

CONSTANTINE INVENTED CHRISTIANITY

A thesis in the field of Ancient History

P.R.F. Brown

INDEX

Introduction	2
Evidence in Support of the postulate of Pre-Nicene Christianity	2
Critical Review of the Papyri	3
Critical Review of the Inscriptions	5
Revision and Assessment of the postulate of Pre-Nicene Christianity	8
Invention - 312-324 CE	9
Military Supremacy - 324 CE	11
Fraud and Persecution at Antioch - 325 CE	12
Nicaea and the Wall of Swords - 325 CE	13
Publications and Persecutions of 331 CE	15
The “Christianisation” of Literature – Mid 4th Century	15
Emperor Julian’s Arraignment: Fiction and Fraud - 362 CE	16
Christian Supremacy and the role of <i>Pontifex Maximus</i> - 365 CE	17
The FLY in the Anointment of Christianity – Late 4 th century CE	18
Cyril and the Political Censorship of the Charge of Fraud - Early 5 th CE	18
Ancient Historians	20
Conclusion	22
Footnotes	23
Schematic and Discussion thereof	24

INTRODUCTION

Evidence from the fields of ancient history is critically examined in regard to its support or otherwise, of the unexamined postulate that Pre-Nicene Christianity existed. From the "*Literature Tradition*" we learn of the ancient authors of antiquity (1) who are to be coupled with their theoretically estimated historicity, and where possible to the ancient texts (2); the literature of these authors (or authors unknown), its philology, and its translations

The "*Field Traditions*" are composed of separate strands of archaeological and/or scientific research: (3) the ancient documents (the physical written sources, original texts, codices, papyri, papyri fragments); (4) architecture, buildings, monuments; (5) inscriptions in stone and metal and mosaic - the epigraphic habit; (6) sarcophagi, burial relics, funerary ornaments; (7) coins (gold, silver, bronze, other); (8) art, paintings and graffiti; (9) sculpture, relief's, frescoes, ornamental works; (10) archaeological relics and other citations. Other fields related to the interpretation and analyses of evidence include: (11) palaeographic assessment of original texts, papyri and papyri fragments; (12) radio carbon dating citations; (13) Collective and collaborative databases (e.g.: epigraphic, numismatic, papyri, etc.).

An elaborately and lavishly appointed new form of historiography is known to have been invented in the fourth century. It deviated from the more traditional forms of history writing in that its content was largely consistent of citations to purported earlier authors, and specifically, their texts and written literature. Like Moses in the bulrushes, it carefully wrapped and swaddled the independently canonical New Testament texts. So far, no one appears to know for sure exactly who the authors of the New Testament literature were, or indeed in which century the texts were first written. The dominant hypothesis is that they were written in the first or second centuries, and there appears to be an array of evidence to support this hypothesis.

EVIDENCE in SUPPORT

Inscriptions cited as evidence in support of the ecclesiastical literature tradition are de Rossi's Cornelius Stone (253), the Marcus son of Alexander inscription (250), the Marcus Aurelius Prosenes inscription (217), the Basilides Inscription in Ostia (250), the inscription of Aurelius Aristreas at Akmonein (3rd CE), the Erastus Inscription (mid first century), the Marcus Demetrianos Inscription (200), the Inscription of Abercius (215 CE), and the Inscription of Pectorius (253). In addition to these, a collection of more than forty Greek inscriptions from Phrygia are also cited. Finally there is the inscription to "Simon Magus".

Citations from the papyri taken as evidence for the existence of Christianity are as follows: PSI.XIV.1412 "via Sotas, the Christian" (205), P.Oxy 3035 Order to arrest "Christian". (256), P.Oxy. 907 (265), P.Oxy. 412 (265), P.Oxy. 405 Irenaeus (3rd C), P.Bas 17 (3rd C), P.Oxy. 2276 (3rd C), P.Oxy. 2404 (3rd C), P.Oxy 4365 - Book lending (3rd C), P.Oxy 43 Nightwatchmen's report (303), P.Oxy 2070 Scratch pad "Christian". (3rd C), P.Oxy 1786 Hymn with music "Christian". (3rd C), P.Oxy 210 A "Christian" fragment. (3rd C), P.Oxy 407 (3rd C). [1]

Constantine's building program of basilicas was the most expensive and lavish construction exercise in antiquity. Before this time, Pre-Nicene architectural citations are rare but extend to often include the "house-church" at Dura-Europa, and the new excavations at the Meggido prison. The Dura-Europa dig, sponsored by the School of Divinity at Yale almost 100 years ago, claimed they had found not a church, or yet a "church-house", but a "house-church" in the desert township. That there is anything "Christian" in this citation has not yet been challenged. The evidence presented in the report is not compelling. It also failed to mention that the emperor Julian had marched the entire Roman army through the town on his ill-fated Persian expedition in the fourth century.

Citations of sarcophagi, burial relics, funerary ornaments, are exceedingly rare, and variously source to the catacombs. The image of a philosopher teaching among his pupils; shepherd and flock is often depicted, and as such cannot be held to be unambiguously Christian. The catacombs of St. Callixtus are often cited here due to the vast tradition of the Vatican, and its restoration program by Pope Damasius some 40 years after the Council of Nicaea.

Citations to Pre-Nicene Christianity from art, paintings and graffiti are again very sparse. Here again, variable figures of Christ, are cited with and without a beard in the wall paintings of the house-church in Dura. But that's about it before the explosion of the emperor-centric renditions of Christ in the fourth century.

Citations to sculpture, relief's, frescoes and ornamental works would include Jonah Marbles (Cleveland Museum) believed to be sourced from Asia Minor, probably Phrygia (Central Turkey), 3rd century c. 270-280 and openly described as early Christian. Heaven knows why. The themes are from the Hebrew Bible.

Citations to archaeological relics and other citations are similarly rare. From the ecclesiastical tradition Bishop Irenaeus reports the existence of "small pottery objects c.250 CE stamped with portraits of Peter and Paul", but to date none of these have surfaced in digs.

On the other hand Pre-Nicene palaeographic assessment of original texts, papyri and papyri fragments abound. The Beatty papyri (p45 150-250 CE, p46 90-175 CE, p47 third century), the Bodmer papyri (p66: 150-200 CE, p72: 200's, p75: 175-200 CE) and the Rylands papyrus (from 130 CE). These citations essentially resolve to nineteenth or twentieth century handwriting analysis assessments by a number of specialists in the field.

Finally, there are two (and two only) extant radio carbon dating citations with respect to the bindings of new testament related codices – gThomas (Nag Hammadi, 350 CE); and gJudas (290 CE +/- 60 years).

THE POPYRI

We will now review this evidence [1] in a critical manner. With respect to the papyri one commentator [2] writes: "It is hard to be sure what phrases establish a Christian

author or Christian presence in the papyri, but on a tight definition there is next to nothing before 300 which is not related to the problem of persecution."

P.Oxy. 43 is a list authored by Oxyrhynchite watchmen on the verso of an account dated 295 C.E., recording streets and public buildings, including a **north church** (col. 1, line 10) and a **south church** (col. 3, line 19), with streets named after each. We may have had two churches 295 CE: but were they Christian?

Another, an amulet (P.Oxy. 407, 3rd/4th c.), quotes a phrase from LXX Ps 145:6, followed by a prayer for mercy and salvation "**through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.**" **Fourth century** Christian amulets were often written text, folded and carried about for protection. On the use of the Lord's Prayer in magic, with additional examples, see Leiv Amundsen, "Christian Papyri from the Oslo Collection. Similar, more popular use of Ps 91 (90 LXX), have thirty papyri examples.

P.Oxy. 1786 - A hymn to the Trinity with musical notation was found on the verso of a corn account dated in the first half of the third century, placing the hymn later in that century. Portions of the last five lines survive, written on a narrow strip of papyrus about two by twelve inches, with corresponding vocal notes above each line. What remains of the text calls upon "the light-giving stars to be silent and the rushing rivers to sing praises with all power to **Father, Son, and Holy Spirit**, Amen, Amen, and for dominion and praise to the giver of all good things, Amen, Amen". However, reference to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are not unambiguously Christian, for example, in the works of Philo.

P.Oxy 2070 from the late third century shows frequent alterations which have been made in the text, apparently by the original hand. That it is a Christian document is presumed from the name "Jesus" (line 10), written in the usual abbreviated fashion (**I—h—**). Portions of eighty-eight lines survive of this seriously deteriorated papyrus roll, though only some fifty lines contain one or more complete words, permitting almost nothing beyond its general character to be discerned. Even that is possible only because citations from two Psalms and Isaiah can be restored. However the presence of a reference to the abbreviated form of the name Jesus does not necessarily make the author of the papyri "Christian".

P.Oxy. 2276 dated from the end of the 3rd century is presumed Christian because it contains the phrase "**in the lord god**", at lines 29–30. However the phrase "in the lord god" is not unambiguously Christian.

P.Oxy. 3035 is an order from February 256 to arrest a certain "Petosorapis, son of Horus, **Chresian**". The citation "chrestian" (meaning 'good') is not the same as "Christian". The original Greek of the former uses an "eta" after the rho, whereas the latter uses an "iota" after the rho. P.Oxy. 3035 also looks to have omitted the 'tau' in "Christian" and as such this citation does not pertain to anything "Christian". This confusion also extends into the Latin as "chrestos" and "christos".

PSI XIV.1412 - An athlete, presumably a professional, sent money to his mother "via Sotas the Christian" (PSI XIV.1412, line 10, 2nd/3rd c.) **See above.**

P.Oxy 4365 is described as an early fourth century private letter at Oxyrynchus and was written in twenty-one words, in six lines, on the back of a piece of papyrus cut from a roll that contained a petition written in the late-third century. It reads simply as follows: *"To my dearest lady sister, greetings in the Lord. Lend the Ezra, since I lent you the little Genesis. Farewell in God from us."* For some commentators, P.Oxy 4365 must be taken as Christian because the expression "in the Lord" and "in God" exhibit **nomina sacra** thus conforming to a pattern established elsewhere. The phrases: "in the Lord" and "in God" clearly, need not have been articulated by a Christian mind.

P.Oxy 1493 dated from the 3rd or 4th century is also considered (by some) to be Christian based on the **nomina sacra** formula. But **nomina sacra** need not have been articulated by a Christian mind.

The negative point emergent in the papyri for is supported by Bagnall, B.A.S.P (1985), 105 who writes there are "very few examples before c.300 of the personal names which Christians in Egypt later preferred to adopt. From c.340 onwards, references to Christians, churches and Christian authorities multiply as do the numbers of favoured Christian names"

THE EPIGRAPHIC HABIT

Giovanni Battista de Rossi (1822-1894) was considered the greatest of the 19th century Roman archaeologists. As a loyal member of the Catholic Church, he was asked by Pope Pius IX to publish his works under the Vatican imprint. In 1857 the Vatican press printed his *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae*. The work contained 1126 inscriptions dating from the year AD 71 to 589. His most famous discovery was made in 1849. In a shed belonging to a vineyard, he found a stone with the partial inscription "~~~NELIUS MARTYR". This was conjectured to belong to one purported Martyr Pope Cornelius (251-253) who supposedly died in exile. A later edition of de Rossi's *Inscriptiones* contained a total of 1374 inscriptions. The first four were scrapped as forgeries. At that time, the oldest known Christian inscription in Rome was cited a memorial to Emperor Caracalla's chamberlain Prosenes, who died in 217.

The grave of Marcus Aurelius Prosenes was established by several of his own freed persons (*liberti*) and reveals an imperial service including several influential positions under Commodus. **Nothing in the original Prosenes inscription suggests Christian identity.** However, one freedman named Ampelius **later inscribed** on the stone the fact that Prosenes was "**welcomed before God**" (*receptus ad deum*) on March 3, 217. The phrase: "welcomed before God", and clearly the mind attached to that later hand, need not have been Christian.

An inscription from about 240-50 CE presumed to provide information about two Christians as members of the imperial household (CIL VI 8987 ' ICUR X 27126 ' Clarke 1971), has been interpreted as Christian because of the phrase "**I beg of you, kind brothers, by the one God**". (*fratres boni, per unum deum*). See Clarke (1971: 121-22) and other experts in Christian epigraphy (cf. Mazzoleni 1999:153-54).

However, the phrase: "I beg of you, kind brothers, by the one God", clearly, need not have been articulated by a Christian mind.

An inscription from Ostia often described as "*probably Christian*" is the grave of Basilides, who was an imperial slave serving as assistant to Sabinus, the imperial paymaster for the port, probably around 250 CE. (CIL XIV 1876) The inscription is categorised as Christian based on the phrase "**he sleeps**". The phrase: "he sleeps" clearly, need not have been articulated by a Christian mind.

A third century grave-inscription to an Aurelius Aristeas at Akmoneia is often cited. The inscription is categorized as Christian based on the warning against violation which says that if anyone violates the grave, "**they will have to reckon with the righteousness of God.**" This is a variation on the so-called "*Eumeneian formula*". The phrase: "they will have to reckon with the righteousness of God." clearly, need not have been articulated by a Christian mind, and neither is there anything unambiguously Christian in the Eumeneian formula.

Sometimes, the Erastus Inscription, from the mid first century is cited (Clarke 1993: 46-57). The inscription actually says something like "*...Erastus in return for his aedileship laid (the pavement) at his own expense*". The basis by which it is cited as Christian is because Paul mentions that an Erastus is a civic functionary of some type, an "oikonomos of the city" (Rom 16.23). This argument is a subterfuge for wishful thinking.

The Marcus Demetrianos inscription is often cited from Claudiopolis in Bithynia and the late 2nd-mid 3rd century. Marcus was an important civic magistrate and benefactor of the city and is presented as *certainly Christian* based on the phrase "**To the most holy ones who also had faith in God**". However, quite clearly the phrase: "To the most holy ones who also had faith in God" need not have been articulated by a Christian mind.

The queen of "Christian epigraphy", the inscription of Abercius dated 216 CE is not unambiguously Christian. The allegorical text of the inscription speaks of "**The Shepherd**" and not "The Christian". In 1894 G. Ficker, supported by O. Hirschfeld, strove to prove that Abercius was a priest of Cybele. In 1895 A. Harnack offered an explanation based upon religious syncretism. In 1896, Dieterich made Abercius a priest of Attis. It is considered moreover that "The Shepherd" associates with the "The Shepherd" and the "Teacher" referred to in the Nag Hammadi manuscripts. The figure of Thrice-great Hermes mentioned on a number of Nag Hammadi texts has often been associated with Apollonius of Tyana. For example "Hermes Trismegistus & Apollonius of Tyana in the Writings of Bahá'u'lláh" by Keven Brown (1997). Additionally, the abbreviated form of Apollonius is **Pol** and the Greek name Apollonius is written in the Codex Bezae.

Similarly the inscription of Pectorius cannot be considered as evidence of Pre-Nicene Christianity. The date of the Inscription of Pectorius is less certain than that of Abercius. Cardinal Pitra and De Rossi date it to the beginning of the second century; others, not later than the fourth. The text of the inscription mentions the importance of eating **fish** (perhaps as distinct from meat), but not the importance of Christianity.

Many commentators defer to Elsa Gibson's "The Christians for Christians Epitaphs of Phrygia". The author presents and discusses a list of 45 inscriptions. The first fifteen reveal common workmanship and the author admitted "more than half of the 'Christians for Christians' inscriptions look like they came from the same workshop". Many of these first 15 are described by the author as having the inscription "**Christians for Christians**", but none of them are dated. They all refer to the sixteenth inscription for their dating. The sixteenth inscription, at the Kutahya museum, is presented with the dating given as 304, but nothing about the inscription is Christian. Of the remaining 29 inscriptions, a further 17 are not dated, while a group of 8 inscriptions are dated by the author to the fourth century. This leaves four stones (22, 32, 36, 42) standing.

Stone 22 did not have a photograph, but is described as an altar fragment located in Altintas Town, in a mosque. It is described as the *sole dated "Christians for Christians" inscription*. The date is described as very faint and fragmentary. In fact, the date was so faint and fragmentary; it was not even noticed by its first cataloguer, Perrot. This leaves a trinity of Phrygian headstones to contend with as follows.

Stone 32 is described as a white marble funerary altar with projecting moulding. All visible parts complete; the bottom is set in cement. Dated to 296/7, it is located at Kizilcasogut; in a courtyard, supporting a wooden column. A poor quality photo was provided.

Stone 36 is described as a white marble door stone; bottom third broken away; large crack through center of stone from top of hole to top of stone. First seen at Usak, now in Izmir archaeological museum, it is dated to 278/9. Another poor quality photo was provided.

The stone 42 is described as "nine fragments of a white marble grave altar; some of these fragments join, so that five pieces can be said to be extant". Its location is described by the author as follows: "*At Uckuyu, "Three Wells", in a place called Bahceler Mevkii, "Region of Gardens", about 500 meters south of the village, on the road to Bekilli; in a wall of a garden belonging to Hasan Gurden, opposite the well called Galaklar Kuyusu*". Said to have been found at this spot before the second World War and to have been broken into pieces by the owner of the garden. It is dated to 242/3. There are eight plates of photographs of the fragments of this altar.

In addition to this information the author informs us of the following. Firstly, the "Christians for Christians" formula is subject to change throughout the distribution of citations presented. There are two main variants, of the original Greek, identified in the spelling of the word "christian" (XPIC- and XPHC-). The variant may be related to "the good" ("chrestus" in the Latin). Thus there is no single and unambiguous Greek wording, but multiple. It is also admitted that in some of the inscriptions (#2), the "Christians for Christians" is identified as ungrammatical.

Secondly, in the sample collection there are inscriptions which even superficially cannot be associated with "Christians", and do not have the "Christians for Christians formula" (#15,16,25,26,31,39), and yet there is an appearance of one workshop. The author described as non-christian (#25). One (#27) mentions "*the lover of the good*".

Thirdly, a far more serious issue is emergent from a number of these inscriptions, many possibly from the same workshop, because it is freely admitted that certain (#2 and #30) of the "Christians for Christians" phrases look to be ungrammatical, but that they have been added by a later hand. Is the case of Oded Golan relevant? For many centuries, especially since the Crusades, there have been Christian pilgrimages back to "The Holy Lands" in search of archaeological relics. Historically the first Christian pilgrim was Constantine's mother-in-law Eutropia, and the second was Helena, his mother, who found the one true cross, and the nails of the purported crucifixion event.

To conclude this review of Phrygian inscriptions it is worthwhile to recall that Eusebius reported that "In 324/5 the Phrygian settlement of Orcistus petitioned Constantine, referring to its totally christian population." Gregory of Nazianzus reported how his father, a great landowner, was converted to Christianity by an opportune dream in the year 325: he had a christian wife already and ended his days as the powerful bishop of the family's home town.

That a rich landholder was prompted in a dream to become Christian c.325 indicates that Constantine was making an impact on the publicity stakes. His military supremacy was well regarded. Town councils and rich "pagans" were trying to get in on the ground floor. There were stampeding supporters in that year, especially in Phrygia.

REVISION and ASSESSMENT

At this stage in the review of evidence we need to step back from everything that we are accustomed to. The evidence seems to be saying that Christianity did not unambiguously exist before the fourth century, and that the ambiguous puzzles and conundrums faced by scholars, academics and lay-people in search of the historical records of Pre-Nicene Christianity, are in fact the ambiguous puzzles and conundrums of a Constantinian inspired ecclesiastical pseudo-history.

To articulate the argument in another manner: we have two options. The first is that Constantine was converted to an extremely small and insignificant but extant religious cult, and sponsored existent members of that cult, to write a history of its beginnings during the period 312 to 324. This first option appears to be supported by palaeographic, or handwriting analyses, but by no other forms of evidence independent of its own literary tradition.

The second option is that Constantine invented his own religious cult, and patronised it heavily. Perhaps he thought the ancient religions were too soft and tolerant. He knew that the Persian army had marched to one monotheistic song for the last century since Ardashir created Zoroastrianism out of a few old hymns, and burnt the rest of the ancient Parthian writings. The implication to this option is that we are not likely to find any evidence at all whatsoever for the existence of Pre-Nicene Christianity for the simple reason that it did not exist before Nicaea. In the remainder of this article, we explore this alternative theory of ancient history.

INVENTION 312-324 CE

Christianity and Paganism were created at the same time. One did not exist until the other had been created. The new intolerant top-down emperor cult brooked no religious opposition from any source, and created the hegemony of the term “pagan” as “Christianity’s religious other”. If we are to permit the papyri and the inscriptions speak for themselves, the word "pagani" first appears in Christian inscriptions from early 4th century, and in the Law Codes in Codex Theodosius 16.2.18 (c.370), coined by Christians -- of the towns and cities.

Constantine, who considered himself the “thirteenth apostle”, and “the bishop of bishops”, invented a monotheistic religion in the fourth century. From his promotion in Britain (304-311 CE) he patiently consolidated his position and marshalled a supremely victorious army of provincial and barbarian troops. From his base in Rome (312-324), armed there with the technology of writing in the Greek and the Latin language, he patiently marshalled the production of army of fictions, which themselves would become supremely victorious in the realm of literature.

With a keen military mind, he mocked the contemporary models of literary integrity, authenticity and academic legitimacy by a variety of methods.

1) Constantine sponsored the wholesale forgery [3] of additional works in the names of genuine authors of antiquity, such as Pontius Pilate (c.-10), Lucian of Samosata (c.165), Julius Africanus (c.170), Origen (c.185), Mani the Prophet of Zoroastrianism (c.210) and particularly Porphyry (c.234), perhaps the leading academic of the Roman Empire at the turn of the fourth century. [4]

2) The original texts of other historians, writers and even Roman emperors were targeted for various degrees of interpolation, or the insertion of a phrase or a paragraph. These include the authors Flavius Josephus (c.37), Trajan (Marcus Nerva Traianus) (c.53), Tacitus (Cornelius) (c.56), Pliny the Younger (c.63), Suetonius (c.70), Marcus Aurelius (Antoninus) (c.121), and Galen (Claudius Galenus) (c.129).

3) Constantine sponsored the fabrication of legions of entirely fictitious authors and their inter-related texts too numerous to name other than in the footnotes. [4] By doing so, he fraudulently misrepresented the natural course of history by the fabrication of a pseudo-history that was to be associated with his new top-down-emperor-cult.

4) Before Nicaea, Constantine set unambiguous and political precedent. He arranged for the execution of leading priests at a number of ancient temples, and for the destruction of other shrines of worship. At Nicaea he burnt the written petitions of attendees whom he had supremely summoned – in their presence. After Nicaea he legislated for the destruction by fire of the writings of the Hellenic academic and philosopher Porphyry, for the destruction by fire of the writings of the Hellenic philosopher and logician Arius of Alexandria, and for the death by beheading of anyone caught concealing said writings.

One hundred years earlier the Persian King of Kings Ardashir had essentially done the same thing. He created the new nation of Iran with the army, and a new monotheism Zoroastrianism from a few old hymns, and he then burnt and destroyed all the ancient writings of the previously existent (Parthian) civilisation. Constantine was about to take the gold and the Greco- out of the Greco-Roman empire of the fourth century.

To the overall editorship of this massive fabrication he appointed his minister of religious and historical propaganda, the masterful rhetorician Eusebius Pamphilus of Caesarea, yet did Constantine retain an active and creative role. Eusebius describes his task as novel. He openly admits that he is the “first to enter upon the subject”, and “to attempt to traverse, as it were, a lonely and untrodden path”.

He described the religion as “new and strange”. Perhaps it is easier to contemplate the role of Eusebius as “yes boss” and “no boss”. Constantine’s career as a supreme imperial mafia thug commenced with the order to have the head of the ex-emperor Maxentius affixed to a pike and sent around the streets of Rome, and then to Africa as a stern warning: there was a new boss in Rome. What was really new? Only the nickname. This was *thick-necked* or *bull-necked*.

Extant Forged Authors

Here are the claims. Lucian of Samosata’s “Alexander the False Prophet” is a rhetorically charged polemic against a purported disciple of Apollonius of Tyana and was forged under instruction of Constantine. Lucian’s “The Life of Peregrin” and the writings and chronologies of Julius Africanus were “Christianised”. Origen who had written voluminous commentary about the Hebrew Bible, was forged with respect to all commentary about the new testament, which was yet to be written. The forgery of Origen resulted in separate controversies in the fourth century. Rufinus's Epilogue to "Pamphilus the Martyr's Apology for Origen", otherwise known as "the Book Concerning the Adulteration of the Works of Origen." depicts this. The Christian Rufinus needs to quote a letter of Origen himself, attesting to the fact that heretics had been tampering with his writings even when he was alive. Eusebius asserts that not only was Mani, the Prophet of Zoroastrianism under Shapur I, a “Christian”, but that there were Christian bishops and in the Persian capital. Aside from these assertions by Eusebius, all later commentary occurs after the Council of Nicaea, and the claim is that all Christian references (eg: Ephrem the Syrian, Epiphanius, Hilary of Poitiers, Cyril of Jerusalem, Augustine of Hippo, etc) to Mani are likewise fabricated.

Useful however to the early fourth century (and later) fabricators, were the current history of the persecution of Mani and his followers. Mani was martyred by the Persian religious establishment in 277 and 291 CE, persecution arose there with the murder of the apostle Sisin by Bahram II, and the slaughtering of many Manichaeans. In 296 CE, Diocletian decreed against the Manichaeans: "We order that their organizers and leaders be subject to the final penalties and condemned to the fire with their abominable scriptures.", resulting in numerous martyrs in Egypt and North Africa.” The fiction of “Christian persecutions” by Diocletian (and others) were based on historical truth being bent.

The forgery of additional works in the name of Porphyry (c.234), who was perhaps the leading academic of the Empire at the turn of the fourth century. [4], against the Christian religion, enabled Constantine to be justifiably enraged and to edict for the destruction of the writings of Porphyry (and incidentally, that “Porphyrian” Arius).

Extant Interpolated Authors

At least two dozen published authors in the field over the last two centuries have analysed its construction and context and have concluded and declared that the *Testimonium Flavianum* was added by a later hand. A number of these authors have accused Eusebius of the interpolation. Similarly, there have been an increasing number of writers concerned that the references to “Christians” and “Chrestus” in the writings of Tacitus, Trajan, Pliny the Younger and Suetonius are themselves interpolations by a later hand, and this is the claim of this thesis. The single reference for example in Marcus Aurelius (Med 11.3) is referred to by both translators Gregory Hays (2003) and Staniforth (1964) as an “ungrammatical marginal comment by a later reader”. Likewise, Galen’s references are also interpolated – in the fourth century or later.

MILITARY SUPREMACY 324 CE

Constantine’s military victory and supremacy in 324 opened up the eastern empire. The eastern lands were ancient in lore and steeped in tradition. Great libraries housed the literature of perhaps millennia. Collegiate academics were still well regarded, as were the priests and custodians of many rich and ancient temples, such as those of Asclepius. It was to these groups that the common people of the empire turned for fourth century medical advice, and for legal representation in matters relating to the empire, more often than not related to taxation.

Architecture is often seen as a tool of propaganda. It is also apparent that its nemesis, the destruction of architecture, also serves as a tool of propaganda when wielded by military supremacists in lands and territories over which they have control. The largest obelisk in the temple complex of Karnack in lower Egypt stood for over eighteen centuries. As a landmark of ancient continuity, its shadow marked out the celestial and diurnal passage of many generations. To slaves, pharaohs or Roman invaders it had always been a landmark in the ancient landscape. To our modern concepts of impermanence, eighteen centuries is a long time. In 55 BCE two of its smaller surrounding obelisks were felled, to commemorate the beginning of the Roman military domination of the Mediterranean world. They were taken back to Rome as trophies. The major obelisk of Karnack waited for the axe of Constantine.

Ammianus Marcellinus tells us that Constantine “made no account” of the antiquity of the structure, and pulled it from its foundations, with the plan to take it back to Rome, or would it have been diverted to Constantinople, we may never know. Constantine destroyed the ancient traditions. And he created new traditions to replace the old. He was a warlord and had the supreme and absolute power over life and death in his empire. He attempted to emulate the Persian King Ardashir’s creation of the Iranian monotheism, with a total restructure of the religion and the written records.

As the eighteen century standing Obelisk of Karnack came slowly and ominously crashing down, the eastern locals scattered ahead of Constantine's power. But he and his keen military mind were methodical and single-purposed, like the shepherds'. His "barbarian" agents compiled intelligence lists of the larger landowners, the influential levels of civilian administration, and the levels of the Hellenic priesthood in and around the major eastern cities.

FRAUD and PERSECUTION at ANTIOCH 325 CE

His first roundup was at Antioch in April 325, where he personally touted the benefits of his new religion to an assembly of traditional, but non-Christian leaders of the city and its environs. Perhaps the assembly consisted of the last in the line of custodians of a number of ancient traditions of administrative, religious, academic, and even military scope. Not one of these contemporary ancient authorities or their sources were tolerated by Constantine or his new policies.

Constantine's Oration to the Assembly at Antioch was an oration to a literally captive audience. The attendees had been privately "interviewed and screened" by Constantine's chief agent Osius, who presided over the "council". They were in no position to talk back. The dialogue was one way. The Boss was about to speak for the first time to the wise and ancient lineages of the eastern empire. The new and strange message of Christianity was about to be a real time broadcast. But what in fact did the Boss himself say at this "Assembly"?

Constantine declared that "Socrates' critical questioning ... was a menace to the state" He declared that "Pythagoras had stolen his teaching from Egypt". He declared that "Plato believed there were many gods ... and strived for the unknowable." He declared that poets "wrote falsely about the gods" and were worse than philosophers. Fox [2] writes "'In a few broad sweeps, Constantine had damned the free use of reason and banished poetic imagination."

Constantine declared that a dove, such as that which had served Noah, had alighted upon the Virgin Mary. He then declared that an ancient Sibyl, a priestess from Erythrae who had served Apollo at the 'serpents Tripod' at Delphi had prophesied the birth of Jesus in the first century BCE. Constantine then quotes (in the Greek) thirty-four hexameters, from the inspired truth of the Sibyl. And most notably, the acrostic formed by the first Greek letter of each line spelt "Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour, Cross." But the clever and inventive military mind of Constantine had already in advance completely out-manoeuvred the arguments of academic sceptical enquiry:

*"They suspect that "someone of our religion,
not without the gifts of the prophetic muse,
had inserted false lines and
forged the Sibyl's moral tone.
These sceptics were already
known to Origen"*

*"Our people have compared
the chronologies with great accuracy",*

*and the "age" of the Sibyl's verses
excludes the view that they are
a post-Christian fake."*

Here "The Boss" essentially shoots himself in the foot. He explicitly defines the recently appeared genre of Christian literature. "We may be suspected of clever forgery" said the Boss to his new troops, civilians, saints and prospective tax payers, but our best intelligence people assure us that these things definitely are not fake." Does this sort of propaganda sound familiar?

However, the Boss is really smart and has his proof that there were in fact ancient authors in the antiquity of the fourth century, who had known of the Sibyl's poem. He declared that Cicero (106-43 BCE) had chanced upon this poem and translated it to Latin and that the advent of Christ had also been predicted by Virgil (70-19 BCE) in a Latin poem, written c.40 BCE, to the poet's patron Pollio. Constantine quotes the Latin poem in Greek to the oration.

The Boss is on record, in his Oration to the Saints, for outright fraudulent misrepresentation of the patristic literature. Antioch is simply the microcosm of the macrocosm. Many commentators also highlight the fact that one sentence of the Oration trod unwarily on Arius' ground. The ground of Arius needs to be perceived in a new ancient historical light.

After Antioch, Constantine made arrangements for the execution of leading non-Christian priests, and for the destruction of number of Hellenic temples, particularly those of Asclepius and the Pythagorean and Platonic lineage. It is now known that one of these temples had received a generous inscription, perhaps in the very late third century under Diocletian, of an epigram to Apollonius of Tyana. The writings of the first century author, sage and philosopher Apollonius of Tyana, and those of his first and third century biographers Damis and Philostratus, were in no uncertain means targeted for polemic and calumny by Eusebius in many books. Constantine wanted changes made, and brooked no opposition.

NICAEA and the "WALL OF SWORDS" 325 CE

These events were a prelude to his military supremacy council, lasting from June to September at Nicaea 325. His letter summoning attendees to this council is preserved, and although he mentions bishops of the west, he does not mention bishops of the east. The letter commences with the address: *"That there is nothing more honourable in my sight than the fear of God, I believe is manifest to every man"*. Quite notably the same phrase *"the fear of god"* is placed into a specific context in his letter [6] distributed immediately after this "council" of Nicaea where he writes as *"Constantine the King to the Bishops and nations everywhere."*

The entrance to Constantine's "council" is described by Eusebius: "units of the bodyguard and other troops surrounded the palace with drawn swords, and through them the men of God proceeded without fear into the innermost rooms of the Emperor, in which some were companions at table, while others reclined on couches

either side." It was "like a dream", Eusebius said, an anticipatory picture of the kingdom of Christ.

According to some later historians the council of Nicaea had been called by Constantine on account of the words of Arius. The Arian controversy arose in opposition to the fraudulent historical claims of Christianity. The source of the Arian controversy were the plain and simple words of one man. Arius of Alexandria, was renown for his wisdom, and his cleverness in logic and disputation. These plain and simple words of Arius are not necessarily theological, and may be viewed as historical commentary in opposition to the rise of Constantine's new god. This perspective is (sketched below in brackets).

There was time when He was not. (He did not exist before Constantine);
Before He was born He was not. (He is a fabrication.);
He was made out of nothing existing. (He is a fiction.);
He is/was from another subsistence/substance (He is fictitious.);
He is subject to alteration or change. (His fictions are alterable).

Based on his intelligence, Constantine had personally summoned key attendees selected from the newly subjugated eastern empire, to Nicaea. During the council Constantine burnt the written petitions of attendees in their presence. At some point in the proceedings, his chief agent Osius first announced what is now known as the Nicene Creed and signed it. As a legal document, it is better described as an Oath. The Oath was taken around to each attendee by Constantine's legal notaries, led by Philumenus, the "master of offices". The attendees had essentially two choices. Either agree with Arius, or agree with "the boss". What were they to do? In any event, the signatures of all attendees were thus given under military duress.

The Oath of the attendees of the Nicene Council was binding them to supreme imperial power, and this structure was personally appointed by Constantine. The Oath contained not only the disclaimer clause consistent of the words of Arius, but also an appended list of twenty-two administrative formalities to be associated with the new Roman church hierarchy. These attendees may not have heard of Christianity before Nicaea, but if they signed in support of Constantine, they would leave alive and unharmed, and they would be rich and influential people overnight. The new structure had many attractive benefits, not the least of which was zero tax status. It was this Nicene power structure that perpetuated itself beyond Constantine, Constantius and Julian.

It must be noted that the ecclesiastical writers of the fourth century referred to the "Nicene fathers" as "the fathers of the church". It was not until Cyril of Alexandria set the precedent of the "Seal of the Fathers" in the fifth century, that the "fathers of the church" began to be seen as "Pre-Nicene authors" of antiquity.

At the conclusion of Nicaea Constantine issued a letter [6] which makes clear the meaning of the phrase "*the fear of God*" as Constantine wished to use it. Constantine refers specifically to "*the enemies of the fear of God*", and these he names as Porphyry and Arius. This edict represents the commencement of the sure destruction of the writings of the Hellenic civilisation. By legislating for the destruction of the writings of its leading academics, such as Porphyry, and that "Porphyrian" Arius,

Constantine started the ball rolling. In the year following this Constantine ordered the execution of his son and his wife, and a number of related innocents.

PUBLICATIONS and PERSECUTIONS of 331 CE

By c.331 CE, the consecration of the new city of Constantine, Constantinople, was marked with a number of events. Firstly Constantine ordered and received from Eusebius fifty Christian Bibles, the first time found, known or mentioned, that the New Testament literature is formally bound together with the Hebrew Bible. Those who regard the historicity of the Constantine Bible as sure need to explain to why it is, with such a prolific set of Pre-Nicene Christian writers, not one of them is recorded to have bound together the Hebrew Texts with their own version of the New Testament writings. Consider that each of these purported authors had to have had their possibly unique New Testament writings preserved to the time of Eusebius, and that they themselves may have preserved and transmitted the Greek texts of the Hebrew bible. Yet we find no codex and no mention of an earlier codex by these purported Pre-Nicene authors, which bound together the new and the old, before the time of the despot Constantine.

At that time Constantine had Arius poisoned and the non-Christian Hellenic priest Sopater executed in Constantinople. Constantine may have once been regarded as “good” in his first ten years of obscurity in the West, but his wielding of absolute military, civilian and religious power had its price. For the decade following (315-325) he was regarded as “a brigand”, and for the remaining decade of his rule (326-337) “on account of his unrestrained prodigality, a ward irresponsible for his own actions” (T.M Banchich). Another translation (H.A. Drake) of Victor gives, for the last decade, “a little boy because of his unrestrained generosity”.

It is generally conjectured by many in the field, that the three remaining great codices of the New Testament literature are descendent from these Constantine Bibles. We may quite reasonably presume that the New Testament canon for the Constantine Bible was assembled in the Greek by Eusebius, in his non-de-plume of Origen, and that Origen’s original Greek writings of the Hebrew Bible were employed in the fabrication.

The “CHRISTIANISATION: of LITERATURE (mid 4th CE)

By the time of Constantine’s death the signatories to the Nicene Oath had seen plenty of business. A new empire wide church structure was in place. It was dynamic, and greedy for an absolute power that it wielded by supreme imperial decree. Land tax by 350 CE had tripled within living memory. Ammianus describes the state of the nation for the period of Constantius’ rule when he writes “**the highways were covered with galloping bishops**”. His obituary to Constantius, and to Julian tell the story of the times from his perspective. His missing books (1-13) containing the history of the empire from the late first century to the mid fourth century, and thus the obituary to Constantine, would make an interesting read should fragments one day reappear.

The fragments that are turning up are particularly intriguing. In 350, at Nag Hammadi, in Upper Egypt, fifty-seven "spurious gospels" were being preserved in the Coptic language. A group of Christian scribes appear to have had such a mass of texts from the pagan's spiritual master, "The Thrice-Great Hermes", that a scribe hesitated before sending any more. Lactantius and P.Oxy. 1025; 1026 from the 3rd century also refer to 'Thrice-great Hermes, our father's god, who always stands besides you'. Fox points out that "the collection is not a single library, not uniformly heretical, nor even entirely Christian. "It includes a poor trans of Plato's republic, and a pagan letter of "Eugnostos the Blessed" the letter was then given a Christian preface and a conclusion and represented in another copy as the "wisdom" which Jesus revealed to his Apostles after his death." [2]

The fourth century process of "Christianisation" of literature was a process of fabrication. Arnaldo Momigliano comments "The rule, that it was very easy to transform a pagan handbook into a Christian one, but almost impossible to make pagan what had been Christian, however, stands: it is enough to indicate the trend of the century — and, incidentally, to explain why the Christians were so easily victorious." [7]

JULIAN's ARRAIGNMENT: FICTION and FRAUD 362 CE

The emperor Julian wrote at a very unique time of ancient political history. It was time immediately after a successive almost 40 year term (from Nicaea, 50 years from Rome) in which a new and strange Christianity as defined by Constantine had received imperial favour. It is worthwhile noting we have no other writings of ancient historians from this period, other than "Ecclesiastical historians" and Julian's was the first voice in a position to be able to speak about "Christianity" in any form of independent fashion. The words of an emperor carried more weight, that your average author, for a certain length of time, and particularly such a scholarly author.

Julian writes that Constantine could not discover among the gods the model of his own career, but had found Jesus out of a life of pleasure and incontinence. Into the mouth of Jesus, Julian puts these words: *"He that is a seducer, he that is a murderer, he that is sacrilegious and infamous, let him approach without fear! For with this water will I wash him and will straightway make him clean. And though he should be guilty of those same sins a second time, let him but smite his breast and beat his head and I will make him clean again."* [8]

In addition to this, and other works and letters which survive, "Julian composed three books against the holy gospels and against the very pure Christian religion" which do not survive. Rest assured they would have made good reading. On good authority we might say that the original three books of Julian's contained the following opening address, followed by a formal legal disclaimer about alteration of his words:

*"It is, I think, expedient to set forth to all mankind
the reasons by which I was convinced
that the fabrication of the Galilaeans is a fiction of men
composed by wickedness."*

*Though it has in it nothing divine,
by making full use of that part of the soul
which loves fable and is childish and foolish,
it has induced men to believe that
the monstrous tale is truth.”*

There is a rather remarkable integrity then, between the first independent written academic and political assessment of Christianity – that it was “***a fiction of men composed by wickedness***” – and the thesis that Constantine invented the New Testament literature and Christianity.

Julian’s charges directly relate to the fraudulent misrepresentation of ancient history. Constantine had fabricated the new testament, and forcefully implemented, assisted by his rightful role as Pontifex Maximus, the new religious order of a new and “chrestus” (Χρηστός in the Greek; “good”) god.

However, Julian did not last long. The Nicene Oath was rich and prosperous, and had the imperially granted power to remain that way. Christianity was by then too new and too dominant to be bothered about technical details, or to be tolerant of academic opinion. Even in his brief rule, Jovian ordered the burning of the Library of Antioch , the death penalty for all those that worship their ancestral gods or practice divination, the confiscation of all properties of the pagan temples, and the death penalty for participation in pagan rituals, even private ones [9].

CHRISTIAN SUPREMACY and the role of *PONTIFEX MAXIMUS* 365 CE

The role of Pontifex Maximus had been held for well over a thousand years by the ruler of Rome. It had represented a religious tolerance even when Julius Caesar had bribed his way to this position in the first century BCE. The position was chief of all pontiffs of all the religions in Rome, which were many. Constantine had naturally assumed the role, and had used it to his best advantage. However with effect from c.365 and Pope Damasius, who had been active in restoring the catacombs of Rome, including those of St. Callixtus, the role was occupied by a Christian bishop.

The persecution and intolerance directed against non-Christians was invented by Constantine and perpetuated by Constantius before a brief and momentary reprieve under Julian. The Christian emperors Valentinian, Valens and Theodosius increase the levels of persecution and intolerance of non-Christians and the destruction of the ancient ways and traditions. In this period alone, one recent study [9] cites no less than 20 instances of such imperial edicts. The burning and destruction of the patristic literature by this newly emergent and imperially inspired religion occurred for a number of reasons yet to be completely researched. English translations of Book 16 of Codex Theodosius are not as ubiquitous as they should perhaps be.

The Fly in the Anointment - Early 5th Century

There was at the close of the fourth century only one fly in the recently invented and supremely ensconced new state anointment of the Roman Empire. It had what might be called a small problem of credibility and authenticity with respect to a remnant of “unconverted” (mainly) Greek academics in that it was considered (quite appropriately) a “fiction” by the extant writings of the emperor Julian.

Logically it was decided to censor Julian’s writings by the writing of a comprehensive refutation, and then burning the original three books of Julian. The refutations of Theodorus of Mopsuestia and Philip Sideta have been lost. An earlier invective against Julian’s writings, written Gregory Nazianzen, contained no formal refutation of Julian's arguments. The job was a nasty one. It called for the right man.

Political CENSORSHIP of the Charge of FRAUD

Cyril also wrote at another unique time of political history. It was a time when Christianity had recently obtained political supremacy as the state religion, and all non-Christians were being persecuted and suppressed. The laws enacted against the persecuted Greco-Roman people were atrocious. The library of Alexandria had been burnt down (although Sagan theorises Cyril himself torched it) and a savage Christian mob of black-robed terrorists known to do the bidding of the Bishop Cyril, had brutally murdered the respected mathematician and philosopher Hypatia.

The tax exempt Bishop Cyril was a political censor and a hit man. He fraudulently covered up the fact that Julian’s invectives were based on the common knowledge of the epoch - that Constantine and “the wretched Eusebius” had fabricated the new Roman religion, to which the Nicene Oath had been pledged under duress, by the first eastern Christian bishops, personally appointed by Constantine. He wrote a ten or thirty book refutation of the contents of the three books of Julian, and it is only this refutation by Cyril which has survived. Neumann extracted and strung together Cyril's quotations of Julian based on Spanheim's (1696) edition of Cyril's polemic *Pro Christiana Religione* to reconstruct what Cyril would have Julian say.

Cyril wrote that Julian had damaged the prestige of the Empire by refusing to recognize Christ, as the dispenser of royalty and power [10]. Cyril acknowledges that Julian composed three books against the holy gospels and against the very pure Christian religion, and that he used them to shake many spirits and to cause them uncommon wrongs. Cyril claimed that Julian spread every kind of calumny against Christ, and pours against him ill-sounding remarks. People relied on the works of Julian, said Cyril, to attack us, which they proclaim to be of an incomparable effectiveness, by adding that there never was a learned man on our side able to refute them, or even show them at fault.

Cyril then states that the reason that he will reproduce Julian’s text word for word, and will oppose his own arguments to Julian’s lies in the appropriate order, was that because Cyril realized that it was necessary to firmly neutralize them. [The “lies” of Julian]. However although Cyril states that he will reproduce Julian’s text word for word, in the next breath, he selects an alternative modus operandi, and groups Julian’s work by categories. Cyril writes that it was well known Julian did not cease turning

and turning over the same arguments in every direction; some developments which are found at the beginning of his work, he also advances in the body of the book and at the end.

It is the opinion of the author that Cyril was faced with three books by Julian which continuously reiterated the invention of the Christian religion by Constantine. The resolution of Julian's ceaseless turning over of arguments resolve not to a baseless invective, but an honest and justifiable conviction related to the political history of fourth century events, and the use of fraudulent misrepresentation.

In order to ameliorate and censor these constant assertions of fiction and fraud, Cyril claimed that Julian had revealed "a kind of disorder in the articulation of his discussion", and, fatally, those who wanted to argue against him seemed constantly to be repeating themselves instead of finishing them once and for all. Therefore, Cyril selected to create appropriate divisions and classification, and he gathered Julian's ideas by categories and faced each one of these categories not on several occasions, **but only once**. Cyril then goes on to write, thus, at the beginning of his book against us, Julian says: "*It is, I think, expedient to set forth to all mankind the reasons by which I was convinced that the fabrication of the Galilaeans is a fiction of men composed by wickedness.*"

The translator Wilmer Cave Wright (1925) noted that Cyril says that he omitted invectives against Christ and such matter as might contaminate the minds of Christians. Such matters, it is argued in this thesis, would have included Julian's conviction that Christianity was a Constantinian inspired invention. Wright also notes that a mutilation of Julian's extant letters also occurred. Julian was censored according to this thesis for his written convictions about the fabrication of the New Testament by Constantine.

Cyril had no option but to quote Julian's opening arraignment, seeing the writings were at one stage extant. The question is how does Cyril respond to Julian's conviction of fiction? Cyril avoids the question. He plays the dissembling dumb card.

Cyril refutes the charge of fiction and fraud levelled by the academic emperor Julian with an opening disclaimer "By 'Galilaeans', he means the Holy Apostles, **I think**," says Cyril, "and by a 'fantastic account' the writings of Moses, the predictions of the holy saints and their declarations inspired by God."

Cyril states that Julian thinks and affirms that Christianity is not worth anything, that this is pure drivel in Julian, and that Julian just amuses himself to attack Christianity alone! Yet Cyril then says that "it can't be doubted for one moment that the direction of the expressions employed by Julian agrees with the nonsense of the Greeks." ... "If there is a plot, it is a plot of the Greeks: It is they who gathered ... this hateful 'fiction', which set up this 'deception', like some trap aimed at simple souls."

In summary, Cyril's refutation is initially very vague about whether Julian is writing about the Holy Apostles and offers a line-up of different 'Galilaeans'. One point is evident. The refutation of Julian's charges of fraud and fiction omits all reference to and mention of the literature of the New Testament; the writings of the Apostles.

Cyril concludes “[The Greeks] have in effect mislaid the whole earth by pretending that the sky and the elements in general were God”, quoting Paul as an authority. It was all over.

The Emperor Julian in a very strict legal sense had written an arraignment of the invention of Christianity by Constantine and “the wretched Eusebius,” and the charge brought to bear was the ‘fraudulent misrepresentation of history’. Cyril neither addressed nor refuted the charge, and although he **thinks** that the charge may have related to the Holy Apostles and/or the Hebrew sages, he does not once mention the New Testament writings of these Holy Apostles, of which Constantine declared himself the thirteenth.

Cyril wrote as a censor of Julian’s charges of the fraudulent misrepresentation of history by Constantine. There was indeed a time, before Constantine, when the new god of Constantine was not.

The Arian controversy, named after the words of Arius, was well and truly over. The opposition had been suppressed in the fields of the empire and its cities, and in the fields of literature.

The history of the invention of the new and strange Roman god by Constantine had been censored and the censorship had been securely sealed. The term “The Seal of the Fathers” is a term that belongs to the tax-exempt Bishop Cyril. Before Cyril, the Christian authors writing during the fourth century referred to the “Nicene Fathers” as the fathers of the church. The “Nicene Fathers” were the attendees summoned into the presence of Constantine and coerced to sign an Oath against Arius of allegiance to “The Bishop of Bishops”. It was Cyril who set the precedent of referring to the fathers of the church as the “Pre-Nicene Fathers” – the purported authors of antiquity whom Eusebius meets on his journey down that lonely and untrodden pseudo-history, *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

This review concludes with a number of quotes by ancient and modern historians:

THE ANCIENT HISTORIANS

Robert Lane Fox [2] writes (1988): "Constantine's conversion had changed Eusebius' own perspective. He had moved from a vivid sense of the immanent End to a new sense that history was happening quickly and that a Christian needed to write and explain why his Church was now where it was. "Details of Constantine's conversion were said to derive from Constantine himself, who had described them "ON OATH" in the hearing of Eusebius. However much we might suspect [Eusebius'] own fiction, "this authority is too boldly emphasised to be the Bishop's deceit."

Michael Grant (Ancient Historians, 1970) writes: "Trances and visions and hallucinations were a feature of the age. Perhaps Constantine had seen a rare cross-like natural phenomenon, produced by the sun. At any rate, whatever the explanation, Constantine was able to convince himself that he had been granted a supernatural experience."

Arnaldo Momigliano (c.1959) writes: "On 28 October 312 the Christians suddenly and unexpectedly found themselves victorious. The victory was **a miracle** — though opinions differed as to the nature of the sign vouchsafed to Constantine. The winners became conscious of their victory in a mood of resentment and vengeance. A voice shrill with implacable hatred announced to the world the victory of the Milvian Bridge" .” and then, in the same article, a few paragraphs later .. “The revolution of the fourth century, carrying with it a new historiography will not be understood if we underrate the determination, almost the fierceness, with which the Christians appreciated and exploited **the miracle** that had transformed Constantine into a supporter, a protector, and later a legislator of the Christian church” [7]

Professor Norman Baynes (1952) describes Constantine's conversion as “An erratic block which has diverted the stream of human history”.

Lord Acton (c.1900) writes: “And remember, where you have a concentration of power in a few hands, all too frequently men with the mentality of gangsters get control. History has proven that. All power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely.”

Smedley Butler (1935) who would have immediately understood the cunning military mind of Constantine, and its modus operandi, writes “War is a racket. It always has been. It is possibly the oldest, easily the most profitable, surely the most vicious. It is the only one international in scope. It is the only one in which the profits are reckoned in dollars and the losses in lives. A racket is best described, I believe, as something that is not what it seems to the majority of the people. Only a small "inside" group knows what it is about. It is conducted for the benefit of the very few, at the expense of the very many. Out of war a few people make huge fortunes”. [11]

Ammianus Marcellinus (c.395 CE) writes: “The theologians maintain that there are associated with all men at their birth, but without interference with the established course of destiny, certain divinities of that sort, as directors of their conduct; but they have been seen by only a very few, whom their manifold merits have raised to eminence. And this oracles and writers of distinction have shown; among the latter is also the comic poet Menander, in whom we read these two searii: *"A daemon is assigned to every man at birth, to be the leader of his life"*. Likewise from the immortal poems of Homer we are given to understand that it was not the gods of heaven that spoke with brave men, and stood by them or aided them as they fought, but that guardian spirits attended them; and through reliance upon their special support, it is said, that Pythagoras, Socrates, and Numa Pompilius became famous; also the earlier Scipio, and (as some believe) Marius and Octavianus, who first had the title of Augustus conferred upon him, and Hermes Trismegistus, Apollonius of Tyana, and Plotinus, who ventured to discourse on this mystic theme, and to present a profound discussion on the question by what elements these spirits are linked with men's souls, and taking them to their bosoms, as it were, protect them (as long as possible) and give them higher instruction, if they perceive that they are pure and kept from the pollution of sin through association with an immaculate body.” [12]

C.P. Jones' (1980) translation of an inscription, now in the New Museum of Adana, an epigram to Apollonius of Tyana [12]: *'This man, named after Apollo, and shining forth Tyana, extinguished the faults of men. The tomb in Tyana (received) his body, but in truth heaven received him so that he might drive out the pains of men (or: drive pains from among men) .'*

CONCLUSION

In conclusion of this review I present a brief schematic representation [Fig.1] of the theory space of antiquity associated with the history of the invention of Christianity by the emperor Constantine, its identification as a fabrication and fiction by the emperor Julian, and the censorship demonstrated in the refutation of Julian's arraignment ("Lies") by the tax exempt Bishop Cyril.

The thesis that Constantine invented his own religion is eminently falsifiable, and can be refuted either in whole or in part with the provision of appropriate unambiguous evidence from the fields of archaeology and/or science. I have attempted to gather together and exhaustively review all this available evidence in this article, but as most researchers will acknowledge, information is still forthcoming from the field.

With this further research into the ancient history of antiquity in mind, I would like to sincerely thank those whose research I have used in this article.

PRF BROWN
Student of Ancient History

Footnotes:

[1] The Journal of Biblical Literature 123/1 (2004), p.5-55, The Oxyrhynchus New Testament Papyri "Not without honour except in their Hometown?" E.J. Epp; also Philip A. Harland's "Connections with Elites in the World of the Early Christians," York University, Toronto.

[2] Robin Lane Fox: Pagans and Christians, in the Mediterranean World from the second century AD to the conversion of Constantine", 1998

[3] Examples of forgery cited in antiquity include Josephus: "Alexander protested that this letter was forged by Diophantus, the king's secretary, a man without scruples and very clever at imitating any hand" ..[later we learn he was].. "executed for forgery" (JW, 4). Suetonius writes that "the emperor Titus could compose speeches and verses in Greek or Latin with equal ease, and actually extemporised them on occasion. ... It often amused him to compete with his secretaries at shorthand writing, or so I have heard; and he claimed that he could imitate any handwriting in existence and might have been the most celebrated forger of all time.". (Titus 3).

[4] Eunapius (re: Porphyry) - *"At any rate he left behind him many speculations that conflict with the books that he had previously published; with regard to which we can only suppose that he changed his opinions as he grew older."*

[5] Celsus (c.178), Jesus of Nazareth (0) the author according to Eusebius of a letter in the Syriac language to the King of Edessa, Jude (0), Matthew (0), Barnabas (0), Simon Magus (0), Judas (0), Mark (0), Luke (0), John (0), Peter (0), Clement of Rome (18), Paul (20), Ignatius of Antioch (40), Aristides the Philosopher (70), Quadratus (70), Carpocrates of Alexandria (80), Aquila of Sinope (of Pontus) (90), Hegesippus (110), Marcion of Sinope (110), Polycarp (110), Papias (110), Valentinus (120), Apollinaris Claudius (120), Basilides (120), Diognetus (130), Epiphanes (130), Aristo of Pella (130), Marcion (130), Mathetes (130), Pinytus of Crete (130), Polycrates of Ephesus (130), Tatian (135), Apollonius (136), Ptolemy (140), Minucius Felix (140), Isidore (140), Agrippa Castor (140), Alexander (of Cappadocia,Jerusalem) (150), Excerpts of Theodotus (150), Heracleon (150), Justin Martyr (150), Ammonius Saccas II (155), Julius Cassianus (160), Apelles (160), Octavius of Minucius Felix (160), Dionysius of Corinth (165), Melito of Sardis (165), Irenaeus of Lyons (175), Athenagoras of Athens (175), Rhodon (175), Theophilus of Caesarea (175), Theophilus of Antioch (180), Bardesanes (180), Hippolytus of Rome (180), Clement of Alexandria (182), Maximus of Jerusalem (185), Victor I (189), Pantaenus (190), Anonymous Anti-Montanist (193), Tertullian (197), Serapion of Antioch (200), Paul of Samosata (200), Apollonius (200), Caius (200), Cyprian of Carthage (200), Cornelius (of Rome) (200), Dionysius (of Alexandria) the Great (200), Novatian (201), Hermias (210), Dionysius of Rome (210), Gregory Thaumaturgus (212), Malchion (of Antioch) (220), Anatolius of Laodicea in Syria (222), Victorinus (bishop) of Petau (240), Peter of Alexandria (250), Phileas (Bishop) of Thmuis (250), Pamphilus (250), Methodius (250), Miltiades (270).

[6] Letter of Constantine following Council: Constantine the King to the Bishops and nations everywhere. Inasmuch as Arius imitates the evil and the wicked, it is right that, like them, he should be rebuked and rejected. As therefore Porphyry, who was an enemy of **the fear of God**, and wrote wicked and unlawful writings against the religion of Christians, found the reward which befitted him, that he might be a reproach to all generations after, because he fully and insatiably used base fame; so that on this account his writings were righteously destroyed; thus also now it seems good that Arius and the holders of his opinion should all be called Porphyrians, that he may be named by the name of those whose evil ways he imitates: And not only this, but also that all the writings of Arius, wherever they be found, shall be delivered to be burned with fire, in order that not only his wicked and evil doctrine may be destroyed, but also that the memory of himself and of his doctrine may be blotted out, that there may not by any means remain to him remembrance in the world. Now this also I ordain, that if any one shall be found secreting any writing composed by Arius, and shall not forthwith deliver up and burn it with fire, his punishment shall be death; for as soon as he is caught in this he shall suffer capital punishment by beheading without delay." -- Socrates Scholasticus' Ecclesiastical History 1:9. A translation of a Syriac translation of this, written in 501, is in B. H. Cowper's, Syriac Miscellanies, Extracts From The Syriac Ms. No. 14528 In The British Museum, Lond. 1861, p. 6-7)

