Introduction

When Heribert Illig introduced his theory on the "fabricated middle ages" (Erfundenes Mittelalter), or more known as Phantom time hypothesis; he mainly referred to western Europe. As per say the many false records from the Carolingian Age, the palace chapel of Aachen that predates by far its era with its architectural solutions (Palatine Chapel), the peculiar calendar reform of Pope Gregory XIII, the characteristic lacking of archeological evidence of the era.

Naturally, refers to peculiarities of the Byzantine Empire as well: the stoppage of constructions, the decadence of literacy, the odd fairytale likeliness of events, the incomprehensible and unjustified actions of the rewriting of chronicles. His arguments on their own are heavy enough and stimulating. Illig on the other hand never even mentions one thing, seemingly, the signs show that he was not even aware of it.

This is none other then the Hungarian chronicles. Those Hungarian chronicles, that back up and confirm his theories with such a surge of elementary power, that it should have been at least mentioned, never the less having its own chapter. It’s not surprising that lately there is a gravy silence that surrounds these chronicles. While in prominent history magazines they try to disproof and debunk that the time line of our chronology has been tempered with, they don’t even dare to mention the Hungarian chronicles in these articles.

With the dating of the Magyar Ingression (Secundus Ingressus) in our chronicles it is where they come under the greatest of confusions: Kálti Márk in the Chronicon Pictum (Képes krónika) sets this date with 2-3 centuries earlier than the today’s accepted official date. Fine, we might say, he did not know the exact date or miscalculated. Only this is not an exception. It’s a reoccurring thing! Namely Kézai Simon (Simon of Kéza writer of the Gesta Hungarorum) leaves the date of the Magyar, second Ingression to the end of the eight hundreds, but dates Atilla the Hun not to the first half of the four hundreds, but well three hundred years later, in the seven hundreds! Hereby it is not Kálti Márk nor Kézai Simon that had poor math skills, rather they confronted unawarely with the same problem, the artificially introduced three hundred years.
Historical amnesia?

According to the official version of history and the chronology that is in use, Atilla the Hun existed in the first half of the four hundreds A.D., while the Magyar Ingression happened at the end of the eight hundreds, in 895 A.D. The time span between the two events are a merely 450 years, which should be considerable as of historical value. The Hungarian chronicles portray the times of Atilla with utter most detail. The same happens with the Magyar Ingression (secundus ingressus). Pages on end with utter most details depiction of events upon events. Therefore we rightfully might expect that the same would happen about the time passed between the two events. That our chroniclers write about those events with at least the same accuracy. Let's say, about the avars and the Avaric Empire that existed in this time period. To our amazement not only they don't do such a thing, they don't even write down the name of the avars nor use the word or expression avar, avaric. The dating of events don't even allow the existence of an Avaric Empire of merely three hundred years. For right after the death of Atilla the Magyar Ingression occurs. This happens after 104 years, over five generations. Kálti Márk and Kézai Simon make the impression as if they would be suffering of some sort of historical amnesia. Three hundred years can't just be ignored as if they would be insignificant. How come they know more about the Hunnic period then the Avaric Empire that predates the Magyar Ingression? Let's admit it: is pure hair raising! Surely they must have had some knowledge of the Avaric Empire, if not first hand at least second hand information. No matter where our ancestors lived during the three hundred years of Avaric rule, it must have been somewhere around the Carpathian Basin. Contact of any kind is likely to take place! Assuming of course that such an Avaric Empire ever existed. If not, it's not surprising that our chronicles "omit" mentioning about such thing.

Not only the Avaric Empire is "omitted", but also the Khazar Empire! This is again mind bothering, for according to the official version of events, prior to the Magyar Ingression our ancestors were supposed to be part of such empire from times after the death of Atilla. Our chronicles haven't even ever heard of any Khazar Empire.

Don't even need to mention that the Carolingian Age, the Frankish Kingdom, with its founding figure, father of Europe, pillar of European history, patriarch of two continents, Charlemagne, doesn't appear either. If not for anything, for his campaigns waged against the avars in the Carpathian basin should have been surely mentioned. Of course there is a small condition for this. One has to be a real, priorly existed historical figure.
How much time passed between the two ingressions?*

The chronicles know of five generations that have passed between the two ingressions:
"... and the birth of that son was prophesied in a dream, hence his name: Álmos**. Who was the son of Előd, son of Ögyek, son of Ed, son of Csaba, son of Etele***." - Chronicon Pictum

Our chronicles set 100 and 104 years between the death of Atilla and the second ingress of Magyars:
"In the year 677 of Our Lord's Incarnation, 104 years after the death of the Magyar king Atilla, in the times of Emperor Constantine the III. and Pope Zachary - as can be found written in the chronicles of the Romans - the Magyars rode out for the second time from Scythia..." - Chronicon Pictum

A few lines further:
"In the year 677 of Our Lord's Incarnation, 100 years after the death of Atilla, on people's tongue Magyars or Huns, in Latin Ungarus, in times of Emperor Constantine the III. and Pope Zachary again they have ingressed into Pannonia." - Chronicon Pictum

The Hungarian chronicles tell even of such details as to which Edömén, brother of Ed, who is son of Csaba, therefore Atilla's grandson, was still alive in times of the Magyar ingress and with the peoples of his entire court moved back to Pannonia. How could this be possible, if between the death of Atilla and the Magyar ingress not 100 nor 104 but 442 (!!!) years have passed according to the official version of history and chronology? Obviously there is no way it could happen as such! Therefore the conclusion is at hand: whether the chronicles serve us erroneous data or the chronology has been tempered with, as Heribert Illig suggests himself. However the thesis about the 104 years is not only based on the Chronicon Pictum but also by the soviet archelogists Zakharov and Arendt. Now lets see what László Götz writes in his work „Keleten kél a Nap” (The Sun rises in the east).

"The then discovered Saltovo-Mayaki culture was categorically classified as the legacy of the Magyars of Levedia (namely Zakharov and Arendt soviet archeologists). They conclude that the swords from the Saltovo and northern Caucasus, in the Koban area, are closest to the ones from the time of the Magyar Ingression. The Saltovo-Mayaki culture appeared at the end of the 8th century and disappeared by the end of the 9th century -they write. By no means is a of Khazar origin, for it lacks exactly form the heart of the Khazar Empire. It embraces in a large semicircle the Khazar centrum in the lower Volga: from mid Volga to the upper Don and Donets across the Koban area till the east of the Caucasus, to the Kuma. (...) The Saltovo-Mayaki culture is the only one in Southern Russia of which factual proofs show that half of it ceased to exist at the end of the 9th century, exactly corresponding to the times of the Magyar Ingression."

So it is impossible not to remark the Saltovo-Mayaki culture that was tied by the soviet researchers to the people of Magyars from Levedia, flourished for about one hundred years (from the end of the 8th century to the end of the 9th century), only to get depopulated at the end of the 9th century with "tragical speed" coinciding with the Magyar ingress. Also it is very hard not to observe the 100, 104 years found in the Chronicon Pictum between the death of Atilla, the retreat of his people back to "Scythia" and the second ingress of Magyars.

(* First Magyar ingress or primus ingressus, under the rule of Atilla. Second ingress or secundus ingressus, that of the Magyar Lords under the rule of Árpád.
** Álom in hungarian means dreamy, sleepy. Álom=dream, sleep.
*** Etele is Atilla)
**Alexandrian chronology in Gesta Hungarorum?**

So we saw that Kálti Márk dated the Magyar Ingression 677 A.D. From his logic another ingression may be deduced! If we add 104 years, to the death of Atilla according to the date of the Chronicon Pictum, 445 A.D. The 104 years that passed from the death of Atilla to the Magyar ingression, we are going to get the date 549 A.D. (445 + 104 = 549) In the chronicle wrote by Kézai Simon in 1272, the Magyar ingression is placed on 872 A.D. A question may be raised: is there any connection between the two dates? **Well, the two dates are one and the same! Only one (549) is expressed in A.D., since the birth of Christ, the other (872) is expressed in the Alexandrian chronology, since the death of Alexander the Great.** We know that Alexander the Great died in 323 B.C. and from the time of his death a chronology commenced. Therefore, if some one in the middle ages used a chronology that had its starting point from the death of Alexander the Great, had to use values greater with 323 years then those who used a chronology that had its starting point as the birth of Christ. Thus:

445 - The death of Atilla as found in the Chronicon Pictum
104 - The amount of years passed from the death of Atilla until the Magyar ingression as found in the Chronicon Pictum.
323 - The amount of difference in years between the chronology from the death of Alexander and the christian chronology.
872 (445 + 104 + 323) - According to Kézai this is the date of the Magyar ingression!

It is highly probable that in the middle ages they have confused the two parallel chronologies by mistake and even on purpose. People must have known the exact dates but whether they were calculated as since the birth of Christ, whether as since the death of Alexander, not so much. With the spread of Christianity the christian chronology spread as well. But in a manner that the Alexandrian dates were just simply defined as christian. This possibility was also taken into account by Illig himself in his book. In the Hungarian version of the book, on page 442 in the chapter called "From Alexander to Alexander", this is what we can find:

"In the discussion with Gunnar Heinsohn he shared me the thoughts on the three hundred years of the middle ages in question, that their appearance might come from the change of the Alexandrian chronology dates into A.D. and were reused as such. (...) Behind this stands the simple logic of not being able to accept anymore the figure of a pagan Alexander, therefore the old dates were just simply handled as "christian dates". (...) In this case the correct Alexandrian dates of the Byzantine bureaucracy were just simply attributed to Christ-dates in the west."

Illig writes all this while unaware that we, Hungarians, have two chronicles from the middle ages that at the dating of the Magyar ingression reproduce exactly the gap of 323 years made by the two dating methods, between that with start from Alexander’s death and the one that starts from the birth of Christ. Even in this case the Hungarian chronicles absolutely support Illig’s theory.
A question still remains: If Kálti states that Atilla died in 445, the ingression took place 104 years later, then instead of a date of 549, why does he communicate a date of 677? Isn’t it contradictory? It is, indeed! The contradiction’s root is exactly in the logic of tempering with the time line of the chronology. Illig clearly states that the introduction of the fabricated three hundred years from 614 to 911 on the time line, doesn’t mean that all is not true. Whether then the fabricated time segment’s peripheries from the beginning and at the end, were stuffed with events back-dated or dated ahead of there time.

With the same rulers multiplied over and over and numbered in series. Therefore Kálti by mentioning the date of 677, does not only take into account the death of Atilla or the ingression of Magyars but also who was the Byzantine ruler of that time. This is why he talks about a date of 677 instead of 549, because he tries to synchronize his dating with that of the falsified ruling period of Constantine the III. Of that Constantine III. from whom meantime they’ve fabricated a IV., a V., VI. and a VII. Constantine. So according to the official version the date of 677 would fall on the period of the rule with the series number Constantine the IV. So Kálti Márk gets into contradiction with himself because he tries to synchronize his dates with the false western chronicles! To our good fortune he also communicates the correct dates of Hungarian source.

So here are given to us such marvelous Hungarian chronicles that reproduce the same time gap which Heribert Illig could show based exclusively on western sources, without the knowledge of the existence of such chronicles. These are two separate and independent evidences of the same thing. On one hand the western European sources that were used by Illig to base his theory. And they stand their ground as evidence with solidity. On the other hand the Hungarian chronicles that totally support the same thing independently from the western chroniclers. But how can it be possible? And how can it be allowed, that such a source in concordance with all these not only to be ignored but not even being aware of it’s existence? However, this is what the Word says:

"Every matter is settled on the evidence of two or three witnesses. (2 Corinthians 13:1)"

Double Standards

The international scientific community always regarded and took for granted western chronicles like Einhard’s ”Vita Karoli Magni”. Against the obvious absurdities and incoherences its trustworthiness could never be questioned. The same scientific community that neglects the entire Hungarian chronicles which on the other hand are classified as untrustworthy. One might wonder, why? Why are historians using double standards in this issue? We know the answer: because of the time-lapse!!! The official argument of the historian academy would be that such chronicles that set only 104 years from the death of Atilla to the Magyar Ingression is pure nonsense and so childish that it doesn’t worth the bother from a scientific point of view. Therefore the authenticity of its information can not be taken likely. We understand this how it goes, don’t we? Just as Jesus Christ was sentenced to death by Caiaphas when to his question Jesus spoke the truth about Himself. The same happens with the Hungarian chronicles that ”dares to take the guts” and leave out the phantom time segment that was more likely introduced later on the time line of our chronology. Therefore it is totally unauthentic and unacceptable. That there would be any problems with our chronology and the problem is not within the chronicles, to our scientists don’t even occur.
This impossible situation has yet another aspect to it, one that really shows the backward mentality of the scientific academy. For however unbelievable would be, there’s a nation in the middle of Europe that believes more to its own enemy, the Byzantine emperor, rather then to its own chroniclers regarding its own history. What we know about the "Hungarian Conquest" (Honfoglalás) is from none other then the "De Administrando Imperio" (On the Governance of the Empire) written by Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos. Taking into account that our forefathers waged battles against the Byzantine Empire and subdued it to be tributary, a question emerges: could be an emperor regarded impartial and truthful on the matters of the Hungarian issue to whom this name meant nothing but trouble? Obviously not! Against this, we take for granted every of its word, meanwhile disregarding our own chroniclers. Constantine VII in his ominous work does anything possible to lessen and blot out the honor of our forefathers.

Let’s see:

"And the Magyars were of seven hordes, but in those times did not have any rulers, neither indigenous nor foreign, but there were some tribal chiefains amongst whom the priorly mentioned Lebediás... And the khagan, the ruler of the Khazars, for the bravery and the military help (of the Magyars) gave a Khazar bride of nobility to the main chiefain, who's name was Lebediás, to have offsprings with, but so happened that Lebediás did not have any descendants from this woman. After a while, the khagan, Khazaria's ruler, sent word to the Magyars to send their main chiefain before him, at his arrival Lebediás asked why was called for. And thus spoke the khagan to him: for you are of noble blood and brave and wise and outstanding amongst the Magyars, we would wish, that you would become the leader of your kind and be submitted to our laws and ordinance."

In one word, according to Constantine Porphyrogennetos, in those times we were the obedient subjects of the Khazar ruler of Jewish religion and didn’t even had the wits nor the ability to choose a leader for ourselves. The Khazar ruler drew the attention upon the fact that we should have leaders of our own. He was the one who personally asked Lebediás to be the leader of our "hordes" and of "our kind". After Lebediás was of humble spirit, he let this "appointed" task to be filled by Álmos, respectively his son Árpád.

"Árpád's inauguration happened according to the customs of the Khazars, being raised on the shield that is. But before Árpád, the Magyars did not have any kind of rulers, this is why rulers of Hungary are chosen from this lineage up to this day."

This would be the famous Árpád dynasty according to Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos. Of course our "master of historical fabrications" does not forget to mention that the Magyars did not have any kind of rulers before Lebediás. Does this with the obvious intent to disassociate, to sever the Magyars from Atilla the Hun, Scourge of God, he who with his grand army forced the Roman Empire to its knees in the 5th century A.D. Opposite to this, the Hungarian chronicles of the middle ages don’t know of any Lebediás, Khazar rulers nor of any Khazar Empire! They know instead of Scythia, calls the Magyars whether by the name of Huns or Scythians, and tells of Atilla as king of the Magyars. Bearing in mind that also according to Heribert Illig, one of the masterminds behind the fabrication of our chronology was Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos, who’s descriptions concerning the history of Magyars was accepted by the Hungarian historians and community without questions.
Constantine III or Constantine VII?

Illig in his book takes account of the eerie resemblance between events of the 5th and the 10th century as well. "The (Byzantine) empire is weakened militarily by the advancements of the Avars around the year 600 to the Balkan peninsula." - he writes. Let’s not forget: with the correction of 300 years the Avaric advancement coincides with the Magyar advancement! For the Byzantine Empire had to face a strong enemy from the north in the beginning of the nine hundreds, namely the Magyars, the suspicion arises that the whole Avaric era is non other then the duplicate of the Magyar Ingression backdated. Illig takes reference on Manfred Zeller, who in his works about the peoples of steppe shows that: "the number of the horse-archer peoples' in the first millennium doubles, filling the empty centuries!" Therefore the Avars are just a duplicate! A duplicate created beside the Hun-Magyar nations with one purpose, to fill in the empty centuries. The archaeological artifacts denoted as Avaric could easily be that of the Huns of Atilla’s.

For now let’s return to the Byzantine Empire: in 602 under the name of Phocas, a fearsome and untalented emperor sits on the throne by usurpation. At this time, the king of the Persians, Khosrau II, taking advantage of the situation makes an attack on Byzantine seemingly to avenge the murdered emperor. In 610 Heraclius puts an end to the terror reign of Phocas, but the Persian advancements continue: they take over Eastern Anatolia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestina, Egypt and on the Northern shores of Africa they reach till Tripoli. The occupation of Jerusalem and the taking of the True Cross happened in 614 may 22nd after a three week siege. An interesting thing about Heraclius is that he had a co-emperor. This is his own son who is already crowned in 613 at the age of two. Being at the side of his father with no contribution in decision making. When he finally got to the throne he only ruled for a mere four months. This being none other then Constantine III, who is mentioned in the Chronicon Pictum about the time of the Magyar Ingression:

"... one hundred and four years after the death of the Magyar king Atilla, in the times of Emperor Constantine the III. and Pope Zachary - as can be found written in the chronicles of the Romans - the Magyars rode out for the second time from Scythia..."

It is very interesting that the Chronicon Pictum’s author sets the emperor from the time of the Magyar Ingression as an emperor who lived in the six hundreds! As we know according to Illig, the start of the phantom segment in our chronology takes place from 614, shortly after the True Cross is taken away. In this time Constantine III is already crowned, but only of three years of age. The time when he gains power to reign falls within the phantom segment. If Illig is right, then the character of Constantine III has to appear in some form in the 10th century as well. And as by magic, in the 10th century we also have a Constantine! This time not the III but the VII! Namely Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos (the Purple-born), who probably was one of the mastermind behind the fabrication of our chronology. After this Illig analyzed Constantine's life story. The story of the 10th century takes its beginning where Emperor Leo VI the Wise within four years becomes a widower three times, then finally Zoe Zaoutzaina gives birth to a son but illegitimate. When Leo crowns this boy as co-emperor, he dies within a year, in 912. (One should keep in mind that according to Illig in the year 911 the history starts anew. So in 912 the crowning of the illegitimate son belong to the real events of the time line.) But this boy has no saying in the state’s matter until the age of 24. In this perspective bares resemblance with Constantine III, who also was crowned as co-emperor at a young age and only could take the state’s power into his hands much later on. So who do you think was the illegitimate son of Emperor Leo from the 10th century? Well, none other then Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos!
The similarities are too remarkable between the life of Constantine III from the 7th century and that of Constantine VII from the 10th century. Worthy of note is the matter of the regaining of the True Cross from the hands of the Persians. It is not by mistake that Constantine VII has put it on the account of Heraclius, by doing this he did nothing else but paying homage to his own father’s memory. For Heraclius in first of all not only being the father of Constantine III from the 7th century, he was also the father of Constantine VII of the 10th century! On top of all Constantine VII Porphyrogennetos arranges the beginning of the real history in a way that would start with his own coronation!

In similarities not only the characters of the two emperors show resemblance, but also the foreign policies of the Byzantine Empire of the 7th and 10th century. As we’ve seen, in the 7th century the empire was troubled from the north by the Avaric advancements, meanwhile, in the southeast by that of the Persians. In the 10th century events repeat with different characters: in the north the Magyars trouble the empire, while in the southeast the Arabic expansion does the same. At this point one pauses for a brief moment and asks himself: isn’t it possible that the Avars of the 7th century are no more then the Magyars of the 10th century? And the Arabic expansion of the 10th century is likely to be the Persian expansion of the 7th century? So, if the Byzantine Empire was troubled in the 7th century by Persians and Avars, in the 10th century these become Arabs and Magyars! Regarding to the Arab-Persian matter this is what Illig writes:

"The mystery of art history becomes clear all of a sudden, why in Spain there are more Persian-Syrian elements then Arabic. (...) We mustn’t wonder anymore on how it was possible for some Arabs few in number from the oasis to victoriously attack empire after empire of the age from Spain to the Indus; it is more likely something supposedly be done by Persian troops."

The Persians on their conquest they brought to Egypt the knowledge of the Koran and along with it the religion of Islam, in this way it reached further to the South till Spain. At this point we should be taking a small detour in analyzing the birth of the Islam, even more knowing that on our way we will find answer why there was specifically 297 years artificially introduced on the time line of our chronology.