

FROM SCYTHIA TO MAGHREB: BEYOND THE PHANTOM MIDDLE AGES



Huns besieging Aquileia (Chronicon Pictum)

This is the English transcript of a lecture held by the Hungarian author Tóth Gyula in November 2012 regarding the issues of the chronology in use and the fictitious historical events and characters that are in present in the history books. The full title of his book is "A kitalált középkoron túl - Szkítiától Maghreb"; "Beyond the fictitious dark ages – From Scythia to Maghreb"

(...)

I greet you all with love as well, and I would like to thank the organizers for the repeated invite. Well, I would also like to say a few opening words about myself. Those who know me, know also that I started getting involved with Heribert Illig's "The Invented Middle Ages" 10 years ago. In that time - to be more exact - in 2003, there was published a short study of mine that was titled "A Magyar Kronikák a kitalált középkorban" (The Hungarian Chronicles and the Invented Middle Ages). Since then long years have passed and I have seemingly not reported any new findings, however in the backstage I have continuously been finding more new discoveries, and soon, if everything goes well, this will manifest in a book at the beginning of the next year. The title of this book will be "Szkítiától Maghreb, a kitalált középkoron túl" (From Scythia to Maghreb: Beyond the Fictitious Middle Ages). I have chosen this title for my presentation as well.

Also, right at the beginning of my presentation I would like to state that I have a blog on the internet concerning this subject. The address is: www.maghreb.blog.hu (in Hungarian only) If there is anything during the presentation that isn't clear, you can check my blog for more elaborate explanations along with other thoughts that there might not be enough time for to express tonight. So as I said before, it was about 10 years ago that I threw myself into studying Heribert Illig's work. I was inspired by one of Gábor Pap's lectures on the internet. It was part of the "Tizenegyedik Parancsolat" (The Eleventh Commandment) series, in which he reviewed Heribert Illig's theory. I must say, as an introductory, that when I listened to this review, I received it with disapproval. The official Academics say that here in Hungary, there is a utopian dream-chasing researcher society, who right after hearing about Heribert Illig's theory got stuck on it and parrots it without critique. This is groundless accusation. This is so untrue, that I started my whole work to disprove Illig's theory. I was so outraged that it is possible to spread such nonsense today in Hungary, that I took it on myself to disprove it.

Before we delve deeper into the subject, let us clarify who Heribert Illig was, and what the essence of his theory is. Illig is a Bavarian, who at the beginning of the 1990's formulated a thesis stating that European history's three centuries, the 7th, 8th and 9th century, are a completely baseless fabrication that we have to forget and erase from our History books, and whence we put these two end-points together, history becomes continuous. Illig claimed that everything that happened between 614's autumn and 911's autumn is fictitious. So, he defined exactly these two end-points. As we will see, however, Illig's theory turned out to be a little edgy. I have found a lot of discrepancies in his work and have been able to find a lot of weak points in Illig's original theory. In succession we will touch upon these points. Still as an introduction, I'd like to tell about what inspired Illig to come up with this thesis. Obviously this conclusion, that Europe's history's three centuries are fictitious, didn't just pop out of his head. This had an antecedent.

He had previously studied antiquity thoroughly as well and having had publicized books on the construction of Egypt's pyramids. He had engaged in Egyptian chronology, Asia's prehistory, and he regularly encountered a problem. Take for example Egyptian history: there is a Long Egyptian Chronology, and Short Egyptian Chronology. It is well known among those who study history, that certain periods of Egyptian history, at the beginning of Egyptology, had been improperly, duplicately put on the time line. So it is that there became a Long Chronology. There is also another example from Asian prehistory. The Mittani Empire's golden age was in 14th century BC. Illig pointed out that the Mittani Empire was stipulated based on runic writing. Greek sources wrote about this Empire as well, however they referred to it as the Median Empire. These two empires as well had been put side-by-side on the time line, so now we speak of a Mittani empire in 14th century BC, and a Median empire from the 8th to the 6th century BC. If we compare the history of these two empires, it becomes clear that we are speaking of one and the same. This was one of the points that made Illig think. The other thing was that he became aware of Pope Gregory XIII's particular calendar reform. As we know, Pope Gregory XIII revised the Julian Calendar in 1582, when right after 1582 October 5th came the 16th. Practically, he skipped 10 days, and his goal with this was to reset the spring equinox in 1582 to it's position in the time of Julius Caesar, when the Julian Calendar was instituted. However, according to common sense, Pope Gregory XIII, instead of 10 days should have revised to 13 days, because since Julius Caesar to Pope Gregory XIII, 13 days had accumulated in our time. And still, Pope Gregory XIII revised the calendar with 10 days, to reset the spring equinox to March 21st, which was probably the same time the spring equinox was in Julius Caesar's time. So then, obviously since Illig had published his ideas on this, many have tried to contradict his theory - some have suggested that maybe the spring equinox' date originally wasn't even March 21st in Julian Caesar's time. Official history sciences state that Pope Gregory XIII had to revise only by 10 days because priorly, the Nicene Creed in 325, had already done such a revision, whence they had already corrected the accumulated time slip, because of which Pope Gregory XIII only had to revise up to the time of the Nicene Creed. Sincerely, however we don't have any sources that might support this claim, so this is a hypothesis, that might be true or not. The point is however, that these are the lines along which Illig had formulated his thesis on, stating that the Dark Ages were dark, because they never even existed. It occurred to him that in this age, in Byzantium, literacy ceases to exist. So interestingly before the fictitious age and after the fictitious age, emperors employ scribes who write passages on the other contemporary emperors, and record the given emperor's deeds and life story. In these three centuries, there is no word of such a thing, and the history on these three centuries is written retroactively. Illig became aware of the break off in building operations as well, how before the fictitious age the thirst for construction was escalating in Byzantium, and after the fictitious age this eagerness spontaneously woke up again. In between the age in question we only know of one or two architectural sites, which more than probably were only dated retrospectively into the age in question. So these were the thoughts that spurred him onto his path and made him think that we are most probably facing a fictitious three centuries that we have to erase from the pages of History. Going into deeper studies of Illig's work, it seemed to me that Illig doesn't provide us with any really good answers on the Whys and the Hows. Namely, those who are familiar with Illig's work put up the question "Why would they have done such a thing?" right away. So, "Who would think of doing such a thing?"; or "What would've been the benefit of lying 300 years into history?" Illig replied to this question that in the age questioned, the Persians were at war with the Byzantine Empire, and in 614, they occupied Jerusalem, and they kidnapped the holiest relic of Christianity, the Saint Cross. This of course was a huge blow for the time's Christianity, so they wanted to win back the Saint Cross, however in reality, they never succeeded to do so. This is why, claims Illig, they tagged 300 years into the time line, in which the Byzantine troops intrude into the depths of Persia, where

they find the Saint Cross, take it back into Byzantine, and so they solve this technical problem. The other answer, according to Illig, for the Why is that in this time there was an emperor named Otto III, who wished to be "Ende Kaiser" (Emperor of the End of Times). The expression comes from a concept, in this age, that there would be a leader, who leads his people through the turning of the millennium, and he shall be the founder of Christ's next thousand year Empire. This was a very appealing concept to Otto III, so he wanted to be the Ende Kaiser. But since he lived in the 600's, he needed to precede his time by annexing 300 years into the time line, so that he would be right at the income of the Thousand Year Anniversary. These are what Illig stated for the Whys.

Here, however, I felt there were much greater explanations, that hadn't been addressed. Somehow I found it unrealistic that it was because of the regaining of the Saint Cross, and Otto III's "Ende Kaiser" ambitions, that 300 years would be tagged into chronology. However if we investigate further into what the conclusive problems were of the era, that there needed to be a solution found for, then we shall see that this era is the following of the time of "The Great Migrations of the Steppes". The main trouble-maker of that time was the great population of people who migrated here from the steppes, Atilla's Hunnic people, who in point of fact dealt a deathly blow to the Roman Empire and with this Calendar Forgery, they wanted to cosmeticize this heavy blemish, and create the opportunity for this Empire to reanimate itself. As we know, Charlemagne's slogan was "Renovatio Imperii Romanorum" (Renewal of the Roman Empire). Atilla finished this Empire off, however, with tagging 300 years into chronology, they wanted to get around this problem. So they pocketed such Empires, people and events into these three centuries, onto which in the next centuries people could refer to, and from which people could recall such great Rulers, Emperors, that could be showed up in the interest of restoring the Roman Empire. So according to my stance, this is the indication for forgery, rather than Otto III's Ende Kaiser ambitions and the retrieval of the Saint Cross.

Illig gave a rather anemic answer for the Hows as well. He said that, frankly, there's no need to get caught up on nobody noticing a thing of this operation, since literacy wasn't too popular, yet at the time the monks writing the various chronicles could write the dates of their fancy, there was no need for anyone to notice anything of this operation. Naturally, Illig is right, I am not arguing this point, but I'd like to offer a completely new approach on the matter. This approach started to take form, when I looked at the various dates in our Chronicles that concern the first and second incoming of the Hungarians. As we know, the Képes Krónika (Chronicon Pictum) informs us that Atilla's death occurred in 445. Those who study history say that the scribes accidentally switched the last two digits of the date of Atilla's death, so originally it would've been 454. Kézai Simon's (Simon of Kéza) Chronicles say that the Settling of Hungarians under Árpád was in 872, but the Chronicon Pictum adds to this 445 date, that the second incoming of the Hungarians' occurred 104 years after 445. So, even though the Chronicon Pictum doesn't state it directly, we can easily derive from these two dates, that Árpád's Hungarians' Settling is supposed to have happened 104 years after 445. This is 549. This is the Chronicon Pictum's data for the Hungarians' second incoming. In contrary to this, Kézai Simon states that the second incoming of the Hungarians is in 872. When I looked at the time difference between the two dates 549 and 872, that was a fairly extraordinary moment. Namely, when I counted out the difference, I got exactly 323. What is 323? As we know, many different chronologies existed in antiquity. Amongst many, there was a chronology that started counting from the death of Alexander the Great. Now, if somebody, for some reason in the Middle Ages, still used this Alexandrian chronology to measure time, then they would have used dates exactly 323 larger than those who measured time according to Christ. And lo, here are two Hungarian chronicles that show this exact 323

year slip. Here I saw, that the reasoning for Calendar Forgery must be different from what Illig assumed. How literacy wasn't popular, so people could sedately lie 300 years into history, 'cause nobody noticed anything anyway. It is more the case that in this time there were still many chronologies existing parallel to each other, that the middle ages still inherited from antiquity. There was the Seleucid chronology, the Alexandrian chronology, the Julian Calendar chronology, and also there were those Hungarians, who brought with themselves from the east their own chronology, called the Saka chronology, still used in modern-day India, which shows exactly 78 years' difference with the chronology of Christ. There were many chronologies that existed in the time of the Middle Ages, at the beginning of the Middle Ages, which were used inconsistently. We can't solemnly swear that when we're reading a date in one of the chronicles, it is necessarily understood according to Christ. This age was the age of great mixing, from the east arrived a huge nation that brought it's own writing system that was right-to-left, and here they found people who wrote left-to-right. They brought their own chronology, and they found different chronologies here as well. These different things at the beginning of the Middle Ages intermixed. This ultimately led to the discovery of Heribert Illig, that 300 years, mistakenly had slipped into our time line. Which is probably accountable to the fact that a Great Alexandrian date, a date 323 years greater, was wrongly taken for a date according to Christ. Which swung the Christian date 300 years later.

Now, when I started my studies, this was when I first realized that probably the Hungarian chronicles are the only ones to have preserved the correct dating. To be exact, when the Hungarian chronicles state the time between Atilla's death and the incoming of Árpád's Hungarians is 104 years, we have to take it much more seriously than we have so far. However odd it may seem, no-one has examined so far what happens 104 years after the death of Atilla. Does anything happen that could be suspicious from the Hungarian view? Namely, this is how much of a joke we'd taken our chronicles for up to now. I looked at what happens 104 years after the death of Atilla. If we start from Atilla's 454, or 453 death date, and add 104 years to that to the second incoming of the Hungarians, then we arrive at 558. I looked at what happens in 558. What I found was a moment of epiphany. In 558 the following events happened in history: we find two peoples, north of the black sea, who according to historians are of Hunnic ancestry. West of the river Don live the Kuturgur or Kutrigur Huns, east of the river Don live the Utigur Huns. In 558 the Kutrigur Huns with the leadership of so-called Lord Kinialk attack Byzantium and a Balkan Crusade unfolds. Byzantium, in order to evade this attack, hires the leader of the Huns east of the river Don, Sandlich Khan to stab the Kutrigurs' derelict quarters in the back. Sandlich accepts the bribe, and whilst the Kutrigur troops are fighting their bloody battle in the Balkans, the Utigurs stab the Kutrigurs in the back, to which effect the Kutrigurs move into Pannonia, and settle there. Now, when I read this, I was completely flabbergasted at how it has never transpired to anyone, how it had never sparked anyone's attention! This is the complete equivalent of the incoming of the Árpád's Hungarians. As we know, Árpád's Hungarians, with the leadership of Levente attacked Simeon, Bulgarian Tsar's Empire. Simeon of Bulgaria, to evade the Hungarian attacks, bribed the Bessi (Pechengs) to attack the Hungarians' deserted quarters, to which effect the Hungarian main troop moved into Pannonia with the leadership of Árpád. Now, I don't want to open an argument on the meaning of this Bessi attack, whether this is what mobilized the Hungarians' movement into the Carpathian Basin. Right now I'd just like to point out that this series of events show exact equivalence with the events of 558. Except that what was called "Kutrigur" in 558, that is "Hungarian" in 895. That which is "Utigur" in 558, is "Bessi" in 895, and in the place of the Byzantine Empire we find Simeon Bulgarian Tsar's Empire. The procession of events in both series of events are in complete correspondence. They are equal so much so, that those who study these two events, arguments', separately from one-another, are surprisingly similar. Namely,

those who study the events of 558, argue about whether this Kinialk's Balkan crusade and Zabergan Khan's arrival into Pannonia happened in the same year, or in two successive years. The historians studying Árpád's Hungarians argue the same exact thing: whether Levente's Lower-Danube crusade happened in the same year as Árpád's arrival to the Carpathian Basin.

So it is not only the succession of events that are the same, the arguments of the historians show surprising similarities as well. This is how seriously we need to take our chronicles. This 104 year difference however doesn't just occur in one spot on the time line, but in two places. According to one coordinate, Árpád's arrival happened in 558, 104 years after the death of Atilla. However, if I start from Árpád's date of 895, and accept this as the right coordinate, I should check to see what happens 104 years before the officially accepted date of the Árpáadian Hungarians arrival. If I subtract 104 years from this 895 date, the amount of time, that according to our Chronicles, passed between Atilla's time of death and Árpád's time of arrival, then we arrive to 791. Is there anything happening in 791? It just so happens, that yes, there is such a happening. Namely, this is the exact year of Charlemagne of the Frankish Empire's attack towards the Pannonian Avars. At this point it becomes clear, that Charlemagne's and the Pannonian Avar's battle is no other than Aladár's and Csaba's conflict (**CS is English CH*). This 104 year difference is on the History's two pages. Once it is between Atilla's 454 date of death and 558's Kutrigurs and Utrigurs. Next it is in Charlemagne's Battle starting at 791 and Árpád's arrival in 895. Now, delving further into this problematic chronology, I continuously encountered a 44 year difference. Atilla's extremely long ruling period caught my attention. The Chronicles say that Atilla was king for 44 years, leader for 5 years and lived for 124 years. Now, this 124 year lifespan seemed unreal to me. So I started to think what is the reasoning of the Chronicles could be, when they tell about this 124 years. My first thought was in connection with this 44 years of being king. To me it was unreal that here comes this Great King, who is leader for 5 years, then comes a mysterious 44 years of kingship in which time nothing happens, then at the of this 44 years of kingship he quickly tramps two crusades against Rome, a Western expedition, then an Italian expedition, then dies. So this 44 years of kingship of which the Chronicles write about, arose my suspicions at first, in context with Atilla. This is when it occurred to me that the author of the book "Time Falsification", Uwe Topper - who is Illig's colleague - wrote about a chronology that started from the Julian Calendar's initiation. So, however odd it may seem, when Julius Caesar introduced the Julian Calendar in 45 BC, he didn't just introduce a new calendar system. He didn't just lay down that a year should consist of 365 days, and there should be leap years every 4 years. But also that from this year, from 45 BC, time started counting. There existed a chronology, that started from this year onwards. Since, however, there wasn't a year zero in this time line, the difference between Christian dates and Julian dates is not 45 years, but 44. So it occurred to me, that this mysterious 44 year kingship in Atilla's time only existed, because somebody, at some time, tagged in a 44 year time period into the middle of his life. So Atilla's life's beginning was dated according to the Christian date, and the end of his life - so his Western conquest, Italian conquest and death, and the rife after his death between Csaba and Aladár - was dated according to the Julian Calendar. Taking this question a step further, I began to think that our Chronicles plainly write that after the death of Atilla, Csaba and Aladár fell into an affray with one-another, because of the question of who has the right to the throne came up, and they both started to rule. The Chronicles write, that because of the viperousness of Detre of Verona, the Huns broke up into different fractions.

Some wanted to make Krimhilda's germanic mother superior offspring, Aladár, king. The Huns' more sober part supported Csaba. Now, we must know, that according to our chronicles, Csaba was the son of Honorius' Greek Tsar's daughter. So Honorius Greek Tsar was Csaba's grandfather on his mother's side. Now then, the Chronicles write that Csaba, at the time of his battles with Aladár became the underdog, and sought refuge right here, settling in Thessaloniki. There is however a major problem. That Atilla dies in 454 according to the official version, and if this is when Aladár and Csaba's battle commences and this is when Csaba escapes to Greece, then he couldn't have found Honorius alive. Since Honorius died in 423. So how could have Csaba escaped to a Tsar in Greece, who in 454 had already been dead for 30 years? That would be completely absurd. However, if I consider that Atilla's death, his two conquests, and Csaba and Aladár's battle in reality commenced 44 years before, then when exactly does this battle take place? Then we should subtract 44 years from the death of Atilla. So if Atilla dies in 454, and we subtract this 44 years from his death, we arrive in 410. If this is when Csaba and Aladár's battle takes place, and Csaba seeks refuge in Greece at that time, then he shall find Honorius Greek Tsar very much alive and well. We are even informed that from 410 until 423, the death of Honorius, 13 years pass. And, what do you know, Csaba spent 13 years with Honorius in Greece. So, astoundingly, it becomes clear all of a sudden, how Csaba could spend 13 years by Honorius, whereas according to official information, whence this battle for the throne commences, Honorius should've been dead for 30 years. So it seems that Atilla didn't die in 454, because this 454 date is square and fair, but isn't to be understood according to Christ. It is to be understood according to the Julian Calendar. If I convert this unto the Christian date, then this is 410. Then I checked what's happening in Europe during this time, 44 years before Atilla. Does anything happen in 410? So Atilla dies in 410, and this is when Csaba and Aladár's battle commences. I found the following in 410 : A Goth leader named "Alarik" pops up, who point for point, to the very detail does exactly the same things as Atilla did 44 years later. In my book published in 2003 "The Hungarian Chronicles and the factious Middle Ages" I've pointed out that what Alarik does in the 5th century's first decade, is the exact equivalent of what Atilla does 44 years later. It is written about Alarik, or more exactly Atilla as well that the Huns at first attacked the Balkans. So the Battles of Tárnokvölgy (Tárnok valley) and Cezunmaur (Czézönmaur) were still towards the Balkans. Alarik starts his work the same way. He attacks the Balkans first. Atilla then unexpectedly sheaths the sword. This is probably when he beweds Honorius' Greek Caesar's daughter. So there became a peace-making dynasty of the Balkan, Greek areas. After this Atilla turned his gaze towards the west. This is the exact same thing we find in the life story of Alarik. Alarik suddenly leaves the Balkans alone, and starts attacking the western areas. About Atilla it is told that the terrified Romans, with the leadership of Pope Leo, there were peace-delegates sent. Point being here they dissuaded Atilla of ruining Rome's City. Interestingly the same element can be found in the story of Alarik. It is written that the Romans sent a peace-delegacy to him as well. In fact, the legend of Atilla tells that he was buried in three coffins in a riverbed. What do you know? Alarik as well was buried in a riverbed, more precisely he was buried at the bottom of a small Italian river. In fact, it is written, that by the end of his life, Atilla was considering crossing the sea, and conquering Egypt, Assyria and Africa. So basically, after having conquered the whole of Europe, he was considering conquering the African realms as well, provinces of the old Roman Empire. This same element crops up in Alarik's story as well, and interestingly between the two rulers, Gothic Alarik and the Hunnic Atilla, this 44 years difference is exact. Now, there is this researcher by the name of Práczky István. He pointed out that in the time in question, not only did different times get mixed up, but different scripts as well. Namely, when the Huns arrived, they brought with themselves their writing that was written from right-to-left: runic writing. The Latin and Greek cultures they found here wrote left-to-right. In that time, a scribe, say, if they were working with transcribing runic scriptures to Latin, it would've been a common

mistake to have forgotten to turn around some words, say names of kings, or Peoples. They would've written it down not left-to-right, but in its original form of right-to-left. This is how it would've happened, for e.g. that Alarik's name was written in the wrong direction. And so it was maintained throughout history books pages in the wrong direction. Namely, Alarik's name backwards is "Kiralá" (aLaRiK<->KiRaLa). That is "KiRáLy", meaning king in Hungarian (KeRáL-KiRáL-KiRáLy). Atilla's kingly title. So, we can see that a great Germanic past is created 44 years before the Hunnic Age. There came the Goths, they held all of Rome in terror. Atilla didn't even conquer Rome, did he? But the Alarik created 44 years before him ruins and plunders Rome, etc....

They've created a glorious past on the basis of Hunnic history. Delving deeper into this 44 year old problem, I looked at what happens in Western Europe 44 years before the Hunnic Age. What I've told of so far was Eastern Europe, more precisely these concerned the Balkans. But what happens west? As we know, Atilla's famous Battle of the Catalaunian Plains according to official sources took place in 451. If I presume that this 451 year date is a Julian Calendar date, then obviously taking away 44 years I would get the correct date. If I take away 44 years from 451, I arrive at 407. I looked up what happens in 407. Again, I was astounded. Namely, history writes in 407: a host of Alans, Vandals, and Suevi emerges out of the Carpathian Basin towards the west. They climb along the shores of the river Danube and Rhein, and on the new year's eve of 406, they arrive in Gallia (Gaul). Here they cross the frozen Rhein, and at the beginning of 407, they ravage the province. Let's realize finally, that this is completely and exactly Atilla's conquest of western Europe, only 44 years earlier. So the ravage of 407 by Alans, Vandals, and Suevi, and the Hunnic ravage in 407 is the exact same thing. The other interesting point of fact is that these Alans, Vandals and Suevi didn't just stop at Gallia; - so we know that the official version of the Hunnic conquests writes that there the Western troops, Goths and Romans, stopped Atilla and from there the Huns had to retreat in defeat to the Carpathian Basin. They make out that the Huns lost this battle. Interestingly enough the Hungarian Chronicles give an account of the Huns and Atilla's spirit rising after this battle, and the whole round world becoming frightened of the Huns. So, is obvious, the question occurs of whether the Huns won the battle or lost it. Or was it perhaps a deadlock? Here we can see how they try to make lost battles out of our won battles afterwards. The official version says that the Hunnic attacks are checked at the battle of the Catalaunian Plains, and the Huns retreated to the Carpathian Basin. Interestingly however, the version in our Chronicles knows one more bit related to this subject, that is excluded from the official version. This is no other than the troops sent to Hispania (Spain). Namely, the Chronicles state clearly, that right before the battle of the Catalaunian Plains, Atilla divided his troops, and sent a third of it with the leadership of "select captains" against the Hispania-invading Miramammona Maroccan Sultan. Right after this, the sent troops departed towards Hispania, and unexpectedly, the Huns were attacked by Roman patrician Aetius accompanied by 10 other western troops. In effect, Atilla called back his troops, who started to make their way back to the main camp. However they arrived late. Because of this, they never again dared venture in front of Atilla, so they went back to Hispania, and settled there, and according to our Chronicles, became inhabitants that place. Our Chronicles also state who were in these troops. Many of them were made captains (chieftains), and because in the Hunnic language captains are named "Ispán", Iberia is henceforth named Ispania. Interestingly this Ispan-ian story of Atilla's western branch is completely excluded from the official history. Why? Because they say what nonsense it is to propose that Atilla sends troops against Arabian forces coming into Hispania, when, as we very well know, the Arabs start to pester Hispania only 300 years later. So the official story says that the Arabs arrive only 300 years later, at the beginning of the 700's. So, how could've Atilla sent troops in contrast?

Let us realize, that it is again the 300 year problem. Now, going back to the 44 year preceding Alan, Vandal and Suevi conquest, interestingly in that Hispanian branch, the Hispanian conquest is there altogether. According to the official versions these Alans, Vandals and Suevi, who ravage Gallia in 407, don't retreat to the Carpathian Basin, but instead turn southward, and in 409 cross the Pyrenees, and settle in Hispania. So, interestingly, in this 44 year preceding chronology, we find Atilla's Hispanian troops. Moreover, if we delve deeper into this Vandal question, it turns out that these Vandals didn't stay in Hispania for long, but took their way, in 429, with the leadership of their so called "Geiserik" king, crossed Gibraltar, and following the northern coast of Africa reached historical Carthage, conquered it, and founded the 100 year Alan, Vandal Kingdom. Now, when I read about this, I started to ponder who might those Alans, Vandals, and Suevi be? Concerning the Suevi, it is quite clear that these really are a Germanic tribe. This Suevi is in accordance to our today's "Sváb" (Schwab, Swab, Kraut). Concerning the Alans, historians have a quite definite standpoint stating that they are who we, even today, find among us and live in the area of Jászság (Yazigland - Hungary) and namely, they are the Jász (Yazigs). This isn't just said by alternative historians, this is completely mainstream, that the Alans are the equivalents of the Jász (Yazigs).

So then, who could these "Vandal" be? If this conquest is Atilla's conquest in 44 years advance, then who could this "Vandal" people be? Here I remembered one of the books of Buda László, with the title "Avarok és Székelyek" (Avars and Szeklers). In this I found a rather intriguing people's name. So they say, that in the 670's early Árpáadian Hungarians could've entered with Kouber's Onogur-Bulgarian people. Amongst these early Árpáadian Hungarians there were people named "Vangar, Venger". Now truly, some Slavs still call us "Venger", even today. It was then that I realized that this "Vangar, Venger" people, if going through consonant morphing of G->D, R->L, easily becomes "Vandal". This is the point from which it can be understood that the Vandal people who made this conquest 44 years predated, reached Hispania, then from Hispania, to Northern Africa are simply the Vangar people. VaNGaR or VeNGeR people, or simply uNGaRs, HuNGaRs. Hence, this Vangar formula becomes completely understandable if we know, the Hungarian name for Bulgarians is very often "NáNDoR". This has a "LáNDoR" form as well. This is the same formula. It formulated the same way from our HuNGaR name. In this "NáNDoR" form, however the NG from "HuNGaR" became ND. It is common knowledge that such a morphing existed, that the NG in HuNGaR became ND. It became ND in VaNGaR, then it consequently becomes VaNDaL. Hence, it makes me think whether this people were really a Hungarian people. If Atilla's troops sent to Hispania really did cross to Northern Africa, and founded a 100 year blooming kingdom, was this actually a Hungarian Kingdom? So, going along this line, I started to look whether there is anything "fishy" in North-West Africa from a Hungarian point of view. I looked at the various settlement names in Northern Africa. I found astounding things! I don't even know how many "Bihar", "Behara" named settlements I found in North Africa, there is all together six Nádor named settlements. Among these there is a Nador settlement that is the center of a Nador province. On wards, there are many "El/Al Magar, Maguerba, Magara" etc.... So, it is completely definite. It is even interesting to consider the Basque, or to be more exact, the Baskir settlement names. Then there's the abundance of Dacian tribe names. So if somebody starts looking at the MARoccan, TUNISian settlement names from the Hungarian standpoint, they might just become dumbfound. Now, this was when I realized that the name of this whole North African area has one overall name. Just like how Belgium, Netherland and Luxemburg are all together called the Benelux states. The same way, Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia has a collective name. This area is called "Maghreb". Now, when I heard of this "Maghreb" form, it occurred to me right away, that in Egypt, up to today, there still lives a people who call themselves "Magyarab". This tribe appeared in Africa at the time of the Islamic Osman Empire, as war

prisoners and settled there. They've lost their Hungarian language by now, but they still maintain their Hungarian identity even today. It is told many times in accordance that in their name, this -ab suffix, in Magyarab doesn't mean Magyar and Arab. It's not a fusion of Magyar and Arab, but the -ab suffix means tribe, branch, from father of. (APa is father in Hungarian. PATER in Latin). Now, I recognized this factor right away in how the Maghreb formula and Magyarab formula are very much the same. Basically, the only difference in the Maghreb formula is, that there is a piling of consonants, but aside from this, it is the same formula as Magyarab. So, it seems that the Hungar captains had settled in North-Western Africa, the ones that Atilla sent against Sultan Miramammona, the ones who didn't dare return before the eyes of Atilla, because they were late for the Battle of the Catalaunian plains. Now then, there these Hungar captains founded this 100 year long Alan-Vandal blooming empire, and starting from there, from North Africa, they went on to attack the Roman colonies, Rome itself, and occupied many Mediterranean islands. This is interesting because, if we think about it, they fulfilled Atilla's original plan, since the Chronicon writes about Atilla himself, that at the end of his life he was thinking about crossing the sea, conquering Egypt, Assyria, and Africa. He wasn't able to do so, however the legion that he sent towards Hispania made it. It was interesting to examine the names of these Vandal kings, those who led these people over to North-West Africa. The king who actually carried out this operation was named Geiserik (Geiserich). Now, the -rik ending to these names usually meant king. If we leave this off the end of the name, we arrive at the original name in question. Geiserik was in truth Geis. This Geis is rather familiar to us Hungarians, seeing as this is an ancient form of one of our Hungarian names: Géza. So, they called this lord the same way they called our King István (Stephen) father. Geiserik's son's name is also quite suggestive. His name was Hunerik. So it becomes clear right away what nation the Vandals belonged to. The last North-West African Vandal king's name was Geylamir. If we pinch off this -mir ending, we arrive at Geyla, also known as Gyula. So, it is completely clear, that this North-Western Africa is suspicious from a Hungarian point of view, and according to any of my knowledge, no one is looking into the subject. This is a huge gray area in the area of Hungarian studies.

Now, coming back to our Chronicles, the first dumbfounding experience was that basically our Chronicles completely support Heribert Illig's theory. This is the point where I generally say, that we should realize finally that we are facing two completely separate things. On one side there is the Hungarian Chronicle heritage, which counts only 104 years between the death of Atilla and the incoming of Árpád. And there is Heribert Illig's theory that was observed with complete ignorance of the Hungarian Chronicles. So throughout 10 years, he labored on this theory not knowing of the chronicles, and for 10 years he was protective of this theory in western Europe so much, that he had no clue of a people in Central Europe, that has a Chronicle heritage that confirms every bit of his theory. See here, the Chronicles don't just state that the time between Atilla's death, and the 2nd incoming of the Hungarians was 104 years. They also state exactly that under these 104 years 5 generations passed by. Atilla's son was Csaba, Csaba's was Ed and Ed's Ügyek, Ügyek's was Előd and Előd's Álmos. This is five generations, so after the death of Atilla until the return of Árpád five generations passed. Now, if I count one generation as 20 years, as they usually count a generation to be 20-25 years, if I count by 20 years, then five generations is 100 years, If I count with 25 years, it is 125 years. So we should realize that the 104 years stated by the Chronicles fall into this exact category. So you can't even say that the Chronicles don't follow up on their own logic, because they line up 5 generations, and the time frame they give is exactly the amount to allow that to be. So I looked at it even more thoroughly, and thought that is probably even more important to think about things that the Hungarian Chronicles don't know of. What could possibly be happening in the time in question, but the

Chronicles don't give account of them. Well, it's extraordinarily interesting to examine the point that in the 300 years time frame stated by Heriberg Illig is exactly when one of Europe's grandest splendor takes place. This is the Carolingian Age, with Charlemagne at it's lead. Interestingly, the Hungarian Chronicles don't mention not with one word the Carolingian Empire, nor Charlemagne. Which is really quite interesting, because this Charlemagne was the one who ended the Pannonian Avar Empire, and connected the territory of Transdanubium. So, practically, when the Hungarians first arrived here with Árpád, the Transdanubian (Dunantúl) territories should've belonged to Charlemagne. And in the face of all this, the Chronicles don't mention one hint of any Carolingian Empire, or Charlemagne existing.

But it isn't only Charlemagne, they don't tell of an Avar Empire either. Further on, there is no mention of Avars at all. They don't even leave enough time for any sort of Avar Empire to exist, since between the death of Atilla and the incoming of Árpád, there is 104 years. Let us see, that this is quite peculiar, since wherever the Hungarians, the forefathers of the Hungarians were before the time of Árpád, in any way, they had to be somewhere in the vicinity of the Carpathian Basin. So, they should've had first-hand information on the Carpathian Basin and Avar Empire. In contrast, the Chronicles say not a word of any sort of Avar Empire, in fact, they don't write the word Avar not even once. It is also quite peculiar that it is in this 300 years that the Khazar Empire north to the Black Sea is abloom. Naturally, the Chronicles know not a word of this at all either. Why is this interesting? Because according to the official viewpoint, before Árpád came in to the Carpathian Basin, we were a part of this Khazarian Empire. As we know very well, Constantine VII says that earlier the Hungarians didn't have a leadership, and the Khazarian King asked Lebedi to be the lord of the Hungarians. Lebedi however was modest, and gave this offer over to Álmos. And this is the origin of the Árpád lineage according to Constantine VII. Now, I must state clearly, that among the contributing intelligentsia of Heribert Illig's theories, he takes note of Constantine VII as well. So when we speak about Constantine VII and his projections, it is good to know that we are looking at our past through the glasses of one of the main constructors of the Calendar Forgery. Now, I must state an observation concerning this 300 years. In this age it wasn't only the Khazarian, Carolingian, and Avar Empires that didn't exist. There was also a certain Onogur-Bulgarian Empire as well. As we know, the head of this Onogur Empire is a certain Kubrat (Kovrat), and we also know that he had a son named Kuber, who later on settled in the Carpathian Basin as he was granted entrance into the Carpathian Basin. The question arises on what we should think about Kubrat's Onogur-Bulgar Empire. It's interesting to examine that the time for this Empire's disintegration, well, so as not to take too big steps... the various chronicles state that Kubrat lead this Onogur-Bulgarian Empire, who had many sons. Whence he felt the end is near, he gathered his sons and bid them not to spread far and wide from each other, because if they do, they are easier to defeat one-by-one. However if they stay together, they remain invincible. He demonstrated this with taking individual sticks, and breaking all of them one-by-one. To demonstrate that it's not that hard to break one individual stick on it's own, but, if he took a whole bundle of sticks, he then couldn't break that. Now then, Kubrat dies, and his sons didn't heed to his bidding, and spread in every direction possible. This is when the Onogur Empire, that is to say, the Asparuks' conquest of the lower Danube began. This is when Kuber's Onogur-Bulgarian people came into the Carpathian Basin. This is when Kubrat's various sons spread far and wide in the many directions. What's the point of interest in context of this story? That this 670 date, when these things happen, are exactly 297 years after the end of the Hunnic Empire. To be more precise: the first arrival of the Huns. So, that 375 year, that is in the *Chronicon Pictum* writes for the first entry of the Huns. At this point we are able to understand, that at the time the Chronicles write about the diaspora of the Onogur-Bulgaran Empire, and among others tells us about how one of the branches enter the Carpathian

Basin, another settles in the Balkans, is nothing else than the entrance of the Huns. That is, the first entrance of the Hungarians. See, we always think that the Hungarians only arrived into Pannonia. This isn't necessarily true. Namely, Bulgarian history as well takes us back to Atilla's people, the Hunnic Empire, and it is quite possible, that at the time one of the branch of the Hungarians settled in the Carpathian Basin, another settled at the lower-Danube. We call them Bulgarians today. But the arrival of these peoples isn't the only thing that's peculiar. Kubrat and Kuber's person is as well. I realized that not long after Kuber's arrival into the Carpathian Basin, in about 5-10 years time he finds himself confronted by the Pannonian Avars, Battle commences, and Kuber must escape from the Carpathian Basin. Where does Kuber escape to? Well, as we know, he heads South and settles in Greece. To be exact, he settles in Thessaloniki. This is interesting, because our Chronicles wrote the exact same thing about Csaba (younger son of Atilla). And here, I began to suspect, that when we read about Kuber's story, we must probably understand Csaba's story. Csaba was the one who, after the death of Atilla, gets in a fight with his oLDeR (eLDeR) brother named Aladár (aLaDáR), lost, and escaped to Honorius Greek Caesar, who was his grandfather on his mother's side. It isn't only Kuber who is intriguing, it is also Kubrat. Namely, history tells us that Kubrat was brought up in Byzantium, where he lived as a hostage, he was then baptized in 619, and after this he was allowed to return to his homeland, to the Onogur-Bulgarian Empire. This story brings forth the history of Csaba, who spent 13 years at Honorius in Greece, and upon his death returned to the land of his forefathers in Scythia. See, the chronicle writes all of these down clearly, and also adds that because the long road and hardships, his trip home to Scythia takes one year. They even tell of when Csaba returned, he finds his grandfather Bendegúz (Mundzuk - Atilla's faather) alive, and he started prompting the Scythians there to move as one to Pannonia, to re-establish his father's fallen-apart kingdom. Once I got to this point, I found myself facing another rather interesting aspect. It occurred to me, how much do we know of Csaba? We know who his grandfather was on his mother's side, we know how he fought with his brother Aladár, where he escaped to, how much time he spent in Greece, how long his trip back to Scythia took, how he still was able to meet Bendegúz there, we know who were his sons, Ed, Edömén. We even know that he didn't find a wife for himself among the Scythians, since they considered him not genuine enough of a son of Atilla, because he is not of a Scythian mother, but from a Greek Caesar's daughter. So, they didn't willingly wed their daughters to him. So, because of this, Csaba, by the counsel of his uncle found himself a wife from the Khorezmian Empire. It is also written, that when the Hungarians came back into the Carpathian Basin, with the leadership of Árpád, Ed was still alive, and arrived with his father's and mother's relatives who were great in number. So, let us realize that we practically know everything about Csaba. We know his life's story to minuscule detail. Whereas, he was the loser of the battle for the throne with Aladár. So, it caught my attention, that we have no knowledge whatsoever of the winner of the battle: Aladár. We have no idea how fortune serves him, whether he starts to rule some place, whether he founds an Empire anywhere, and whether anything happens to him.

So, by this point I started to speculate that Aladár's story is written down somewhere, although it's not definite, that he is known as Aladár in historical records. I looked at what happens right after the death of Atilla in Western Europe. Is there anything suspicious? Well, it turns out that in 457, that is 3-4 years after the death of Atilla, in the west a certain Childerik (Chilmerich) named ruler pops up, who at the same time is the founder of the Frankish Empire. So I started to speculate, could this Childerik possibly be Aladár? See, it would be completely logical, since, as we know, Aladár was supported by the foreign nations, with a few Huns. These "foreign nations" probably meant Germanic nations, since as we know, Aladár was born of Krimhild, German mother superior. He even had connections to these Western-Germanic territories.

Furthermore, as I remembered a conversation with Pap Gábor (*Hungarian art historian*), where he noticed how interesting it is that in the name of Childerik, we are still able to find a today's English word: Child. Who could've been that great ruler, whose son could've been Childerik? So, it was at this time, when I thought that in Childerik we have to actually see Aladár. And at this point I remembered that Heribert Illig thought of Charlemagne as fictitious. He claimed that such a ruler never even existed, Charlemagne is fictitious as a whole, we have to forget him and completely erase him from history's pages. Yes, however I realized that the time between the starting date of Childerik's kingship and the starting date of Charlemagne's kingship is exactly 311 years. So, as we know, Childerik started ruling in 457 in western Europe and if we add 311 years to this date, we get 768. 768 is no other than Charlemagne's date of claiming the throne. Alright, but then what is this 311 year? Well, one who is practiced in the various parallel chronologies, may know that there existed a Seleucid chronology as well, that started 312 years before Christ. Since there wasn't a year zero in it's timeline, between the Christ chronology and Seleucid chronology there is an exactly 311 year difference. Now, if I propose that Childerik's claim of the throne in 457 is the Christian calendar correlation of Charlemagne's date of reign, and the 768 date is a Seleucid date, then it can easily be that these two kings: Charlemagne and Childerik, were equivalent. This however automatically drives us forward. If we've claimed Childerik to be Aladár, and Charlemagne starts his reign exactly 311 years after, then Charlemagne must be Atilla's eLDeR son aLaDáR as well. This however leads to astounding consequences. Namely, if we reminisce Charlemagne's conquest against the Avars, we've already derived that this must be Csaba and Aladár's battle. However, this Frank Empire, who wiped out this Avar Empire, was lead by Charlemagne. Charlemagne however seems to be equivalent with Aladár. And here it becomes apparent why Charlemagne was depicted being crowned with the Hungarian Sacred Crown. As we may know very well, when Illig's book appeared, the original print was published with a cover depicting Charlemagne being crowned as Caesar, with our Sacred Crown (*Friedrich Kaulbach - The Coronation of Charlemagne*). See, when we encountered this image, we had no idea what to think. What is our Sacred Crown doing on the head of Charlemagne? How, in the world, does any western painter come to immortalize Charlemagne with our Sacred Crown, at all? Now, if I know that Charlemagne is in fact the other identity of Aladár, it is then completely logical, that when these throne-battles ceased, he didn't just take cart-fuls of treasures from the Carpathian Basin, from the center of the Hunnic Empire, but also took with himself the crown of his father, Atilla. This would be the original event that led to Charlemagne being depicted with our Sacred Crown so often. This is around where I was with my studies, when this year, around March 10-11th, the conference of "A Szkítiából kijöttekről" (*Of those whom emerged out of Scythia*) took place. I think that conference ended somewhere around this point - this was about the last momentum I stated. What we actually have to think about Charlemagne, and that Charlemagne is actually connected to Atilla's older son Aladár. So, everything that I will state now are realizations I came to after that. Really, I can say that this conference in March gave the studies such a push, that almost more material was gathered in the month after, than in the 10 years before that altogether.

Before the new discoveries since the March conference, I'd like to make a curve back to one last thing from the old collection. Namely, some questions arouse. What we should think of the Hungarian Conquests (of the Árpád Age), since as we know, when the Hungarians arrived into the Carpathian Basin, for a couple hundred years, we regularly make raids to various territories to western Europe. Official history says these raids to be spontaneous, without any specific purpose - or, well to be more exact, they did have a purpose: to ravage and plunder as much as possible, to beat as many temples as possible to the ground etc.... Now, with our new knowledge if we reexamine the raids, then what exactly were they about? Now, as we know, Atilla

conquered the whole of the continent. Namely, as the *Chronicon Pictum* states: Reigning over North, South, East and West in its width and height, he was thinking of crossing the sea and conquering Egypt, Assyria and Africa. Now, it is completely obvious, that if here on this continent, there would've been one foot of land, that was not under the authority of Atilla, he wouldn't have thought that he needed to go over to other continents and conquer there as well, but would've first tried to conquer the unconquered territories. So the mere fact that he was thinking of conquering Africa, tells us that the whole of Europe was lying at his feet. If this was true, however, then let's picture the situation of there being this mighty ruler, mighty King, who conquered the whole continent, would it be imaginable that he retreats from these conquered territories, without leaving garrisons, captaincies, Ispáns, to superintend to the conquered areas? It is completely unimaginable, for him not to have left garrisons behind him. However, when Atilla died, and the battle for the throne erupted, then these captaincies and garrisons remained without a Crown. They basically fell off the Hunnic Imperial central. There wasn't a "crowned head" that they would've been subjected to. To be more exact, there was such a crowned head, and Charlemagne was that. Basically, these aristocracies, these captaincies that were left behind, lived as Europe's aristocratic families, and they were the seeds of the later forming princedoms, earldoms, kingdoms. So, it is good for us to know, that it isn't bigotry to say that the whole continent is a Hun founded continent. Those Hunnic captains were there at the time of the beginning of the French state, the German state, the Spain state, who Atilla put there to supervise those territories. Now, if we evaluate our "raids" from this point of view, then what exactly were they about? This is not about plundering, pillaging at all, but the Árpád Hungarian, after having resettled in the Carpathian Basin, visited these princedoms, earldoms and captaincies, to subject them to Atilla's rightful heir, the contemporary current Hungarian ruler. So, basically, they tried to reunite the whole of Atilla's Empire, that fell apart because of this battle over the throne. They went all the way to the heel of the Italian boot, and Hispania, and various places across the continent, so that the aristocratic families that lived there, who grew out of Atilla's ex-captains, would be reunited again with Atilla's European Empire. It's not about any pillaging. See, even from the national view, many times people think of these raids to be due to Charlemagne taking out carts full of Avar treasures from the Carpathian Basin, and basically, the Árpád Hungarian during the "raids", wanted to redeem these treasures. There were political motives in the background, and they simply wanted to reunite this European Continental Empire, that had fallen apart, and were doing so by going to the captaincies. This however, also raises the question, - well Fehér Mátyás also wrote a book titled "Az avar kincsek nyomában" (*In the footsteps of Avarian Treasures*) if I remember well, and he gave the basis to the thesis that these raids were to redeem the treasures taken away by Charlemagne. If however this wasn't the main point of the Conquests, then it still is worth thinking about how these various Avar treasures renamed as "Christian Relics" ended up in western Europe. If it is true that Atilla put Hunnic captains at different points of the western territories, then those captains probably took those treasures as family treasures with themselves. So, it is not complete coincidental, that golden treasures full of palmetto leaves and griffin-vine decorations, later get renamed as "Christian Relics" are found throughout Europe's various monasteries. They were taken there by the various Hunnic captains that Atilla placed there during his conquest of western Europe.

There is one more important thing that I forgot to speak about. This is the Anglo-Saxon campaign. However odd it may seem, well, to anyone who has studied the history of the British Isles, the British Isles formed a part of the Roman Empire in Antiquity, and later, in the mid of the 400's, to be more exact, 449, certain Anglo-Saxon conquerors invaded these territories, and created seven kingdoms. These seven kingdoms later unified, and gave the basis of what was later named "Anglia".

It made me think how peculiar it is that Atilla's western European conquest took place in 451, and the Anglo-Saxon conquest in 449. The difference is only two years. Back in the days, when I worked in the Great Library of Debrecen, there were huge atlases from many centuries, which I regularly picked up and looked through, and in some of these I found that the date of the Anglo-Saxon conquests was put to 451. With time, this 451 somehow slipped back with two years, how, I do not know, but in any case, this two year slip made it possible for us to notice that the Anglo-Saxon conquest is no other than part of Atilla's western European conquest. Namely, the "Angol" (Hungarian for ENGLish) name for this people is no other than a variation of our "Hungar" name after it had gone through a consonant morphing of R->L. Moreover, the "Saxon" name is being considered by english historians themselves, as no other than "Sakai-suna", that is the "Sons of the Sakas", hence of Scythians. So, those Anglo-Saxon conquerors, and those (H)eNGeLs who settled on the British Isles at the exact midst of the 400's, at the same time as Atilla's western European conquest, were HuNGaRian (eNGL-(h)uNGaR). Now then, I'm not sure if anyone is familiar with Varga Csaba's name, he passed away not so long ago. He wrote an excellent book titled "Az Angol szókincs Magyar szemmel" (*The English Language from the Hungarian View*) It is good to know, that we have connections not only with North-West Africa, not only with the western European territories, but with the British Isles as well.

And now I'd like to get on to my newer findings, that I've discovered since the conference in March. The whole thing started, when at this conference, as we know, there were many other lectures as well, and in the breaks, a person regularly came up to speak with me, and by his own account, he came all the way from Transdanubia, expressly because he was interested in my lecture. And he came up to me in every break and had a recurring thought, that he kept saying. This is what it was: "*Believe me, the Nicene Creed is the key. The Nicene Creed stands in the very midst of this whole Calendar forgery*". Then came another lecture, and another pause, and he came up to me again, and told me again: "*The Nicene Creed is the key. Believe me, the Nicene Creed is the key*". Well, I knew very well, that the Nicene Creed is very important from the viewpoint of the fictitious middle ages, since, as we know, official academics always base everything on the Nicene Creed, when it states that in 325 they probably had already corrected three days, the three days slip originating from the imperfection of the Julian Calendar, that by the time of 325 had already slipped 3 days was corrected on the Nicene Creed, and because of this Pope Gregory XIII only had to correct 10 days in 1582. So, he wasn't doing correction compared to the introduction of the Julian Calendar, but to the Nicene Creed. Now then, one more thing, the Nicene Creed is very important from yet another aspect. This is that the Nicene Creed's main problem wasn't solving various calendars' coordination problems. They basically wanted to establish the question of when Easter should be celebrated by the Christian world. So, for this they brought a rule, that it should be on the Sunday after the first full moon after the spring equinox. So in accordance, Easter was celebrated then after. But there was yet another interesting factor of this Nicene Creed. It was that in the Christian world at that time there so happened to be a heretic movement. This was the Arian heresy. What is to be known about Arian heresy is that it was circulated by a certain "Bishop Arius". Although he accepted the basis of Jewish and Christian teachings, he didn't accept the Godly nature of Jesus Christ. He said Jesus Christ is a great prophet, mighty teacher, everything is good and well that he taught and said, but he isn't equal with God, he isn't the son of God. So, basically, he refused Jesus's godliness. It was on the Nicene Creed that they discussed this movement's teachings, and finally decided to anathematize it. This was not acceptable for the most part of the Christian world, so Arius and his teachings were from then on maledicted. Uwe Topper was the one who became aware of how interesting it is that we hear of Arianism at the end of the 300's so little, and at the beginning of the 400's. It

is even recorded of Atilla that he made the Archbishop of Ravenna go away, to the urging of Pope Leo. But in the later years we don't hear of Arianism, the subject ceases to exist, and finally disappears. Topper then tells us to be vigilant of the fact that 300 years later there appears another important religious movement, which in the same way accepts Jewish and Christian sacred texts, but in the same way questions Jesus Christ's godliness. This religious movement is Islam. This is when one comes to understand that the Arian movement of the 300's, with introduction of 300 fictitious years survive as Islam. So more than probably the excommunication of Arius and Mohammed's migration, known as Hijra – as we know Islam started with Momammed running from Mecca to Medina – are the same. The traditional date for this is 622. The Nicene Creed, when they excommunicated Arius is 325.

Interestingly between these two dates is exactly 297 years, the exact amount Heribert Illig claims to be fictitious. Now, see the Arius' heresy's 297 year slip over explains us other things as well. Namely, he makes it clear why it was exactly 297 years that was slipped into chronology. Topper directs our attention to the fact that if there was any chronology used in the Nicene Creed, it was definitely not the Christian chronology. Simply because at that time, it never occurred to anyone to count time according to Christ. As we know very well, two hundred years later, in 525 comes a monk named Dionysius Exiguus, otherwise of Scythian descent. He is the first one to bring up that it might be more honoring if we didn't use all sorts of various, irrelevant calendars, but would count years from the Birth of Christ. Dionysius Exiguus' proposal, however was to no avail.

There was a need for many hundreds of years to pass by, for this chronology to become popular. As we know the English chronicler Bede was already counting dates according to Christ. But even he didn't have many followers for years on end. It is only after the turn of the millennium, that there are many more chronicles written according to Christ. So Uwe Topper pointed out that if they used any sort of chronology on the Nicene Creed, it couldn't have been in any way Christian. So what did they use instead? Topper gives an answer to this as well: He tells that the Catholic church before Christian chronology the Julian Calendar would've been more popular to be in use. That means 44 years larger years than Christian chronology, since the Christian calendar starts counting from the 45th year of the Julian Calendar. So, if on the Nicene Creed used any sort of dating system, they would've used the Julian calendar. The Julian equivalent of this 325 year is not 325 however, but 44 years more. That is 369. This is when it is understood why exactly 297 years was tagged into the chronology. Because if we add 297 to 369, then we arrive at 666. So, in point of fact, with this they wanted to express that that heretic movement that tore itself away from them, that questions the godly nature of Jesus, is in every way an Anti-Christian movement. Since, who else could be Anti-Christ, but those whom question the godly nature of Christ? So, we wouldn't even be able to say that what they did was illogical. So, what they did was completely logical! This date, when this movement started, was put to the dreaded year of 666, so that their own followers would be held back from following the heretic movement. With this sign-language they were telling people not to follow this movement, because it is Satanic. So, this is the origin of the 297 years. This is all well known knowledge, however, I've already told of this on the March conference. What was the thought that woke up in me concerning the Nicene Creed? This person regularly came up to me, and aroused my attention to realize that "the Nicene Creed is the key". Once I arrived back home after the lecture, I looked again into what might be of concern in accordance with the Nicene Creed. The first thing that came to mind was: isn't it interesting that this Julian Calendar date of the Nicene Creed, 369 date, is so close to the 373 date? Well, according to our Chronicles, this is when the Huns first arrived back into the Carpathian Basin. The first arrival in Atilla's time. So the Creed happens in

369. In 373, four years after, in come the Huns. Here I thought, "Could this have been the original mobilizing power of the Huns?" Could anything have perhaps happened on this Creed, that angered the Huns, because of which the Huns felt that they need to enter the western territories? As I was pondering this possibility, I rejected this thesis, reason being, that we never compare a pear to an apple. Namely, if I say that this 369 date is a Julian Calendar date, and 373 date is Christian... You can't just burst out saying these two dates were close to each other. One is a Christian date, another a Julian date. I can't just deduct a conclusion stating that these two dates stand close to one-another. So then I turned my back on this road. After some time then it so happened, whilst ordering my books on my bookshelf, out of the blue, surprising to myself as well, an old Hungarian Chronicle slipped into my hands. I didn't even know that I possessed such a Chronicle. I reached into the bookshelf, saw an interesting book spine. So I reached in, took it out, looked at it, and saw that it was a book written by Hess András in 1473 titled "Chronica Hugarorum". Right there on the spot, while it was still hot, I flipped it's pages, and what one looks for in a time like this? Dates. What dates does he inform us of for the first arrival of the Hungarians and the second arrival of the Hungarians? Right on the 10th page, I myself was surprised, Hess András writes that the Hungarians' first arrival during the time of Atilla happened in 328. Quickly I did some calculating, defining the difference between Hess András's 328 and the Chronicon Pictum's 373 date. It turned out that the difference is exactly 45 years. So, with one year difference in total, it is the same time-slip I kept encountering over and over again whilst studying the early Middle Ages. At this point, I fell into deep thought. Could it be that this 373 date, we have so far thought to be a Christian date, be actually a Julian Calendar date? Are we to understand this date as a Julian Calendar date? And the Christian equivalent of this is 328? Could it be possible that the Huns arrived in 328? Let us then notice, that the Creed happens in 325, and in 328 the Huns arrive. So those two happenings were close to each other after all. The Nicene Creed and the arrival of the Huns. According to one coordinate, one happens in 325, the other in 328, According to the other coordinate, one happens in 369, the other in 373. However, whichever coordinate system I start from, the two events are really close to each other. Now, when I got this far, I said, let's see what happens in 328. Who is ruling over Rome in this time? What does the Roman Empire look like at the time, in the year of 328? This is a basic question, since if this is when the Huns arrive, it is good to know what sort of Roman Empire they are facing. It turns out that in the year of 328 Constantine the Great is the ruler. The Christian ruler that made Europe Christian. As we know, in 313 he pressed the famous Edict of Milan, in which peace of religion was propagandized, in 325 he himself was president on the Nicene Creed, and in fact, he was the Great Forefather of the Christian rulers thereafter, Great Constantine. Then I started to wonder whether the Hunnic history according to the version in our Chronicles is possible to fit into the 328 picture. Plainly, would it be possible that, what our Chronicles write about the Roman position in the time of the Huns first arrival, be fitted into the 328 date in which Great Constantine holds together the Empire in one strong hand. It turned out that, no, not at all. Since, what do the Hungarian Chronicles tell us about? The Hungarian Chronicles tells us of when the Huns arrived here, over Pannonia, Pamfilia, Frigia, Macedonia, and Dalmatia, a certain Macrinus named lord ruled of Sabarian (Savarian) decent. However, the Hungarian Chronicles tells us also of how the Romans in this time chose Detre of Verona as King. We also know from the Hungarian Chronicles, that in this time in the Greek areas a certain Honorius Caesar ruled, whose daughter Atilla later married. To whom Csaba, later on, escaped to. So, the Roman Empire wasn't so unified after all. As I was thinking about these questions, I saw that this was a wrong line of thoughts yet again, it is not possible to put the Hunnic arrival to 328 after all, since the Chronicles know of Honorius, Detre of Verona, Macrinus, whereas in 328 Great Constantine is the only ruler, there aren't any joint rulers, and he holds the whole Roman Empire together in one hand. At this time it occurred to me however, that Heribert Illig and Klaus Weissgerber published a

book together. This isn't the original "The fictitious middle ages", but a book that is written explicitly regarding Hungarians. The title was "Magyarok a kitalált középkorban" (Hungarians in the fictitious middle ages). In this book there was a really interesting table, which was based on Huszár Lajos's works, who is an internationally recognized numismatist. He put together a table in which he collected the coins of various Roman Caesars in "Avar", that are actually Hun tombs. This table had an extraordinarily interesting data, which even escaped the attention of Illig and Weissgerber. The following: whilst from the most Caesars they found 1, 2, maximum 3 pieces in these tombs, there was found 10 from Great Constantine. There is a sudden protrusion of value at Great Constantine, which implies that the people, whose tombs they've excavated, which is actually a Hun people, not Avar people, could have only entered in a time when that Caesar ruled who had that right of coinage: Great Constantine. This made me think then, yet again, "Could Great Constantine have some link to the Huns' entrance even so?" Let's evaluate this question more thoroughly.

As I was thinking about this, on another line I started to become engaged with the Diocletian chronology. Now, we must take a by-pass, so that we understand the Diocletian chronology. As we know, Diocletian was one of the Caesars of the Roman Empire. He gained power in 284, and from this year on there started a chronology. This was the so-called "Age of the Martyrs". Now then, why was the Diocletian chronology called the "Age of the Martyrs"? Because Caesar Diocletianus, in 303, carried out the bloodiest, most merciless Christian manhunt in the History of the Roman Empire. And because this Caesar gave so many Martyrs to the Christian world, the Age starting from the time of his claim of the throne is called "The Age of the Martyrs". Caesar Diocletian is interesting from another point of view as well, however. Namely, at the beginning of his reign he was constantly occupied with having to at times fend off the Germanic tribes of the Rhine, or there was an uprising in Egypt, so he had to quickly hurry over to that area, or it was the Persians who were being naughty, or there was some other problem in some other place in the Empire. He was constantly in a shuttle-service between the borders of his Empire, and he just had enough of it. So he resolved himself to a really extraordinary decision: in 292 he came to the decision that the empire east of Rome should be split in half, and there needs to be a western part, and an eastern part. Moreover, there needs to be a Caesar over each and each territory. So there should be a complete, Augustus Caesar to the west, and an Augustus Caesar to the east as well. Moreover he wasn't satisfied with this either. It is not enough for there to be one Caesar over half an Empire, he is to have a Sub-/Vice-Caesar, who doesn't have the Augustinian title, only Caesarian. Practically, he developed a system, that there's an Empire, that is split in half in the middle, to an eastern side and western side, there is also an Augustinian Caesar ruling over the western side, who has a Caesar titled vice-representative, and there is also an Augustinian Caesar ruling over the eastern side, who has a Caesar titled vice-representative. In this way, four Caesars ruled over the empire all at once. This was the time of the Tetrarchy. Tetra means four, and the foursome of these Caesars was called a Tetrarch. The Tetrarchy, however, was the shortest lived ruling structure of the Roman Empire, since in 305, Caesar Diocletianus and Maximianus - Diocletianus chose for himself the eastern side, taking beside him as vice-caesar Galerianus, whilst on the western side, Maximianus became the Augustus, whose vice became the Constantinus Chlorus whose son became the later known Great Constantine. The point now is that in a completely unprecedented thing happened in the year 305 in Roman history. Both Augustus Caesars, both Diocletianus, who ruled in the east, and Maximianus, who ruled in the west, suddenly showed an incredible example of modesty and humbleness. They renounced their thrones, and retired. See now, even when contemporaries asked Diocletianus what's going on, how come he's suddenly giving up the power in his hands, and why he's suddenly retiring, according to records said, to grow cabbages with his

own hands. Now, I leave it up to everybody to decide how credible it is of a Roman Caesar, that he is now going to retreat, to retire, and start gardening in his back garden. This is complete nonsense. When did all of this happen? In 305. Let's wake up and smell the roses. There's Tetrarchy, with four Caesars over the whole Empire, and suddenly by the chance of some miracle, four Caesars unexpectedly decide to retreat into retirement. Now, when I started to think about this, I engaged into this whole train of thoughts, because from the time Caesar Diocletianus claimed the throne, there began a chronology named "The Age of the Martyrs", and I, as one who studies various chronologies, should be aware of such a chronology's existence. I should have some information on this as well. This is what started my endeavor with this chronology. And on the other train of thoughts, when I ran into the fact that by Hess András's means the first arrival of the Huns is 328, but this 328 date is not able to fit in to the Empire of Great Constantine, since the Hungarian chronicles know of Macrinus, Detre, Honorius, it then occurred to me suddenly, that, "Is it not possible, that this 328 date is 23 years more than it should be?" If I correct this with 23, I subtract 23 from 328, I arrive to exactly 305, that is Diocletianus' and Maximianus' mysterious date of retirement. Now, so that we all understand what this 23 year is, and that I am not playing around with unsupported time frames, In contrast to this, however, the official date of this same event is 895. The difference between the two dates is 23 years. Then I became aware of the Merovingian Dynasty, the Dynasty of that Childerik we identified as Aladár, starts with Childerik, however for some mysterious reason I cannot fathom, it is not Childerik they account for founding the Merovingian Dynasty and Frankish Empire, but Childerik's son, Chlodwig, who starts his reign 23 years after Childerik. I ran into this 23 year difference yet again. Then I noticed as well, that, even though Charlemagne starts his reign in 768, he starts his Battle against the Pannonian Avars in 791. There's a 23 year gap of naught-doing. Let's see, that between the 768 date of Charlemagne's claim to the throne, and 791, when he drives his troops against the Pannonian Avars, between these two dates is exactly 23 years difference. So, I started thinking what this 23 year difference could be. So, in this time it flashed before me, that there was yet another chronology, to be counted with, that was very popular. One of these was the chronology starting from when the Roman State was founded. As we know, according to tradition, Rome's City was found in 753 BC. The Greeks however had a similar chronology, this being the chronology starting from the First Olympic Games. As we know, the First Olympic Games were in 776BC. Now, if I get mixed up in these two chronologies, and at times synchronize the dates to the foundation of the Roman State, and at other times synchronize dates to the First Olympic Games, then a fictitious 23 years could present itself between events that belong together, since 776 comes 23 years before 753, the Foundation of the Roman State. So now, at this point the 23 year old difference hit me, when I was reading the 328 date that Hess András wrote as the Hungarians' first arrival and Caesar Diocletianus' mysterious retirement in 305. I looked at it, and saw that between the two dates there is exactly 23 years' difference. This is when I started getting suspicious about whether it is possible that the arrival of the Hungarians' wasn't in 373, or 328. But in 328 -23, that is in 305. That is exactly at the time when Caesar Maximianus and Diocletianus mysteriously disappear off the pages of History. Then I started to play with the idea of whether the Huns arrived in this time. What do the Hungarian Chronicles know of? Do the Hungarian Chronicles know of this ruler named Macrinus, who according to our chronicles ruled over Pannonia, Frigia, Pamfilia, Macedonia and Dalmatia? Yes, well Kézai Simon writes of this in the following way: In this time over the Romans ruled a Tetrarchy named Macrinus, which will be elaborated in 6 continuing articles. So, however odd it may seem, in Kézai Simon's chronicles, there it is, all in one, that this Macrinus was a Tetrarchy. However, the time of Tetrarchy had ended in 306. With Great Constantine's claim to the throne. So the Huns' arrival couldn't have been earlier than 306. And this is when I came to understand that Macrinus', that is Diocletianus' and Maximianus' retirement happened because of the Huns' appearance.

Now, what do the Chronicles inform us of? They tell us that this Tetrarchy named Macrinus asked for the help of this certain Detre of Verona, when they heard that the Huns have settled by the Tisza and two great battles commenced. One of the battles was the Battle of Tárnokvölgy (Tárnok vally, Hun. Tárnokvölgyi Csata). Here the Huns didn't win yet, they gained an idea of the Romans' weapons and soul, is how the Chronicles describe this battle. It was in the second battle that they annihilated the Roman troops. This was the Battle of Cezunmaur (Czézönmaur). Indeed, however our Chronicles tells of how in the course of the Battle of Cezunmaur (Czézönmaur) Macrinus and Detre disappeared from the pages of History. Whilst Macrinus died, Detre of Verona got an arrow in his head and arrived back to Rome with this deadly wound. Let us realize finally that two Roman Caesars disappear in the same time. So then it suddenly occurs to one's mind, that this is exactly the same thing written about Diocletianus and Maximianus. It is time to realize that one of them is identified as Macrinus, and the other as Detre of Verona. So then I started to ponder on this Detre of Verona. This was always of singular spectacle to me. Reading even the old Hungarian folktales Detre of Verona always struck me as a singular character. Even in the Songs of Nibelung (Nibelungenlied) the Germanics commemorate Detre. So I thought of what this Detre could possibly mean. So it suddenly hit me that, what else could it mean but the word "Tetra". Let's realize finally that Detre's name is shown into different forms according to various chronicles. Some call it Detre, others Dietrich, some as Tetricus. Take for example the Tarih-i Üngürüs (*Turkish copy of The History of the Hungarians*), where this same name is mentioned as Tetricus. This is where I came to the understanding that this Detre, Dietrich, Tetricus is no other than Tetrarkos. Thus, another quadrant of the head of Rome, that happened to rule over the western areas of the Empire. And even Macrinus was named Tetrarchy by one of the Chronicles. So it is completely obvious that this was when the arrival of the Huns happened, at the beginning of the 300's, around 305, when Caesar Diocletianus and Maximianus suddenly disappear from history's pages. But then I started to ponder on about the name of Macrinus, if we've managed to unravel Detre's name, that all it means is "Tetrarchy", so it says nothing of this Caesar's forename, then what could "Macrinus" possibly mean? I looked at what kind of different names various chronicles write this Macrinus name as. Well, forms such as Macrinus, Matrinus, Maternus etc. came up. Martinus also comes around. It was then that it got through my head, that what the chronicles could hardly get through as Matrinus, Macrinus, Maternus, Martinus is no other than Martyrus! It is the Caesar that throughout the Christian persecutions gave legions of martyrs to the Christian world. So that Caesar Martinus, Matrinus or Macrinus was no other than Diocletianus, who in 303 started the bloodiest massacre of Christians in Roman history. This however brings with itself astounding recognitions. Because then, suddenly it is understood: "Why then did the Huns arrive?" "What was the original reason for the Huns' conquest?" "What angered the Huns so much that they entered the west, and put their foot down to end this Empire once and for all?" The Christian persecutions! It is now time that we realize, that the reason of our existence here is that this 108 nations in Scythia had enough of the persecutions that were happening in Europe, and decided to put an end to it. And basically, they mopped up the Roman Empire in it's whole. And it is here that one realizes why the Hungarians were always called throughout 1000 years as the "The Shield of Christianity" (*Kereszténység Védőbástyája*) This is where we started being the Shield of Christianity. At the time of Atilla, when he had had enough of the Christian manhunt, we came in, and at the Battle of Cezunmaur, we defeated this Caesar, who lost his life in this battle. When I got to this point - well, this in itself is quite an astounding recognition, and I know I should leave time in order for people to stomach this information, but one recognition followed the next. Namely, I realized, that if I put the first arrival of the Huns into the time of the Tetrarchy, and realize, that this whole arrival was not in 328, neither in 373, but in 305, two years after the start of the Christian persecutions, then who could Great Constantine be, who right after this great

cataclysm, surfaces out of the ruins and becomes a Great Emblem for Christian Rule and once again holds the Empire together in one strong hand. The later Christian rulers regularly refer to His rule. It then occurred to me, that it can be no other, according to the logic of consequent events and time frame, that it can be no other than Aladár himself. Atilla's eLDeR son in another time frame. It is time for us to realize that, in Kézai Simon's chronicles, the first arrival of the Huns happen in 700. This is a completely different coordinate. But it is an existent coordinate, since Kézai Simon, black on white, clearly writes that, at the time of Atilla, when the Huns arrive, this happens in 700. Later, Charlemagne, who claims the throne in 768, who is likewise a great and emblematic Christian ruler, can be no other than Aladár. After identifying him as Aladár we analyze this in another time frame, and hypothesize that the Huns' first arrival was in 305, and the agony of the Tetrarchy, when the fight commences, and Macrinus and Detre disappear, that is Caesar Diocletianus and Maximianus, is itself the Hunnic Age, then the Age that proceeds this time is Great Constantine, can not be any other person. He takes on the same role as Charlemagne in the coordinate of the 700's. So I examined what similarities there are in Charlemagne's and and Great Constantine's life. Since I identified both as Aladár, then it is befitting to have some sort of eclipse between the two great Christian rulers' history. Well, what do you know, the first story I stumble upon is the question of offerings given on the Papal State, that surfaces the same way in connection with Charlemagne, and Great Constantine. It is said of both great rulers that they had donated to the Papal State. As we know, this Donatio Constantini (Donation of Constantine), Caesar Great Constantine's book that donates this territory to the Papic State, it is realized quite early, along the Middle Ages already, was identified as a forgery. We know also, that long centuries later, Charlemagne donated this same area to the Papal State. So occurs to mind, "Why did this have to be donated twice?" And then the solution comes right away, that they didn't donate this twice, only these events happen duplicately on two separate time frames. We're looking at two separate coordinates - one commencing at the beginning of the 300's, the other at the beginning of the 700's. There are other similarities as well in Great Constantine's and Charlemagne's life, however. It is important to know of both, that, when Pap Gábor held his lecture 10 years ago, he pointed out how odd it is that Charlemagne has to cross the Alps two times, whereas this task would be a great task to achieve even for a modern army. But it is written that Charlemagne crosses the Alps with his soldiers. What was the meaning of these crossings? This Langobard (Lombards) people was moving in towards middle Italy and the Pope felt himself in danger of the Langobards, and asked for the help of Charlemagne. Charlemagne therefor crossed the Alps, defeated the Langobards occupying northern Italy, and the areas conquered from them, he presented to the Italian Papacy. If we jump 300 years back in time, and examine what happens in the time of Great Constantine, we find astounding similarities. It turns out that Great Constantine... well I don't know the exact date just now... but he crosses the Alps in the same way, regulates Maxentius who was occupying northern Italy, and presents the areas conquered from him to the Papacy. So, let's realize, it is the same exact train of events, Charlemagne does the same exact thing as Great Constantine centuries before him. And then it is revealed straight away, that there wasn't a separate Charlemagne and a separate Great Constantine. Both identities were fabricated out of the same person, who is no other than Atilla's elder son Aladár. Now, whence I beautifully derived this theory for myself, I published this idea on my blog right away. Right after I published it, a researcher from Transdanubia, got in touch with me and proposed extraordinary questions. One of the questions was, that, "All of this is very well, but how were they able to get the easterners to accept Great Constantine with the eastern Papacy?" It is important to know that the eastern Papacy canonized him into a Saint. Now then, anyone reading the Donatio Constantini (Donation of Constantine), it becomes apparent that the apropos of this donation is, other than giving a basis for the Papal State, where the Papacy can form a state, it being presented donated to the Papal state,

there was another important motivation of this donation. And this was, that the Pope enjoys supremacy above the eastern patriarchies. That is the Antiochian, Jerusalemian, Alexandrian etc. patriarchies. His patriarchic primacy stretches over them as well. Now, if Great Constantine's identity was created so that the Pope can extend his own power over the eastern churches as well, how could they make the eastern churches accept that Great Constantine really existed? How could they even get the eastern church to canonize him into a Saint. So, I realized that indeed, this is quite a contradiction. This can't be so easily deducted, as I had just done. There has to be some sort of explanation on why Great Constantine was accepted in the east. What I started to think about right away, well, let's get back to the name "Constantine", first. Namely, Chlodwig, whom I identified as Childerik - there's 23 years difference between Chlodwig and Childerik. The story of Chlodwig's christening was recorded by Gregory of Tours. This story of his christening made me ponder, namely, he writes, "To the christening well does the New Constantine go, so that in the christian water he rid himself, bathing, of his old leprosy". Now, I don't know how well anyone knows the story of Great Constantine's christening, but it is to be known, that Great Constantine caught leprosy, and he healed through Pope Silvester's christening, and through the christened water he was healed according to the legend. It is really interesting, that these same sequence of events appear concerning Chlodwig. See, if I identified Childerik with Aladár, then the Chlodwig 23 years later is likewise Aladár, but when Chlodwig is christened, his old leprosy is again commemorated, which however takes us over to Great Constantine. And Gregory of Tours tells us of Chlodwig's christening, that "To the well does the New Constantine go". Now pray, this was the point of complete epiphany, that the name "Constantine" was Atilla's elder son's, Aladár's new name in christendom. He received this name. Now, I'm not sure if we quite apprehend that this is the way in which different historical figures are fabricated for us. Various names are taken of various historical figures, and different characters are produced. Take for example, this Aladár name, what does it mean? It simply expresses his relationship to his younger brother Csaba. Namely, all "Aladár" means is "Elder". That is, that he was the Elder son. Compared to his younger brother, he was the Aladár, the Elder. The "Childerik" name then expresses his relationship with his father. Who was he compared to his father? A "Child". He was Atilla's Child. But then, what name did he receive with the event of his christening? He received the name Constantine. Now then, we have the basis to claim him as Great Constantine. And who was he for the common people? A Great King. And from this name they manufactured the name "Károly" (Carlo, Karol), or Charlemagne, Charles the Great. So, let's wake up and smell the roses, again, that various character traits of the same historical figures are taken as basis, and hence new figures are neatly lined up on the time line. Now, coming back to Great Constantine, the question was, "How could they make the easterners accept him?" If the Roman church created the identity of Charlemagne to extend their primal rule over the eastern patriarchs, then why did the eastern patriarchs accept him? Why did they canonized him? This was the question the Transdanubian researcher asked me point-blank. It so occurred to me that there might be someone to the east, someone great and significant, who influenced the easterners so much, that they honored him as a saint, and made him into a saint, maybe his name was Constantine as well, and that it might be imaginable, that this eastern Constantine was blurred together with the western Constantine, with Atilla's elder son, Aladár. I began to get the impression, that in the identity of Great Constantine's two different historical figures got intermingled. The western Aladár, and an eastern somebody, who for a time I wasn't able to identify.

It happened then, that this researcher sent me another question. He said, "We should say something about the Slavs as well" "Who were the Slavs?" "I subsequently point out that these aren't Slavs, those aren't Slavs, those weren't Slavs either. There had to be Slavs somewhere. Where the real Slavs were?" As we know, I've

revealed about the Croats (Horvats, Horvát), that they are Csaba's Khorezmian relatives. I've revealed that the Polish (Lengyel) are Sarmatians. The Bulgarians aren't Slavs either, because they're of Hunnic descendant as well, so I was asked righteously, where the real Slavs were? He proposed one other question as well: "What should we think about Cyril and Method? We should place them on the time line as well" And as I was thinking about the question of the Slavs, about Cyril and Method's question... well, one more thing about the Slavs... I recognized quite early in time, that the name "Slav", is quite an interesting name. Namely, this Great Hunnic western tribal confederacy (branch), identified itself with this "Szári", "Száli" (Sari, Sali) notion, name. It means "golden, shining, glistening, white". Basically, one of the name of the Hephtalite Huns was "Szári". It's really interesting that among the Vandals, whom I mentioned in the first part, there were Silingi Vandals and Hasdingi Vandals That "Siling" word comes from the "Száli" word. Among the Franks as well, there were Salian Franks and Ripuarian Franks. There as well, this Sali can be traced back to this "golden, shining, glistening, white" and it meant "white", that is Hephtalite. And taking this thought on wards, I soon understood, that if I say "Szár törzs" or "Szár Ág" (Sar tribe or Sar branch), just like where in "Maghreb" -eb means "part of a tribe" (Hun. -ág), it then sounds like "Sar ab". This "Sar ab" later on however is "Serb". If however I examine the R-L, B-V morphation of this word, we arrive at "Sal av" (Száláv). But this "Sal av" later on is "Slav"!

So basically - and a lot of people don't like this concept, I've received tones of attacks on this, that those people, that we interpret as a foreign ethnicity from ourselves, that they "stole" the Highlands (Felvidék - highlands of Hungarian Kingdom, Carpathian Basin, today Slovakia) from us, and this way and that way as well, they hate us, and we hate them as well, to be honest, sometime at the dawn of our History, they were our dear kin. This is the name of the Huns who were to the west of Scythia, "Száláv" or "Száráb" (Salav, Sarab). Which became Serb or Slav. And here it is that I'm coming back to Great Constantine and the one who proposed the question, "What do we have to think about the Slavs, and where do we place Cyril and Method?" I started thinking about Cyril and Method's story. What are we to know about Cyril? Cyril starts his journey in Thessaloniki. This in itself is extraordinarily interesting. Since we know that Kuber, who we've identified with Csaba, settles in Thessaloniki. We know that Csaba as well, settles exactly in Thessaloniki. And here, in the same area, where otherwise Slavs live, Thessaloniki, inside of Greece was a Slavic area, and Slav is Hephtalite Hun, so the strings are starting to become attached again. A certain "Cyril" named fellow pops up, who puts a great amount of doing into Slav writing, Slav conversion, and who finally goes to Khazaria, and converts many there as well. And as I was pondering this, I bought a book about Cyril's life, and on the cover of this book, I didn't need to even flip the pages and I was already astounded. On the cover there stood: "Cirill-Konstantin és Method életé, működése" (Cyril-Constantine and Method's Life, Operations) Well, what is Constantine doing tagging along with Cyril? It turns out that Cyril's original civilian name was Constantine. He only adapted the Cyril name not long before his death, since this was more of his monk name, or at least this is what the official history states. So let us realize, that Cyril starts his journey at exactly the same place as where Csaba arrived at in Greece, from the areas of Thessaloniki, he does a great amount of work for those Slavs who I've identified with the Hephtalite Huns, and later returns to the Khazarian Empire, to convert there as well. Just the same way, as it is said of Csaba, that he returned to his ancients' land, Scythia. It started to dawn on me, that when we speak of Cyril, this person is no other than Atilla's younger son Csaba. Whose name it seems was also Constantine, which he received at the time of his baptism. So, it is time to realize, that Atilla has two sons, one to the west - he is Aladár, according to his baptism: Constantine. He also has a son on the east, he is Csaba, who is Cyril as well, his name according to baptism is: Constantine. And these two figures, so Atilla's two sons, were blurred into Great

Constantine's Character. So, Great Constantine really does kneed together two historical figures, the western Aladár, and eastern Csaba. And at this point, I suddenly became enlightened concerning the name: "Cyril". I suddenly realized, that this "Cyril" word comes from the word "Kyrillos". But what is "Kyrillos"? Well, it's Király (King). It's our own Hungarian word Király (King). So, let's realize, that there is a Károly (Carol, Charles) to the West, and there is a Kyrillos in the east. There's a Constantine to the west, and there's a Constantine to the east. And in this way, one suddenly understands, that, all these historical figures, starting with Cyril, up until Great Constantine, from Great Constantine through Childerik and Chlodwig until Charlemagne, they're all the same historical characters. Atilla's two sons. Basically, they are the two onto whom the later christian Europe was built upon. Well, truly, this is all I planned as an ending. (...)

Well, then, if there aren't any more questions, I thank everyone for their attention, and again, I remind everyone's attention of my blog: <http://www.maghreb.blog.hu> (Hungarian only!!!) There are 35, now 36 different chapters in which I break down in details every one of these thoughts. I know, that these last thoughts, especially the Hunnic being of the Slavs, and Cyril's person may arouse some doubts in some people, and could be difficult to accept. I advise going to my blog, and there I go into the finest details, with more additives, that could help in the understanding and acceptance of what we've heard here.

Tóth Gyula: "The Sack of Rome, and - The Dark Ages?" lecture was lastly found at this address:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Moat-sqjnd4> *The Phantom Dark Ages and Beyond - Gyula Tóth*
<https://vimeo.com/93065091>

Csaba Varga's books <http://www.frigkiado.hu/angol-nyelvu-kiadvanyok>
The Nostratic Language <http://www.nostraticlanguage.info/>
Hungarian Holy Crown: <https://theholycrown.weebly.com/>
Hungarian Culture: <https://hungarians.weebly.com/>

"He who controls the past controls the future. He who controls the present controls the past."

—George Orwell, 1984