

Stratigraphy of San Giusto (**provisorial 1st attempt**)(Conventional dates after Volpe 1998, 287-338), author's tentative dates in **bold green**

610-700	Period VI	90 years	2 nd phase: Reconstruction of villa by few destitute survivors failed; Entire complex covered by sediment 1 st phase: octagonal baptistry added	235-300 [300=900]
550-610	Period V	60 years	“Evento traumatico”. “Disastro”. Destruction layer; hiding of hoard	[in period of 230s Cassiodor+Justinian]
500-550	Period IV	50 years	2nd basilica church	200-230
400-500	Period III (structure unaltered [“ <i>invariata</i> ”]from II)	420 years	1st basilica church; location of hoard with 3rd to 6th c. coins	80-200
80-400	Period II		Typical Roman basilicas; classical mosaics	
1st century	Period I	few decades	[?1 st century BC material?]	50-80

With the author's reconstruction of Justinian's 6th century as the 3rd century (Heinsohn 2012) right after the cataclysm that struck down the Roman Empire around 230, San Giusto's period II/III is liberated of its extreme length of 420 years that are not due to stratigraphic wealth and depth but to Justinian's 6th century textbook forced on San Giusto's period V. The coins of the 3rd to the 6th century found in one hoard of 1043 pieces once more prove that rulers now spread from 285-500 are in actual fact sub-*Caesares* (sub-*Augusti*) if not identical emperors under their different names of the period 160-230. That explains that none of them left palaces or tombs in Rome that can be dated between 230 and 500. San Giusto's hoard is helpful by providing a stratigraphy based time frame for coins that now receive catalogue dates whose creation the excavators do not understand but have to trust blindly.

-Heinsohn, G. (2012), „Nur 3. und 6. Jahrhundert im Münzhort von San Giusto“, *Zeitensprünge*, vol. 24, issue 1 (April)

-Volpe, G., Hg. (1998), *San Giusto, la villa, le ecclesie*, Bari: Edipuglia

Italy's recent excavations (since the 1990s) are all burdened with chronologically overstretched periods (like II/III in San Giusto). There is also an innocence in their approach. If, e.g., the new castles built after 1000 (Normans) are discussed they are attributed to a process that is called "return of the cities", thereby admitting that there were no such things after Rome's fall. Yet, when did that fall happen? Excavators date it in the 6th century. I date it to the third and try to prove it by the chronological overstretch of some strata to meet that 6th c. date.

One of the excavators of San Giusto was very aware of that problem. He openly admitted that he had to obey coin and ceramics catalogues. He would be at war with the entire establishment if he would date according to his expertise as an excavator. He understands that world history has to be rewritten if he would date a single site according to evidence, thus ignoring catalogue dates.

There are also funny outcomes of that chronological overstretch. For many smaller sites recently excavated the excavators brag with their blossoming while the capital was already in ruins. In actual fact that could be claimed for hundreds of sites. For *Muro Lucano* (Basilicata), e.g., it is stated:

“There was a time when Basilicata enjoyed a golden era, while all around it an empire was collapsing. We are in the 4th-5th century AD, and Rome was losing its dominion over the world. At the same time, however, the economy was flourishing in the territories of Basilicata” (Archeonaut 2007, 56).

- Archeonaut (2007), *Journeys through time: Touring around Basilicata*, Potenza & Matera: APT Basilicata