

order of unity, then the fact that two points from D fall into Π is unrelated to their “dependence”; however, if $\lambda \cdot |D| \ll 1$, we are forced to acknowledge that it is extremely improbable that two points should fall into Π independently (for $|D|$ tests, the probability is $\lambda \cdot |D|$). Therefore, they must be somehow dependent.

The computation is fully consistent with the obtained results, viz., for independent numerical dynasties, we obtain $\lambda \geq 10^{-3} \simeq 1/|D|$ (i.e., the probability that they fall independently into the corresponding parallelepiped Π is of the order of unity); whereas for dependent numerical dynasties, the value of λ does not exceed 10^{-8} , i.e., the probability that they fall into the corresponding parallelepiped Π independently is not greater than 10^{-5} . Thus, the probability of “random” identification of two independent numerical dynasties does not exceed 10^{-5} . The standard counter-argument that “an event of infinitesimally small probability can occur in great many phenomena” can be reciprocated by the computation of probability, proceeding from the complete number of tests. An event of an infinitesimally small probability can, in fact, “occur” in a great number of tests; however, we should not forget that the number of tests multiplied by the probability of the event in question in one test must be of the order of unity.

5.18. Possible explanation of the three chronological shifts discovered in the Global Chronological Diagram

1. *The general idea and the 1,000-year shift.* We now give one of possible explanations for the chronological shifts discovered in the GCD. For example, the 1,053-year (or c. 1,000-year) shift could have arisen from later juxtaposing two different techniques for writing dates, viz., the abbreviated form “IIIrd c. since Christ” could have been written as “X. III century”, where X is the first letter of the word Christ (Gr. *Χριστος*), i.e., one of the most widely spread medieval anagrams of the name “Jesus” [44]. This is consistent with the overlapping of Gregory VII Hildebrand (11th c. A.D., born c. 1020, pope from 1073 until 1085; *ibid.*) and Jesus Christ in shifting downwards by 1,053 years (see the GCD, Fig. 66).

In particular, the 3rd c. since Christ (or Hildebrand) is the 3rd c. since the beginning of the 11th c. A.D., which just yields the 13th c. A.D., or X.III century. This form of writing is well consistent with the Italian names of centuries, widely spread in the Middle Ages, viz., the 13th c. was called *Trecento* (the third hundred years), and the 14th c. *Quattrocento* (the fourth hundred years). Similarly, the year 1300 could have meant originally I.300, i.e., the 300th year since Jesus (Gr. *Ιησους*). This way of writing is consistent with the preceding, since the year 1300 = 300th year since Jesus = 300th year since the beginning of the 11th c. A.D. (from the birth of Hildebrand). In this connection, in our opinion, more attention should be paid to the fact that, in medieval documents, especially, of the 13–14th cc. A.D., the first letters (meaning, as assumed today, “large numbers”) were separated by dots from the last letters denoting dates representing less than ten. For example, the year 1527 is written in this fashion in the Latin letters on the well-known map of the world by Diego Ribeiro. See “Dürer Kunst und Geometrie”, E. Schröder, Berlin, 1980, p. 14.

Finally, another way, viz., a date in expanded form when the formula “since the