

THE CHRONOLOGICAL TIMELINE OF THE EUROPEAN HISTORY ACCORDING TO THE HUNGARIAN CALENDAR

HUNGARIAN CALENDAR=ASTRONOMICAL DATING

I sincerely hope that my argumentation up to now was quite convincing and reached its goal that is the existence of a time-slip of 200 years became clear and firmly proved.

The time-slip was revealed by the retro-counting of the vernal equinoxes, but the extent of the time-slip with year exactness was verified by the recorded ancient solar eclipses. As it was said before, the historians restored surprisingly well **the related chronology** of the Antiquity, the corner-points of which will be repeated briefly here below:

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

In this year, on Jan.1 the Julian calendar was introduced coinciding with a new moon, which coincidence was quite important for the conservative contemporary Romans.

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

This year is an unmovable corner-stone of the traditional historical chronology, since in this year Emperor Augustus died in Nola.

CE 644 (Traditional AD 450=CE 450)

The starting year of the reign of Marcian, the emperor of the Romans. To this year can be connected the Gallia campaign of our King Etele (Attila).

CE 651 (Traditional AD 457=CE 457)

The death of Marcian, he is followed by Leo on the Byzantine throne.

CE 654 (Traditional AD 462=CE 462)

The beginning of the new time reckoning system (otherwise it is exactly the 500th year of the Julian era) which can be connected to the name of Gaeseric, the King of the Vandals. Today we call it as the Spanish era or Era Cos (Era Cons). In comparison with the starting year of the Hungarian Calendar we can determine an error of one year, counting from the starting point of the beginning of the Julian calendar. (CE 154 = 1st Julian year)

CE 659 (Traditional AD 465=CE 465)

The 9th year of the reign of Emperor Leo I. According to the view of our general teaching (mainstream scholarship) in these years the Antiquity is ending, and we are not yet justified to count the time in AD (Anno Domini) system, despite of the fact that since the time of emperor Theodosius the Christianity became a tolerated religion.

Up to this moment the time-slip of 194-198 years can be followed well, proving the fact that the makers of the traditional chronology relied more on the historical sources (very correctly by the way), than on the mistakenly identified solar eclipses. They ignored in every and all cases the mistakenly identified solar eclipses and followed the records of the historical sources!!! From that moment the identification of the years by the means of the names from the related pair of consuls is ended, and in Byzantium the years are numbered starting from the Creation of the World. Afterwards these Byzantine year numbers can be synchronized with the AD (Anno Domini)

system of time counting by the deduction of 5500 or 5508. The 8 years of uncertainty is not avoidable.

CE 693 (After the Traditional AD 485=CE 485)

Gregory of Tours in his chronicle (III/2) mentions a year after the reign of Huneric, the king of the Visigoths, which year is undeterminable up to now. On the basis of the description of the solar eclipse we can conclude that the eclipse occurred at such a time when one could notice with naked eye that the sun was darkened partly only, as the author says it. The time was Oct. 5 early morning when the sunrise started together with the eclipse. As Gregory put it the two-thirds of the sun was covered. From the source of Marcellinus we also learn that in Constantinople during the reign of Anastasius I the sky was darkened. There is no point to compare our solar eclipse with mistaken ideas.

(Solar eclipse of 693 Oct. 05)

CE 698 (Traditional AD 512=CE 512)

Before the end of the reign of Anastasius I, Marcellinus indicates another solar eclipse which was observable on Dec. 8 according to the Hungarian Calendar.

(Solar eclipse of 698 Dec. 08)

Surprisingly the Annals of Ulster and the *Chronicum Scotorum* also know and record this solar eclipse, in my opinion they are very right to do so, since the path of the eclipse was total at the British Isles.

The traditional (academically) view is that the source of Marcellinus was simply copied by them, since the event of Jun.29 in CE 512 was not observable on the British Isles.

CE 715 (Traditional AD 525 and AD 517)

In this astronomical year Dionysius Exiguus completes his Easter table in Rome. The teaching of the general opinion (mainstream scholarship) maintains that this is the year of the consulship of Probus, and this year accepted as AD 525. To make the situation more complicated the year of AD 517 is also a year of the consulship of Probus, consequently here is the moment where the time-slip of 198 years decreases down to 190 years. At those times nobody reckoned the time in the system of Dionysius Exiguus, so it is not important at all to anyone that the year of CE 715 accidentally removes 8 invented years from the erroneous system of time counting. Since the time counting invented by Dionysius Exiguus confirmatively will go into use only after another 200 years, in the Carolingian era, it will be awfully difficult to find out which years are really the years of the invented history.

In the Byzantium the years were counted independently from Rome, and from the year of CE 717 begin the reign of Justin I.

CE 717-755 (Traditional AD 527-565=CE 527-565)

The period of the reign of Justin I, the Byzantine emperor.

CE 787 (Traditional AD 590 or AD 592)

A year of the reign of Emperor Maurice Tiberius, which year is not determined more clearly („When he left the palace...”)

(Solar eclipse of 787 Sept. 16)

Anyhow it can be stated that his reign was between the years of CE 773 and CE 792.

CE 801-832 (Traditional AD 610-641)

The reigning period of the Byzantine emperor, Heraclius I.

“In the year in which Heraclius commenced to reign over the Romans there was an eclipse of the Sun during four hours” (Michael the Syrian, Book II, Chap. 1)

As Phocas was executed on Oct 5, this eclipse has been ascribed after Oct 5.

(Solar eclipse of 801 Dec. 09)

CE 804 (Traditional AD 612=CE 612)

From Saint Isidore of Seville (Isidorus Hispalensis, page 101) we can learn that *„in the 650th year of our time counting, in the second year [2nd indiction] of the reign of Heraclius I, Sisebut was put on the throne of the king, after Gundemar, and he was the ruler during eight years and six months.”*

CE 807 (Traditional AD 614/617=CE 614/617)

The solar eclipse of CE 807, Feb. 11 is a spectacular sight on the NASA map of the solar eclipses. Its literary mentioning can be found in the *Chronicum Scotorum* at the year of 614. Evaluating the context of the record the year of 617 is more realistic.

(Solar eclipse of 807 Feb. 11)

CE 812

“There happened moreover a severe famine and great mortality; the sun also was darkened and ashes rained.” (Georgios Hamartolos)

It occurs in the early part of the text that deals with his reign, but it is not safe to infer the date from this. The eclipse of 812 May 14 is the only possibility.

(Solar eclipse of 812 May. 14)

CE 813 (Traditional AD 621=CE 621)

Turning again to Saint Isidore of Seville (page 103) we can quote that „*In the 659th year of our time counting, in the tenth year of the reign of Heraclius I, by God's grace the leadership went to the glorious Swintila. Under king Sisebut, he became an army commander, he occupied Roman fortresses and defeated the Ruccons. After he gained the throne, in an open fight he occupied all the remaining Hispanian cities which were still in Roman hands, and having miraculous success of arms he covered himself with greater glory than other rulers. He became first the absolute ruler of Hispania surrounded by the sea; no one of the previous leaders could reach this same goal.*”

CE 816=Yaz/185=AH 1 (Traditional AD 622=CE 622)

The beginning of the Arabic chronology (Moslem calendar)

July 31 is the first day of the lunar year of AH 1!

CE 822=Yaz/191=6/7AH

April 25 is the date when Ibrahim, Mohammed's son died.

(Solar eclipse of 822 Apr. 25)

CE 826=11/12 AH (Traditional AD 632)

Agapius says, in a partly illegible passage, „*the sun was obscured*”, apparently about the time when Mohamed died (AD 632 June 8) and Abu Bakr succeeded. This seems to refer to solar eclipse of 826 Aug 07.

CE 833

“In his reign, the sun being obscured in the middle of the day, stars came out in the sky.” (Isidorus)

“His”=Constans II after Spanish Era 678 (CE 832)

(Solar eclipse of 833 Sept. 17)

CE 834

“Third year (of Constans) was an eclipse of the sun.” (Cedrenus)

(Solar eclipse of 834 Mar. 14)

CE 840

(Solar eclipse of 840 May. 05)

“In this times an eclipse of the sun, such that stars appeared in the middle of the day, terrified all Spain and foreshadowed a Gascon invasion with a not-small army” (Isidorus)

“His”=Constans II after Spanish Era 685 (CE 839)

CE 878

“Obscurata est pars solis”=Part of the Sun was darkened.” (Annals of Ulster under AD 688, in *Chronicum Scotorum* under 685.

(Solar eclipse of 878 Oct. 29)

CE 891

“After the Emperor reentered the city, there was an eclipse of the sun so that stars appeared.” (Georgios Hamartolos)

This is sometime during the first reign of Justinian II, and the eclipse of 891 Aug 08 is the only possibility.

(Solar eclipse of 891 Aug. 08)

Despite of the fact that in Europe we do not have a well-established and traceable Christian chronology, we can state that the related historical chronology is good, although it is equally true that the time-slip of 198 years proved for the Antiquity, now has altered down to 194 years only because of the different attempts of synchronization.

Understanding the fact that the time counting, invented by Dionysius Exiguus, or more exactly the yearly *Kalendariums* (calendars) based on his Easter table, will indisputably occur only in the Carolingian era, I suggest to follow the time-flow of history in such an area, as Hispania, where our efforts to find out the truth will be aided by two different types of continuous time counting (chronology).