

REVOLUTION IN THE COMMON CHRONOLOGY!

THE TIME-SLIP OF 200 YEARS IN THE TIME COUNTING OF  
OUR CALENDAR

ZOLTÁN HUNNIVÁRI

200 YEARS,  
WHICH WILL SHAKE THE WORLD

(Hátsó cover)

It can easily happen that the intervention of world-wide importance by the Pope Innocent III (1198-1216), that is the creation of the „restored” and reformed Roman Catholic chronology, will not live up to its 806th birthday.

Although there was an almost entirely successful manipulation to hide all traces leading to this significant action of the pope in the year of CE 1206, and to make the intervention (the correction of the calendar) unnoticed for future generations, now it is firmly proved that the pope’s action to correct the calendar dating took place in CE 1206 in Rome.

The magic mirror of the „scientific chronology” which was meant to project into our past and was created by the laborious efforts of the academic science, had suffered just a single blow with a hammer, which is with the Hungarian Calendar, and this magic mirror had immediately broken up into its constituent mosaic parts.

Perhaps the fate willed it so that thanking to strange coincidences, the Hungarian Calendar „was born” in 2002.

Since 2002 this Hungarian Calendar is pushing forward with merciless determination, and relentlessly bulldozes away all the negligence’s of the common chronology, which chronology is supposed to be sacred according to the academic science.

When the piece of trickery came to light in 2002, and it was shown that the beginning of the Julian calendar was not in the year of BC 45, instead of that, the Julian calendar was introduced 200 years later, no one yet could guess about the persons who made the re-setting of the calendar, and about the time when this re-setting was introduced.

And equally no one yet could guess about the extent of this phantom period of time which was filled up with invented history.

This small book intends to supply the Readers with evidences which came to light up to now, and are listed here, in order to support the above mentioned re-setting of the calendar.

The limited volume of this book allows only the presentation of the evidences in brief.

## INTRODUCTION

The Hungarian Calendar is a particular kind of chronological system (which remains hypothetical while awaiting official recognition), which holds that Julius Caesar had introduced the Julian calendar in the year of CE 154 (a year calculated through a process of astronomical retro-counting from the present day), exactly 1856 years ago.

The officially accepted and universally propagated date for the introduction of the Julian calendar is the year of BC 45, which differs by 198 years from the proposed date (CE 154) of the Hungarian Calendar.

Only one explanation is possible to explain this 198 year difference: we have a hidden surplus history of 198 years, or to put it more plainly, 198 years of our history has been invented.

The Hungarian Calendar has determined the date of CE 154 as the starting date of the Julian calendar, by simple astronomical calculations. These calculations essentially count back year by year from the current year's vernal equinox (the day in spring with equal day and night) and the results of the "*new chronology*" are then validated by critical analysis of the historical solar eclipses.

A signally important conclusion of the Hungarian Calendar is that the dates of the vernal equinox (spring point) in the starting year of the Julian calendar (CE 154) and at the time of the "Augustan correction" ( 54 évvel később, in CE 208) were both on March 21.

This statement can be easily checked by astronomical retro-counting of time.

The Hungarian Calendar answers the main question: why was it that Pope Gregory, in 1582, amended the calendar (very correctly, by the way) only by 10 days?

The Hungarian Calendar also hypothesis (on the basis of the same backward counting of the time) that Jesus Christ was born in CE 194 (supposing that Jesus died when He was 33 years old).

I will try to illustrate this conclusion with detailed analysis.

Summarizing the results of my investigations, I have determined that the related chronology is correct up to the year of 1016 AD. This is the same year astronomically as 1206 CE, which is important, because since then time has been counted or amended accurately to the present year, which we call 2011 CE.

So, how was it possible to insert 200 fictive years into our history?

How could this insertion have remained unnoticed for so long?

How was the hidden readjustment of our calendar performed?

When was our common history filled up with imaginary events?

Who are those personalities who must now be erased from our history books forever?

This study tries to give you the answers, not just to these questions but to a number of other, very similar and equally exciting, questions.

## **What is the meaning of the time-slip?**

For those of my Readers who meet first time this concept I am obliged to describe some fundamental ideas:

### **The concept of time, time reckoning and calendar**

Before going into any details of our subject it is quite proper to determine some basic ideas of not very simple character.

As the title of my book suggests clearly, here every discussed question will be related to the time, the time reckoning and the calendar.

Every matter and event exists *in time*: being not only somewhere but also some time or other.

The *time* combines the instant with eternity. It rolls on silently, without any interruptions, invisibly, impalpably and unfathomably.

The concept of *time* is not a very simple matter since the time can not be determined physically and philosophically. In the sense of philosophy to compute the time means making of the infinite time axis to be finite, that is to make the time axis measurable.

The measurability can be reached when we point out a starting position on the time axis and at the same time we use specified periods of time as units of measurement.

While the starting points on the time axis have usually conventional character and are connected to imagined or real natural or social events (the Creation of the World, the birth of Jesus, dates related to the reign of monarchs, etc.), the units of measurement align themselves directly or indirectly to astronomical phenomenon.

Recently, the *date* is such a concept for us which illustrates that in our Julian/Gregorian calendar an event where is placed, in a system of time reckoning, which was determined arbitrarily.

Today it is widely accepted that our system of time reckoning (the calendar) is in operation since 2010 years of time, along with its imperfections.

According to this system of time reckoning the recent year (solar year), in which we now count the days, weeks and months, is the 2011th year.

It might be quite boring for many of my Readers, but here I repeat once again that our natural unit, *the tropical solar year* is the period of the earth's orbit around the sun, which can be expressed in days, while *the day*, which is the smallest natural unit of time measurement, is the period of the earth's axial rotation. Everything will be very simple for us if these two units will be integral multiples of each other, but it is not so.

Unfortunately, the period of the earth's orbit around the sun is not exactly 365 days, or 365,25 days, but it equals to 365 days 5 hours 48 minutes and 47 seconds, or, when calculating it to four decimal places, is 365.2422 (giving 365 days, 5 hours, 48 minutes and 46.7 seconds). The astronomers call this unit as tropical year.

***The tropical year is defined as the period of time taken by the sun to travel on its visible orbit, the ecliptic, from one spring point to the next.***

The spring point is the intersection of two celestial „great circles”, one being the ecliptic and the other the projection of the earth's equator, in the sky above us.

The spring point is the day of equal daylight and night; the vernal equinox is usually on the 21st of March, while the autumnal equinox is on 23rd of September.

Consequently we could say that the tropical year is the apparent 360 degree journey the sun takes from one 21st of March to the next.

Beyond the year and the day we still have the third astronomical cycle, ***the month***, which is an ancient reference point in the system of time reckoning.

A lunar month is determined by the passage of the moon around the earth. The visible signs of the passage are the expansion and contraction of the moon, the change of the position and the shape of the moon.

The astronomical lunar cycle (month) is the interval between two new moons (or between two identical phases of the moon), that is between two alignment of the moon and the sun.

It lasts an average of 29 days, 12 hours, 44 minutes, or otherwise 29.53059 days.

Similarly to the different forms of the time reckoning ***the calendar*** is the product of an ancient urge to organize time.

The natural measuring unit of the calendar is the year.

Using the calendar the ancient people could be in possession of records about many hundreds of passed years, while in the modern

society the calendar creates a social time, different from cosmic or personal time, a time that is intelligible to everyone, and many thousands of years can be bridged over.

## WHAT IS THE CHRONOLOGY?

The civilized nations had developed time-measurement and time reckoning into a science.

This science is the chronology or the science of eras, which today has both become a very independent science, and an important auxiliary science of the historical science.

Almost everywhere and at all times, time-measurement and time-counting have been related to the motion and alteration of celestial bodies. In our Julian/Gregorian calendar, for this purpose, we need only the concepts of the day and the year.

A method of time-measurement which based on the best possible exact calculation of the motion of celestial bodies is the subject of *mathematical chronology*.

*Historical chronology* gives us a picture showing the time-measuring and time-counting methods of different peoples in different eras.

It also seeks to arrange events in their correct order of occurrence and to assign dates to known events.

The components of our recent time-reckoning partly come from the peoples of the ancient times, and partly are the results of amendments made in the Medieval Ages.

The *Julian calendar* is the result of the reform introduced by Julius Caesar. He had reformed the Old Roman calendar, and from the moment of the introduction of his reform one tropical year was considered to be equal to 365.25 days.

Julius Caesar used a simple method for the regulation of his calendar, after every three years of 365 days there was introduced one leap year of 366 days, in order to align the calendar with the tropical year.

A fragment of the Julian calendar for the AD 20-23 years

Of course, in a short scale the Julian calendar seemed to be in complete order, but for the period of many hundreds of elapsed years, the neglected yearly difference of 11 minutes and 14 seconds starts to add up and creates difficulties. The calendar adds to every single year such an extent of extra time in comparison with the reality of the tropical year. As a consequence of this „over-regulation” the difference of extra minutes causes a one whole day error of the calendar in every 130 years in comparison with the originally settled turning point of the tropical year.

During the passing centuries the neglected extra minutes produced an error of many days in the calendar (an error of 10 days during the period of 1300 years).

This problem was tackled by the calendar reform of pope Gregory in 1582, when he removed the extra 10 „leap days”, that is an accumulation of the surplus days since the time of the calendar reform of Julius Caesar, in order to re-establish the astronomical reality, and to move back the date of the vernal equinox to March 21.

If we take it humorously, Pope Gregory killed 10 days and doing so the calendar was put into order. And of course, for the future he adjusted the calendar on such a way that the accumulation of 1 day error in every 130 coming years was eliminated forever.

As an illustration let us take the Russian example. Their Great October Revolution of 1917 has the date of November 7th in the Gregorian calendar. This example shows that the error of the Julian calendar had accumulated another 3 days of error and had grown to 13 days in 1917.

After describing the fundamental ideas let us go back to the original question:

***What is the meaning of the time-slip?***

**In general it means that the years of the mathematical chronology and the years of the historical chronology are not in synchrony, there is a considerable difference between the two methods of calculation.**

Before a certain period of time in our past, the historical events (which are considered as facts by us) had not happened on those dates which are assigned to them and are taught to us in our schools.

And the alteration does not make just a couple of years or a couple of decades, but it represents a time-slip of more than 100 years.

All of the different theories about the time-slip, which were published up to now, agree on the fact that our historical time axis is artificially extended (inflated), or putting it from the other end, recently a certain volume of „never happened” history is in general use.

In Hungary the best known theory of the „time-jump” is the one of Heribert Illig. His theory takes into consideration a time-jump of 300 years, or more exactly it supposes to be in circulation 297 invented years, placing those imaginary years between AD 614 and CE 911. Accordingly, the introduction of the Julian calendar is affected by a time-slip of 297 years, which means that the Julian calendar must had been introduced in CE 253.

The mentioned book of Illig, the „Invented Middle Ages” forced to respond the dominating figures of the Hungarian scientific society, who unanimously refused the theory of the time-jump, and consequently they also refused the possibility of the related time-slip. And according to the scientific approach in our world today, the starting point of the most widely used civilian chronology is the year, in which Jesus Christ was born on the basis of the ecclesiastical tradition. The events preceding the birth of Christ are dated with the indication of „before the birth of Christ”, only from the 17th century. When we apply the continuous backward counting of the Julian years from the recent, we realize that the Old Roman calendar was reformed by Julius Caesar in BC 46 and he introduced the Julian calendar in BC 45.

Making the above statement we are confronted with the chronological contradiction: the pope Gregory corrected only the accumulated error of roughly 1300 years, while 1627 years had

elapsed between the two events (that is between the introduction of the Julian calendar and the introduction of the Gregorian reform)! This fact at first glance indicates an error of 327 years (1627-1300), meaning that the era of Caesar is moved closer to us in time by 327 years!

If this error of 327 years will be firmly proved the consequence of it will be that Julius Caesar had introduced his calendar about the time of CE 282 =1582-1300)!

## **THE PRECISE DETERMINATION OF THE EXTENT OF THE TIME-SLIP**

The 10 days correction of the Julian calendar in 1582 by the pope is an undisputed fact, as far as I know, nobody refuted it up to now. If it is so, what is really the problem here?

The basic problem is that by *the means of the 10 days correction we can and we must determine the beginning date of the Julian calendar.*

To assist my efforts in finding the starting date I turned to the results and calculations of the modern astronomy.

I make no claims that either the sun or the earth stopped in their courses during the last three thousand years. Nor do I suggest they travelled backwards. You will not find arguments here about planets and stars leaping into the heavens, or standing on their heads, or rolling over, or all of these.

And above all, I have no information about changes to the earth's rotation or orbit caused by meteor storms or the action of comets. Equally I deny the reality of any catastrophic theory in relation to the near past of humanity!

In the era when Gregory had reformed the Julian calendar, the opinions which were in circulation about the time reckoning, were still very confusing.

In the times of Gregory and 200 years later after his reign too, the learned people were convinced that the age of our earth is maximum 7000 years. And the people of those times had considered that the Holy Bible is a book of historical genuineness, beyond any shadow of doubt.

***But why does this 10 days correction make a problem?***

The reason is that the mathematicians of Gregory and the people of his era equally thought that their time-distance from the birth of Jesus Christ makes exactly 1582 years.

However the 10 days correction made by Gregory is enough only for a journey of 1300 years back on the time-axis of the mankind's history, returning back to the year of 282.

And we can see that the difference (error) of 327 years arises between the result of the backward time counting and the date which is offered, accepted and taught by the academic science in connection with the date of the beginning of the Julian calendar.

Supposing that the introduction of the Julian calendar had really happened in BC 45 we can conclude that Gregory's attempt to synchronize the astronomically correct time with the calendar time in 1582 could have been only a failure.

However nobody denies the fact, that the synchronization was performed successfully.

On the basis of the elapsed or calculated 1627 years which make the distance between the two dates (BC 45 and 1582), Gregory theoretically was supposed to make a 12.7 days, that is a 13 whole days of correction.

The academic science very modestly calls the ten days correction as the „***anomaly around the calendar reform***”.

Well, let us go back to Gregory's reform of 10 days, which ***restored*** the spring point of March 21 for the calendar.

The concept of restoration at the same time means that somewhere in the past, and very exactly at the start of the introduction of the Julian calendar, the spring point also was on March 21.

Before going to our backward counting of time and before fixing the conditions for the retro counting, let me quote the most important idea from the Papal Bull of Gregory, since the bull gives us the right to go ahead with our retro-counting:

*„So that the day of vernal equinox can be restored to the tenth day before the April calends, it is ordered that ten days will be removed from the month of October 1582, whereby after the feast-day of Saint Francis on the fourth of October, the following day will not be fifth but the fifteenth of October. The error, which has been compounded over many, many years, is now corrected.”*

The twelfth (XII) day before the April calends was March 21. Therefore this was the day fixed by the edict, to which date the day of the vernal equinox was supposed to be restored. Gregory's intervention was aimed to restore astronomically the vernal equinox of March 21.

Going from the other end, let us search in the deep past for a period of time when the date of the vernal equinox was dominantly March 21 (the original target date of Gregory's action of restoration). Consequently now it is a very correct question:

### ***When was this important period of time?***

It is quite clear that BC 45 is not suitable, since in that year the date of the vernal equinox was March 23!

Using the astronomical backward time counting we have a very wide time interval for the period of time in question!

Between the year CE 96 and CE 319 there are spring points of March 21.

First (during 32 years) we have one such date in every four years, then, during the next 32 years two such dates in every four years.

From CE 152 we have a 100 years long such dominant period of time, when in every four years three of the vernal equinoxes have the date of March 21.

Inside of the 100 years long period in the middle part of it during 32 years, in every four years four vernal equinoxes have the date of March 21!

(The calendar reform picture)

Our first and rough attempt indicates that for the mentioned astronomical date of the Julian calendar's beginning we should search

*between the years CE 152 and CE 252.*

The situation will be altered drastically when someone will prove that the starting date of the Julian calendar was connected to the March 22 date of the vernal equinox. In such a case the start of the calendar must be shifted back on the axis of the astronomical time to the years between CE 22 and CE 128.

Those, who prefer the date of March 23 for the original vernal equinox connected to the beginning of the Julian calendar, must travel back another 130 years on the astronomical time-axis, and by selecting this version they should look for the era of Julius Caesar between the years of BC 108 and BC 2.

Unfortunately, the academic science had decided to search just in this period and had selected the year of BC 45 for the starting year of the Julian calendar!

Afterwards, the academic science (passing this „knowledge” from generations to generations during the centuries) had no other choice than to create the „*anomaly around the calendar reform*” phrase of explanation, in defend of its selected BC 45!

But beyond the offered March 23 dates of vernal equinoxes we still have more fun.

Serious and famous „ancient” authors in their „antique” works had described very simply that what the „true case” is and we are left alone to believe in them.

Believe it or not, Pliny the Older, the biggest „ancient” natural scientist states many times very firmly that in his era, in the first century of our chronology, the date of the vernal equinox was March 25.

His contemporary, Lucius Iunius Moderatus Columella, an expert writer of high rank and a professional of agricultural works from the first century also indicates March 25 as the date of the vernal equinox. And of course, we can not forget about the contemporary of Augustus Caesar, Publius Ovidius Naso exiled to Tomi, since he had produced a whole book about the Roman calendar, and he found out that the vernal equinox is connected to March 26.

To verify their valuable statements we should have another 260-390 calendar years back on the time-axis, since the acceptance of these statements needs such an earlier time period.

My conclusions in connection with the above statements (sources) have their support from my graphical illustrations and listings in tables, published in both editions of my book, The Hungarian Calendar.

I do not believe in the writings of those „ancient” authors, in my opinion all of them are impostors from the Medieval Ages, but the academic science accepts them as genuine sources.

Thousands of encyclopedias offer to us these senseless data, a rabble of experts uses in the thesis submitted for a degree these terrific nonsense, producing the illusion of scientific character, and coloring sometimes the date of March 25 with March 24.

After all, these scientists can be right when they declare that both dates (March 25 and March 24) can occur with considerable probability because of the difference of sixteen hours, resulting as the consequence of the leap year insertion into the calendar.

About the offered different dates of the vernal equinox my regular Readers can study plenty of factual quotations in the 2002 edition of the Hungarian Calendar.

It is a very sad outcome that our astronomer experts, who are citing Pliny, make us to believe in their scientific approach, and they verify by this the very shaky chronology of the historians.

The wakening by the 2002 edition of the Hungarian Calendar did not make much resonance, but its good effect is that a new fact was published: 2050 years ago the date of the vernal equinox was on March 23, instead of March 25 or March 24.

**And equally it was expressed firmly by me that Julius Caesar did not live at that time, his era is closer to us in time by 200 years.**

## **THE HUNGARIAN CALENDAR IS A TEACHING THESIS**

I am forced to place my confidence in giving this title to my revolutionary chronology system, despite of the fact that the etiquette or the obligatory modesty would call only for the concept of „hypothesis”.

My most important reason to do so is the lack of time for being modest, since the New Chronology System, THE HUNGARIAN CALENDAR is ready for use.

### **But what is really the Hungarian Calendar?**

In short terms, the Hungarian Calendar is such a chronological system which maintains that Julius Caesar had introduced the Julian calendar in the year of CE 154 (in a year which is the result of astronomical retro-counting of time from the present day, and means a period of time elapsed 1856 years ago).

The officially accepted and world-widely propagated date for the introduction of the Julian calendar is the year of BC 45 which differs by 198 years from the proposed date (CE 154) of the Hungarian Calendar.

To explain this difference of 198 years there is only one possibility: we have a hidden surplus history of 198 years, or putting it more drastically, we have 198 years of hidden „invented history” on our astronomical time axis.

The Hungarian Calendar has determined the date of CE 154 as the starting date of the Julian calendar by the means of simple astronomical retro-counting of the time related to the vernal equinoxes, and later on the „New Chronology” was verified and confirmed by the critical analysis of the historical solar eclipses. After the detailed analysis of the Julian and Gregorian calendars the Hungarian Calendar hypothesis reached its conclusion that Julius Caesar astronomically fixed his Julian calendar to a vernal equinox (a turning point) occurring on March 21, and he could maintain his calendar in „good shape” by inserting a leap year in every four year period.

And there is no contradiction in connection with the Papal Bull of Gregory, which also indicates that the Council of Nicaea fixed the vernal equinox to the date of 21 March in order to make uniform the calculation of Easter.

Julius Caesar got the idea of his calendar reform from Egypt, where it was already known for ages that the length of our tropical (solar) year is approximately 365.25 days.

The necessity to insert in every four year period a leap year was stated in the trilingual, so called „Canopus decree”, which was found in the delta of the Nile, and was of earlier origin by cca.150 years than the era of Julius Caesar. The hereby attached calendar of the year 154 (as the result of retro-counting of time) shows to us that the first reformed calendar year was beginning at a new moon, which fact could help considerably in convincing the Romans (who were attached to their traditions) about the necessity of calendar reform.

Since a very long time there is an attempt to restore (reconstruct) the leap years distribution of the starting years, without any convincing result.

However the Hungarian Calendar states that the starting year of Julius Caesar, the CE 154 year is a leap year having 366 days, and in that year the vernal equinox had occurred on March 21 at 0:55 of dawn (Starry night pro).

Consequently, during the following 30 years the vernal equinoxes dominantly had occurred on March 21.

**Why we attach great importance to this fact?**

In the next year after the starting year of the Julian calendar, that is in CE 155 Julius Caesar was killed, and shortly after, his adopted son, Octavian became the sole ruler, under the well-known name of Emperor Augustus.

His biography was written by many authors, and in the biography it is expressly stated that he celebrated his birthday at the time of the autumnal equinox, when it occurred on Sept. 23.

The Divine Augustus in CE 190 (traditionally BC 9) had erected the biggest solar clock of all times and an altar of peace (ARA PACIS) on the Field of Mars in Rome.

To construct the horizontal solar clock a 22 m tall obelisk was brought in from Heliopolis, Egypt.

The obelisk was put on a 6 m high basement, and adding on the top of the obelisk a sphere for sharpening the shadow they reached an almost a 30 m height of the construction.

The special feature of this solar clock was that its shadow pointed exactly to the altar of peace only twice in the year, on the days of the vernal and autumnal equinoxes.

No doubt at all, that the erection of the altar was performed because of Augustus, and this striking astronomical installation was connected to the birthday of Augustus, that is to the date of September 23.

Discussing about this famous solar clock it is the right time now to free ourselves from the public belief, which is widely circulated and is originating from the book Saturnalia (I.14.13-14)

of Ambrosius Theodosius Macrobius:

The author who lived many hundreds of years after Augustus maintains that the „priests” made mistake when they did not follow properly the rule of the leap year insertion in every four years, despite of the fact that this rule was openly declared on the whole territory of the Empire and was engraved on plaques too.

According to him *„the error was existing during 36 years, instead of 9 days those years were extended by 12 days.*

*This error later was eliminated by Emperor Augustus who ordered that in the following 12 years not a single day was to be inserted, and doing so, the extra 3 days which accumulated in the past because of the negligent decisions of the priests, in the following 12 years will be counterbalanced.”*

Macrobius, who pretended to be a very educated pagan, had slipped over a very small matter. He had forgotten that the ceremonial calendar, alias Julian calendar was well-known to the Egyptian priesthood, and in BC 30 this calendar was introduced in Egypt after the battle of Actium.

And in Egypt no chance was left for the leap year insertion in every three years.

(In my opinion there was no chance in Rome too, since the „expert” of Julius Caesar M. Flavius was not killed on the ides of March together with Julius Caesar.)

**On the basis of the above said the Hungarian Calendar does not consider any spoiling of the Julian calendar and any following Augustan reform!**

And in addition I think that the month of Sextilis (our later month of August), has 31 days since the times of Julius Caesar!

My idea of this has the support from the archaeologists of Rome.

In the discussed moment we have 35 elapsed years after the introduction of the Julian calendar, and as we know it very well, the earth makes one full turn around the sun during 365 days 5 hours and 48 minutes, instead of the period of 365.25 days. This 12 minutes of yearly error slowly but steady „spoils” the spring point location which is fixed originally to the date of 21 March in the calendar. (That is the date of the occurrence of the vernal equinox.)

For example, in the year when the altar of peace was consecrated, in traditional BC 9/CE 190, the vernal equinox was on March 20 around 17:53.

In this period of time the date of the occurrence of the vernal equinox was altering between March 20 and March 21 in every two years.

The experts know it well that the vernal equinox of March 21 determines an autumnal equinox of Sept. 23, by adding cca.10 hours.

It means that in the year BC 9=CE 190 the autumnal equinox happened on Sept. 23 at dawn.

And in the followings, in every year till the death of Augustus Caesar on Aug 19 in traditional CE 14=CE 212, the autumnal equinox occurred on Sept. 23, so this was the date when the equinox line of the giant solar clock pointed exactly to the altar of peace.

The observant Reader could notice that between the beginning of the Hungarian Calendar and the reform of Gregory we have 1428 elapsed years, which is not in synchrony with the 10 days amendment. The volume of 1428 years asks for an 11 days amendment, so there seems to be a heavy contradiction when I state that the astronomers of Julius Caesar and that of Augustus as well, were capable to determine the length of the tropical year, and the time of the occurrence of both equinoxes with a close exactness to the hour.

Do not worry my dear Reader, the contradiction is only a seeming one. One small detail was not noticed by other researchers. As you could read about it in my previous books, Pope Gregory had only directed back his calendar to the period of dominating March 20 dates, and not to the period of dominating March 21 dates of the vernal equinoxes.

The graphics of the Hungarian Calendar illustrate it very well that the „11 minutes of erosion” had been eating away at those few March 21 MEQ dates very quickly after the time of Gregory’s reform.

The non-expert Reader also can see easily that between a restored March 20 date and an original March 21 date we have an 11 days amendment, and not a 10 days one.

Making an amendment of 10 days we only can reach the range of the March 20 dates of the vernal equinoxes, which range can be found between CE 285 and CE 385 according to our recent knowledge.

Following our reasoning the 10 days amendment by Gregory supports the amount of  $130 \times 11 = 1430$  years, and not the amount of  $130 \times 10 = 1300$  years.

Theoretically, the Julian calendar was introduced by such an amount of years (1430) earlier than Gregory's reform was made.

Translating this into figures:  $1582 - 1430 = 152$  !

Thus theoretically CE 152 is the resulted year of the introduction!

The Hungarian Calendar, after carefully considering every aspect and taking into account the appearance of the New Moon on Jan.1, determines exactly the year of CE 154, as the starting year of the Julian calendar!

By the general acceptance of the Hungarian Calendar teaching thesis the „*anomaly*” around the Gregorian calendar reform ceases to exist, there is no more contradiction, our calendar is correct for the past and for the coming 3000 years as well.

One can sniff at this idea, one can disparage the method of retro-counting of time, one can question the continuous system of the distribution of the leap years, but it does not make much difference, since the academic science is hoist with its own petard when itself uses the regular leap year insertion in every four years for the periods of time including also the eras preceding the reign of Julius Caesar.

Our offered starting year (CE 154) of the Julian calendar means an alteration of 198 years from the one (BC 45), which is verified by the academic science (mainstream scholarship), and which is being an official view, and is propagated exclusively by the public educational system.

The popular English proverb says: The proof of the pudding is in the eating.

Let us see, how my brave (?) hypothesis will do „in the eating”!

## **THE ASTRONOMY IN THE SERVICE OF THE HISTORICAL SCIENCE**

It is a well known fact that the records of numerous astronomical observations reached to us in different chronicles and in old accounts of travels, and for ages there were more or less successful efforts to identify those astronomical observations.

It is an open secret for the historians that history is usually written after the events mostly by the victors, consequently in every single case the veracity-contents of the record must be examined very carefully.

We are equally aware of it that the dates of the historical chronology are verified by the historical solar and lunar eclipses, and our recent academic science relies heavily on those dates without any hesitation.

**If it is true that these historical solar and lunar eclipses had been identified correctly, then we do not have any possibility to search for any phantom time and invented history in the period of time between the era of Julius Caesar and Pope Gregory.**

The academic science exactly relies on these eclipses and ensures us with confidence that our chronology is in complete order, fully coincides with the astronomical chronology, there is no place for the researchers to look for possible mistakes.

Our recent chronology is determined by deadly safe corner-points, such as the beginning in BC 45, or the death of Caesar on the ides of March in BC 44, or the year of CE 14 (AD 14), in which year on the 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, Emperor Augustus passed away at Nola (near Naples).

To prove the genuineness of the Roman chronology we have good support from the solar and lunar eclipses recorded in the historical sources.

The academic science praises and prefers this method willingly, although the scientists are getting more and more uncertain in the process of application when they analyze the results of this method. One hundred years ago F. K. Ginzel had performed a monumental work (*Spezielle Kanon der Sonnen-und Mondfinsternisse... von 900*

vor Chr. bis 600 nach Chr.) and he still identified surely 60 solar and lunar eclipses up to the date of the fall of the Western Roman Empire (that is up to the traditional CE 476).

Approaching to our present days and reaching the year of 1970 the number of the surely identified eclipses became considerably reduced when Robert R. Newton, the professor of Johns Hopkins University stated that four-fifths of the ancient “observations” are incorrect or unreliable.

The latest research gives us another result which is more distressing than the version of Robert R. Newton was.

F. Richard Stephenson, in his book, the “Historical eclipses and earth’s rotation” **indicates only two European solar eclipses** for the first 300 years of the Julian calendar, which eclipses are also questionable at the same time.

Unfortunately, the Chinese solar eclipses which are presented by Stephenson to verify our Roman Catholic chronology do not worth anything, since there was not any contemporary synchronization between the Roman Caesars and Chinese Emperors. The Chinese chronology was established by Jesuits sent to China by the Roman popes after the year of 1582, and those Jesuits used the method of retro-counting of the time...

According to the Hungarian Calendar nothing is wrong at all with the veracity of the ancient solar eclipses, when we start to find and locate those eclipses at their right position on the time axis that is in the area which is closer to us in time by 200 years!

In my book, “The final countdown” I have done this detailed search and I put the eclipses at their correct places on the time axis.

Here below I bring you briefly only the results.

### (The final countdown)

As I have already mentioned earlier, according to the traditional chronology Emperor Augustus died in AD 14 on 19th of March at Nola near Naples, which date means the year of CE 212 according to the Hungarian Calendar.

As we are very interested in it, let us have the main data of our year: The vernal equinox occurred on March 21 at 2 o’clock at dawn, while the autumnal equinox happened on Sept 23 at around 12 o’clock.

The literary sources mention a solar eclipse at the location of Nola a little earlier than the death of Emperor Augustus. (H. Z. The final countdown, p.16-21)

Later by 58 years after the introduction of the Julian calendar, that is on Aug.14 in CE 212, which date is earlier by five days than the time of the death of Augustus, the various astronomical programs indicate a solar eclipse which fully satisfies all our needs.

And this solar eclipse has a good companion, a lunar eclipse, which is connected to the first year of the reign of Tiberius, and mentioned in connection with the revolt of the Pannonien legions. The date of the lunar eclipse is Jan. 24 in CE 213.

Looking back to the traditional year of CE 14, my Reader can already guess without any hinting from me, that the academical science can not show to us any solar eclipse connected to CE 14. After 400 years of intensive research the experts have given up the struggle agreeing with the following opinion of D. Justin Schove:

*„In ancient times the sun was often credited with an eclipse around the time of the death of a famous person. Such a statement usually amounts to no more than a stock of literary compliment. Augustus seems to be no exception.”*(Schove, p.5)

In general it might be the case, but in our case this „crediting with an eclipse” was not necessary !

This single solar eclipse (CE 212) is enough to prove the righteousness of the Hungarian Calendar in the chronological dispute with the traditional chronology which was mistakenly established and is taught and used today.

An event recorded in a certain writing can only bear any historical character when we can safely say the exact time and the location of

that event. When we can not get these sure data the event leads us into the world of the legends and myths.

Without the mathematics and the astronomy the whole of the history will be a mess, and the geese of the Capitolium would be placed easily next to the capitulation at Sedan.

Considering all the above said and in order to break the conspiracy of silence I am forced to use elementary methods in trying to explain for the general public how we got the invented history of 200 years on our astronomical time axis, who adjusted our calendar, and how and when the “hidden reform of the calendar” was performed.

In order to evaluate the above thoughts it is a not negligible moment too, that on the selected location of the earth a total eclipse of the sun can only happen in intervals bigger than 200 years.

It means that a solar eclipse is quite a rare phenomenon in comparison with the lunar eclipses. This feature makes the solar eclipse as a good tool for the exact determination of a time period.

## **BACK TO THE BEGINNINGS**

### **(THE FINAL COUNTDOWN)**

The year of CE 153 (Trad. BCE 46 or BC 46, or a.u.c.708)

Julius Caesar who was in this year the “Pontifex maximus” (the pontiff), the consul and the dictator in one person, had reinstated the Roman calendar, inserting (or recovering) two intercalary of 27 days each, which were left out earlier in the period of the civil war.

The numbers of the days in this year were  $354 + 54 = 408$

(Hungarian Calendar, edition 2004, p. 91-177)

The year of CE 154 (Trad. BCE 45 or BC 45, or a.u.c.709)

The starting year of the Julian calendar, Julius Caesar is the absolute ruler of the whole Roman Empire. In this year he adopted Octavius, the later Emperor Augustus, and appointed him as his heir of his wealth.

(Calendar of CE 154)

The year of CE 155 (Trad. BCE 44 or BC 44, or a.u.c.710)

The devotees of the Republic headed by Brutus and Cassius killed Julius Caesar.

The year of CE 156 (Traditional BCE 43 or BC 43, or a.u.c.711)

Octavianus, Antonius and Lepidus, the proconsul of Gallia made the second triumvirate, which was legitimated by the meeting of the populace of Rome.

The year of CE 164 (Traditional BCE 35 or BC 35, or a.u.c.719)

In the year of Poplicola and Nerva consuls there was a solar eclipse according to the Chronicon Paschale. This solar eclipse was observable in the whole basin of the Mediterranean Sea on Sept. 4. (The final countdown, p. 31-33)

(Solar eclipse of 164 Sep 04)

The year of CE 166 (Trad. BCE 33 or BC 33, or a.u.c.721)

The History of the later Han (Hou Haushu) inform as that one roman convoy reached the Chinese capital Luoyang in CE 166 (In the 9<sup>th</sup> year of Jen-hi period at Hau Huan-ti emperor). The convoy was sent by An-tun, the roman emperor. The mainstream science is sure Han An-tun was not else than Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.

Some scholars who do not prefer him, are ready to modify by five years the Chinese chronology in order to find an Antonius Pius. According to the HC the “An-tun” of the History of the later Han is Mark Antony (Marcus Antonius).

The year of CE 168 (Trad. BCE 31 or BC 31, or a.u.c.723)

Struggling for world dominance the fleet of Antonius was beaten in the battle of Actium.

According to the Chronicon Paschale in that year, during the consulship of Octavianus and Messala Corvinus there was a solar eclipse. The location is not mentioned, so we can identify it without any trouble with the solar eclipse which was seen in Alexandria on Dec. 17 shortly after the sunrise. (The final countdown, p. 34-35)

(Solar eclipse of 168 Dec 17)

The year of CE 194 (Trad. BCE 5 or BC 5, or a.u.c.749)

The hypothetical year of the birth of Jesus Christ, supposing that he lived up to 33 years of His age. (CE 227 – 33 = CE 194!)

The year of CE 195 (Traditional BCE 5 or BC 5, or a.u.c.749)

On Jan.13 there was a lunar eclipse. Herod the Great presumably died at the end of January.

In this astronomical year the Jews, in the terms of the contemporary Julian calendar, observed the 32 hours old new moon crescent on March 29 at sunset, and this observation indicated for them the first day of the Nissan month. The celebration of Pascha which was to be held between Nissan 15 and Nissan 21 meant the celebration in the period of April 12-18. (The final countdown, p. 37-40)

The year of CE 197 (Traditional BCE 2 or BC 2, or a.u.c.752 and the 311-312<sup>th</sup> SE

In relation to this year Dio Cassius in his LV book indicates a solar eclipse during the consulship of L. Cornelius Lentulus and M. Valerius Messala. The eclipse occurred on June 3 and the location can be the whole basin of the Mediterranean sea. A blatant error was made by the scientists when they analyzed this eclipse. Not finding any suitable solar eclipse around the Trad. BC 2, BC 3 years they slightly changed the names of the consuls in their original literary source, and made some additions to the source in brackets.

And doing so they created a phantom solar eclipse for CE 5, which eclipse also is in difference of 8 years from the related Roman chronology, but it was really well observable for the contemporary people living near the Amazonas River. (See more details in my book; The final countdown, p. 27-30)

The year of CE 198 (Traditional BCE 1 or BC 1, or a.u.c.753)

The astronomers scientifically used to call this year as the „zero” year, but the existing error of 198 years happily will free the astronomers from the inconvenience of such labeling.

The year of CE 199 (Traditional CE 1 or AD 1, or a.u.c.754)

The beginning of the Christian chronology, the traditionally accepted date of the birth of Jesus Christ. The academicians naturally also say that this statement about the birth date is completely false, although they used to determine an error of 5-7 years in connection with the birth of Jesus.

The Hungarian Calendar maintains that the actual „error” is as large as 194 years and this error brings us to this year.

The officially accepted error of 5-7 years is usually blamed on Dionysius Exiguus who lived 500 years later. However, as we will see later on in due course, the starting year which was determined by Dionysius using the retro-counting of time, is in correlation with the year of CE 191.

Unfortunately nobody noticed this correlation. We will discuss this problem later on.

And hereby let us fix once again our basic concept: the 1st year of the New chronology is the year of the birth of Jesus Christ, the year of the Incarnation of our Lord, which year is astronomically the same as the 195th year of the ancient Olympiads (195/1), or the 754th year of Rome's foundation and the 313-314<sup>th</sup> years of the Seleucid chronology.

The events preceding the birth of Jesus Christ are dated only from the 17th century by using the Before Christ (BC) indication.

Experiencing such an extent of uncertainty, my dear Reader please do not be surprised that the original alteration (an error of 198 years) of the Hungarian Calendar from the traditional chronology gradually is reducing, first going down to 194 years, and then „shrinking” to 190 years in the period of the 9th century.

It is equally evident that the error will disappear completely, from the year of CE 1206.

The year of CE 212 (Traditional CE 14 or AD 14, or a.u.c.767)

This date is an unmovable corner-stone of the traditional historical chronology, since in this year Emperor Augustus dies at Nola on August 19.

In the previous chapter I have already supported the idea by the presentation of an impressive solar eclipse. (The final countdown, p. 12-21)

(Solar eclipse of 212 Aug 14)

The year of CE 213 (Trad. CE 15 or AD 15, or a.u.c.768)

Here is a revolt in Pannonia backed by a lunar eclipse at the beginning of the reign of Emperor Tiberius. (CE 213, Jan. 24!)

The years from CE 212 till CE 235 (Trad. CE 14-37) The reign of  
Tiberius

To determine the correct chronological order here we can already rely on the numismatics, since every single year in the reign of Tiberius is demonstrated to us by the products of the mints.

**Within the above period let us determine the crucifixion date of  
Jesus Christ**

The year of CE 227 (Trad. CE 29 or AD 29, or a.u.c. 782)

In this year Jesus was crucified. We know about it by a day exactness, since He died on the Cross on the Nissan 14, a day earlier than the Jewish Passover, during the occurrence of a total lunar eclipse.

This date is April 19 in 227 (Thursday), calculated by retro-counting of the time.

Using the leap day insertion rule of the Hungarian Calendar, this particular time was on April 18, on a Friday according to the Jewish chronology.

Here I would like to note that the scientists since many centuries are searching for a solar eclipse, doing so on the basis of the records of the evangelists, although they know it well that at a full moon only a lunar eclipse can occur.

The three hours of darkness mentioned by Luke can be connected to a lunar eclipse only, since a solar eclipse can darken the skies maximum for a period of five minutes.

The sources mention the day as Friday, so I am obliged to restore this our year and to show the phases of the moon calculated for the coordinates of Jerusalem.

Here are the data for the year of 227, retro-calculated in NASA UT time.

New moons: Feb 3, 20:51, March 5. 06:09, April 3, 15:36

Full moon: April 19, 03:46

Delta-T = 2 hours

Having the retro-calculated basic data and Jerusalem as the location I bring you my calculation based on the Jewish calendar which is an early, not yet recorded version of the Jewish calendar, and operating and relying on the pure experience.

In our year the first day of the last month (Adar) of the Jewish calendar was on the date of Feb. 4 of the Hungarian Calendar.

The new moon occurred on Feb 2 in the evening around 23:00.

In reality the observers could see the hair's-breadth thin crescent in the evening of Feb. 4, and by this the first day of the last month had begun.

On the next day before noon, still on the first day of the month, the responsible persons went to the fields, looked around and noticed that the barley crops have not yet come up. This fact meant only one thing, that the next month was supposed to be not the Nissan but the month of Veadar, to be inserted after the month of Adar.

After the elapsed two months the new moon came on April 3 at dawn at 01:00, thus in reality the observers could see the crescent in the evening of Apr 5, and by then the new year had started with the month of Nissan.

On Nissan 15, in the evening the Passover had started and continued till 21<sup>st</sup> of Nissan.

As Moses states it the 15<sup>th</sup> of Nissan is the "Sabbath-day of the feast" which is always Saturday or "Sabbath" determined by the phases of the Moon, as we saw this.

Since we know the length of the lunar month (the cycle of the phases of the moon equals to 29.53 days), and we know the day belonging to Nissan 1, it can be determined easily that Nissan 15 occurs always after the Full moon. It was the same case in the year of 227, and above all of this we have a lunar eclipse which occurred definitely on Nissan 14.

Consequently it became clear, that in the early Jewish calendar the days of the week, or more exactly the Sabbath (Saturday) were determined by the phases of the moon (lunar month) of the New Year, thus resulting in the other fact, namely **that the preparation day of the feast is always Friday !**

The conclusion is that it is needless to search by continuous retro-counting of the days of the week for the time of Good Friday, the 1000-year long searching efforts must be stopped.

If someone thinks that the time of the lunar eclipse on Apr 19, in 227 is a bit too late, I can assure him, that the delta-T hypothesis is not based on a firm theory.

By our scientists the slowing down of the Earth's rotation around its own axis is determined a bit too fast.

After the acceptance of the Hungarian Calendar the delta-T (and phase of the Moon) must be recalculated, and I will not be surprised if our lunar eclipse would start earlier by 1.5-2 hours as the result of the recalculation.

## **ADDITIONAL ANCIENT SOLAR ECLIPSES VERIFYING THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE HUNGARIAN CALENDAR**

Against my solar eclipses presented in the previous chapters the academic science could not produce much for the defense of its „genuine case” and to verify its mistaken chronology.

After analyzing the first sixty years of the Julian calendar it can be concluded that the related chronology is perfect, the Roman history was very well restored by the expert historians without any need of turning to the solar eclipses for support.

Of course they restored the history having in their dating the difference of 198 years in relation to the dating of the Hungarian Calendar, from the start of the Julian calendar.

This difference is also valid in the later centuries where the numismatics overtakes the main role when we try to determine the reigning years of the emperors.

Here below I present in brief all those solar eclipses which are given in details in my book „The final countdown” published in 2005.

To verify the chronology of the Hungarian Calendar those eclipses are exceptionally interesting, which are labeled in the handbooks as „erroneous”, since they are not found and can not be found because of the time difference of 198 years. (In the previous chapter I discussed only such eclipses.)

Our next eclipse might be a lot more impressive, since this is such an ancient solar eclipse which was recorded with day-exactness in the Julian calendar system, while it could not be seen at all!

The scientific literature contents this „pearl” of eclipses under the title of the „PREDICTED ECLIPSE OF CLAUDIUS”, which eclipse is the gift of the humanists to the educated humanity.

The case is (according to the recorded source) that a solar eclipse was predicted to happen on the birthday of Emperor Claudius, that is on August 1, and the emperor let to know the people of Rome about it in the form of a proclamation, adding also some scientifically educational flavor to his proclamation (explaining the time of occurrence, the length of it, the cause of the solar eclipse, etc.).

The names of the consuls make it clear that the eclipse is connected to the traditional CE 45 year.

Of God’s will it is really true that on our earth we had a solar eclipse, 109 years earlier than the date of the introduction of the Julian calendar, but in Rome it was not observable, not by the subjects of Emperor Claudius, and not by the smart republican people who lived 200 years earlier.

However it was a spectacular phenomenon at Dakar in Africa, and above the Indian Ocean to the south from the Maldives islands.

The scientists know very well that the eclipse was not observable in Rome, and in connection with the identification of that solar eclipse they kick around the responsibility between each other.

They reassure themselves that this solar eclipse is after all a calculated (retro-counted) one, and not an observed and recorded one.

But where is the expected source-criticism?

The question is arising: Since what time the humanity is capable to predict by calculation a solar eclipse, or to determine the time of it, using the retro-counting?

Naturally the scientists are not willing to drop this solar eclipse, since this the eclipse which would verify the exactness of the ancient Julian calendar, and such a regularity of the calendar which can be followed up to the present days.

**Such a solar eclipse which is not visible at Rome but „recorded” there, meaning that calculated, can shake to the foundations of the**

**complete structural system of the science, including the credibility of the C-14 tests and the „science” of paleography!**

I could cry or laugh when our scientists feel sorry for the humankind because of the great loss of those annals from Tacitus which were dealing with the discussed era!

It is the right time to note that emperor Claudius was the ruler between CE 239 and CE 252.

And the date of his birthday is not so vitally important for us. (The final countdown, p. 49-55)

The sequence of the events presented up to now show to us clearly that the reign of Emperor Nero occurred between CE 252 and CE 266. Consequently, Agrippina could not be killed on April 30<sup>th</sup> in CE 59, when there was a total solar eclipse visible to the south from Sicily. Pliny does it in vain when he gives us the date with day-exactness; this only discloses about himself that he is able to calculate. And he is so dare that he gives us the data about the hour for Armenia!

(It occurred in Campania between the 7th and 8th hour of the day, and in Armenia between the 10th and 11th hour.)

It is a very remarkable exactness „ in the antique era” from such an author who at the same time has very confused opinion in connection with the dates of the main turning-points of the year, and who only knows the consuls of his own era making approximately an error of 30 years when he names them.

The epitomizer of Dio Cassius is adding more for us when informing a detail about the eclipse, saying that the stars could be seen in Rome, in the midst of the sacrifices that were offered in Agrippina’s honor.

The researcher-scientists usually take this as an indecency of an artist. (The final countdown, p. 58-60)

Studying the scientific literature of the academic historical solar eclipses, I pay special attention to those events, which can be placed very firmly in time in the system of the traditional chronology, but at the same time you can not find any astronomical solar or lunar eclipses near and far, for those same events.

Two of such events, that is two solar eclipses were recorded for us by Philostratus, and based on him the two eclipses used to be mentioned as „the solar eclipses of Apollonius”.

The work of Philostratus, describing the life of Apollonius of Tyana, since a long time is labeled as an historical novel. Probably this opinion was strengthened by the fact that his solar eclipses could not be identified. However, we can also learn from his work that shortly before the solar eclipse Apollonius met a flesh and blood, real consul, who held his office in AD 66 year of the traditional chronology.

Considering the offered location of Rome, and naturally considering the 198 years of time-slip of the Hungarian Calendar we can state that the Romans could observe a very spectacular solar eclipse on April 3<sup>rd</sup> in CE 265 a bit earlier before the sunset.

After all the above said for the historians remains only to consider, that the consulship of Telesinus must be attached to this year, that is to CE 265 ! (The final countdown p. 60-62)

(Solar eclipse of 265 Apr 03)

For those of my Readers, who are still suspect that we only have an unlucky coincidence in connection with the 198 years of time-slip, let us examine the „INVISIBLE 'SECOND' APOLLONIAN ECLIPSE” of Philostratus:

Based on the source this event is placed in the vicinity of AD 95, which later by 28 years in comparison with the first solar eclipse. The academic view in connection with this case is the complete rejection, despite of the fact that the author gives also the location:”Apollonius was in Greece.”

The source also indicates that the author speaks about an annular solar eclipse, and from Chapter 25 we can also learn that the event took place around the time of assassination of Domitian, which had happened at AD 96 on Sept.18 of the usual chronology.

Ginzel in 1899 found no suitable eclipse round this time and location, so he regarded the description as referring something other than an eclipse.

Apart from this, by other researchers, the passage has several times been taken, if hesitantly, as referring to AD 95 May 22 solar eclipse, the track of totality of which starts in the Indian Ocean and ends in the Pacific...

I do not intend to follow those researchers, since the annular solar eclipse of HC/CE 295 March 3 was visible also at the requested location that is in Greece!

(Solar eclipse of 295 Mar 03)

Taking that this solar eclipse was visible perfectly in Rome too, it was considered that other author, writing in different source-system could record this same event.

Speaking of the emperor Nerva the epitome of the Roman History from Sextus Aurelius Victor is connecting the death of the emperor to a solar eclipse.

The date of Nerva's death, like the date of the death of Augustus, is an unmovable corner-stone with a day-exactness (which is AD 98, Jan. 25), and to this date the usual chronology can not offer anything.

Taking into consideration that here we have a less than two-year time-gap in comparison with the previous source of Philostratus, and supposing that our literary source from Victor recorded for us the date of Nerva's death with erroneous indication of the month and the day, it can be the case, that the different sources relate to the same solar eclipse when they mentioning Apollonius in Greece and Nerva in Rome.

Now in this case once again we have a real solar eclipse on offer against the traditional „false” one.

I am very confident to draw the attention of the interested researchers to the date of 295, March 3, as the date of the new unmovable corner-stone of the Roman history!

This corner-stone is the death of Nerva!

As a consequence of the above said we have Trajan as emperor between CE 295 and CE 314, while Emperor Hadrian reigns between CE 314 and CE 335. This means an alteration of 197 years from the

usual chronology and just one year difference from the related Roman chronology.

Unfortunately nobody can offer any solar eclipse of corner-stone quality for verification up to the year of CE 418.

(I could not find any, and the researchers who are trying in the frames of the traditional chronology, are equally without any results.)

The solar eclipse of CE 418, July 19, determines the year of the assassination of emperor Caracalla, which year is the year of CE 417.

(Solar eclipse of 418 July 19)

In the year CE 445 the millennium (the 1000<sup>th</sup> year) of the city of Rome was celebrated.

(Picture coins)

The legend on the coin:  
IMP PHILIPPUS AVG, SAECULUM NOVUM

The solar eclipse which was observed on Nov 1 in CE 487, and which is connected to the consulship of Tiberianus and Dione according to the source, the “Consularia Constantinopola”, points to the traditional AD 291 year. (487-291=196 years of difference)

This is another such a case when there is no need to compare our well identified solar eclipse with the erroneous suggested ideas.

(Solar eclipse of 487 Nov. 01)

The year of CE 603 (Traditional CE 410 or AD 410)

Using the Hungarian Calendar we can determine with the exactness of the year and the month, the time when Rome was raided by Alaric, the king of Sarmatas/Getas.

The date of CE 410, June 18. could not be the right one, firstly because of the visibility which was limited to Morocco, and secondly because it was not in August...

To create a clear picture for everybody, it would be desirable as soon as possible to teach in our schools the correct astronomical time, what is the year of CE 603 and the date of the solar eclipse is August 12!

(Solar eclipse of 603 Aug. 12)

The fictive solar eclipse of Alaric in 410 was definitely a fictive one!

The year of CE 616 (Traditional about CE 410 or AD 410)

The official science repeatedly considers as a literary invention that solar eclipse which can be connected to the stay of St. Jerome in Bethlehem, since between AD 350 and AD 420 there is no trace of any considerable solar eclipse.

In the system of the Hungarian Calendar the solar eclipse of May 21, CE 616 proves it decisively that the story of St. Jerome is not an invention !

This is once again another such a case when we do not intend to compare our factual, well identified solar eclipse with abortive ideas.

(Solar eclipse of 616 May. 21)

The year of CE 644 (Traditional CE 450 or AD 450)

The start of the reign of Marcian, the Roman emperor can be verified with the solar eclipse of CE 644 Nov 5 as against the traditional one of AD 450.

(Solar eclipse of 644 Nov. 05)

To this year can be connected the Gallian campaign of Attila, the king of kings.

The year of CE 651 (Traditional CE 457 or AD 457)

Marcian was the ruler till CE 651, and then he was followed by Leo on the throne.

The 9<sup>th</sup> year of his reign is verified with the solar eclipse of CE 659, Jan. 28.

(Solar eclipse of 659 Jan. 28)

And this is the end of the ancient world (Antiquity).

The next impressive solar eclipse of CE 693 Oct. 5 already belongs to the Middle Ages and verifies the ruling years of Anastasius, the Eastern Roman (Byzantine) emperor.

There, in the Byzantium, at that era the time reckoning is already in fashion, although they do it on a bit unusual way, starting the counting from the Creation of the World.

We might think, the solution is here! We should only find out when the world was created, and immediately we will have at our hand a very professional, unerring method of time reckoning.

Unfortunately the situation is not so simple, since we know about cca. 200 different starting date to use.

Since my intention is very serious to find the point where the time-jump had happened (and in my opinion I have already verified the existence of the 200 years of time-slip across the entire time period of the ancient world (Antiquity), on a very convincing way), I should study in details the development of our present civil chronology, which is nothing else than the Roman Catholic chronology.

But the detailed study must be preceded by the clearance of the concept of the „era”.

## **THE ERAS**

As we could see earlier the chronology is dealing with the year, which is the biggest unit of the time experienced directly by us.

And what is more, the chronology works with the year in backward direction.

I also understand that the retro-counting is a human activity, thus the possibility of mistaking is always there. And the error also can grow out of proportion. As we are going deeper and deeper into the past the error can be bigger and bigger.

The counting of the years can be performed on many different ways; I do not wish to describe those ways, for my study is more interesting the eras which cover an infinite line of the years.

The era is the continuous line of years counted from a certain historical event or natural phenomenon.

The event from which the counting of the years starts is called as the starting point of the era, the epoch.

In order to understand more easily the Christian chronology we should be first familiar with the Christian Ages of the World, since those

Ages of the World are preceding the chronology which is expressly based on them.

„With the Lord a day is like a thousand years and a thousand years is like a day.”

This notion was taken by me from the Holy Bible. 2 Peter 3:8.

I would equally quote from the Koran, since it says:”with Allah one day is such, as a thousand years of your counting.” (22.Surah)

Studying the history of the early Christianity we can state that the biblical story of creation was developed on the analogy of the days of the week. The days were connected to the line of generations of the Old Testament, and the days were named after Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses and David.

The Sixth World-day (Age of the World) was dedicated to Jesus Christ.

At the beginnings there only were the basic statements, and from them it was a small step to conclude, if the Days of the Lord equal to 1000 years, and the Creation was performed during six days, then the Fullness of Time relates to the 6000th year.

No matter what the different sources (contradicting each other in many cases) would write, the above statement about the 6000th year, theoretically and mathematically can not mean anything else than the following: a chronology „based on the birth of Jesus” can only place the Advent of the Savior at the year 5001 or 5000, that is at the beginning of the 6th Age (World-Day).

Ennek következtében a Kr. u. 1000. year meghatározó jelentőségű kell, hogy legyen az egyházi időszámításban.

The formation of the Christian Ages of the World of history is based on the Christian eschatology, which is the study of Christian beliefs concerning the final events and ultimate purposes of the world.

The belief that the Kingdom of God predicted by the Old Testament, the Messianic Age or Millennium of Messiah, is still future and will come about prior the Final Judgment and final eternal state, is called millennialism (or chiliasm), which is a specific form of Millenarianism.

According to the eschatology the history of the world is a closed unit which had started from the beginnings, that is from the creation of the „first man”, and this history is progressing through millennial ages towards the Last things, the eschaton, that is the Last Judgment of God, as it was designed by God in His divine schedule.

For this view of history the Chiliasm was to provide the numerical outline, and to fulfill this task the Chiliasm turned to the biblical story of Creation.

According to the biblical story, after 6 days the Creation had been completed, and on the 7th day, Saturday (Sabbath) God rested from all His works, and the 7th day was blessed and sanctified by Him as the day of settling the Creation and the day of His great satisfaction.

The six days of Creation have a heightened significance because they also provided a template for the Ages of the World, and each of the six days equal to a 1000 year long historical period in the history of mankind coming into existence by the Creation.

The culmination of the Creation is Adam, who is an archetype and parallel of the culmination of mankind's history: that is of Jesus Christ who is bringing the Redemption.

Similarly to the case of Adam, the „masterpiece of Creation” who was created by the Lord in the middle of the 6th day, when the sun was at its highest position in the sky, Jesus Christ was supposed to be born about the middle of the 6th millennium of mankind's history, that is in one of the years around 5500.

After the „incarnation of the Lord” (*incarnatio Domini*) there will be another half millennium of battle with Satanic forces, then at the beginnings of the 7th millennium, on the Saturday (Sabbath) of mankind's history, there will be the Second coming of the Lord, the *parusia*, and the Final Judgment of God followed by the Messianic Age.

These ideas had given the chronological frames of the Christian Ages of the World.

And these Ages of the World which we find in the early chronological works were not produced to explain the Bible or to determine the date of the birth of Jesus Christ, they rather were written to fulfill the time

counting purposes. Those authors wished to propagate a time counting system which can describe the entire history of mankind.

Generally the authors relied on the information of ages in the translation of the Septuagint [„Septuaginta (LXX)], and they calculated about 5500 years before Jesus Christ.

The most important and earliest chronography of the Ages of the World can be connected to the name of Sextus Julius Africanus. In an Anno Mundi (AM means: after the Creation) yearly counting system, in an era counting the years beginning at the assumed creation of Adam (world) Africanus placed the date of the birth of Jesus Christ in the 5500th year.

Hippolytus, who was calculating the Easter cycles, gave exactly the same year, which is 5500.

Out of this concept arose the Alexandrian method of Annianos for calculation of world era. Annianos lived 400 years later, after the birth of Jesus Christ, and Pandoros also knew this method at the same time. They placed the time of the birth of Jesus in the 5501st year, and they had recorded also for us their offered date for the birth of Christ!

The data of 5501 as the year connected to the birth of Jesus Christ was taken by Maximus the Confessor, and later by Georgius Syncellus too. It is an unanimous opinion (which can be understood from the professional publications) that from the 7th century the above Alexandrian era was the preferred era used by the Byzantine Christians, having the year of 5508 as the starting year of the era.(This era used to call as the Proto-Byzantine era.)

The era of the World, which is recorded in the Chronicon Paschale of the 7th century, is called as the Byzantine era of the World, having the 5509th year as the starting year of that era.

It is very enigmatic, how had it happened that between the Alexandrian and Byzantine eras the difference of 15 or 16 years occurred, if the Byzantine era was also originated from Alexandria, from the birthplace of the time counting.

Was it possible in the East that in earlier times they were not familiar with the time counting method starting form the Creation of the World?

Could it be that during the reign of Emperor Justinian (527-565) they did not calculate and did not celebrate Easter?

To calculate the Easter it is not enough to know the indiction year (that is any of the years in a 15-year cycle used to date medieval documents) and the year number of the emperor's reign.

And how is it, that in the East they accepted the Alexandrian era and time counting exactly in that moment, when in Alexandria the same time counting was officially ended, because of the Arabic invasion? Something is very strange here.

In my opinion the only case can be that the Byzantine Christians obviously were doing their own time counting of the era, having 15-16 years of difference in comparison with the Alexandrian era!

And I still have another problem as well, when I read from Ginzel, that the Byzantine counting of era was not becoming dominant immediately, and until the 10th century we can find also the Alexandrian counting of era in use (Ginzel, III/292). Which means plainly for me, that from the days of Justinian, the emperor and the private persons used to date the diplomas and used to calculate Easter according to the Byzantine era of the world, while certain habitual Byzantine (?) historiographers, such as Theophanes, were doing otherwise.

For example Theophanes (traditional 9th century), at the beginning of his work was still thinking in the frames of the Alexandrian era of the World.

According to him in the times of Emperor Augustus the year of Jesus' birth was VD=5500, and Jesus was crucified 33 years later, that is in VDXXXIII=5533.

There is another time counting of era which delayed the birth date of Christ by three centuries to AM 5200. The author of this version was the fourth century chronicler, Eusebius, but after him this era counting was used by Orosius, Victorius (the version of March 25, 5201), sometimes by Bede and by the documents (5199) of the Roman martyrs.

The essence of the new time counting of Caesarea Eusebius is the extension of the remaining time for the world by 300 years, in order to place the End of the World at the 800th year.

He shifted from 5500 to 5200 the birthday of Christ inside the Sixth age of the world!

The frame of the conception of „a thousand years as one day” had remained unchanged; only the birth of Jesus was shifted inside the Sixth age of the World. The Seventh age of the World (which is not of this world and lasting eternal) will start only at the beginning of the 801st year, and probably the Final Judgment will start too at the same time.

If the contemporaries of Charlemagne, especially at the ending of the related time period, were using the mentioned time counting, then they would never suggest any coronation of Charlemagne as emperor, just in the 800th (or 801st) year.

Do not worry; they have already not counted the time on such a way. They were already familiar with the invention of Dionysius, and they obviously used his system, otherwise we would not have the calendar of Lorsch, which calendar mentions literally the year of 789.

The consequence of this for us is the fact that in the meantime the starting point was shifted again by a new 200 years, we can say, theoretically, to the 5000th year after the Creation.

Practically, the time counting system „according to Jesus’ birth” means the above system.

Up to this point there is no devilish falsification, or conspiracy, the related chronology is in good shape!

The contemporary scientists of Karulus/Carolus/Charles certainly knew it well that the date of coronation, when their king (Charles) became a Roman emperor (a laureate general), is at the time distance of about 800 years from the birth of Jesus.

Calculating the event in the astronomical time at this moment we are at the year of CE 990.

## **THE CHRISTIAN CHRONOLOGY**

The time is counted usually from certain historical or natural event, while the measurement and the indication of the time mainly is

performed by using such units of time (year, day, etc.) which are based on the motion of the celestial bodies.

The basis of our present day chronology, the starting point of our era is the year of the birth of Jesus Christ.

It is a well-known fact that in connection with the year of Jesus' birth there is no a uniform opinion. The earliest tradition had already its differences regarding the date, but we are not disturbed with this fact at all, we are very confident in counting the passing years, starting from that certain year.

It is too early for me to enter the never-ending dispute about the exact number of years which indicate the real birthday of Jesus precedent the presently accepted year of Jesus' birth.

I would rather like to investigate, since what time we know this certain starting point, the year of AD 1 or CE 1.

Our recent Christian (and civilian) chronology (*aera vulgaris*) is originating from the first half of the 6th century, from the Roman abbot, Dionysius Exiguus, who was preparing Easter tables for the calculation of the date of Easter, in the year of 525 of the traditional chronology.

Not long ago our era rightfully was still called as the era of Dionysius (*aera Dionysiana*), since personally he was the founder of this time counting method.

This era calculates with Julian solar years and it indicates first time at all, the time of the leap year. The researchers suspect that before Dionysius there were other attempts to count the time from the birth of Jesus Christ, but those calculations went unnoticed by the learned public.

According to the calculations of Dionysius Exiguus, the year of the „Reincarnation of Our Lord” became the 1st year of the new chronology, and this year was the same as the 1st year of the 195th Olympiad, the 754th year of the foundation of Rome, and the 312th year of the Seleucids year-counting.

This synchronization seems to me as a well-founded one, since the mentioned chronology systems are actually occurring in other literary works, although they are lack of any dating of coins.

Having such an axiom we should ask immediately the basic question:

## **Since when we can know exactly what is what in the dating of our era?**

If the criteria is the recording, then since 1431.

Our era is strictly documented from this year, when in the Vatican the AD (Anno Domini) dating was introduced.

Of course we can go back further in time, for example to the age of Boniface (1294-1303) who was issuing a bull, *Antiquorum habet fidem*, in which bull he insisted on the celebration of the Saint Year, 1300.

It is clear that during the two-third of the whole period of time our discussed dating system was not in use. Consequently the exactness of this dating system can not be valued highly.

Supposing that 1300 was the centenary of the Christian chronology we have the right to look for similar celebration in the 1200 years.

However during the office of pope Innocent (1198-1216) there is no mention of any celebrations, instead of them we have many records about Joachim de Fiore and his followers, who were expecting that time the coming of the millennium...

## **The 1000th year!**

So we got a dead-end here.

I should suspend the retro-counting and the deepening into the past, instead of it I must examine, on what basis Dionysius Exiguus (D.E. in the followings) created his chronology.

You can read everywhere that in the West D.E. brought into use the Alexandrian method of the calculation of Easter. In the year of 525 he amplified the Easter table of Cyrillus of Alexandria (Cirill).

So D.E. was the first who counted the years from the birth of Jesus Christ.

Of course nobody maintains it that he or his master, pope John (523-526) introduced the Christian (Catholic) chronology.

The copy of D.E.'s Easter table can be also seen in Ravenna on a marble tablet. The competent paleographers' and the „marble-urologists” consider the tablet in Ravenna as originating from the 6th century...

Sorry I am digressing from our subject, since we are devoted ourselves to determine firstly the beginning of the Christian chronology and not the beginning of the Easter celebration. One thing is clear, in the sixth century the Christian chronology is not yet introduced in the sense of our today's understanding!

**But since when was it introduced? And where was it performed?**

The Christian people of the Medieval Ages partly inherited the elements of their time counting from the ancient people (from the Romans and the Eastern people) and partly developed it themselves. Naturally it had happened during the old times that at different places and in different times some works came to light, dealing with the Christian chronology beyond the calculation of Easter, but these works in their own age or at their place of origin never went into use. In other words at that time the time counting from the birth of Christ did not yet exist.

Bringing them in chronological order, works of great importance were written by Isodore, the bishop of Seville (570-636) and by the Anglo-Saxon Venerable Bede, the monk and presbyter from Jarrow (673-735).

The researcher must experience with big surprise that in the early 13th century, when Magister Chonradus, de Sacro Bosco (1235) lived we also can not speak about any Christian chronology.

We came again to the same point, realizing that before 1300 we can not consider any proved Christian chronology.

After all of this do not be surprised to read the following sentence in the book of István Hahn, titled „The calendar systems and the chronology”:

**„Our chronology based on the calculations of D.E. and on the statements of the humanists from the 16th and 17th centuries seems to be inaccurate and problematical in many ways.”**

Since our subject is the Christian chronology, our question of „Where?” naturally can only be related to Rome.

Thus my opinion is that in Rome in the early 13th century the Christian chronology (in the sense of our today's understanding) is still not developed.

The writings of D.E. (recorded in AD 525 according to the official science) „were in vain”, they went unnoticed. The monumental works of Venerable Bede written up to 735, let us say, in his isolation in Jarrow were also „in vain”, they did not influence at all the chronology of Rome in the 8th century.

In my opinion, in Rome and in Constantinople in the 8th century the counting of the years had happened according to the operative „Byzantine” chronology.

If we accept the above statement, namely that the Christian calendar expressed in Julian years, in the 13th century is still inexact and problematical, then it is rightful to ask:

How can it be that in the different early chronicles one can find lunar and solar eclipses which are indicated with day exactness, mentioning in many cases the days of the week too, and their dates are analogical with the dates getting by our modern retro-counting?

**Naturally there is only one such possibility:  
RETRO-COUNTING!**

The science of paleography can expect its big crisis, since it did not perform well qualifying compilations prepared in the 15th century (for example in the case of the manuscript of the „History of Rome” from Ammianus Marcellinus) as manuscripts of the 11th century, based on the „style of writing”. (Vaticani Latini)

I sincerely hope that after making the corrections, the historians also will not forget to adjust their opinion relating to the Huns, Hungars, which opinions actually rely on the sources of Firenze (Florence) of the 15th century, and not on genuine sources of the 11th century.

We got our dead-end again, since on the turn of the 12/13th centuries (when we are going backward from the 15th century) the chronology of the AD system had already not been proved to exist, while looking at it from the other side of the time axis, it seems to be impossible that the new method of time counting would spread just from Anglia, first in the Empire of the Franks, and then in Italy too.

To confuse our issue more, we have numerous Kalendariums of very good quality from the Carolingian age, for the years between AD 780 and AD 870, which were ideally processed by Arno Borst.

The way out from our dead-end can be expected from the beginnings of the Easter calculations, so let us continue now with their examination.

## **THE ANTECEDENTS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHRONOLOGY THE CALCULATION OF EASTER**

We should turn back to the beginnings, to the primitive Church, that is to the first Christian communities which were consisting of Jewish members, thus they celebrated the feasts of the Jews. Later on the Christianity in the process of St. Paul's mission turned to organize the Christian communities of gentile character, and it became more and more usual that the communities celebrated on the first day of the week, on Sunday, replacing the Saturday (the Hebrew Sabbath), and the Sunday gradually received the name of „Lord's Day”.

These early Christian converts began to observe the Lord's Day on Sunday in honor of Christ's Resurrection. The Christians celebrated also the two big feasts of the Jews, the Passover (Easter) and the Whitsun (Pentecost), but from the earliest time they have already given a new meaning to those celebrations.

The Easter became the celebration of Christ's Resurrection, while the Whitsun became the celebration of the Advent of the Holy Spirit. But the celebration of Easter was not fully uniform. It was a general custom to celebrate the day of Resurrection on the Sunday following the 14th of the first spring month, the Nissan (the Jewish Easter), and on the preceding Friday they remembered about the crucifixion of Christ.

But the Christians of Asia Minor celebrated the memorial day of Christ's crucifixion on Nissan 14, whatever the day of the week.

The Jews have eaten their Paschal lamb (which was slain in late afternoon) in the evening of the 14th day of the spring month of Nissan, and the 15th of the month was the first day of their Easter. After the destruction of the Second Temple, or Jerusalem (in the traditional AD 70) the Jews turned to celebrate the Pascha (Easter) on the day of the vernal equinox (that is on March 21). Some of the Christians followed suit.

For us must mean more than just a notion the fact that for the times of around the CE 70s the astronomical retro-counting indicates the vernal equinox of March 22, while the destruction of the Second Temple of Jerusalem is dated as the year of CE 268 by the Hungarian Calendar, and in that region of time the retro-counted vernal equinoxes are still dominantly occurring on March 21!

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> centuries considerable differences came into being around the date of the Easter celebration. And in addition to it the meaning of the feast also became different in the East from the West: The quartodecimans, who maintained that Easter should be kept on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of the first month, celebrated Easter rather in remembrance of the Last Supper and the Crucifixion, while in the West Easter was the celebration of the Resurrection.

However they neither used astronomical calculation, nor observation (the Jews in the old days used observation by the way) to determine the New Moon and the Full Moon, which were regulating the date of the Easter. Instead of that they relied on time circuits or cycles which were based on the regular repetition of the sequence of the moon's phases. Such a cycle, or period of time, after which the sequence of the Paschal Full Moons will be the same again we call as Easter Cycle. When the days of Easters are pre-calculated for one or more such Easter cycles we speak about Easter canon or Easter table. Starting from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century we already know a few such Easter tables. The oldest primitive Easter cycles were based on the 8-year cycle. As such an example we can have the Easter canon of Hippolytus in the first half of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century, which is mentioned by Eusebius.

I do not wish to analyze the double 8-year cycle (16 years) of Hippolytus, which starts from the first year (traditional AD 222, Apr.13.) of the reign of Alexander Severus. I only would like to draw the attention of the future researchers to my question: Why is it that in

the Easter canon of Hippolytus the celebration date of Easter alters between the dates of March 20 and Apr. 21?

Although around the times of the trad.AD 222 the vernal equinox still occurs on March 21!

Could not they measure the occurrence of the vernal equinox?

No, it was certainly not the case!

According to the Hungarian Calendar **Emperor Alexander Severus started his reign in CE 420**, just exactly 198 years later, when the Full Moon occurred on Apr.14 of that year (determining by me this date with regular retro-counting from the present days)!

And in addition to this, in that period the date of the vernal equinox was dominantly March 19.

I hope no more explanations are necessary.

Naturally, we still must examine one thing: why was it that Hippolytus started his table with the 1st year of Emperor Severus?

During his period of time Hippolytus (relying on Sextus Julius Africanus) believes that the birth of Christ can be assigned to the 5500th year after the Creation. He thinks this because of the fact that Adam was created on the sixth day of the Creation. And he gives more details, starting that Christ was born in the 42nd year of the reign of Emperor Augustus, in a.u.c.752 (traditional BC 2) on a Wednesday, on Apr. 2.

(I hope that my dear Readers do not need any assistance from me to notice at once that the exact naming of the week's day is pure anachronism, the naming of the day here must be only from the later intervention of an over-zealous copyist, who was able to retro-count, since for such an early time period the time measuring concept of the 7-day unit of time, named as „feria”, was not yet known and was not yet in use. The application of the „feria” starts from a later period, from the end of the 4th century, from the time of Theodosius II).

The suffering of Christ should be dated for a time which is later by 30 years, that is to the a.u.c.782 year, exactly to the year of the reign of Emperor Tiberius.

The Readers of the Hungarian Calendar know it since 2002 that the determined date of the Crucifixion with a day exactness is 227 April 19 (AD 29)!

Hippolytus gives us the exact names of the two Roman consuls, as Rufus [C. Fufius (sic!) Geminus] and Rubellio [L. Rubellius Geminus].

There is no need to fabricate unnecessary theories about his reasons to start his Easter cycle from the following year, since he named his pagan sources, the consuls and Emperor Augustus.

Hippolytus did not yet know the myth of Dec. 25 connected to the birth of Christ, so it is also not the time for us to brood over an idea that which was the year when March 25 was a Friday or a Sunday. He calculates his Easter cycle from the year of Crucifixion, CE 228 adding to it 192 years. (228 + 192 = 420 !)

This is nothing else than two of the 84-year cycles plus one cycle of 16 years and one cycle of 8 years, but it can be interpreted also as 12 units of the cycles of 16 years.

### **„One day is with the Lord as a thousand years”.**

For Hippolytus who wrote in 5738 after the Creation it meant that the „Last Day” will come after another 262 years!

As I have already noted the calculation based on the 8-year cycle is quite erroneous, permanent correction is needed. In Alexandria as early as in the 3rd century they changed to the Metonic Cycle of 19 years (235 lunar months), using it and its multiples for the calculation of Easter.

The change to the Metonic cycle is connected by the science to the name of Anatolius of Alexandria, not bothering about the fact that initially the Metonic cycle's appearance was in 76 years (4x19) long or 95 years (5x19) long versions. Anatolius works in the AD 270-280 period according to the traditional chronology and prepares his Easter tables.

The Metonic cycle is the realization of the fact that after 19 years, that is after 235 lunar months, the phases of the moon repeat themselves, their sequence will be repeated and the moon's phases will occur in exactly the same periods of the solar year.

( $365.25 \times 19 = 6\,939.75$  days, while  $29.53059 \times 235 = 6\,939.6886$ )

„From the Paschal Canons of Anatolius: 14. ”There is then in the first year the new moon of the first month, which is the beginning of every cycle of nineteen years, on the twenty-sixth day of the Egyptian

Phamenoth, but according to the months of the Macedonians, the twenty-second day of Dystrus, or as the Romans would say, the eleventh before the Kalends of April.

15. On the said twenty-sixth of Phamenoth, the sun is found not only entered on the first segment, but already passing through the fourth day in it. They are accustomed to call this segment the first dodecatomorion, 'twelfth-part', and the equinox, and the beginning of the months, and the head of the cycle, and the starting-point of the planetary circuit." (Eusebius, 342)

We can thank Eusebius for the detailed information. We can conclude from it that in the 1st year of the cycle of Anatolius the vernal equinox, believe it or not, occurs on March 19. The approach through the trad. AD 270-280 years as his lifetime is not good at all!

According to the table of the Hungarian Calendar between CE 448-483 the occurrence of the vernal equinox is always March 19. Please look for Anatolius in that period of time.

Since he was an Alexandrian he probably counted his Julian year from Aug.29 (Thoth 1) and in his cycle he included 7 leap months and a "saltus lunae" (+1 day in order to make the cycle to repeat) in the 19th year.

It is a pity that the only Latin manuscripts of his cycle, which are available today, can not make it possible to restore safely his cycle and to fix it to calendar years.

In the 4th century the Festal letters and the Easter table of Saint Athanasius are listing the Easters together with their year indicators for the period of AD 328-373.

The Alexandrian bishops Theophilus and St. Cyrillus had also left for us Easter tables based on the 19-year Metonic cycle.

The Council of Nicaea also accepted and sanctified the Alexandrian method of Easter calculation, when they determined the time of the celebration according to the Alexandrian principles.

The Council ordered that Easter must necessarily celebrate on the same Sunday by all churches, and this Sunday must be the first after the full moon following the vernal equinox.

Their reason for this decision was that Christ died on the preparation day of the Jewish Passover, which is always at full moon, the full moon is always on Friday (feria 6), the celebration is on Saturday, and the Resurrection is the following Sunday.

The calendar date of the vernal equinox was fixed exactly for March 21. Till today the orthodox science is in debit to us, there is no a definite answer, why the date of March 21 was chosen.

The most frequent offer as an answer is that March 21 was taken from the Alexandrian Christians.

It is true that the Alexandrians knew very well that during the life of Jesus (CE 194-CE 227) the date of the vernal equinox was dominantly the March 21.

Sometimes the simple answer is the best!

According to the Nicene regulation we have the earliest Easter when the full moon is on March 21 and the next day is Sunday (March 22), while we have the latest one when the full moon is just on March 22 and the following full moon is coming after 29 days, just on the day of Sunday. In the latter case the following Sunday will be the Easter, that is Apr. 25.

Anyhow, the calculation of Easter generally was only accepted after several passing centuries.

As a consequence of the different calculations it had happened that the time of the Easter in the East and in the West differed from each other sometimes by a few weeks, and what is more, by a whole month, although Rome in a few occasions agreed with the important Alexandria on the Easter question adapting the Alexandrian way.

After this brief intermezzo we can go back to the times of Dionysius Exiguus, where earlier we got blocked up.

### **When was living and calculating Dionysius, „The Small Scythian”?**

On the basis of his available writings it can be determined by the exactness of an astronomical day.

According to the official teaching, on the turn of the 5/6 centuries he was already a monk in Rome and exactly in AD 525 (which year was identified by him) he put on the table his epoch-marking performance, the elaborated Alexandrian Easter table for 95 years.

It is almost incredible that someone in the dark Middle Ages hits upon the birthday of Christ with such exactness and can guess right the astronomical time retro-counted from the present.

It was his great achievement that he accepted fully the Alexandrian calculation rules, he developed those further, he made the Latin Church to accept those same rules and he put an end to the everlasting disputes' on Easter.

On the suggestions of Bishop Petronius and others he calculated and designed his canon of Easter for the future.

In other words he has given the dates of the Paschal Full Moons and the Easter Sundays.

And in his interpretation the date of the letter following the finished great work was the 525<sup>th</sup> year after the birth of Christ, when the consul was Probus. Since then this date is the basic pillar of our traditional chronology, nobody dares to doubt it.

The tables of Dionysius are highly praised; allegedly his astronomical calculations are completely free from any mistakes.

### **But is it really so?**

The Hungarian Readers can collect important details in connection with the birth of his work from the book of Ágoston Teres, "The Bible and the astronomy":

*"Bishop Cyrillus started his first cycle with the 153<sup>rd</sup> year of the era of Diocletian, and he ended his last cycle with the 247<sup>th</sup> year of that same tyrant."* (Teres, p.212)

For the Reader of our present days it means that Cyrillus from Alexandria has given to us a reliable Easter table for 95 years, between the AD 437 and AD 531 years.

Luckily for us D.E. attached the last 19-year cycle of Cyrillus, placing it before his work, so we can see that the calculation starting from AD 532 is not more than the extension of the "ready-made and adapted" 19-year cycle up to the year of AD 626.

**Where is the praised calculation of his? What is the innovation here?**

Digging a bit deeper we can find out that Cyrillus of Alexandria made his calculations up to the year of AD 512 only.

Ginzel also noticed this logical faultiness and he made a concession saying that probably an anonym computist calculated the missing 19 years. (Ginzel III, p. 235)

I find it very peculiar that this preambular piece of the years 513-531 does not indicate the leap years, although they are there.

If they would not be there, or they would be there in a different sequence, it is sure that the table would fall out from the “integral whole”!

While at the same time the cohesive link between the „preambular piece” and the „work” is provided by the means of the indiction.

Why he did not show the leap years?

Was he disturbed, perhaps by the recognition that in Alexandria the leap year was a bit shifted in comparison with the Roman or Byzantine chronology?

Were the Romans and the Byzantines counting the years on the similar way?

Having such a suspicious start we should keep an eye on the „Small Scythian”, perhaps we can find yet another strange things.

On the NASA website by the means of the phases of the moon (given for several thousands years) it can be quickly justified that the phases of the moon (full moons) being in the „preambular piece” could not be the results of a calculation made by 100 years earlier, or between the years of AD 513-AD 531 either !

In connection with the Easter tables the researchers frequently point out that the tables are erroneous, not much can be expected from them, they can not reflect properly the actual astronomical situation, etc.

I almost agree with the experts on that, but I have a small „but” to add.

To determine the initial age of the moon (which is calculated with the so called ecclesiastical method) was also needed at least one good glance into the skies. That glance was to determine the certain LUNA I from which one can already calculate the LUNA XIV (the 14th day of the first lunar month of the spring, also called the 'Paschal term' because Easter is the Sunday after it), and according to the established further rules one can calculate the Easter.

After the ending of the Metonic cycle, as I have already mentioned, the phases of the moon repeat exactly on the same days of the solar year. The Metonic cycle has only an error of 1.5 hours!

After 16 elapsing Cycle of 19 years the phase of the moon will be older by one day.

(This is a period of 304 years!)

**Unfortunately the phase of the moon is not capable to become younger on a big average as the time is progressing!**

Expressed or not expressed by the scientists, that the age of the Ecclesiastical Full Moon only is approximating the age of the actual astronomical Full Moon, it means only one thing that the LUNA I can occur earlier (which means that it is older) than it is indicated in the Easter table.

However, the error of the mentioned Easter which was calculated differently at different locations, never was the consequence of an earlier indication of the first Moon crescent of the spring than the observation had happened.

After comparing the table of D.E. with the moon phase of NASA it can be stated that his tables could not be prepared in CE 525, the moon phases of the year 519 simply exclude that possibility.

D.E. indicates the Easter Sunday on March 31, while he puts the LUNA 14 on March 30 instead of the actual Apr.1.

And above all of that, the Luna 14 is the day preceding the full moon in fifty occasions!

It is evident that as the astronomical time passes the full moon is aging, so we should look for that astronomical period where in the Easter table of the 19-year cycle the full moons do not overtake „themselves”.

The time-slip of 198 years of the Hungarian Calendar makes our life a lot easier in this regard.

In the previous chapters we verified the reign of emperor Anastasius with a very spectacular solar eclipse of 693 Oct 5. He was the ruler between the years of AD 491 and AD 518 according to the traditional chronology. Consequently D.E. produces his tables not long after the death of Anastasius, somewhere around the years of the CE 720s.

If someone studies thoroughly the features of the 19-year cycle, not only can be aware of the fact that the calendar repeats itself in every aspects after every 532 years, but he can recognize also that the calendar almost perfectly repeats itself in every 190 years, which means after every 10 cycles. (In the latest case the only alteration is a part-time error of 1 day in two years from the four years in the distribution of the days of the week, because of the uncertain leap year. But this minor error means nothing in comparison with the 190, and 198 years of the time-slip.)

Thus we should determine the following: which one is the year, when astronomically will be repeated the phases of the moon, the full moon, that is the Easter of our selected year, 525 (which was offered by D.E. and since then was accepted and validated by astronomical calculations) on such a way that the actual occurrence of Easter will be later than its indicated date in the table of D.E.

Using the Hungarian Calendar (198 years of time-slip) we can find easily the astronomical year of CE 715, when D.E. really made his tables.

Since D.E. was forced to juggle with an 8-year period and to remain in deep silence about his juggling, we received a logical answer explaining the alteration of the time-slip from 198 years (which was verified by a dozen of ancient solar and lunar eclipses) down to only 190 years!

Looking at the happenings from CE 715 we can experience complete order, the full moons of the first 19-year cycle of D.E. (which is shifted by 190 years) are coming neatly on the dates indicated in his table!

Please do not hesitate to check it yourself on the NASA website:

<http://sunearth.gsfc.nasa.gov/eclipse/phse/phases>.

After checking that  $95+19$  years I think I proved my statement about the time-slip of 190 years in connection with the age (lifetime) of Dionysius Exiguus.

If someone is still not convinced let him answer the following question: What was the problem of D.E. in connection with the Easter of the year 526, when everything is so clear there? The full moon is expected on Monday, Apr.13, and the Easter Sunday falls on Sunday, Apr.19, in perfect lines with the rules. No problem at all!

But 190 years later, in the astronomical year of 716 the full moon occurs in a quite critical moment: using the today's retro-counting the full moon was on Saturday, Apr.11 at 15:09 UT according to our today's knowledge!

So it is quite in order to write a letter about the question of Easter, and to ask, when it is correct to celebrate the Easter. The given answer mentions a full moon of Sunday, Apr.12, and on that basis the Easter of Apr. 19 is the correct one!

And the situation is similar in connection with the year 455 also. Patriarch Proterius is grumbling about an Easter rather to be celebrated on 24th, instead of Apr. 17!

On the above calendar extract it is clearly seen that such a problem could not be in 455, since the full moon was to come on Apr.18, **so the questioning is not suitable!**

But in 645 the situation is quite problematic! We can expect a full moon on Apr.16, Saturday at 20:20 (a few hours only depart us from the Sunday), so in this case the time of Easter can be a subject of dispute. Finally they celebrated the Easter on Sunday, Apr.24.

The structure of the year 709 also supports the righteousness of the time-slip of 190 years. When the full moon occurs on March 30, Saturday at 06:42, you can celebrate the Easter on March 31. This year stands against the impossibilities of the year 519.

Now I briefly summarize my statement, hypothesis, according to which Dionysius Exiguus prepared in the astronomical year of 715 his Easter table for 95 coming years, when in Alexandria the year was the 6017/18 year, and the Alexandrians were busy to calculate their Easter dates by the means of the 19-year cycles.

We should give to D.E. big credit for synchronizing the Alexandrian calculation of Easter with the Roman/Byzantine one. This synchronization caused an 8-year alteration in the beginning of the Alexandrian world era and in the Byzantine world era as well.

Since D.E. thought so and also wrote it down that his particular year was the 525th year after Christ, his year became permanently indicated as such, and since then the civilized world consider this year as correct, and count the passing years on that basis!

(His notion was willingly verified by the astronomers...)

Despite of the fact that we all know, his calculation was not correct.

The 8-year error, or shift could not come to light up to now, since the contemporary lists of consuls indicate in 517 and 518, and in 525 too (in a synchronized way to the birth of Jesus) consuls with the name of Flavius Probus.

It is hard for me to imagine that D.E. in his own lifetime could confuse the “era of the martyr” with an “era of Diocletian” which never existed.

It can be assumed that the misunderstanding can be assigned to his later copyists.

Anyhow we got the unexpected gift, the year CE 284 as the technically correct, astronomical starting point of the beginning for the “Era of Martyr”.

Let me state again that the 95-year cycle of D.E. related to the years CE 722-817.

The consequence of this fact is that following the calculation pattern of D.E., the birth of Christ happened in the astronomical year of CE 190 (189. Dec. 25!), while the first year of Jesus was the year of CE 191!

To have a comparison we repeat that according to the Hungarian Calendar Christ was born in CE 194, while AD 1, the first year of Christ (as D.E. adjusted it to the Roman history, to the consuls, to emperors Augustus and Tiberius) was the year of CE 199!

Here you can check again the difference of 8 years:  $199-191=8$ .

Very well, now we have the knowledge that D.E. made his Easter table in CE 715, but we still lack of the explanation, how and when the chronology of the AD system became accepted for general use. To find an explanation we should get to know a better the Venerable Bede, the Grand Master, who was already quoted by me before.