



Chapter 17

***THE
COUNTERFEIT
GOLGOTHA***

When it was realized by Eusebius that Constantine had abandoned the teaching of the Holy Scriptures in favor of the information he received from visions, dreams and signs, he decided on a different format of instruction for those who believed in the teaching of the Bible. What he did was to provide a way in which those trained in the Holy Scriptures could recognize his real teachings from the counterfeit.

Eusebius began by combining an oration given at Constantine's death with the discourse that he gave at the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. He made one document out of the two separate works and it has become known as *The Oration of Eusebius*. He provided an introduction to the whole work (the first chapter) then from chapter two to chapter ten (inclusively) he recorded his *Oration to Constantine* as a eulogy at the time of his death, then from chapter eleven to the end of chapter eighteen he recorded the discourse that he gave in Jerusalem at the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It was in his last chapter (XVIII) that he asked Constantine to tell him and the bish-

ops why his visions had him select the region of the Venus Shrine as the place of Jesus' passion.

The most important part of the two "*Oration*s," however, is the "Introduction" itself. It is a powerful testimony of Eusebius that gives his own opinions on what the truth really was concerning the activities of Constantine. Though these two "*Oration*s" are filled with much laudatory praise about Constantine (indeed, Eusebius gave excessive flattery to the point of *ad nauseam*), it appears to me that this maneuver of Eusebius was a literary device to get his readers' attention. The fact is, this style of writing was so out-of-character with Eusebius. Never had he resorted to such honeycombed fawning of a person. This was so unlike Eusebius. And that is no doubt the exact appraisal that Eusebius wanted his readers to make. Anyone who would have known Eusebius before the time of Constantine (and those familiar with his early writings) would have said: "*This is NOT* the Eusebius that we have known in the past." With this in mind, Eusebius was actually saying to his readers: "Anyone reading these *Oration*s should know me better than this, so don't take me seriously in these teachings about Constantine." He gave two major "keys" in the text of the *Oration*s to show this.

Eusebius Provides a Key to Understand his Writings

In his Introduction Eusebius gave some instructions on how to interpret what he was actually meaning. Once this first "key" to his type of discourse was understood, Eusebius then informed his readers not to deviate from that "key." This "key" would show that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as the place of Jesus' passion is a counterfeit manufactured by Constantine. To recognize this first (as well as his second) "key," one must strip away all of his sycophant comments about Constantine that he gave in his "Introduction" and in the two "*Oration*s," and one will be left with some revealing information that shows the real character of Constantine and the actual type of government Eusebius thought Constantine was introducing. Eusebius shows that Constantine and his government were

contrary to the simple teachings of the Holy Scriptures.

Eusebius starts out his Introduction by saying: “I come not forward prepared with a fictitious narrative, nor with elegance of language to captivate the ear, desiring to charm my hearers.” The fact is, Eusebius wanted to tell the truth, but it would not be understood by “the common crowd.” He said that he was “leaving the common track of men to pursue the untrodden path which it is unlawful to enter with unwashed feet.” Yes, but Eusebius gave clues to help those truly tuned in with the holy teachings of God to perceive what the truth really is. He said his teaching was only for those “who are *initiated* into the universal science [the queen of sciences, real theology], and have attained to Divine as well as human knowledge.” Eusebius adopted this method of hiding his true meaning because he got his example from the Holy Scriptures themselves which he said were written in such a “disguised form” (*Proof of the Gospel*, VI.257c) or in a “veiled way” (*ibid.*, 265c). Eusebius believed the Bible was written in veiled meanings written “darkly and in obscurity by some secret and hidden words” (*ibid.*, 268d).

Though in the Introduction, Eusebius shows (with excessive laudation) that Constantine was great and noble and had celestial wisdom with things in reference to God, Eusebius was really telling the initiated something quite different. These are the people to whom Eusebius was appealing. He said: “Let those, however, who are within the sanctuary, and have access to its inmost and untrodden recesses, close the doors against every profane ear, and unfold, as it were, the secret mysteries of our emperor’s character TO THE INITIATED ALONE.” To Eusebius, only those who were initiated would be able to perceive the secrets of Constantine’s character. And who were those “initiated”? The true “initiated” were those who obtained their instruction from “the sacred oracles [the Holy Scriptures], given not by the spirit of divination, or rather let me say of madness and folly, but by the inspiration of Divine truth, [let them] BE OUR INSTRUCTORS in these mysteries.”

Never Deviate from the Holy Scriptures

As plain as Eusebius could make it, he directed his readers to the one standard by which all mysteries can be understood. He told his readers to let the Holy Scriptures “*be our instructors*” and *never to deviate from them*. This is the “key” that Eusebius was giving to his readers. He insisted that only the Holy Scriptures should be consulted and relied on for the understanding of secret mysteries and not “the spirit of divination, or rather let me say, of madness and folly” that was prompting Constantine and his advisors.

Eusebius taught that one should stay with the Holy Scriptures to discover all matters of divine truth. Doing this would allow his readers to discern “THE COUNTERFEIT COIN.” Or, as Eusebius closed his Introduction, “With these oracles [the Holy Scriptures], then, *to initiate us* in the knowledge of the sacred mysteries, let us essay, as follows the commencement of our divine mysteries.”

Common Practice to Hide Meanings in Writings

It was quite common in this period (and several centuries before) for many authors to record information in their works that only their initiates would understand. As for Eusebius, he called attention to this literary device that he thought was used even in the Scriptures and it was also utilized by Plato to record his true feelings concerning any subject if he found it prudent to do so. This is how Eusebius thought the Holy Scriptures were written (as well as Plato). It was one thing to read the outward teaching and gain excellent information, but the wise were advised to dig beneath the surface and find secret communications which only the initiated could understand. Note what Eusebius said.

“But the deep and hidden reason of these things [in the Scriptures] they [the prophets] left to be sought out and learned *in secret communications* by those who were capable of being initiated in matters of this kind. It will be well, however, to describe in a general way a few points in the contemplation of these matters, and to show that herein also Plato entertained the sentiments which were

dear to the said people” (*Preparation of the Gospel*, Bk.XI.7).

And to show this principle adopted by Plato to instruct those initiated into his real doctrines, Eusebius said that the philosopher actually believed that there was in reality a singular God but that he commonly referred to the Deity in the plural when he was talking to the uninitiated.

“But that he [Plato] had a knowledge of one God, even though in accordance with the custom of the Greeks he commonly speaks of them as many, is evident from the *Epistle to Dionysius*, in which, giving marks to distinguish his letters written in earnest from those thrown off at random, he said that he would put the name of ‘The gods’ as a sign at the head of those which contained nothing serious, but the name of ‘God’ at the head of those which were thoughtfully composed by him. Accordingly he thus speaks word for word: ‘With regard then to the distinctive mark concerning the letters which I may write seriously, and those which not, though I suppose you remember it, nevertheless bear it in mind and give great attention to it. For there are many who bid me to write, whom it is not easy for me openly to refuse. So then the serious letter begins with ‘God,’ and the less serious with ‘gods’” (*ibid.*, XI.13).

Eusebius had the same problem Plato encountered. He was also called on to give orations and to write discourses by those “whom it is not easy for me openly to refuse.” The bishop found himself having to resort to this common stratagem in order (not simply to preserve his life, which was no doubt a factor) but that his early writings might be preserved for posterity. Had Eusebius been *utterly plain* in his dealings with Constantine, there was a chance that not only he, but his writings as well would have been destroyed. His historical works were most important for those of the future who would need to know the truth of what was happening to Christianity at this crucial period of time. Eusebius was used to resorting to the literary devices that most authors were forced to apply if they found themselves in a hostile environment to the their teachings. So, Eusebius tells his readers of the Introduction to his

“*Orations*” that those who are truly initiated into the divine and secret mysteries of the Holy Scriptures will be able to identify the true character of Constantine and the actual source of his government which he was then forcing on the Christian world and the Roman Empire itself. But to do so the initiated would have to pay attention to the “key” that Eusebius provides to understand his true teaching. And what is that “key”? He said:

“Let those, however, who are within the sanctuary, and have access to its inmost and untrodden recesses, close the doors against every profane ear, and unfold, as it were, the secret mysteries of our emperor’s character *to the initiated alone*. And let those who have purified their ears in the streams of piety, and raised their thoughts on the soaring wing of the mind itself, join the company which surrounds the Sovereign Lord of all [God], and learn in silence the divine mysteries. Meanwhile *let the sacred oracles* [the Holy Scriptures], given not by the spirit of divination, or rather let me say of madness and folly, but by *the inspiration of divine truth*, be our instructors in these mysteries; speaking to us of the sovereignty, generally: of him who is the Supreme Sovereign of all, and the heavenly array which surrounds the Lord of all; of that [true] example of imperial power which is before us, AND THAT COUNTERFEIT COIN” (*The Oration of Eusebius*, I.4,5).

Eusebius told the *initiated* to stay away from the madness, the folly, the spirit of divination and the counterfeit coin and remain solidly with the teachings of the Holy Scriptures (which he called “the sacred oracles”). Eusebius provided much secret teaching if the *initiated* retained the interpretation which came solely from the Holy Scriptures. Note this. When he gave his *Oration* concerning the thirtieth anniversary of Constantine’s coming to power in the Roman Empire, Eusebius said this number of years represented “the revolution of three cycles of ten years” (*The Oration of Eusebius*, VI.1). And then he went into a long discourse on the numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4 and that in a special way the number 4 produces 10. But how can 4 lead directly to the number 10? Eusebius gave the answer: “The number four produces the number ten. For

the aggregate of one, and two, and three, and four, is ten” (*ibid.*, VI.5). True enough, but what significance does it have?

The Mysterious Chapter Six of Eusebius

The whole of his sixth chapter is devoted to the discussion on the significance of these numbers and the importance of a triad of tens which equals thirty (the number of years of Constantine’s rule). The commentator of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (vol.I, p.587) did not know why Eusebius saw significance in the numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4 giving an aggregate of 10, but he thought the concept was probably Pythagorean in origin. He called attention to the fact that Philo in the first century (*de Mund. Opif.* ch. 15) also mentioned that the sum of the first four numbers produced 10 (and that it was significant in matters dealing with creation). Did Eusebius have the same thing in mind? Without doubt he did. It is pretty clear what Eusebius was trying to show his readers what was being created right in front of their eyes in the early part of the fourth century if they would simply let the Holy Scriptures (not Pythagoras) be their inspired guide.

All of those *initiated* into the divine mysteries of the Sacred Scriptures should have been able to know what Eusebius was talking about. It is not difficult for us to see as well. In the Book of Daniel we have an example of the numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4 leading directly to 10. Using the interpretation of Daniel’s four kingdoms and ten toes (horns) as understood by Eusebius (*Proof of the Gospel* 15 Fragment 1), the number 1 represented Babylon, number 2 was Medo-Persia, 3 was Macedon, and 4 was the Roman Empire, and this led directly to number 10 which was the empire of ten toes, “iron mixed with miry clay” (the last heathen empire of 10 kings prophesied to exist just before Jesus’ Second Advent).

In his *secret* teaching to those *initiated* into the teachings of the Holy Scriptures, Eusebius was saying they were seeing the culmination of the heathen empires prophesied by Daniel in the emer-

gence of Constantine's empire. Indeed, Eusebius made it clear in his use of the number 10 that he wanted his readers to realize that it represented the final number, and no matter how many series of 10's that they would witness in the future, the present "10" (which came from the 1, 2, 3 and 4; that is, from Babylon, Medo-Persia, Macedon and the Roman Empire of Augustus) would remain as a unit and a steadfast empire until that "10" would be destroyed by the Second Advent of Jesus. Look at how Eusebius said that this "10" of Constantine was the final "10" no matter how many cycles of 10's would exist in the future.

"For the unit is the tenth of ten, and ten units make up a decade, which is itself the limit [the final number], the settled goal and boundary [the terminus] of units; it is that which terminates the infinity of number [that is, the number 10 reaches out to infinity], the term AND END of units" (*The Oration of Eusebius*, VI.16).

It was this 1, 2, 3 and 4 leading to 10 that Eusebius associated with Constantine's empire. But it did not end there. The particular *Oration* that Eusebius was presenting (of which we have been speaking) was that given at the thirtieth anniversary of Constantine's rise to power. And Eusebius had a great deal to say about this thirtieth year of Constantine. It was, to him, a direct outgrowth of the "mysterious" 1, 2, 3, 4 and 10 that he was referring to in his chapter six. Continuing from the quote above, Eusebius said:

"Again, the triad combined with the decade, and performing a threefold circuit of tens, produces that most natural number, thirty. For as the triad is in respect to units, so is the number thirty in respect to tens" (*ibid.*, 17).

In simple language that the *initiated* would understand, Eusebius was informing his readers that even Constantine's thirtieth year was a part of the 10 kingdoms mentioned in the Book of Daniel. It did not make any difference how many series of decades there would be in the future, the philosophy that governed the Empire of Constantine would continue until the 10 kingdoms of Daniel would

be destroyed at Jesus' Second Advent. And more than that, the present thirtieth anniversary of Constantine was important because it was a triad of decades that equaled the course of the moon. Constantine's thirty years, according to Eusebius, was under the influence of the moon. Continuing with his discourse in chapter six he said:

“Again, the three combined with ten, and performing a threefold circuit of tens, produces that most natural number, thirty. For as the triad is in respect to units, so is the number thirty in respect to tens. It is also the constant limit to the course of that luminary which is second to the sun in brightness. For the course of the moon from one conjunction with the sun to the next, completes the period of a month; after which, receiving as it were a second birth, it recommences a new light, and other days, being adorned and honored with thirty units, three decades, and ten triads” (*ibid.*, VI. 16. 17).

This may appear as an exercise in philosophical nonsense (and many have accepted it as primitive reasoning on numerology which characterized the age of Eusebius), but Eusebius was telling his readers something in what appears as “mumbo jumbo” on the surface. He identified Constantine's empire with the 10 anti-christian kingdoms that the Bible says will exist just prior to Jesus' advent. And he said that the past thirty years of Constantine's reign was under the influence of the moon. Anyone knowing the symbolic usage of the moon in the Book of Revelation understands that this is the luminary equated with Satan the Devil and his government (Revelation 11:2; 13:5, the references here are to *lunar* motions). The Book of Revelation also shows that the heavenly virgin who gives birth to the man child destined to rule all nations with a rod of iron (Jesus), dominates the moon by having it “under her feet” (Revelation 12:1). To Eusebius, Constantine's “lunar” empire will be eclipsed by that of the true Jesus.

A Further Sign from Eusebius

There is yet another “sign” that Eusebius gave to his readers to

show when he was giving secret teaching in his outward discourses designed for public consumption. Note this: In Eusebius' early works (composed primarily *before* the ascendancy of Constantine over all the Roman Empire) it was common for him to use the name "Jesus" (or its various combinations, such as "the Lord Jesus Christ") with complete freedom and with an attitude of adoration and worship. Eusebius' *Preparation of the Gospel*, *The Proof of the Gospel* and his famous *Ecclesiastical History* contain the name "Jesus" (or its combinations) in all circumstances where it would have been natural to use it. But in the works intended for the general public (which we have been discussing) written after Constantine came to full power within the Roman Empire and after he began his campaign of governing the Christian Church (including its building activities and theological discussions), Eusebius NEVER used the name "Jesus." Thus, in his *Life of Constantine* and his two "*Orations*" in praise of Constantine the name "Jesus" is conspicuous for its ABSENCE! As Professor T.D.Barnes astutely observes in regard to Eusebius' work *Praise of Constantine*, he "deliberately eschews exclusively Christian terminology, never uttering the name Jesus or the word Christ" (*Constantine and Eusebius*, p. 253).

And though Eusebius was willing to use the title "Christ" in his *Life of Constantine* (and only in chapter XVI of the "*Orations*"), the normal titles he used in place of "Jesus" were "Saviour, Lord, Logos, Sovereign, Son of God and the Son." But it is easily recognized that all these titles were not exclusively biblical. They were equally used by priests of the pagan world to refer to their own deities. Though Eusebius honored the title "Christ" (he had a long discourse on its significance in *Proof of the Gospel*, IV.15,16), he showed that "Christ" could refer to many humans (priests, prophets, kings), but the name "Jesus" was in a higher classification to Eusebius. Eusebius said that the mere mention of the Name of Jesus could drive away all the work of the demons, and "every demon and unclean spirit shudders at the Name of Jesus" [*ibid.*,

III.6 (132,133)]. Eusebius called specific attention to the fact that “in the name of Jesus every knee should bow” [*ibid.*, III.7 (136)].

The title “Christ,” however, was not as important to Eusebius as the name “Jesus” (or combinations of titles with it). When it became obvious to Eusebius that Constantine was more interested in his visions and dreams than in what the Holy Scriptures themselves taught (note his long journey to Constantinople to give a scriptural discourse on the tomb of Jesus but he got nowhere with Constantine), Eusebius *then* had second thoughts about Constantine. Eusebius began to see very early that the Christian Empire of Constantine was going to be controlled not by the teachings of the Holy Scriptures but by the visionary experiences of Constantine and those near him. Thus, the whole demeanor of Eusebius in his writing (his style and contents) changed drastically after Constantine assumed full authority over the Roman Empire. So altered was Eusebius’ style and content that one would almost wonder if the same man wrote the later works which were so different from his former. But he was the same person all right. After AD.326, he simply had to couch his writings and discourses in a literary style that only those who were initiated into the secrets of the Holy Scriptures would understand.

Eusebius believed Constantine’s Empire was the “Babylon” of Scripture

So, what was Constantine’s Empire in the interpretation of Eusebius? He saw it as the 1, 2, 3 and 4 (its head was Babylon, followed by Persia, Macedon and then the Roman Empire) which had developed under Constantine into the 10 (the anti-christian kingdom of the prophet Daniel). If one stays squarely with the Holy Scriptures for the interpretation of these mysterious numbers of creation put forth by Eusebius, then one is led directly to Daniel’s account of the various world kingdoms of the heathen that would continue on earth until the coming of the Kingdom of God. Constantine’s thirtieth year was, to Eusebius, a triad of decades

which answered to the course of the moon and this signaled the Satanic power which motivated his government. Thus, Eusebius saw Constantine's Empire as lunar in origin (associated with darkness), and not that of the sun which represented God's (Malachi 4:2). To Eusebius, Constantine's empire was to be equated with the "Babylon" mentioned in Revelation 17 and 18 which was an extension of the "Babylonian" image of Daniel 2. Because of this, Eusebius simply refused to use the holy name of "Jesus" (the one that all people must use to be saved — Philippians 2:10,11) in his later works meant for the general public. He instead resorted to the use of the normal heathen titles that most people in the Roman Empire were accustomed to using for their pagan deities. In a word, Eusebius was saying that Constantine's Empire was not the Kingdom of our Saviour and Lord Jesus Christ.

The above indications were some of the factors that represented Eusebius' "keys" (his use of the word "Jesus," or its lack of use, being the main one). This is what he used to teach the initiated after A.D.326. Thankfully, by this stratagem Eusebius was able to preserve his former (and true) writings for us today. If he would have been too plain with his personal feelings and would have objected most strenuously to the interpretation of the visions and dreams of Constantine, he would at the best have been sent into exile or at worst to a premature death, but (more importantly to Eusebius I am sure), he knew that such openness of his beliefs to Constantine would have meant the destruction of all his writings and the world would no longer have had these valuable documents to retain the truths that he thought were essential for preservation.

Eusebius' Writings were Edited

It was even essential to Eusebius that his early writings be edited so they would not be in danger of destruction after his death. It is well known that Eusebius was in the habit of bringing his works up-to-date when occasion merited it. And if there was ever a time to edit his earlier works, it was after A.D.326 when Constantine

began to establish his type of Christianity based on his visions and dreams. Eusebius' early historical works in many cases gave information which was counter to what Constantine was obtaining from his visionary experiences. For example, in no way was the real Sepulchre of Jesus on the western side of Jerusalem. This important event actually happened near the southern summit of the Mount of Olives and not where the Venus Shrine was later built. And in his early work called *Proof of the Gospel*, Eusebius made it clear that the real "Mother Church" for all Christendom was at the cave (which was really a *cave/tomb*) on the Mount of Olives. Even Jerome, a hundred years later, acknowledged that the Lord's Church was *founded* on Olivet (*Letter CVIII.8*). The Mount of Olives actually represented the spiritual "Mount Sion" for Christians, and before the time of Constantine it was to the *cave/tomb* on Olivet (and *only* to that spot) that Christians came from around the world to worship God. But after A.D.326, everything changed. All attention shifted to the western area of Jerusalem where the Venus Shrine had been built by the emperor Hadrian.

Now note an important point. Whereas Eusebius' early work called the *Preparation of the Gospel* was in fifteen complete books (all of which have come down to us), his sequel to that work called the *Proof of the Gospel* (which was at one time found in twenty books) is deficient in its latter TEN BOOKS. Eusebius' books eleven to twenty of his *Proof of the Gospel* have not come down to us. Why do we have only the first ten books of *Proof of the Gospel*? What happened to the last ten?

It ought to be obvious what happened to the latter portion of this early work of Eusebius if one looks closely at the subject matter that Eusebius was beginning to discuss at the end of book ten and the start of book eleven. Look at this point carefully. Eusebius in the first ten books of his *Proof of the Gospel* had just reached the history of Jesus up to the time of his crucifixion. And right at the

end of book ten, which was the very time we need the plain teaching of the historical records which Eusebius was referring to regarding the place of Jesus' crucifixion, burial and resurrection, all the teaching of Eusebius is ABRUPTLY BROKEN OFF. The events which Eusebius had written about concerning Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection (and the subsequent events leading to the establishment of the Christian Church at Jerusalem) are not brought down to us. In a word, those last ten books of Eusebius' *Proof of the Gospel* are missing. And the missing section began at the very time Eusebius began to write about the place of Jesus' crucifixion and the events that succeeded that momentous occasion. But why were the latter ten books of *Proof of the Gospel* taken out of this important work of Eusebius? The answer is not difficult to understand.

The problem was, Constantine had selected a place for Jesus' passion that was utterly contrary to the historical accounts that Eusebius had recorded in his early writings. This historical material which Eusebius had preserved that showed the essential truths of where Jesus was crucified and resurrected was either taken out of his *Proof of the Gospel* by Eusebius, or by later people shortly after Eusebius' death who destroyed the last ten books so that Constantine's new Golgotha (the one selected by his visions and dreams) would be retained as authoritative for the Christian Church.

Interestingly, however, if it was actually Eusebius himself who "hid" his latter ten books to his *Proof of the Gospel* (in order that the fifteen books of his *Preparation of the Gospel* and the first ten books of his *Proof of the Gospel* could be saved from destruction), then it would pay us to look carefully at what Eusebius finally presented to the world by his editing of those early twenty-five books. And no one will be disappointed if one looks carefully. It was in those early works that Eusebius was still able to show that the "Mother Church" of all Christendom was on the Mount of Olives

and that Olivet itself was indeed the spiritual “Mount Sion” of the early Christians before the time of Constantine. And not only that, notice what he said in *Proof of the Gospel* Book VI, chapter 18. Amongst a host of words that the superficial reader would pass over, Eusebius couched four central points that, when put together in a sequential pattern, identifies the actual spot of Jesus’ crucifixion and resurrection from the dead. At the commencement of section 294 of chapter 18 he said (point one) that Jesus’ “spiritual blood has fallen” in Jerusalem, and that (point two) this saving knowledge would “go forth from Mount Sion,” and that (point three) as the Shekinah Glory (the Holy Spirit) left the old Temple in Jerusalem and went “to the Mount of Olives,” and that from the Mount of Olives there came forth (point four) “the events of the day of His passion, and the living water, flowing into all the world, and to crown all, the Kingdom of the Lord ruling over all the nations, and His One Name, filling all the earth.”

What this conclusion to chapter 18 shows (of Eusebius’ Book VI of his *Proof of the Gospel*) is that (when the four points he raised are put in a sequential sentence format) we have a remarkable testimony of Eusebius himself where the actual crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus took place. Condensing his four points into a simple sentence that all can understand, Eusebius said: “Jesus’ blood fell on the spiritual Mount Sion which is the Mount of Olives to which the Holy Spirit retreated after its departure from the Temple at Jerusalem and that the events of Jesus’ holy passion took place at that Mount Sion.” It takes a careful analysis of the concluding part of chapter 18 to comprehend the teaching of Eusebius on this matter, but those *initiated* into the secrets of the Holy Scriptures, according to Eusebius, would be able to discover the truth without difficulty.

In short, Eusebius was showing that Jesus was crucified and resurrected from the dead near the southern summit of the Mount of Olives. And, of course, this is exactly what the Holy Scriptures

reveal as the truth as we have demonstrated in the early chapters of this book. Eusebius in his later works is stating that anyone who is initiated into the principal factors of scriptural interpretation can know what the truth is in regard to the true place of Jesus' resurrection from the dead. But more importantly, Eusebius was showing that the *initiated* will also be able to discover the truth of the type of government that Constantine was then establishing and it was not in accordance with the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. As he said in his introduction to his *Oration in Praise of Constantine* that the *initiated* would be able to discover what is true from the counterfeit. And to Eusebius the "truth" was exactly opposite of what Constantine was then advocating.

Constantine Took Over Control of the Christian Church

What Eusebius was able to see was that Constantine had not only conquered all secular opposition to his rule within the Roman Empire, he had effectively taken over control of the Christian Church as well. With his visions, dreams and signs Constantine positioned himself within the Christian community as the overall "bishop" with an apostolic rank which he concluded was higher than the original apostles (including Peter) because at his burial he positioned himself higher in rank than the apostles themselves.

Constantine established in the fourth century what became known as *Caesaro-papism* (Caesar is Pope). So different had the Church become from that of the apostles that St. Bernard (died 1153) called it the "Church of Constantine," not that of Peter (McBrien, *Catholicism*, pp.612,825). Interestingly, while Constantine dominated the Church from A.D.325 until his death, his control was accomplished while he was *unbaptized* and *not even a member of the Church*.

In effect, what Constantine established in the fourth century was a politico-religious empire based on philosophical and theological principles that were completely contrary to the doctrines of the

Holy Scriptures and the early teachings dispensed by the original apostles. This is what Eusebius was able to observe without the slightest difficulty and why he explained this fact in his *Oration of Eusebius*. In those eighteen chapters, Eusebius told those who were truly initiated into the teachings of the Holy Scriptures what the real character of Constantine was like and that he was actually being motivated by the spirit of divination (which, to Eusebius, was an expression of madness and folly) (*The Oration of Eusebius*, I.4,5). In the next chapter it will be explained why the majority of the world finally went over to the interpretation of Constantine and his mother Helena that the site of the Temple of Venus was the place for Jesus' crucifixion and resurrection from the dead. It is an interesting matter indeed.