

all these divergences were naturally taken into account in the choice of jets. This fact also increases the number of possible jets distinguished for a chosen dynasty.

It may turn out in comparing two dynasties that only two jets are dependent in the set of all possible pairs of them, whereas the others are independent. It is important that the rule durations are considered only approximately, since the error function $f(a_i)$ was introduced into the algorithm. In other words, if a rule duration a_i is less than 20 years, then the difference $a_i - b_i$ is considered by us only to the accuracy of ± 2 years. If a_i varies from 20 to 30, then to the accuracy of ± 3 years. However, if a_i is greater than 30 years, then the admissible error may attain ± 10 years, and then increase linearly with the growth of $[a_i/10]$ ([] meaning the integer part of the real number). Hence, it suffices to know only very approximate values of rule durations, and not the exact ones, which are unknown in many cases. It turns out that the nature of the rule-duration graph is important (i.e., the form of the broken curve). Thus, both the algorithm and the results obtained on its basis are extremely stable with respect to perturbations of the rule durations within the indicated limits.

The application of the method to historical data traditionally believed to belong to before the 13th c. A.D. unexpectedly led to the discovery of dynastic pairs (jets) a and b , regarded as independent in all respects, but for which the proximity coefficient $\lambda(a, b)$ is of the same order as for necessarily dependent dynasties, i.e., does not exceed 10^{-8} . Below, we give Tables 4–18 indicating (relative to dating traditionally) the rulers from the most interesting special dynastic pairs discovered, for which $\lambda(a, b) < 10^{-8}$ (Figs. 43–64). It means that they are probably dependent, and are duplicates or parallels. We compare the rule-duration graphs for the rulers enumerated consecutively, and also consider the overlapping of two dynasties on the time axis after a rigid shift of one of them until it coincides with the other. The mutual dispositions in time of individual rulers are nevertheless retained (under such rigid shift). For better visibility, we join the starting points and ends of the overlapping rulers by vertical lines. We illustrate this with further important examples. Calculating the average shift, we have compared the rule ends. That all these overlapping dynasties in Tables 4–18 (Figs. 43–64) are parallel is perfectly consistent with the decomposition of the Global Chronological Diagram (GCD) (Fig. 65), i.e., the modern ancient and medieval history “textbook” (see its definition and description in the Part 1), into the sum of four identical chronicles. Its description in Table 19 (Figs. 66(1), 66(2), 66(3), 67) is more detailed than in [24], Fig. 3. The line E (left column) schematically represents the ancient and medieval history of Europe, the Mediterranean and Near East with respect to traditional dating, whereas B gives the biblical chronology and history described in the Old and New Testaments. This history is represented with an upward shift by $c. 1,800$ years in accordance with its overlapping of the events of European history, discovered by the author. The letters K, T, II, P, C, H in the GCD, Figs. 65, 66, Table 19, represent different historical epochs or periods. For brevity, we re-designated the epochs denoted *ibid.* by black triangles and the letters MT simply by T . The line C_0 in Table 19 is the original, i.e., the chronicle that probably describes the authentic history of the above regions and their authentic chronology (see the first line at the bottom of Figs. 65, 66). Line C_1 (third line from the bottom in Fig. 65) represents the distorted original C_0