Council!), 346, 350 and 370.

Thus, if we follow the modern tradition, we find ourselves forced to accept that the very first celebration of Easter after the Council of Nicaea infringed roughly three of four rules according to which the Council established this celebration. And only 500 years after the Council, that established the Easter Book, it began to conform faultlessly to the rules that determined it! This does not look plausible. Note that Scaliger, as he compiled in 16th century the chronology hitherto accepted, could not defect this nonsense, because in his time calculation of the full moons for the distant past was an extremely difficult problem. The incongruity had been observed much later, when the Scaliger version of chronology had been already canonized and called "scientific", and any changes in it had become intolerable.

1.3. A date from Easter full moons. The fact that, when the Easter Book was compiled Easter was defined as the first Sunday after the first spring full moon is not only known from the ecclesiastical tradition; it ensues also from the Easter Book tables. Among them there is a table of Julian dates of Passovers (the spring full moons) for all years of the 19-year lunar cycle, the "circle for the moon". The Easter Book is based on the assumption that the dates of spring full moons punctually recur every 19 years. The date of Easter is determined as the first Sunday after such a (calendar!) full moon. To find the date of Easter, one is to find the "circle for the moon" for the year, then to determine from the Easter table the date of the corresponding full moon and finally turn to the next Sunday.

The compilers of the Easter Book regarded the schedule of spring full moons they used (the "circle for the moon" or "the Metonian cycle") as *perpetual*; they canonized it and based the entire Easter Book on it. This implies at least that *in their time the real "circle for the moon" was exactly as they canonized it.* That they did not suspect any inaccuracy of the Metonian cycle and believed that the "circle for the moon" would ever correspond accurately to real full moons observable in the sky, is also noted by ecclesiastical tradition (Matthew Vlastar, see above). But today we know that the Metonian cycle is in fact not precise. Real spring moons shift slowly to earlier dates of the Julian calendar (the shift amounts to approximately 24 hours per 300 years). Clearly, this gives us a possibility to estimate (roughly) the date when the Easter Book was compiled: it suffices to compare the table of Easter full moons with the precise modern tables of lunar phases and to find the time interval in which the coincidence is satisfactory. Note that the modern theory enables us to calculate lunar phases for the past very precisely (within minutes), but we only need the dates of full moons, so we used the formulas of Gauss.

Statement 2. A satisfactory coincidence (within 1 day) of Easter full moons with real astronomic full moons occurred only between 700 and 1000 A.D. Before 700, real full moons always came later than the Easter ones, and after 1000, vice versa, real full moons (i.e., Passovers) came earlier than the Easter full moons. The beginning of the 13th great indiction (in 877 year) is the time of the IDEAL coincidence of real and Easter full moons.

Thus, the Easter Book could have been compiled between the 8th and 10th centuries, and could not have been compiled at any other time.

Consequently, if we regard the Council of Nicaea as the Council that established the Easter Book, then it had to take place in the 8–10th centuries, *most probably in the end of the 9th century (after 877).* Indeed, the Council established the Easter Book for immediate usage and for usage for as long as possible without additional recalculations. Therefore, the Council had to compile the table for the whole 532-