

## The Dark Pages of the Middle Ages

written by Gyula Tóth

May 4th 2006

[All footnotes are mine./Kartavirya]

### The Hungarian Chronicles and the Fictitious Middle Ages

When Heribert Illig developed his theory known as the Phantom Time theory he drew his arguments mainly from the history of the Western part of Europe. He drew attention to the immense amounts of forged documents that remains from the Carolingian empire, the Palatine Chapel of Aachen with its architectural features preceding its own time by several centuries, the extraordinary calendar correction of pope Gregory XIII and the conspicuous and inexplicable lack of any archaeological findings, being typical for the era.

Of course he also addressed the oddities of the Byzantine empire: he mentioned the end of construction, the decline of the knowledge of writing, the transformation of events of the era in question into (quasi) fairy-tale and the inexplicable and unmotivated rewriting of chronicles. His arguments are in themselves heavy enough and worthy of consideration. However, Illig never addressed one issue, never referred to it with a single word – in fact, it seems he was not even particularly aware of the problem: the issue of the legacy of the Hungarian chronicle tradition.

Specifically, this Hungarian chronicle tradition, which supports its hypotheses with such elementary strength, should have enjoyed an elevated position in his book or even a separately devoted chapter. It is not coincidence that lately our medieval chronicles have become surrounded by a conspicuously great silence. While in single issues of our renowned historical journals efforts are being made to "refute" the facts of falsification of our chronology, they do not even dare mention the issue of our [Hungarian] chronicles.

At first glance, our chronicles seem to be in terrible confusion, regarding the issue of dating the reconquest [of the Carpathian Basin]: Márk Kálti in his *Chronicon Pictum* ("Illuminated Chronicle", written before 1360 AD) mentions a date two-three hundred years earlier than that which is derived from officially accepted chronology. Very well, we might think, we don't not need to attribute too much significance to the issue, surely he made a mistake in writing or calculus. Yes, but he is not alone with this problem. Namely, Simon Kézai in his chronicle (*Gesta Hunnorum et Hungarorum*, written around 1282-1283) leaves the Magyar reconquest at the end

of the 800's, however he dates Attila not in the first half of the 400's but three centuries later, that is the 700's! With this both Márk Kálti and Simon Kézai together make clear that it is not their mathematical knowledge which was lacking but they were in fact trying to remedy the same problem, namely the problem of the illegally inserted three centuries, albeit using two opposite methods.

Historical amnesia?

According to the current officially accepted chronology, Attila lived in the first half of the 5th century AD, while the Magyar reconquest took place in the last years of the 9th century AD. The difference in time between the two events is at least 450 years, which has to indeed be considered to be a significant chronological difference. Despite this the Hungarian chronicles cover quite extensively the time of Attila and report the most minute details possible. This same chronicle legacy covers also the Hungarian reconquest in similar extent and amount of detail. After all this we could expect with full justification that our chroniclers, having covered the historical eras mentioned, also should mention the approximately 300 years of the Avar age separating these two events. Faced with this issue, not only do the chroniclers not mention this – they do not even write down the word "Avar"! Further, they date the events in such a way that no time is left for any Avar age, for between the death of Attila and the Hungarian reconquest they claim a distance of five generations and altogether 104 years! Márk Kálti and Simon Kézai give the impression that regarding the events between the era of Attila and Árpád they seem to suffer from some kind of historical amnesia! They skip over 300 years with such nonchalant wastefulness as if these years truly never happened! Would our chronicles' memories fail in such a way? How is it possible that they remember the Hun times more accurately – it being much further away from them in time, than that Avar era which immediately preceded our reconquest? We must concede: this is very strange! Wherever our ancestors lived during the 300 years of the Avar period they certainly had to have lived in the vicinity of the Carpathian Basin. They should have had first hand information on the Avar empire, with its centre in the Carpathian Basin, assuming of course that there actually existed an Avar empire at all. Because if it did not exist then it is not such a mystery why our chroniclers are so silent about it.

However, the Hungarian chroniclers do not only fail to mention the Avar empire, they also fail to mention the Khazar empire. This silence is strange because preceding our reconquest – according to the official version of history – the Hungarians were part of this very Khazar empire, and – on top of it all – this, during the time between the era of Attila and Árpád! It certainly seems that they failed to tell Márk Kálti and

Simon Kézai about this fact, since – as with the Avar empire – they do not mention any form of Khazar empire!

Maybe I do not even have to mention, that the glorious Carolingian empire and its head, Europe's father, the driver and motivator of world history, the transformer of the world, the patriarch of two continents, Charlemagne does not merit mention in our chronicles either. If not for anything else, but his military campaigns of annihilation of the Avars in the Carpathian Basin, he should have deserved to be mentioned! Of course to be mentioned certain criteria have to be met, namely, and above all, it helps to be a real, existing, historical person!

The quoted passages are from *Chronicon Pictum*, pages 21 and 22. Országos Széchenyi Könyvtár (National Széchenyi Library)

How much time passed between Attila and Árpád?

The old Hungarian chronicles know of a distance of five generations separating the time of Attila and that of Árpád:

"... and this boy's ancestry was foretold in a dream, this why he was named Álmos ((Hungarian 'álom' = dream; 'álmos' = someone who is dreamy or sleepy)), who was the son of Előd, son of Ögyek, son of Ed, son of Csaba, who was the son of Etele ((The original, non-latinized version of the name Attila. In the Icelandic mythological epic the Edda he is mentioned as Atle))." (*Chronicon Pictum*)

Our chronicles talk about altogether 100 or 104 years between the death of Attila and the second entry of the Hungarians into the Carpathian Basin:

"677 years after our Lord becoming flesh, 100 years after the death of king Attila, the Magyars or Huns – thus called in the tongue of the people and in Latin called Ungarus – in the reign of emperor Constantinus III and pope Zacharias again entered Pannonia." (*Chronicon Pictum*)

The Hungarian chronicles also report such details, according to which Edömén, the brother of Ed – who was the son of Csaba and thus the grandchild of Attila – actually lived to see the Hungarian reconquest and thus he himself together with his household also returned to Pannonia! How would all this be possible if between the death of Attila and the Hungarian reconquest there passed not 100 or 104 years but 442 years (!!!), which is claimed by the official chronology?! It is obvious it simply

would not be possible! Thus the conclusion is likewise obvious: either the Hungarian chronicles' claims are false, or our chronology has been forged, as Heribert Illig suggests!

In any case, the argumentation concerning of the 104 years is not only supported by the *Chronicon Pictum* but also by the research of the Soviet archaeologists Zakharov and Arendt. But let us see how László Götz writes about this in his work entitled "Keleten kél a Nap" ((The Sun Rises in the East)):

"The so-called Saltov culture discovered at that time was firmly placed within the remains of the Lebedian Magyars (that is by the Soviet archaeologists Zakharov and Arendt). They state that the swords found at Saltov and the Kobán area in northern Caucasus bear closest resemblance to the Magyar weapons of the reconquest era. The Saltov culture appeared in the end of the 8th century and disappeared at the end of the 9th century – so they say. In any case it cannot be a Khazar culture because it is not to be found in particular in the centre of the Khazar empire. It surrounds in a massive semicircle the Khazar centre of the lower Volga: from the middle of the river Don, through the upper part of the river Donets all through the Kubán region all the way to the eastern Caucasus mountains, to the river Kuma. (...) The Saltov-Majack culture is the only archaeological culture in southern Russia (Ukraine), on the territory of which it can be shown that life ceased to exist at the end of the 9th century, that is, exactly simultaneously with the event of the Hungarian reconquest." (This and all following excerpts by the author)

It is important to note that the Saltov-Majack culture, which the Soviet archaeologists connected to the Lebedian Magyars preceding their reconquest, blossoms approximately 100 years (from the end of the 8th to the end of the 9th century), before it was – at the end of the 9th century, that is at the exact same time of the Magyar reconquest – "depopulated with tragical suddenness"! It certainly is difficult not to recall the death of Attila, the falling apart of his empire and the retreat of his peoples to "Scythia", and the 100 - 104 years separating said events and the second entry of the Magyars, as written in the *Chronicon Pictum*!

Alexandrian dates in Kézai's chronicle?

We have seen, that Márk Kálti dated the Magyar reconquest to the year 677 after the birth of Christ. However, from his logic we can derive another date for the reconquest! If we add to 445 AD – which is the date of death of Attila according to the *Chronicon Pictum* – the 104 years that according to him passed between the

death of Attila and the second entry into the Carpathian Basin of the Magyars, the result we get is the year 549 AD. ( $445 + 104 = 549$ ) Simon Kézai in his chronicle written 1272 dates the reconquest of the Magyars much later, namely to 872 AD. This begs the question: is there any connection between these two dates? Well, these two dates are in actual fact one and the same, only one (549) is to be understood as years passed since the birth of Christ, while the other (872) is to be understood as years passed since the death of Alexander the Great! Alexander the Great died in 323 BC and we know that a chronology commenced starting the year of his death. Hence, if someone living in the Middle Ages was thinking in terms of number of years passed since the death of Alexander the Great, then he would use dates exactly 323 years greater than those who already were counting time according to the birth of Christ! To summarise:

445 - Attila dies this year according to *Chronicon Pictum*.

104 - number of years passing between the death of Attila and the Magyar reconquest according to *Chronicon Pictum*.

323 - the number of years differing between the chronology that measures time from the death of Alexander the Great and the Christian chronology.

872 ( $445 + 104 + 323$ ) - according to Kézai this is the date of the Magyar reconquest!!!

It is easily conceivable that in the Middle Ages they knowingly or unknowingly confused these two chronologies running parallel to each other! They still knew the correct number of years but whether this number was to be counted from the birth of Christ or the death of Alexander the Great had become unclear. With the spread of Christianity also Christian chronology became commonplace but in such a way that the old Alexandrian dates remained but were henceforth understood as Christian dates. Illig also mentions this possibility. In his book on page 422 ((Hungarian edition)), in the chapter called "From Alexander to Alexander" he writes:

"In the dialogue between myself and Gunnar Heinsohn he suggests that the proposed three centuries of made-up medieval history got into the chronology due to the Alexandrian dates being read as dates related to Christ. (...) The logic behind this was that due to reasons of divine grace the references to the the pagan Alexander the Great were no longer accepted and therefore the old dates were simply reinterpreted as "Christian dates". (...) In this case the more correct date, namely the the Alexandrian date according to Byzantine beaurocracy would have been conferred on the West, which would have then become changed there into a Christian date."

Illig writes all this without the slightest knowledge of the fact that we Magyars have two medieval chronicles which, concerning the dating of the reconquest, produce exactly the 323 years of difference between the chronology counted from the death of Alexander and the one counted from the birth of Christ. As we have seen the Hungarian chronicles in this respect too marvellously support the theories of Illig.

However, a question arises: if Kálti proclaims that Attila died in 445 and that the reconquest took place 104 years later then why does he state the date of 677 instead of 549? Is this not a contradiction? Well yes, this certainly is a contradiction! However, the cause of this contradiction lies in the very logic of the calendar forgery. Illig expounded clearly, that the appearance of the fictitious three hundred years in the timeline does not mean that none of the events falling between the years 614 and 911 are true. Rather, it is much more a case of fleshing out the outer regions of the fictitious period in question with predated and postdated events, as well as multiples of rulers provided with regnal (ordinal) numbers. Thus Kálti mentions also the year of 677, because he is not only aware of when Attila died and how many years after this the Magyars entered the Carpathian Basin, but also who was at that time the currently reigning Byzantine emperor. In other words Kálti writes 677 instead of 549 because he wants to synchronise his chronicle to the time of the falsified reign of Constantine III! This was the Constantine III out of which, during the course of time, was fashioned a Constantine IV, V, VI as well as a VII, too. According to the final official version in the year 677 a Constantine provided with the regnal number IV happened to be reigning. Therefore Márk Kálti ends up contradicting himself because he wants to synchronise his data with the false Western chronicles! Luckily though, he also states correctly the dates from pure Hungarian sources.

We have here then such a Hungarian chronicle legacy, which with such stunning consistency reproduces the very difference of three centuries in question which Heribert Illig managed to shed light on based exclusively on Western European sources, and all without being at all aware of this Hungarian chronicle legacy! We should notice that this constitutes two completely different and from each other totally independent things which nevertheless match each other perfectly. On the one hand we have the Western European side of the matter which stands on its own, for Illig has been supporting his theories with arguments for years based exclusively on Western European sources. On the other hand is the Hungarian chronicle tradition which is totally independent from the Western European system of arguments and still completely supports it! Can we, are we allowed to overlook in its entirety such great consistency? In any case, thus says the Word:

"At the mouth of two witnesses or three shall every word be established."  
(2 Corinthians 13.1)

## Double standards

Until now the international scientific world has treated as holy writ such Western chronicles as for example the work of Einhard about the life of Charlemagne. Despite the obvious absurdities practically every statement, every half sentence was taken at face value. This is the very same international scientific world which ignores in its entirety the medieval Hungarian chronicle literature and brands it from the viewpoint of historical science as untrustworthy. On what basis? Why are our historical scientists using such double standards in this matter? Why is a medieval Hungarian chronicler more untrustworthy than a Western counterpart? We know the answer: due to reasons of chronology. Namely, the official academic argument goes that the medieval Hungarian chronicle literature, which derives altogether only 104 years between the death of Attila and the Magyar reconquest, is guilty of such obvious stupidity that it is impossible to take it seriously from a historical-scientific point of view and accept its claims as trustworthy! Do we understand this? Our Lord Jesus Christ was also sentenced to death because when asked by Caiaphas he stated the truth about himself! They treat the Hungarian chronicle tradition the same way: the reason they don't take its statements seriously and consider it untrustworthy from a historical-scientific point of view is that it states the truth! Because it courageously and simply leaves out – skips – the fictitious period which probably was smuggled retrospectively into history. The possibility that maybe the problem is not with the statements of the Hungarian chronicles after all, but that the chronology itself is incorrect and that some flaw slipped into our chronological system has so far not entered our scientists' minds.

There is yet another aspect to this whole embarrassing situation which clearly sheds light on the impossible mentality of our historical-scientific academia. However unbelievable, in the middle of Europe lives a people who, concerning their own history, would rather trust its enemy, the Byzantine emperor, than its own medieval chroniclers! After all, the larger part of what we know about the period of the reconquest and the times immediately prior to it we take from the scholarly work entitled "De Administrando Imperio" ((On the Administration of the Empire)) written by the Byzantine emperor Constantine VII ((Porphyrogenitus, "the Purple-born"))! Considering that the Magyars declared war on Byzantium and for a time even made it pay tribute to them, the question arises: can we consider the Byzantine emperor

who our ancestors had offended and insulted so many times to be impartial to the Magyars? Obviously not! But despite this we accept without question every word of Constantine VII, while considering our own medieval chroniclers to be untrustworthy. Indeed, Constantine VII commits himself fully in this his ominous work to paint the honour and dignity of our ancestors in as much an unfavourable light as possible. Let us see:

"And the Hungarians were comprised of seven hordes, but at this time lacked a ruler. They had neither a native nor foreign leader but there were amongst them certain tribal leaders and the head of these leaders was the previously mentioned Lebediás... And the kagan, the ruler of Kazaria gave to the head leader called Lebediás a prominent Kazar lady as a wife, for the chivalry shown and military help he received from the Magyars, so that he may father children; but it is a matter of history that Lebediás never fathered any children by this wife. After some time had passed the kagan, ruler of Kazaria asked the Hungarians to send to him their head tribal leader, so Lebediás, when he had arrived and presented himself to the king of Kazaria, asked him why he had been sent for. And the kagan spoke to him thusly: For the following reason have you been sent for: since you are of noble ancestry and wise and chivalrous and the first among the Magyars, it is our wish, that you become the ruler of your race and that you be subject to our laws and regulations."

In a word, according to Constantine Porphyrogenitus at that time the Hungarians were the loyal subjects of the Jewish Khazar king, but we did not have enough brains to elect a leader for us among ourselves. The Khazar king drew our attention to the fact that it was high time we too had a chieftain. He asked Lebediás to lead his "hordes" and that he be the ruler of "his race". But since Lebediás was a humble person, he referred this honouring request to Álmos and his son Árpád.

The initiation rite of Árpád went "according to Kazar customs and practices in such a way, that they raised him onto their shields. But before Árpád the Magyars never had their own ruler; therefore the Magyars elect their rulers from this bloodline [clan] until this very day."

This would then be the genesis of the noble royal house of Árpád, according to Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus. Naturally, our master forger does not miss the opportunity to emphasise that before Lebediás the Hungarians did not have a chieftain! He does all this obviously due to the ulterior motive of forcibly separating the Magyars from Attila the Hun, the Scourge of God, who, in the 5th century, at the head of his immense armies could force even the Roman empire down on its knees.



In face of this, the Hungarian chronicles know of neither Lebediás nor the Khazar king nor indeed Khazaria! They do talk, however, of Scythia and call the Magyars alternately Huns or Scythians, and, where Attila is concerned, talk of him as a Hungarian king. To all this let us also add the statements of Heribert Illig, according to whom one of the originators of this medieval calendar forgery is none other than Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, whose statements concerning Hungarian history the Hungarian historical-scientific community has uncritically accepted. To this I believe no further comment is necessary.

Constantine III or Constantine VII?

Illig also reports on the conspicuous similarities between the Byzantine state of affairs of the 7th and the 10th centuries.

"Around the year 600 AD the advancing Avars weaken the imperial realm militarily on the Balkan peninsula", he writes.

Let us not forget: with the correction of the 300 years the time of the advancement of the Avars coincides with the advancement of the Magyars. Since Byzantium will need to involve itself in another conflict with yet another strong northern enemy, this time in the beginning of the 900's and the Magyars, there is a strong suspicion that the entire Avar era is nothing but a chronologically predated duplicate of the Magyar reconquest. Illig refers to Manfred Zeller, who in his work about the steppe peoples points out: "the number of these horse peoples doubles in the 1st millennium, filling up the empty centuries!" Hence the Avars are simply just a duplicate. They are nothing other than a nation created from one of the adjectives used to describe the Hun-Magyars and its only purpose was to fill out the empty centuries. The rich archaeological finds admired under the Avar name might as well be the legacy of the Huns of Attila.

But let us return to Byzantium: in 602 a frightening and talentless figure sits on the Byzantine throne in the person of Phokas, who can only come to power by regicide. Husrau II, the Persian king takes advantage of the favouring moment and attacks Byzantium, allegedly to avenge the death of the emperor. Although in 610 Heracleitos topples the terror reign of Phokas, the relentless advance of the Persians continues: they conquer East Anatolia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt and via the shores of North Africa march all the way to Tripoli. The taking of Jerusalem and the capture of the Holy Cross takes place on May 22, 614 AD, after three weeks of siege. It is interesting to note, that Heracleitos has a co-ruler, his own son, who is

crowned already at two years of age, but who lives in the shadow of his father for a long time without any real executive powers. When he finally and belatedly comes to genuine power, suddenly his wasting existence ends. The person in question is none other than Constantine III. On top of it all, this is the very same Constantine III also mentioned in the Chronicon Pictum in connection with the dating of the Magyar reconquest:

"... hundred and four years after the death of the Hungarian king Attila, in the time of emperor Constantinus III and pope Zachary – as it is written in the chronicles of the Romans – the Magyars emerged a second time out of Scythia..."

Very strange it is that the author of the Chronicon Pictum manages to find the Byzantine emperor at the time of the Magyar reconquest to be an emperor living in the 600's!

As we know, according to the theory of Illig the fictitious centuries start the year 614, that is, not long after the capturing of the Holy Cross. Constantine III is already crowned co-ruler, yet he is only three years old. The time when he comes to genuine power, actually already takes place in the phantom era. If Illig's theory is correct, then Constantine III has to appear in some form also in the 10th century. And lo and behold, the miracle of miracles, in the 10th century we again meet a Constantine – true, this time not III but VII! Indeed, it is the very Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus who in all likelihood was one of the creators of the fictitious centuries. After all this, Illig starts to examine the 10th century life history of Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus. The story begins somewhere at the start of the 10th century, when pope Leo is widowed three times within four years, before Zoe gives birth to an illegitimate son. After crowning this boy co-ruler the year before, Leo dies in 912. (It is worthwhile to point out that according to the theory of Illig history starts again in 911, therefore, at the time of the crowning of his illegitimate son in 912, we are again witnessing genuine history take its course!) This boy rises to real power very late, 24 years after his coronation, meaning that up until then others were managing the affairs of the realm, which obviously must have stung in the eyes of the young emperor. In this regard he resembled very much Constantine III, who also got his hands on the governmental reins rather late, and who also was crowned co-ruler by his daddy, the emperor. At this point who do you think was the illegitimate son of emperor Leo of the 10th century? Indeed, none other than Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus himself! So there is a conspicuous similarity between the lives of the Constantine (III) of the 7th century and the Constantine (VII) of the 10th century. It is interesting to note, that Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus gives the credit for

repossessing the Holy Cross from the Persians not coincidentally to Heracleitos, since by this act he honoured his own (7th century) father, paying homage to his memory. Due to the fact that Heracleitos, by being the father of Constantine III of the 7th century, was in fact also the father of Constantine VII of the 10th century! On top of it all, Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus manages things in such a way, that the genuine history more or less starts again from the time of his own coronation!

But not only do the persons of the two Constantines show conspicuous similarities, but also the foreign political affairs of 7th century and 10th century Byzantium. In the 7th century, as I have already mentioned, the Avar advance from the north was afflicting the empire, while the Persian conquests in the east were multiplying the worries of "Constantines" of all ages. In the 10th century it is as if history would repeat itself: from the north the Magyars are disturbing the peace of the empire, while from the southeast the Arab advance is doing the same. This is the point at which a feeling of apprehension starts to boil up inside: is it not possible, that looking at the Avars of the 7th century we actually see the 10th century Magyars? And is it not possible, that the advance of the 10th century Arabs in actual fact is identical with the 7th century Persian advance? If the Byzantine empire in the 7th century had to face the opposition of the Persians and Avars, then these peoples turn into Magyars and Arabs in the 10th century! In connection with the Arab-Persian problem Illig writes the following:

"A certain mystery of art history becomes clear, which asks why there are to be found many more Persian-Syrian than Arab elements in Spain. (...) We no longer have to wonder how a small number of Arabs from oases could succeed in attacking all nations of their time from Spain to the Indus river with such favourable results; this is more to be expected from the Persian armies."

During the course of their conquests in Egypt the Persians became acquainted with the Quran and with it also with Islam and thus moving westwards they took them both with them to Spain. At this point it might not be a waste if we take a little detour and examine in more detail the circumstances of the birth of Islam, even more so, since during the course of our research we will also get an answer to the question why it is exactly 297 years that were inserted into our history.

### The flight of Mohammed

In the 4th century after the birth of Christ biggest challenge for the Christian world church still in formation were the different heretical movements. Among these the

biggest and thus the most threatening was the so-called Arian heresy. Its founder was an Alexandrian priest, Arius by name, who was born around 256 in Libya and died 336 in Constantinople. He started to propagate the teachings of his heresy, the most important element of which was the denial of Christ's divinity. In the eyes of the Christian church this was a serious danger indeed, for the Arian teachings started to spread like wildfire. The Ostrogoths, Visigoths, Lombards, Vandals and Burgundians had all accepted the Arian teachings and the many adherents of this movement were to be found also in Antioch and Alexandria. Swift action was needed to stop this progress as soon as possible. The very reason for the famous first council of Nicaea was what course of action was to be taken against the Arian heresy. At this synod convened in 325 AD Arius was denounced as a heretic and severe measures were taken against the Arian heresy.

We still hear about Arianism in the middle of the 5th century, however the issue was by then in decline and during the following 2-3 centuries no heretical movement was known that would have questioned the divinity of Christ. However, in the beginning of the 7th century starts another important religious movement, namely Islam, which accepts in essence the Jewish and Christian holy books but denies the divinity of Jesus Christ exactly like the Arians three hundred years earlier. We know that Islam actually started with the prophet Mohammed's flight from the Arabian city of Mekka to Medina. This event is called the Hidjra, which means to flee or run. According to conventional historiography this took place in 622 AD and this also constitutes the start of Muslim chronology.

In his recently published book "The Great Calendar Forgery" ((Published in Hungarian. Original title of the German edition: "Erfundene Geschichte")) Uwe Topper formulates a most unusual hypothesis: he claims nothing less than that Islam is in actual fact the direct continuation of one of the secondary branches of the Arian heresy! Until now no one has drawn a parallel between these two movements, which is fully understandable considering the rift of three hundred years between them. But if we examine their main tenets then the correlation becomes obvious indeed. The correlation becomes even more obvious, if we deduct the 297 years from the date of 622 of the Hidjra – that is, the flight of Mohammed from Mekka to Media – which Heribert Illig considers to be fictitious. Hence we get back to the year 325, the very year of the first council of Nicaea, which is a significant realisation indeed!

While studying the Great Illustrated Encyclopaedia of World History in recent weeks, I have come to an interesting conclusion. The work notes, that the 'hidjra' (flight) expression might perhaps not be appropriate, maybe the words 'passage' or

'departure' would have been more accurate. For some strange reason, though, it was still the 'hidjra' expression – that is, the concept of flight – that became conventionally used. So the issue becomes instantly understandable if we place the event of the Hidjra 297 years earlier, that is, not in 622 but instead in 325! For if it can be proven that the flight of Mohammed took place in 325, that is, at the time of the council of Nicaea, then it becomes perfectly clear why he had to resort to fleeing! Namely, it was exactly in 325 at the council of Nicaea the Arian heresy was banned and it was exactly then that severe measures were enacted against the movements that denied the divinity of Jesus. Nothing would have motivated the flight as late as 622. In 325 on the other hand, in view of the harsh measures decided upon by the Nicaean Council, there was all the more reason for it!

But why did the timing of the Hidjra end up exactly 297 years later, that is from 325 to 622? In his recently published book mentioned earlier Uwe Topper discusses also that lesser known chronological system which is based on the calendar reform of Caesar the starting year of which is the year of introduction of the Julian calendar, that is the year 45 BC. This was the Julian (or Provincial) Aera (or Era) which initially was in use mainly in Spain but later on became widely used also in western France, North Africa as well as the Mediterranean islands. According to Topper the Era was that kind of chronological system which suited itself very well to support the power ambitions of the Church and was introduced at a time when the chronological system based on the birth date of Christ was not yet widely accepted. Being aware of the existence of the Era system makes us understand easier why exactly 297 years were inserted into our chronology:

In order to underline its contempt for the heretical movements denying the divinity of Christ even more; and to prevent if possible its adherents to follow such false teachings, the Church authorised itself to date the event of the birth of Islam to the year 666, that is, the number identified with the Antichrist! But let us see according to which chronological system it did all this: well, according to that chronological system which was widely used in those days by the Church, namely, the Julian Era! Later though, as we know, they started referring to the years as being from the birth of Christ and therefore the previously agreed upon dates according to the Julian Era were relabelled into dates according to the birth of Christ. If we want to convert the dates derived according to the Julian Era into (correct) dates counted from the birth of Christ it is only possible if appropriately subtracting 44 years, and hence out of the previously agreed Julian Era 666 date for the Hidjra became, with said subtraction of 44 years, the year 622 AD! Officially accepted historical science dates to this very day the event of the flight of Mohammed to 622 AD. So the reason for adding exactly

297 years to the calendar was to be able to place the Hidjra, that is, the birth of Islam – a movement grown out of the Arian heresy – on the Julian Era year of 666, the year of the number of the Antichrist.

However, the Julian (or Spanish) Era makes possible further revelations. Many times one cannot show an exact difference of 297 years between events and dates on either side of the time rift that, nevertheless, essentially belong together and the reason for this is that one of either date is given either according to the Julian Era or Christ. Let me immediately give an example:

The famous Library in Alexandria was the priceless collection of the Ancient World. 700 000 scrolls were kept there, according to Roman sources. Allegedly, this library was destroyed in 642 AD as a result of the Arab conquests when Amr ibn el-As, the commander of khalif Omar, conquered Egypt. At that moment the commander asked the khalif for instructions as to the future fate of the library. The answer of the khalif was this: If the books contain the same as the Quran they are superfluous, if not, then they are dangerous. Thus in either case they have to be burned! So these priceless scrolls were utilised not exactly according for what they were meant: they served as fuel for heating of the water in the bath houses of the city! All this then happened in 642 AD.

However, we know that the 642 destruction was not the only terrible destruction in the history of the Alexandrian library. Namely, in 389 this priceless collection was seriously damaged by fanatic Christians, maybe even Arian Christians. The Pallas Great Lexicon expresses it very laconically:

"The Serapeion Library fell victim to the Christian impatience in 389."

Thus, we are presented with two years in which very similar events occurred. These two years are 642 and 389. In both the famous Alexandrian Library is destroyed. Let us examine the connection between these two dates. If we interpret this 389 date according to the Julian Era, and then, by subtracting 44 years, convert it into a date according to Christian chronology, we end up in the year 345. ( $389 - 44 = 345$ ) The difference between the year 345 and the year 642 is exactly 297 years. ( $345 + 297 = 642$ ) It is thus interesting to observe how the fanatical Christians (maybe even Arians) who destroyed the Alexandrian Library in 389 turn into an Islamic army 297 years later. This shows clearly how the origins of Islam in actual fact lead back to a certain Christian heretical movement, namely the Arian heresy.

In the volume titled "The Birth of Europe" from the informational series of books titled "Illustrated History", in the chapter about the age of the khalifs I found a very interesting section about the rapid spreading of Islam:

"Damaskus was played into the hands of the Muslims by its Christian bishop himself. He sent a message to the besiegers through which gate they could climb at night. The city gates of Antioch though, opened without a struggle. The patriarch there, Job, joined the Arab troops and he encouraged the population of other cities under siege, shouting at the top of his voice over the city walls: 'It is better if you submit and pay your levies to our lord, than to be killed or dragged into captivity!' Even the patriarch of Alexandria, 'the pope of Egypt', Benjamin, greeted ceremoniously the entering Arab troops at the head of the leaders of the city, instead of encouraging his followers to defend themselves. The conquerors met tougher resistance only in the Greek cities of Asia Minor, but there the overrunning of far away lands was also soon stopped." ((The overrunning that is, of conquering Muslim armies))

Let us note: where did the advancing Muslim troops encounter the most feeble resistance? Well, firstly in Antioch, the gates of which "opened without any struggle", where even the patriarch there, Job, encouraged the population of the city to submit. Secondly, in Alexandria, where Benjamin, the Alexandrian Christian bishop, "the pope of Egypt", greeted ceremoniously the Muslim army. ... Does this not remind us of something? Where did Arius, the founder of the Arian heresy, previously have a prominent position in the Church? In Alexandria, no less! Antioch was likewise the seat of Arianism.

Let us read the Pallas Great Lexicon:

"The Arians – also called Eusebians named after the lead character Eusebius from Nikomedia – favoured by the court nevertheless endeavoured to oust the bishops of the true faith and replace them with Arian partisans. Thus it came to pass, that Eusthatius, the high priest of Antioch, was deprived of his seat. In a short period of time they removed many bishops from their positions and replaced them with Arian partisans. Due to this of course uprisings broke out in many parishes, but the Arians continued undeterred on their initiated course."

And where did the Arab troops encounter the most fierce resistance? Where were "the overrunning of far away lands stopped"? In Asia Minor, where the Arian teachings never could take firm root. What a coincidence! Let us also note, that in said three cities, Damaskus, Antioch and Alexandria, who was the first to submit to

the Muslim hordes? In all three instances the Christian patriarch of the city! ... Under normal circumstances we would expect that it would be those very Christian patriarchs who would encourage the citizens of the cities to a resistance to the bitter end against the adherents of the foreign faith. But no! Indeed it is they who encourage as fast a submission as possible. How can this be? Well, the answer is very simple: These cities were the seat of Arian Christianity and these patriarchs were the followers of the Arian teachings. They greeted the "Muslim" troops as their own awaited fellow Arian brothers in faith. All this lead us to conclude, that there is no time gap of 297 years between the Arian heresy at the beginning of the 4th century and the emerging Islam at the beginning of the 7th century and that these two movements have indeed a lot in common with each other.

The mighty sultan Miramammona

We have seen, that Uwe Topper came to the controversial conclusion that Islam had begun several centuries earlier than previously thought and was present already in the 4th century BC. But Topper goes even further: according to him the also Arab conquest of the Iberian peninsula took place much earlier. On page 138 in his book he writes that instead of in 711 the Muslims appeared in Hispania probably already in 414. On this point it might be worth checking what our national chronicles have to say, since both the Chronicon Pictum and the chronicle of Simon Kézai reports on a highly interesting event. I quote the Chronicon Pictum:

"Departing from here, [Attila] marched down the Rhone to Catalaunum, where he divided his army of which he sent one third under selected captains against the mighty sultan Miramammona; upon receiving this news he fled the city of Sevilla from the Huns and traversing the so-called straits of Sevilla escaped to Morocco."  
(page 12)

In one of the editions of the Chronicon Pictum the original text is appended with an explanatory footnote. At this point the following footnote is made:

"The mentioning of Morocco is a completely nonsensical invention, since at this time the Moors or Arabs could not have entered Europe."

Now, according to official chronology this is indeed true. However, if the theory of Uwe Topper proves to be correct and if the conquest of the Iberian peninsula by the Arabs really took place 297 years earlier, then it is easily conceivable that at the time of Attila the Moorish encampments in Hispania were already bustling with activity!



The falsification of history in the West displaced the birth of Islam to a date three hundred years later and with it also the Arab conquest of the Spanish peninsula, while leaving Attila in the 5th century AD. Due to considerations of chronology no serious historian has thus far been able to state such claims without the risk of being ridiculed, as that Attila the Hun would have stopped the Moors, although both our medieval chronicles (the *Chronicon Pictum* as well as the chronicle of Simon Kézai) make unequivocal references in support for such a claim. The Arab expansion in Hispania was thus chronologically disconnected from the time of Attila and the Western chroniclers immediately used this to their advantage. They invented a new fictitious Western ruler by the name of Charles Martell and wrote that it was he who stopped the advance of the Arabs, after having procured a great victory over the armies of Abd-el Rahman at the battle of Poitiers in 733. And this Charles Martell is none other than the grandfather of Charlemagne, of whom it is becoming more and more clear, thanks to Illig's theory, he really never existed.

With the new conclusions reached by Topper the timeline that was previously turned on its head is suddenly in one fell swoop corrected and everything falls into place. It becomes clear that our medieval chronicles are proven reliable in this regard and are not mistaken, when they connect the checking of the Arabs to the West European military campaigns of Attila. If we subtract 297 years from the date of 733 of the battle of Poitiers then we really end up back in the beginning of the 400's, that is, exactly in the era of Attila. Topper also calls to attention – among other things – the fact that when the date of the birth of Jesus Christ was determined in the Middle Ages an error was made of 7 years. At first, individual events were adjusted to this incorrectly calculated starting point and fixed to their dates the corresponding 7 year error. Later however, when this error was discovered, they corrected the previously determined dates by adding to them 7 years. Since correction of a number of previously determined dates was unsuccessful, we find corrected and uncorrected dates mixed with each other within the problematical time period. As an example Topper mentions the Great Synod of 318, which is at a time distance of exactly 7 years from the council held in 325:

"... maybe the year 318 is an invention too, in which the Great Synod allegedly condemned Arius. And how come he had to be excluded twice from the Church? The two synods are crucially separated by 7 years. Could the first synod be the first one dated and the second be the same event but corrected from the displaced date of birth of Christ by the mentioned 7 years?"

If we treat the date of the Charles Martell victory at Poitiers, 733, as one of these

uncorrected dates and if we add to it the 7 years by which the birth year of Jesus Christ was adjusted, then the resultant date we get is 740. According to official historiography the West European military campaign of Attila took place two years before his death, that is, in 451. If we treat the claim of the *Chronicon Pictum* as reliable, however, according to which Attila died in 445, then the West European campaign consequently ends up in the year 443. And lo and behold: between the date (740) of Charles Martell's victory at Poitiers – corrected by the 7 years – and the date (445) of Attila's West European campaign as given by the *Chronicon Pictum* is a difference of exactly 297 years! So it seems, then, that we need to erase both Charles Martell and his grandchild Charlemagne from the history books! (Perhaps it is not a coincidence they are both named Charles. It seems the coins stamped with the "Carolus" name were used also by Charles Martell.)

Shortly after Attila sent one third of his army against sultan Miramammona, Aëtius' forces attacked the Huns. This what Kézai writes about it:

"... under the leadership of chosen captains he sent one third of his forces against the sultan of Morocco, Miramammona. Upon hearing this Miramammona fled the city of Sevilla and by traversing the strait of Sevilla to Morocco escaped the Huns. Meanwhile however Ethele ((See footnote 4.)) was suddenly attacked by the Roman patrician named Aëtius together with ten Western kings. And when Ethele hearing this asked them, via his envoys, for a truce, so that he may join with that large part of his people that was absent, they did not agree and thus on the field of Belvider the battle between the two armies raged from morning until night. There was between the two armies a brook, so very small, that had anyone thrown a piece of hair into it, the quiet flowing of the water might almost have been stopped; this brook became so large due to the blood of men and animals from the battle that coaches together with their drivers and armed men were swept away, and this flood caused many casualties, indeed. This battle then, that took place between the Huns and the Western king on the aforementioned location, as told by the ancients, was greater than all the battles of the world fought in one place and in one day. In this battle the king of the Goths, Aldarikh falls miserably; when the other kings hear of his death they take flight. From this day forth the soul of the Huns and king Ethele was exalted, and fear gripped all the earth, and upon hearing the news several countries served them by paying taxes."

According to official historiography the Westerners gave Attila a good thrashing at Catalaunum. It is very strange, that according to the record it was indeed after the battle that Attila's soul "was exalted", and the fear of the Huns gripped all the earth to

such a degree, that "upon hearing the news several countries served them by paying taxes"! What is actually the case here, then? Who actually lost the battle of Catalaunum? In any case, László Götz writes the following in his work "Keleten kél a Nap" ((See previous footnote.)):

"The alleged Roman victory at Catalaunum is in all probability a lie. After a lost war it would have been impossible for Attila to be in Italy – in the heart of the empire – in the Spring of the following year. But there is independent evidence for this claim: by analysing the text of the record of the battle it has been shown that Jordanes copied almost word for word Herodotos' historical record of another battle, namely the battle of Salamis."

No more lies!

When I suggested for the first time that there is exactly 323 years difference between the date of the reconquest according to Kézai's chronicle, 872, and that of the Chronicon Pictum, 549, – that is, the exact time difference separating the Christian chronology and the chronology measured from the death of Alexander – I found myself facing reactions such as this: "If you take the statements of the Chronicon Pictum so seriously, then you should also find an answer to explain why Kálti writes such an absurdity that Attila lived a 124 years!" True! – I thought. It is rather unlikely, that a chieftain of over a 120 years of age would go into battle at Catalaunum, and would, after this and on top of it all, also see himself fit to marry!

The other point which is usually brought up against the reliability of the Chronicon Pictum is in connection with the emperor Honorius. You see, Márk Kálti writes that emperor Honorius was a Greek, that is, East Roman emperor! Upon hearing this our highly esteemed historian comrades start to roar with laughter, saying: Emperor Honorius was not East Roman, but West Roman emperor! And not even Dr. Klaus Weissgerber, who accepts the existence of the fictitious centuries, fails to note when writing about Kálti's chronicle: "Honorius was indeed West Roman emperor and ruled between 395 and 423." ... Well yes! This certainly is a tremendous cardinal error. How could Mark Kálti be so mistaken? This is indeed an unforgivable negligence. Kálti even dresses it up: According to him Attila marries the daughter of this Greek (!) emperor named Honorius and from this marriage the legendary leader of the Székelys ((Szeklers, Szekels or Latin 'Siculi', one of the most ancient Hungarian ethnic groups)) Csaba is born! Honorius is then none other than the maternal grandfather of Csaba, to whom he fled – in Greece (!) – from the civil war that broke out after the death of Attila. But let us read from the Chronicon Pictum

itself:

"So the vanquished Csaba and his brothers – those brothers who being on the other side at the beginning of the conflict but who joined forces with Csaba – altogether sixty in number, fled, according to legend, along with fifteen thousand Huns to Honorius, the grandfather of Csaba. Although Greek emperor Honorius wanted to install him in Greece, he did not stay there but returned to Scythia, the seat of his ancestors, in order to remain there. Csaba stayed with Honorius in Greece for thirteen years and due to the dangerous and difficult journey his return to Scythia lasted another year. (...) the Székelys thought Csaba had fallen in Greece; that is why the people have a commonly used saying to this day: "You should return when Csaba returns from Greece." Csaba was a legitimate son of Attila by the daughter of Greek emperor Honorius; his sons were named Edömén and Ed." ((This needs the support of a comment from the original Hungarian text: "A legyőzött Chaba és testvérei, Atyla királynak azok a fiai, akik a másik oldalról őmelléje álltak át, szám szerint hatvanan, úgy mondják, tizenötezer hunnal nagybátyjához, Honoriushoz menekültek. És a nagybátyjához van egy jegyzet: a 19. fejezetben a nagyapja volt; valamint a Honoriushoz: a krónikaíró szerint Kelet-római, a jelenleg érvényben lévő besorolás szerint Nyugat-római császár. Source: Képes Krónika, a Krónika magyar szövege, a Krónika latin szövege, Nemzeti Kincseinkért Egyesület 2003, a magyar szöveg Barsi János fordítása.))

Following this we can start feeling ashamed immediately: ... this is what we can expect from our uneducated Finn-Ugrian chroniclers. What do we want with our 124 year-old Attila and Kálti, who thinks the West Roman emperor is a Greek emperor! And this is not all! Honorius actually dies already in 423! How could Csaba have fled to Honorius after the death of his father, Attila, in 453 (!) when Honorius, by that time, had been dead for over 30 years?! On top of it all, Kálti writes that the death of Attila took place during the time of pop Gelasius I, who only became pope in 492!! ... That does it! ... That is the last straw! ... The person who after all this still believes even one word of the Hungarian chronicles is undoubtedly an amateurish dilettante chasing an imaginary glory, the paragon of the spiritual underworld, who, for reasons of base vanity or material gain, is propagating his distorted theories of ancient history at variance the official version! ... Therefore I now proclaim from down here to all the idle officials of science up in their ivory towers: it is time to get off your high horses, because it certainly seems highly probable, that the singular reason for all the absurdities of our chronicles is the calendar forgery of the Westerners!

Seeing these apparent absurdities of Kálti's chronicle I was struck by a suspicion

according to which Attila's West European campaign and unfortunate death really did not take place in the middle of the 5th century, but almost half-a-century before this, in the beginning of the 5th century. More precisely: in the end of the first decade of the 5th century, that is, exactly during the reign of emperor Honorius. However, the last episodes of Attila's life, like for example his West European campaign, was chronologically displaced to the later date of the middle of the 5th century. The question arises: how could they do this? How did they push the last period of Attila's life from the end of the first decade of the 5th century to the middle of the 5th century? Now, to explain the cause of such half-a-century calendar displacements, the 44 year difference between the Julian Era dates and the Christian Era dates proves to be the best choice. But can such a surplus in the years of Attila's reign be at all supported? Yes they can! We read the following in the Chronicon Pictum:

"Attila was king ((The original text of Kálti says, in Hungarian, 'királykodott', which has a poetic meaning of "kinging around", being a not so serious, even comical expression.)) for forty-four years, commander for five years, he lived for a hundred-and-twenty-four years."

I have a very strong suspicion that Attila was not king for forty-four years and the only need for this remark was that the time period of the first half of Attila's life was still calculated according to the Christian Era chronology, while the second half was calculated according to the Julian Era. Between these two systems of chronology is – as we have seen – a difference of precisely 44 years. There appeared therefore an empty period of 44 years, which Kálti fills with – for want of something better – "kinging around"! ((See previous footnote.)) This explains also the extremely great age reached by Attila and it was these 44 years that separated Csaba's journey to Greece from the period of emperor Honorius' reign.

But what could have been the initial reason for this process? Why was there a need to create a break of 44 additional years between the the first and the second half of Attila's life? Now, however unbelievable: the issue at stake is Hispania. What was needed was time. Time for what? We find the answer in Uwe Topper's book, where, on page 198, he writes:

"Because the goal of the Spanish endeavour of forgery was this: the creation of a Christian prehistory, in order to justify the recovery of the Iberian territories."

In other words, they wanted to create a Christian history in Hispania predating the Arab conquest of the same, which created the legal basis for the reconquering of the

peninsula and the fight against the Moors. In order to manage this however, the Visigoths had to be marched into Hispania somehow, preferably before the arrival of the Arabs! But how can this be achieved if the Visigoths never ever set foot in Hispania? Well, they did not hesitate for long: no matter if Visigoths never set foot in Hispania, they were simply dragged there!

We have seen earlier, that the time difference of the date – corrected by 7 years – between the victory of Charles Martell at Poitiers and the Chronicon Pictum date for Attila's West European campaign is exactly 297 years. As they created Charles Martell out of Attila, they created the Visigoths entering Hispania the exact same way. But out of whom were they created? Out of none other than the Huns of Attila; those Huns who were sent by him to Hispania against the sultan Miramammona. We know, that these Huns arrived too late for the battle at Catalaunum and out of fear for Attila they never returned to Pannonia. They remained in Spain and became the population of that country. Let us read Simon Kézai:

"On the Spanish campaign of the Huns.

The third troop which was sent against Miramammona, could not take part in the battle due to it being delayed, stayed among the Katalauns and eventually turned into inhabitants of Katalaunia. For the Huns alone, excluding the others of foreign nationalities, counted three-hundred-and-thirty-two-thousand and thirty-two. Of these Huns several in the army were made captains, who are called 'spán' in the tongue of the Huns and after them was later named the whole of Ispania, where they were previously named Katalauns."

So we can see, that there is no question of a small military force here. 330 000 Hispanian Hun immigrants is indeed equivalent of a homeland conquest proper! So here we have this large number of Huns stranded and settled in Hispania. Somehow Goths need to be made out of these! How? ... You'd better hold on now. According to official historiography Honorius was not East Roman, but West Roman emperor, during the reign of whom a usurper of the throne appeared, Constantinus by name. Thus a civil war erupted between Honorius and Constantinus. Let us follow the developments according to the Great Illustrated Encyclopaedia of World History:

"But by that time Sarus, a general of Goth blood, received word that he should strike down the rebel and bring his head to the feet of Honorius. (...) But Constantinus was not afraid; he entrusted the leadership to the Frankish Edebich and the British Gerontius and these worked zealously until they forced Sarus out of

Gallia. Constantinus now planned to take possession of Spain, too. (...) Constantinus invested his son Constans, who previously had been a monk, with the rank of high commander and entrusted to him the thousands of Honorians – thus were some barbarian troops named who were under military command, in honour of Honorius – and he succeeded in traversing [Spain]. (...) The territory fell into the custody of the Honorians and they hurried to quench their thirst for plunder. They did not bother guarding the mountain passes so in the Autumn of 409 barbarians broke into Spain and the territory was overrun."

Let us note:

We are in 409, when "barbarian" hordes (presumably Goths?!) called HONORIANS (!!!) in honour of Honorius, break into Hispania and overrun the territory. With the correction of 44 years according to the Julian Era chronology the event corresponds almost precisely (with an altogether difference of 2 years) with the West European campaign of Attila, when the HUNS sent against Miramamma to Spain are stranded in the territory. And at this stage who cares anymore about such tiny contradictions as that these Honorians, defying their name, fight on the side of Constantinus himself, against the emperor Honorius! But – I ask – what if these Honorians did not receive their name from Honorius at all? What if these are, in actual fact, Huns? Perhaps they are the people of HUNOR, that is, HUNORIANS!

We have seen earlier, that the victory of Charles Martell over the Arabs in 732-733 in actual fact is analogous with Attila's West European campaign and is its repetition, its altered duplication which the Westerners have made their own. We have seen that if we subtract the 297 years that Illig considers fictitious, from the date of the battle of Poitiers corrected by seven years, we end up in 443, that is, designated by the Chronicon Pictum to be the year of Attila's West European campaign. If we however take the uncorrected date for the battle of Poitiers and subtract, not 297, but 323 years that is appropriate for the correction according to the Alexandrian chronology, then we arrive in the year 409 after Christ. (732 - 323 = 409) And surprise, surprise: the "Honorians", named after Honorius, start pouring into Spain in the Autumn of this very year, 409!

It can be assumed, that the 330 000 Huns that settled in Hispania remembered for a long time that they were in fact Huns, the descendants of Hunor, the son of Nimrod. Therefore then, somehow, it had to be explained to them gently and carefully that they remember incorrectly! With devilish refinement it had to be communicated to them that they are really not Hunor's descendants at all, but Goths named

"Honorians" after the emperor Honorius! Do we now understand why the Greek emperor Honorius had to be made into a West Roman emperor? This is why! It would have been exceedingly difficult to explain why an army fighting in the Pyrenean mountains far away in the West was named after an East Roman emperor! This is far more believable of a West Roman emperor. So Honorius was made into a West Roman emperor and the stake was the creation of a Gothic history in Hispania predating the Arab conquest. The fact, however, that alongside Honorius appeared an even more Western emperor than he, namely Constantinus, the ruler of Hispania, Gallia and Britannia, is indicating that it was not entirely possible to completely cover up that Honorius really ruled in the East!

Sure, but what happens if one day these Huns in Hispania start to examine their history and find out that the West European campaign of Attila took place the exact same year they themselves crossed the Pyrenean Mountains and took possession of their current homeland? Then they will no longer believe they got their name after Honorius! So something needs to be done. For example, the West European campaign of Attila has to be moved in time, from the year 409 – utilising the Julian Era dating system – and push it to the middle of the 5th century. This is why we find Attila's 44 years of "kinging around" ((See previous footnote regarding this expression.)) in Kálti's chronicle, this is why Attila's life span is stretched to become 124 years and this is why the chronological connection between the flight of Csaba and the period of the reign of Honorius is broken. And that Attila would have sent an army against the Arabs simply has to be denied. But an even better idea is to displace in time the birth of Islam by 297 years and to write that the Arabs expelled by the Huns of Attila were actually checked by Charles Martell.

Thus we see how it is possible to manufacture even three different events out a single one, by dating them according to different chronological systems. The date of Attila's West European campaign according to Christian chronology is 409. But the Julian Era correction already pushes it to the middle of the 5th century, while if using the Alexandrian dating it ends up in 732. Thus they become Honorians in 409, Huns in 451 and Charles Martell's Franks in 732.

Let us observe, in light of the above, how other "absurdities" of our chronicles also receive new meaning: If Attila's death really did not take place in the middle of the 5th century, but around 410, and at this time Csaba flees to his maternal grandfather in Greece, Honorius, then another statement of the Chronicon Pictum becomes clear:



"Csaba stayed with Honorius in Greece for thirteen years..."

And why did Csaba spent exactly thirteen years in Greece? Don't we want to guess?  
... Because it is exactly thirteen years later, in 423, that Honorius dies. So Csaba leaves to join his people in Scythia only after his maternal grandfather Honorius' death in 423. Right after the death of his imperial protector. We see the beautiful order in which the until now unintelligible and twisted data line up themselves. To achieve this there was need to learn the facts about the calendar forgery of the early Middle Ages.