

The parallel was noted by F. Gregorovius himself:

“The fall of Peter de Vineis ... fell like a shadow across the life of the Great Emperor (Frederick—A. F.), in the same ways that the death of Boëthius overshadowed the life of Theodoric the Great. The two German kings resembled one another in the last stage of their career ...” ([44], V. 5, p. 263).

5a. Theodoric died natural death. Fall of Gothic (TRQN) dynasty in Italy. Sixth-c. war overlaps with biblical war with Pharaoh	5b. Frederick died natural death. Fall of Hohenstaufen dynasty in Italy. Accounts of 13th c. called Frederick II “Pharaoh” ([44], V. 5)
6a. Theodoric of Ostrogoths	6b. Frederick II (Hohenstaufen)
6.1. Dynasty of Goths: Amalaric, Athalaric, Theodahad, Vitiges, his nephew, Gothic ruler from Ravenna (Uraja, Ildibald), in 526–541 A.D., figuring under the name of one king, Tarquinius Superbus (according to Livy)	6.1. Conrad IV
6.2a. Totila	6.2b. Manfred
6.3a. Roman emperor Justinian	6.3b. Pope Innocent, Roman ruler
6.4a. Tejas	6.4b. Conradin
6.5a. Narses (Belisarius)	6.5b. Charles of Anjou

This is the short scheme. Because we do not have the space here, we cannot give a detailed comparison of the “biographies”, and only confine ourselves to the extremely vivid example. F. Gregorovius absolutely correctly indicates the following parallel:

The gloomy Charles of Anjou stepped into the arena of ancient battles between the Roman and German peoples as Narses (!—A. F.), and Manfred assumed Totila’s tragic mien (!—A. F.); for, though the balance of forces was different, the *situation was essentially the same*. The pope invited foreign aggressors to the country to liberate it from the Germans. The Swabian dynasty fell as the Gothic (!—A. F.) once did. The stunning destruction of both powers and their heroes embellished history with a double tragedy on the same classical stage, the latter tragedy seeming to be only the exact reproduction of the former (!—A. F.) ([44], V. 5), ([44*], V. 5, p. 287).

The overlapping of Charles of Anjou and Narses is also confirmed by the phonetic parallel. “Charles” meant simply “king” in antiquity. In the 13th c. A.D., coins often contained the inscriptions *Karolus* and also *CAROLVS* ([44], V. 5, P. II, p. 369, Note 2). Therefore, “Charles of Anjou” means “Anjou king”. In other words, this is Anjou Caesar, CAESAR OF ANJOU, or CESAR AN in abbreviated form. Read from right to left, it sounds like NARASEC, i.e., NRSC, which is practically identical with “Narses”. Arabs and Jews read from right to left which turns CESAR AN into Narses.