt his memory is preserved through his building activities: he left behind wonderful palaces and mosques, irrigation system, roads and bridges. His subjects lived in peace and safety.

He was followed by his son, the eleven year old Caliph al-Hakim. According to my calculations he would rule as shi’ite caliph until 1217 (411 AH).

On March 4, 1193, at the age of 55 years Saladin died of a fever. The “Righteousness of faith” was buried in the garden outside the Umayyad Mosque in Damascus. His mausoleum until now is one of the most important sight of the Syrian capital.

Three of his sons took over to rule his realm at different locations.

In Cairo, al-Aziz who governed the city, in 1195 became the Sultan of the young shi’ite Caliph, but he died in 1198 during hunting.

Saladin’s oldest son, al-Afdal became the ruler of Damascus, while his third child az-Zahir got Aleppo for governing.

The frictions between the sons were stopped by Saladin’s younger brother in 1200 when he took over the regency in Egypt. In the following year he became Sultan there and kept his title until his death in 1218.

In 1198 Amalric of Cyprus became king of Jerusalem. In those hard times he ruled the kingdom successfully.

The year of 1204 is connected with the biggest crime performed against our mankind, with the Fourth Crusade. The Crusader “Knights” sacked Constantinople. The Doge of Venice had permitted three days for pillage of the city. Untold treasures of gold, silver, and holy relics were plundered. The priceless treasures which were preserved from the past by Byzantium, now were either destroyed or carried away, a great civilization got its deadly wound.

Since 1198 the Pope in Rome was Lotario di Segni, who is more known under the name of Innocent III. We cannot blame him directly for the occupation of Constantinople, but he benefited from it considerably, it strengthened his omnipotent rule.

When Innocent III took the papal throne they calculated that they live in the 1008th year counted from the Incarnation of Christ (AD). But they also knew that their time counting was not in harmony with the Arabic (Sunite-Seljuq) time counting which is in use from the time of Jalal al-Din Malik Shah I.

Based on the recommendations of a committee of astronomers, including his favoured poet Omar Chajjam, Malik Shah adopted in 1079 CE the solar Jalali calendar, reforming the former Yazdegrd calendar which was still in use on the Persian territories after the Muslim Arab conquest too. They determined “scientifically” the first year as the year of Muhammad’s “Hijra” (emigration) from Mecca to Medina. The new calendar got the name of Jalali and in this calendar were put together the components of the Persian solar year and the Muslim Hijra.

Harmonizing the different chronology systems they had the followings:

March16, 1079 CE in the calendar of the Jalali time counting corresponds to the first day of the 458th year (that is to the Farvadin 19th day of the Yazdegrd era and to the Ramadan 10th day of the Hijra 471 year).

Because of the fact that they mixed the insignificant Yazdegrd III up with Shah Yazdegrd II they caused a fatal mistake in the time counting when they determined July 16, 622 CE as the first day of the year “1 AH”.

As we could see previously, the Abbasid Caliphs did not use on their coins the new year counting of Seljuq origin, since fifty years later after Malik Shah’s time al-Muttaki still minted coins with 329,330,331,332,333 AH year numbers on them.

But after another twenty years later, under good Seljuq protection al-Muqtafi had already minted his coins 545-554 AH year numbers on them.

The Fatimid Caliphate which was expanding from West to East was also not in use of Malik Shah’s invention, and these facts had disturbed the clear sight of the later historians.

The territories in the vicinity of the Kingdom of Jerusalem adopted the “Seljuq Hijra”, consequently the educated Christians could report to the papal court around the times of 1200 that Muhammad lived six hundred years earlier. It was undisputable that the time distance between Jesus Christ and Muhammad consists about 600 years, thus something is wrong with the calculation.

Innocent III who 15 years earlier ran away to his country estate frightened with the coming 1000th year and the following End of the World, now as a pope had the power to rectify the “old style” Christian time counting which was only known and used within a very narrow circle of educated people. Beyond the reform of Malik Shah the pope was inspired for action by the contradictions of chronology in the Vulgate and in the Septuagint too. The uncertainty was also increased by the mixing up of the era of the Martyr and the era of Diocletian.

The advisers could convince the Pope that Dionysius was the one who made somewhere a miscalculation in time counting.

The correction of the chronology was done in the year of AD 1016 by adding another 190 years to the recent AD year of the calendar, thus the year of AD 1016 is the same as the year of 1206 CE!

In the calendar the following year was numbered as 1207.

The resetting of the calendar did not cause any difficulties since the Christian calendar before was used only in a very narrow circle of the Western Church.

The Easter tables also could be left without any major change, since the phases of the Moon are repeated after 190 years on the same day of the year.

The resetting of the calendar disturbed the sequence of the leap-years and it resulted in a two-year shift. Because of this reason the solar and lunar eclipses which occurred before the later retro-calculated 1206 CE (AD 1016) alter by one day (50 %,in the calendar) from their actual occurrence, or remain intact, depending on their year of occurrence within the 4-year period.

I firmly believe that Innocent had altered the time counting in all good faith (he was completely “innocent”), but the consequences of his silent calendar reform were quite frightening. The later historians and chronologists in confusion filled up with invented events and persons the arising new time period which appeared from the nothingness.

In many cases, as we can see it studying the Arabic history, we can witness the shuffling to and fro by 190-194 years the dynasties.

Turning back to the Arabic history, according to my calculation the Fatimid Caliph al-Hakim died in 1217. He was followed by his son, the sixteen year old az-Zahir who was in office until 1232.

He was quite powerless in the shadow of the Ayyubid al-Adil who himself died in the following year of 1218. He was followed by his adult son al-Malik I. al-Kamil Nasiraddin who ruled until 1238.

In Baghdad after his long reigning period in 1225 an-Nasir ibn al-Mustadi died, and he was followed by his son az-Zahir who was on the throne just for two years.

In 1226 the Caliph in Baghdad was already az-Zahir’s son al-Mustansir. He was in office until 1242. In those days (since 1221) the Eastern territories of the Islam realm was already devastated by the Mongol troops.

In 1232 the Fatimid Caliph az-Zahir was followed by his eleven year old son Maad al-Mustansir who stayed in office for an unusually long period during six decades.

In Egypt al-Malik al-Kamil in 1238 was followed by al-Malik al-Adil for a short period, then until 1249 by as-Salih Ayyub.

In Baghdad al-Mustansir died in 1242 and was followed by his son al-Mustasim. He was the last Caliph in Baghdad and ruled until 1258.

Hulagu Khan (the grandson of (Genghis Khan) left the Mongol steppes aiming to annihilate the Abbasid Caliphate. The Tartar warriors trampled on everything, in 1256 Hulagu destroyed the fortress of Alamuth.

At this point al-Mustasim resigned in favour of the Fatimid caliph al-Mustansir, his turban and raglan were taken to the safe place in Cairo together with his declaration about his resignation.

(Of course here the chronological order tricked on the historians, since Saladin could never taken the above items back to Baghdad.)

In January 1258 Hulagu attacked Baghdad and sacked it on February 10. The Caliph, his family members and his officers were taken in prison and were killed within the next ten days.

The greater part of Baghdad’s population also was killed.

From this moment the Friday prayer did not mention the name of the Caliph of Baghdad.

In 1260 Hulagu occupied Syria, he took Aleppo and Damascus, but after he was called home on the business of succession.

Meanwhile in Egypt in the Fatimid Caliphate the Ayyubid dynasty was replaced by the Mamluk dynasty (from 1250).

The Mamluks were the ones who stopped the Mongol-Tartar expansion to the West (in 1260).

The Mamluks made it possible for the shi’ite and Abbasid Caliphs to live in peace until 1365.

Under the Mamluk Sultan al-Ashraf nasir ad-Din (1363-1376) the Fatimid Caliphate ceased to exist, when al-Adid Abu Mohammad Abdallah died in the 567th year of the “true Hijra”.

In Egypt and to the east from Egypt the “Seljuq Hijra” time counting system of Malik Shah became common practice, and according to my knowledge until today nobody questioned chronology.

Zoltan Hunnivari

July 12, 2009 CE (H.C.)

Rajab 19. 1430 of Seljuq Hijra

Rajab 19, 1230 of True Hijra

When 1815 solar years has passed after the birth of Jesus Christ (AD)

Europe. Carpathian basin, Hungaria