that Passover (the 14th moon) could not be shifted by 532 years (because of the inaccuracy of the Metonian cycle) and made a mistake:

"Dionysius failed, though he did not know that. Indeed, if he really supposed that the First Easter fell on March 25, 31 A.D., then he made a rough mistake as he extrapolated the inaccurate Metonian cycle to 28 previous cycles (that is, for 532 years: $28 \times 19 = 532$). In fact, Nisan 15, the Passover festival, in the year 31 fell not on Saturday, March 24, but on Tuesday, March 27!" [335, p. 243].

That is a modern reconstruction of what Dionysius the Little did in the 6th century. It would be all right, but it presupposes that near Dionysius' date of 563 A.D. the 14th moon (Passover) *really fell on March 24*. It could be that Dionysius was not aware of the inaccuracy of the Metonian cycle and made the mistake shifting Passover from 563 to the same day of March in 31 A.D. But he could not have been unaware of the date of Passover in the the almost contemporary year 563! To that end it was sufficient to apply the Metonian cycle to the coming 30–40 years; the inaccuracy of the Metonian cycle does not show up for such intervals. *But in 563 Passover (the 14th moon) fell not on March 24, but on Sunday, March 25*, that is, it coincided with Easter as determined by the Easter Book. As he specially worked with the calendar situation of almost contemporary year 563 and as he based his calculation of the era "since the birth of Christ" on this situation, Dionysius could not help seeing that, first, the calendar situation in the year 563 did not conform to the Gospels' description and, second, that the coincidence of Easter with Passover in 563 contradicts the essence of the determination of Easter the Easter Book is based on (see above Sec. 1).

Therefore, it appears absolutely incredible that the calculations of the First Easter and of the Birth of Christ had been carried out in the 6th century on the basis of the calendar situation of the year 563. It was shown in Sec. 1 that the Easter Book, used by Dionysius, had not been compiled before the 8th century and had been canonized only at the end of the 9th century. Therefore, *the calculations carried out by (or ascribed to) Dionysius the Little had not been carried out before the 10th century.*

Hypothesis. We have already seen (in Sec. 1) that it is told in the "Church Fathers' Rules" of Matthew Vlastar that the equinox "this time" fell on March 18. In fact, the spring equinoxes in Vlastar's time fell on March 12, and they fell on March 18 in *the 6th century. Therefore, if we date Vlastar's text by the equinox, we get the 6th century.* Apparently, the same late medieval text was included both in the "Rules" of Matthew Vlastar and (in Latin transcription) in the treatise of Dionysius the Little. Probably, the text was written by Vlastar himself or by one of his predecessors in the 12–14th centuries. It contains, as we saw, the dating of the resurrection of Christ, but not a single word on the date of the birth of Christ. Probably, exactly this text of Vlastar was soon thereafter used by Dionysius the Little, who subtracted 31 years from the date of Christ's resurrection, thus obtaining the date of the "birth of Christ", and introducing new era. If that had happened in the 14th century, this is an explanation why the systematic usage of this era in the West began only in the 15th century (the year 1431). Later (apparently in the 17th century), Dionysius' Latin text was dated by the equinox to the 6th century, and the aforecited reconstruction of his calculations appeared. The name "Dionysius the Little" is, apparently, merely the name of the 17th-century chronologist Dionysius Petavius (Petavius = the Little), who concluded the construction of Scaliger's chronology (this has been already noted by A. T. Fomenko [21]).