i.e., almost all. What, then, is the difficulty that worries the specialists?

The difficulty arises from the fact that the above data on Easter Book contradict the accepted date of the Council of Nicaea, that canonized the Easter Book. This contradiction can be easily seen from a very rough and simple calculation: if a one-day difference between Easters and the true full moons accumulates in 300 years, and by the times of Vlastar (approximately 1330) it had accumulated to 2 days, then the Easter Book had been compiled approximately in 730 (because $1330-300\times2=730$), and canonized still later. This does not agree with the date of 325 A.D. Note that Matthew Vlastar himself perceives no contradiction (though he knew about "1-day-in-304-years" shift of the "circle for the moon" and could do this obvious calculation). He merely did not yet know about the dating of the Council that established the Easter Book 325 A.D.!

The contradiction is so obvious that it could not be left unnoticed by researchers. It was noted in the form of seemingly strange reservations:

"The fact that the Council of Nicaea passed no firm prescriptions on celebrating Easter only after the spring full moon can be seen from the history of the celebration of Easters in the first years after the Council" (i.e., passed, but not "firm" ?—G. Nosovsky).

"By the way, it should be noted that in the Alexandrite lunar cycle, the 14th day of the return of the moon (i.e., full moon) always fell one or two days earlier than the real full moon" (?!—G. Nosovsky) [337].

But the new moon, and so the full moon, can be easily determined by merely looking at the sky. A systematic 2-day error in full moons looks inexplicable not only for the 4th century but even for the time of the caveman.

"To determine Easters according to the rules of the Orthodox Easter Book, it is important to assure that Easter should not coincide with Passover ... The tables ... provide dates of Passovers from 900 A.D. on" (?!—G. Nosovsky) [338, p. 14].

But why from 900 A.D. only? Is it not because the coincidences in question only ceased to occur in 8th century (see below)?

So, when was the Easter Book really compiled?

1.2. A date from the Easter determination rule. A computer experiment. The apostolic (i.e., the basic) rule on Easter requires that Easter should not coincide with Passover. The ecclesiastical tradition tells that Passover is the first spring full moon (see, for example, [331]). Nowadays the dates of full moons can be calculated very precisely. To that end we used the well-known Gauss formulas, with the help of which we calculated (using a computer) the Julian dates of *all* spring full moons from the 1st century A.D. until today and compared them with the dates of the Orthodox Easter indicated in the Easter Book. As a result we come to the following conclusion.

Statement 1. The Council that established the Easter Book (in medieval and modern tradition, the First Council of Nicaea) could not have taken place before 784 A.D., because only after this year (due to slow shift of the lunar phases) the coincidences of "calendar" Easters (i.e., the determined by the Easter Book) with the "lunar" Passovers ceased to occur. The last such coincidence occurred in 784, and since then the dates of Passovers and Easters diverged forever. Therefore, the Council of Nicaea could not have canonized the Easter Book in the 4th century A.D. when the calendar Easters coincided with Passovers 8 (!) times—in the years 316, 319, 323, 343, 347, 367, 374 and 394, and 5 times came even two days earlier (which is forbidden by the 4th rule on Easter): in the years 306, 326 (one year after the