

out the observations personally ([13], V. 4, p. 467). The textual study discloses the reason for this strange phenomenon. Describing the technical characteristics of the four eclipses (the time of their maximal phases and the phases themselves, etc.), he hinted that he had precisely calculated all of them (*ibid.*). The astronomer F. Ginzl, while taking note of this declaration by Ptolemy, did not feel doubtful about the computations having been made in the 2nd c. A.D., before the eclipses.

After everything we know about the *Almagest*, we may ask: Is it true that the computations were made in the 2nd c. A.D.? As to the “personal observations” concerning eclipses, they are as reliable as the statement about the “personal observation” of the stars. That lunar eclipses are apocryphal and calculable can also account for Ptolemy’s not mentioning a word about the immeasurably more impressive solar eclipses, e.g., the annular solar eclipse in 125 A.D., whose maximal phase was seen in Alexandria at 10 a.m., occurring only a fortnight before the lunar eclipse described by him. Ptolemy disregarded this solar eclipse. From our point of view, the author of the *Almagest* simply was not aware of any solar eclipse of the time and could not determine their characteristics, since, even in the 15–16th cc. A.D., to determine the umbra of a solar eclipse was an extremely complicated problem, in contrast with lunar ones whose predictions and computations could be carried out successfully. The identification of others of Ptolemy’s eclipses, carried out by F. Ginzl, is based on solutions strained to a small, but quite definite, degree, which completely rejects the traditional dating of this part of the *Almagest* [13].

It should be borne in mind that calculating astronomical data “in the past” could have been carried out in the Middle Ages also as “computation exercises”. The same might be attributed to attempts to make such calculated astronomical dates agree with hypothetically ancient calendars, eras, etc.

11. Duplicates in Greek Chronology. The 1,800-year Chronological Shift

11.1. The Epoch of the Crusades in 1099–1230 A.D. and the Epoch of the Great Greek Colonization in the 8-6th cc. B.C.

Here, we will analyze the basic duplicates arising under the shift by c. 1,810 years. Apparently, medieval Greece in the 10–15th cc. A.D. was an arena of the basic events now referred to in the history of classical ancient Greece. As I discovered, the global history of Europe and the Mediterranean probably possesses numerous identifications represented in the GCD. The “modern textbook” is the result of gluing the four practically identical chronicles together, which are shifted with respect to their original (first chronicle) backwards by c. 333 (Byzantine–Roman shift), 1,053 (Roman shift), 1,778 or 1,810 (Greco-biblical shift) years, respectively. The shift by c. 720 years, being the difference of the first and second, is also important. The names stress the history of civilization in which they are especially important. In the table below, we briefly indicate which events of medieval history in the 10–15th cc. A.D. served as the originals of those described by Herodotus in his *Histories*, and then referred to profound antiquity.