

## THE MODEL OF HOLY SOVEREIGN IN ENCOMIA OF EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA

MAKSIM PRIKHODKO

Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University  
prihodkomaxim@yandex.ru

---

**ABSTRACT.** The article examines the hagiographic model of a Holy Emperor, formed by Eusebius of Caesarea in his later encomiastic speeches “In Praise of Constantine”, “On Christ’s Sepulchre”, and in the laudatory biographical work “Life of Constantine”. In contrast with the literal, rhetorical and political interpretation of Eusebius’ concept of Holy Emperor, the author takes a new approach to the symbolism of the figure of Emperor Constantine. The article’s task is to reveal and trace the image of Constantine as a working “symbolical mechanism”, associating profound religious and philosophical concepts, such as the relationship between eternity and history. The investigation highlights the originality of Eusebius’ symbolical thinking, which, in contrast to the ancient traditions and customs, provides the Christian-philosophical view of the problem related to preserving the examples of holiness in the memory of descendants. It is this that consists of the tasks of hagiography. The proposed model of a Holy Emperor is based on two main components: the ruler as a *sacred image*, and the ruler as a subject of *sacred history*. Eusebius finds the sacred image in the very soul of Emperor Constantine, which reflects the eternal ideas and is likened to the Word of God. In the light of the sacred history, the Basileus acts as an “interpreter” of the Word of God, revealing it in his politics, the understanding of divine providence and his place in it. The Christian emperor opens the logos-like principle in people through his deeds, transferring it from the intelligible realm to the empirical sphere, that is the sphere of history.

**KEYWORDS:** Eusebius of Caesarea, image, sacred history, holiness, biography, typology, logos, Bible, emperor Constantine, symbol.

\* The research was carried out at Immanuel Kant Baltic Federal University with the support of the Russian Science Foundation, project No 22-18-00214, <https://rscf.ru/en/project/22-18-00214/>.

---

Eusebius of Caesarea is known not only as the “father of the Church history,” but also as the founder of the genre of Christian hagiography. The later works of Eusebius of Caesarea: “In praise of Constantine” (336), “On Christ’s Sepulchre” (335),

“Life of Constantine” (337)<sup>1</sup>, are not only panegyrics to the first Christian Basileus, but also represent the experience of theological and philosophical understanding of the figure of the Emperor as an agent of divine providence and history of salvation.

Researchers have paid considerable attention to Eusebius’s speeches. However, not enough has been said regarding the hagiographical aspect, which is so significant in the writings of the Caesarea bishop that were dedicated to his beloved emperor<sup>2</sup>. Our interest lies in the symbolical concept which was included by Eusebius in the figure of Emperor Constantine. Such a theme was treated within the works of Anna Wilson and Claudia Rapp<sup>3</sup>. The reasoning of both authors concerns mainly the literary, rhetorical and political aspects of the works of Eusebius. Recently a special attention has been paid to Eusebius’ philosophy of image of saint emperor. We find this approach in the works of Van Nyffelen and J. Francis. The authors focus on the connection between written biographical story and its painted image. The scholars show how this idea is developed by Eusebius, who unites the figure of Emperor with Divine Logos-Christ and portrays Emperor Constantine as a “living icon” of God’s reign<sup>4</sup>.

We will continue to explore the symbolism behind the figure of Emperor Constantine as a hagiographic model. Our task is to reveal and trace the image of Constantine as a working “symbolical mechanism”, associating profound religious and philosophical concepts, such as the relationship between eternity and history, whilst presenting the tasks of man as the archetypical fulfillment of the Eternal Being in the empirical reality. Moreover, Eusebius demonstrates the presence of eternal, sacred truth in physical temporality. In contrast to ancient philosophers, the Cesarean theologian provides the own Christian philosophical approach to the problem of preserving holiness in the memory of descendants.

To regard this task, we highlight two components of this model: *the sacred image* – the ontologically and psychologically fixed image of the holy emperor and *sacred history* – the image of the emperor, which is part of the sphere of Divine

---

<sup>1</sup> Below referred to as *LC*, *SC*, and *VC* respectively. I address *In praise of Constantine* and *On Christ’s Sepulchre*, with Greek text from: Heikel 1902. English translation of both noted works from: Drake 1976. I address *Life of Constantine*, with Greek text from: Winkelmann 1975; English translation: Cameron and Hall 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Timothy Barnes was one of the first to point out the importance of the hagiographical component of the works of Eusebius: Barnes 1989; the problems of Eusebius’ hagiography was investigated by Averil Cameron, Anna Wilson, Claudia Rapp: Cameron 1997; 1999; Wilson 1998; Rapp 1998.

<sup>3</sup> A. Wilson, *Op. cit.*; C. Rapp, *Op. cit.*

<sup>4</sup> Nuffelen 2013, 239-240; Francis 2003, 575-600.

Providence and the history of salvation.

### 1. Sacred image

At the beginning of *VC*, Eusebius speaks about perpetuating the memory of Constantine. The author points out the dual existence of the soul in earthly life: *in time* and *in eternity* (*VC* 1.2.1-2; Winkelmann 1975, 15-16). Taking as the basis of his reasoning the meaning of tombstones that preserve the memory of their ancestors, Eusebius speaks of two types of images: mortal and immortal monuments of the dead. The first are ordinary statues and sculptures made by human hands from various materials, or inscriptions on pillars and boards. But all these are “images of mortal things” (*VC* 1.3.2; Winkelmann 1975, 16). However, there are, according to Eusebius, other, genuine or “immortal monuments (ἀθάναται στήλαι)” of the life and death of the righteous. Such a “monument” was awarded to Emperor Constantine, who “one of all the ever former rulers of Rome, having become a friend of the all-sovereign God, showed people an “example of a holy life (παράδειγμα θεοσεβούς βίου)” (*VC* 1.3.3-4; Winkelmann 1975, 16-17). This *example*, realized in the life of the emperor, is the “imperishable monument”, which captures the ideas (ιδέας) of the immortal soul (*Ibidem*). Following this *example* makes Emperor Constantine a “friend of God”, like the biblical righteous (e.g. Moses), and, in turn, an *image* for other people (*Ibidem*).

We find the term *paradeigma* as a crucial element of Eusebius’ model of holy emperor. Eusebius’s text from the third book of *The Gospel Preparations* helps us to clarify the noted opposition between the “immortal” and material monuments. The bishop of Caesarea talks about it in the treatise of the philosopher Porphyry *On Statues*. Speaking about the impossibility of depicting intelligent nature in statues of gods, as “deaf-mute images of living flesh in lifeless and dead matter,” Eusebius finds only one bearer of an intelligible image – the human soul:

Rather does the rational and immortal soul and the impassible mind in man's nature seem to me to be rightly spoken of as preserving an image and likeness (εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν) of God, inasmuch as it is immaterial and incorporeal, and intelligent and rational in its essence, and is capable of virtue and wisdom. (*PE*. 3.10.16; Dindorf t.1 1867, 128)

In contrast to the symbols and allegories of Porphyry, based on things of the sensible world, Eusebius finds the human soul as a truly congenial bearer of the image of the incorporeal divine nature. Instead of the symbolism of the human body and material things, the Christian apologist speaks of the “image and likeness of God” manifested in virtue and wisdom. This image at the end of the life of a righteous

person is revealed, but it is very difficult to adequately depict either visually or verbally, since the highest nature of soul (the nature of mind) “cannot be seen or figured, neither discernible by sight, nor in its essence comprehensible by speech and hearing.” (*PE*. 3.10.17; *Ibidem*)<sup>5</sup>

The term “παράδειγμα,” denoting the example/pattern that Emperor Constantine implemented in his life, is also used by Eusebius in relation to the Son of God, when the author discusses the principle of the similarity of the Son to the Father. Using an analogy, Eusebius says that just as radiance is an excellent light, since it “retains in all respects the resemblance to its prototype,” so the Son, “the radiance of the eternal light” (*Wis*. 7.26), is the entirely authentic image (οἰκεῖον παράδειγμα) of the Father (*DE*. 4.3.3; Dindorf t.3 1867, 214). Applying the terms *image* and *likeness* to the Son of God, which describe the creation of man in *Genesis*, Eusebius writes that the Son:

is the only Son and the only image of God, endowed with the powers of the unbegotten and eternal essence of the Father according to the example of the likeness (κατὰ τὸ παράδειγμα τῆς ὁμοιώσεως). (*DE* 5.4.13; Dindorf t.3 1867, 315; Ferrar t.1 1920, 246)

So, in Eusebius, the term παράδειγμα allows to express the relationship between Father and Son with maximum exactness. Thus, precisely because the essence of the Son is established as the manifestation of the qualities, activities, essence, form and divinity of the Father, He is the *image of God* and, thereby, carries within Himself the maximum exactness of likeness to the Father in His own essence (DelCogliano 2006, 473).

With regard to Emperor Constantine Eusebius uses the term παράδειγμα, speaking about the reflection in the Christian emperor’s life an *example* of the ruling of the Supreme Sovereign-God, or the Divine Logos. In the *VC*, Eusebius repeats the thought, which he initially claimed in the *Demonstratio Evangelica*: that this παράδειγμα cannot be described in the ordinary speech. Van Nuffelen explains this idea of Eusebius as follows: “human logos can perceive the wondrous sight of Constantine in heaven, but not express it” (Nuffelen 2013, 237). In this regard, Eusebius speaks of his inability to adequately express the royal essence of Emperor Constantine, on the one hand, and of a certain “enlightening” to reasoning about this essence, on the other (*LC Prol.* 1-4; *VC* 1.2-3; Heikel t.1 1902, 195-196; Winkelmann 1975, 15-16). This kind flows from the character of the similarity the Son-Logos to Father which the emperor shares, in turn: the reign of Emperor Constantine corresponds

---

<sup>5</sup> Eusebius Caesariensis, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 3.10.17.

to the image (εἰκῶν) of the Divine Kingdom inasmuch as the basileus himself reveals the image of the Word of God:

Only-Begotten Logos, yes, the great high priest of the great God, older than all time and all ages, dedicated first and foremost to the glory of His Father, petitions for the salvation of everyone, distinguished with first rank of the universe, but second to rule in the paternal kingdom. For He was the very light beyond the universe, which plays around the Father, which mediates and separates the eternal and ungenerated Form from created existence (διεἰργον τῆς τῶν γενητῶν οὐσίας τὴν ἀναρχον καὶ ἀγέννητον ἰδέαν), the light which gushes forth from the ceaseless and eternal divinity above and proceeds out over super-celestial land, shining over everything within heaven with rays of wisdom brighter than the sun. And this selfsame One would be the Governor of this entire cosmos, the One who is over all, through all, and in all, visible and invisible, the all-pervasive Logos of God, from whom and through whom bearing the image (εἰκῶν) of the higher kingdom, the sovereign dear to God, in imitation of the Higher Power, directs the helm and sets straight all things on earth (LC 1.6; Heikel 1902, 198-199; Drake 1976, 85).

In the quoted passage, the term εἰκῶν has a meaning close to the noted παράδειγμα. However, we see new connotations here. If a παράδειγμα reflects the visible and general correspondence to the principle of the kingdom of God, as an *example* or *a model*, then the term εἰκῶν describes a metaphysical characteristic that likens both the kingdom of Constantine and the very personality of the emperor to the Divine Logos and His reign. In the “image of the highest kingdom” (εἰκόνα τῆς ἀνωτάτω βασιλείας), which the basileus carries, “from the Word of God and through Him,” we see a clarification of the mentioned inexpressible παράδειγμα (VC 1.3.3; Winkelmann, 1975, 197). In the Logos of God, the Caesarean theologian demonstrates the moment of separation between “the eternal and ungenerated idea (ἰδέα)”, and “the essence of things being generated (τῆς τῶν γενητῶν οὐσίας).” Here we see an application of the Middle Platonic reception of Plato's *Timaeus*, in which transcendent, unborn ideas are no longer independent, but are “placed” in the Mind of God, understood as the *Demiurge* or *Logos* (Dillon 1996, 60). Eusebius regards a similar action of separation of transcendental ideas and immanent things in the very metaphysical essence of the reign of Basileus Constantine. We must clarify this metaphysical act in order to understand the essence of Eusebius' analogy. To do this, we turn to Philo of Alexandria, who connected Middle Platonism of the 1st century AD with the Biblical (Jewish) cosmology and psychology.

Philo distinguishes two modes of ideas and, accordingly, two modes of the Divine Mind-Logos. The first one represents ideas as the *causes* of things. In this sense, Philo calls them “forces” and applies the term “uncreated” to them. These

ideas exist in the Mind-Logos of God eternally. In their eternal existence in the Divine Mind, these ideas-forces are as “infinite” and “indescribable” as God himself.<sup>6</sup>

The second mode embraces ideas as the *patterns* of things (Wolfson 1962, 231). Ideas do not remain in the Mind or Logos of God. They go beyond God’s Mind in the act of creation. So, the *uncreated* Mind becomes the *created* Mind. This act itself is an act of word, speech. For Philo, the world consisting of ideas is the *world of ideas* or the *intelligible world*, that is a world that continues to be the subject of the thought of the Mind, but no longer the Mind located in God and identical with His essence, but the Mind created by God: the uncreated Mind (Logos) by the act of creation becomes created Mind (Logos), thus *uncreatedness* and *createdness* are two modes of one Logos of God (Ibidem, 232).

So, Logos for Philo is the same as Aristotle’s *active mind*,<sup>7</sup> and in this sense Logos is the place of the intelligible world with its ideas. The intelligible world comprises the content of the Logos, just as in Aristotle the *forms* are the content of the Mind. Similar to Aristotle’s *Mind*, which it is in the actual activity of thought, is identical to the intelligible object, so in Philo “the intelligible world is nothing other than the Logos of God, when it is already occupied with the act of creation”.<sup>8</sup> This activity of the the divine Mind Philo links with the appropriate activity of the human mind. Elsewhere he mentions that “the human mind” was formed “in accordance with the archetypal idea (ἰδέαν), namely, the highest Logos.”<sup>9</sup> It is in this sense that he speaks of the Logos in its relation to the individual human mind as an *archetype* (ἀρχέτυπος) or *model* (παράδειγμα) of the latter, and of the latter as a *copy* (μίμημα) of the former<sup>10</sup>.

Eusebius in every possible way emphasizes the creative moment in the similarity of the Logos to the Father, as well as in the similarity of the human soul to the Logos. This idea can be seen in the contrast between the “living image” and “dead images” drawn by Eusebius. Thus, in the SC the Caesarean thinker separates false images and the true image in the incarnation of false gods in statues and the incarnation of the Word of God in an animate body. According to Eusebius, the Word of God:

prepared for Himself an all-holy temple, a physical instrument, a perceptible dwelling for intellectual power, an image august and thoroughly sanctified, preferable by far to all inanimate carvings. For a representation made out of inanimate matter, fashioned

<sup>6</sup> Philo Alexandrinus, *De opificio mundi*, 6.23; *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*. 15.59.

<sup>7</sup> Aristoteles, *De Anima* 429a.

<sup>8</sup> Philo Alexandrinus, *De opificio mundi* 6.24.

<sup>9</sup> Philo Alexandrinus, *De specialibus legibus* III.36.20.

<sup>10</sup> Philo Alexandrinus *Heres.* 48, 230; 233; cf. *Opif.* 23.69; *Spec.* III, 36

by the hands of petty craftsmen into an image of bronze and iron, gold and ivory, stones and wood, might be a suitable dwelling for demons. But the divine image, wrought by the power of divine wisdom, partook of life and intellectual existence. An image filled with every virtue, it was the dwelling of the divine Logos, the holy temple of a holy God. (SC 14.3; Heikel 1902, 242; Drake 1976, 115).

We can notice that in the definitions of the incarnate Word of God as “image (ἄγαλμα) august and thoroughly sanctified,” and as “the divine image,” Eusebius emphasizes livingness or animation of the incarnate God’s Logos in contrast with soulless of pagan statues. Regarding to the image of Emperor Constantine, we see the similar meaning: the emperor is considered as “living image”, like a “living Logos” of God.

As it has been said above, Eusebius speaks of the synergy of the royal action of the Logos and the emperor. Basileus embodies the “royal law” (νόμος βασιλικός), which, in essence, is not writing and tables, but “the living and hypostatic Word of God, Who directs His Father’s kingdom for all those under and beneath Him” (LC 13.6 Heikel 1902, 237). To Eusebius, the one God manifests Himself in the soul of man as the unity of virtue, representing the monarchy in the soul into the likeness of the Divine monarchy in the universe. The autocracy of God is realized both in the virtuous soul and in the monarchy of the Christian basileus. This view relates to the geek concept of the ruler as “living law”<sup>11</sup>. Eusebius notes that the power to reign, as well as the ability to obey, comes from the same Divine Logos, imprinted in the human soul as “the image and likeness” of God. This makes a man a “sovereign animal”, capable to rule and be ruled. Basileus reveals these royal features of the soul associated with the image and likeness of God contained in it (LC 4.2 Drake 1976, 88).<sup>12</sup>

Thus, the *image* of holy emperor includes not only the principle of domination, but also an ability to obey to the supreme authority of God. In other places of the Eusebius’ works, this trait refers to a *piety* (θεοσεβεία, εὐσεβεία), by which the author distinguishes the basileus Constantine from other pagan rulers. It is this feature that is included in the “royal image-example (τὸ βασιλικὸν παράδειγμα)” to which Emperor Constantine corresponds only, in contrast to his opponents-tyrants.<sup>13</sup> Thus, Basileus the autocrat, dominates both over the sensual principle of the soul and over external enemies and divisions, who:

<sup>11</sup> See: H.A. Drake 1976, 69; Prikhodko 2023, 15-16.

<sup>12</sup> The term *χαρακτήρ* in Eusebius can be considered in the context of the mentioned opposition of material inscriptions: tables, images and their intangible analogues.

<sup>13</sup> See: LC Prol. 5; VC 1.3.1; 1.5.1; 1.10.2.

has modelled himself after the archetypal form of the Supreme Sovereign, whose thoughts mirror its virtuous rays, by which he has been made perfectly wise, good, just, courageous, pious, and God-loving. Truly, therefore, is only this man a philosopher-king, who knows himself and understands the showers of every blessing which descend on him from outside, or rather, from heaven. He makes manifest the august title of monarchical authority in the remarkable fabric of his robes, since he alone deserves to wear the royal purple which so becomes him. This is a sovereign who calls on the Heavenly Father night and day, who petitions Him in his prayers, who yearns for the highest kingdom. Far from thinking his present state comparable to that of the All-Ruling God. (*LC* 5.4; Drake 1976, 89).

Thus, we are given the image of a *basileus* - a philosopher and a righteous man. Platonic reminiscences are obvious, but in a Christian vein: religious piety is added to the thirst for the light of the heavenly world. Constantine is an autocrat not only due to his social position, but also his personal status - as a master over the passions of his soul. This inner dominion is achieved by faith in God and constant prayer to Him. So, in the image-paradigm revealed in the life of Emperor Constantine, we find the fulfilment of the harmony between the heavenly and earthly kingdoms that is similar to the correspondence of the human *logos* to its archetype. All these points constitute the sacred image of the emperor, serving as edification, and example for others.

## 2. Sacred History

The further development of the image-theory we find in the *LC*, where Eusebius devotes considerable attention to Emperor Constantine's analogy to the Divine *Logos*:

The Only-Begotten *Logos* of God endures with His Father as co-ruler from ages that have no beginning to ages that have no end. Similarly, His friend, supplied from above by royal streams and confirmed in the name of a divine calling, rules on earth for long periods of years. As the Universal Savior renders the entire heaven and earth and highest kingdom fit for His Father, so His friend, leading his subjects on earth to the Only-Begotten and Savior *Logos*, makes them suitable for His kingdom... (*LC* 2.1-2; Drake 1976, 85).

This comparison is both a rhetorical device and an important philosophical idea: Christ, the Word of God: a) prepares for the Father of Heaven and Earth, the highest kingdom, and the emperor, "His friend, brings the inhabitants of the Earth subject to himself to the only begotten and saving Word, and through this makes them ready for the same kingdom (*LC* 2.2; Drake 1976, 85);" The Savior b) fights against



spiritual hostile forces, and the emperor fights against earthly, bodily forces; The Logos, through its seeds, c) endows rational beings with the knowledge of the Creator, and the emperor “is His friend, like an interpreter of God – the Word, calls the entire human race to the knowledge of the All-Good, appealing to the ear everyone and loudly proclaiming to the inhabitants of the Earth the laws of piety and truth” (LC 2.4; Drake 1976, 86).

Here we see the development of the ancient concept of the “seed logos”. In its Platonic version, this doctrine explained the principle of the development of the ideas of the divine Mind-Demiurge.<sup>14</sup> The originality of Eusebius lies in the fact that he applies the principle of a seed’s development to the universal history: The Logos-Christ is presented in the minds of people as in a seed, and the Christian emperor reveals this logos-like principle in people in his politics, transferring it from the intelligible realm to the sphere of empirical facts into the realm of history. It is in this role, the pious Basileus appears as “a certain herald of the Divine Logos” (τις ὑποφήτης τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου) (LC 2.4; Drake 1976, 86).

The term ὑποφήτης means *suggester, interpreter, expounder* of the will of the gods or divine judgment. This theme is heard in the comparison of Basileus Constantine and Christ as saviors and winners. The Savior-Christ “invisibly defeated invisible enemies,” and the Basileus completes the victory of Christ in the bodily, earthly reality. The Great Heavenly King did the latter for the Earth, when in the person of “His attendant” he prepared “an invincible warrior” (LC 7.12; Drake 1976, 97). This earthly servant of the heavenly King himself fulfilled his assigned mission with dignity: he defeated the enemies of the true God. Thus, many of the Basileus’ enemies became like the “gods” of the polytheistic pagan religion, while the Basileus shows the “image of the One Supreme Sovereign.” (Ibidem)

Thus, Eusebius combines the principles of natural renewal and historical formation. According to the bishop of Caesarea, God, giving a rational, logos-like nature, called a rational creation:

to anticipate and foreknow here the promised hope of the heavenly kingdom, then on behalf of this He even came Himself – yes, the Father of His children did not shrink from coming into contact with mortals. Tending His own seeds and renewing the commitments made from above. He preached to all to partake of the heavenly kingdom.

---

<sup>14</sup> Within the framework of Stoicism, Logos (He is God, the Creative Fire) is understood as a “seed” containing “seminal logoi” - the potency of all things that have arisen, exist and will arise in the future (*Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* I. 98; 102.) The doctrine of the seminal logos contains a religious and philosophical justification for the ethics of Stoicism. Logos is the universal reason or world principle that permeates the universe, and is also the principle of true knowledge and human virtue (Pohlenz 1965, 120.).

He invites and exhorts all to be ready for the journey above, and to have prepared a proper garment for the call. By an indescribable force He keeps filling with His message all that the sun oversees. He has modelled the kingdom on earth into a likeness of the one in heaven, toward which He urges all mankind to strive, holding forth to them this fair hope (... τῷ τῆς κατὰ γῆν βασιλείας μιμήματι τὴν οὐράνιον ἐκτυπούμενος, ἐφ' ἣν καὶ σπεύδειν τὸ πᾶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων παρορμᾷ γένος, ἀγαθὴν ἐλπίδα ταύτην προβεβλημένος.) (*LC* 4.2; Drake 1976, 88)

In the quoted text, the participle *ἐκτυπούμενος* means the paradigm of the development of the earthly kingdom. In its historical progress, it was designed to be like the heavenly kingdom, having within itself its types (τύποι) and embodying them in historical development. Thus, Eusebius uses the theory of *seminal Logos* in two aspects: the first being traditional (Stoic), as the potencies of virtues and sciences embedded in the human soul (nature), and the second, the historical one, as the unfolding of God's pre-established plan in history, the implementation of the Logos both in the human soul and actual events. This is also indicated by the participle *προβεβλημένος* at the end of the passage, signifying that "hope" is "premised", i.e. given in something that is fulfilled subsequently.

Constantine himself, developing innate virtues (seeds of the Logos) in his soul, becomes capable of communion of the Divine Mind, Wisdom, Goodness and Truth; that is, of the communion of the Divine Logos:

And in this God's friend henceforth (ἐντεῦθεν) shall participate, having been furnished by God with natural virtues and having received in his soul the emanations from that place. His ability to reason has come from the Universal Logos, his wisdom join communion with Wisdom, goodness from contact with the Good, and justness from his association with Justice. He is prudent in the ideal of Prudence, and from haring in the Highest Power has the courage (*LC* 5.1; Drake 1976, 89).

Here, in Eusebius we see that the Logos acts in two levels: in the soul and the empirical life, i.e. in the history. The action of Constantine starts from his very soul, as following to the good potencies, the union with the Logos, and continues outside, into the world, as the war against the pagan leaders (tyrants), reconciliation of the Church and the building the new, Christian state. Thus, we can conclude that through participation in the Divine Logos, Constantine understands the meaning of history, he sees in the earthly kingdom the type of heavenly kingdom laid down by God and understands the God-established vector of development of the earthly kingdom.

### Conclusion

In the encomia of Eusebius of Caesarea, we identified and examined two main components of the model of Holy Sovereign.

1) *Sacred image*. It is spoken of as a complete, imprinted image-idea in the soul, almost indescribable and inexpressible in the means of the sensory world. Nevertheless, it is not devoid of clarity, visible in the overall picture of the life and deeds of Emperor Constantine. This sacred image is grasped by Eusebius as “an example of pious life (παράδειγμα θεοσεβοῦς βίου)” carried out by the Christian basileus and likening him himself to the biblical righteous, and his rule to the Kingdom of God. The image of the emperor’s reign reflects the creative action of the Divine Logos – the transition of an uncreated idea into a created essence, the analogue of the brow is the synergy of the divine Logos and the rational principle in the human soul.

2) *Sacred history*. Another component of the model of the holy sovereign in Eusebius is the becoming image in history, which is an analogue of biblical history and the sacred history. In this aspect, Eusebius innovatively applies the ancient concept of the “seminal logos”, showing the life of the emperor as the development of the potentialities of the Logos in the historical sphere. In this regard, the basileus acts as an interpreter of the Word of God, demonstrating in his policies an understanding of Divine Providence and attending to it. The Christian emperor reveals the logos-like principle in people in his politics, transferring it from the intelligible realm to the sphere of empirical facts, the sphere of history.

### ABBREVIATIONS OF EUSEBIUS’ WORKS

- LC. – *De laudibus Constantini* — In praise of Constantine.  
 SC. – *De sepulchro Christi* — On Christ’s Sepulchre.  
 VC. – *De vita Constantine* — Life of Constantine.  
 DE. – *Demonstratio Evangelica* — The Proof of the Gospel.  
 PE. – *Praeparatio Evangelica* — Preparation for the Gospel.

### REFERENCES

- Arnim, I. (1964) *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. Vol. I. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner.  
 Barnes, T.D. (1989) “Panegyric, History and Hagiography in Eusebius’ Life of Constantine,” in: *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*. R. Williams, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
 Cameron, A. (1997) “Eusebius’ *Vita Constantini* and the Construction of Constantine,” in *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*, S. Swain and M. Edwards, eds. Oxford: Clarendon Press.  
 Cameron, A., Hall, S.G. ed., tr., comm. (1999) *Eusebius. Life of Constantine*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- DelCogliano, M. (2006) "Eusebian Theologies of the Son as the Image of God before 341," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 14.4, 459-484.
- Dillon, J.M. (1996) *The Middle Platonists 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. Cornell University Press.
- Dindorf, G. (1867) *Eusebii Caesariensis opera. Preparationis Evangelicae*. vols. 1-2. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Dindorf, G. (1867) *Eusebii Caesariensis opera. Demonstrationis Evangelicae*. vols. 3-4. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Drake, H.A., ed., tr. (1976) *In Praise of Constantine: A Historical Study and New Translation of Eusebius' Tricennial Orations*. Berkeley: University of California publications.
- Ferrar, W.J., tr. (1920) *The Proof of the Gospel Being the Demonstratio Evangelica of Eusebius of Caesarea*. vols. 1-2. London New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Francis, J. (2003) "Living Icons: Tracing a Motif in Verbal and Visual Representation from the Second to Fourth Centuries C.E.," *American Journal of Philology* 124, 575-600.
- Gifford, E. H., tr. (1903) *Eusebius of Caesarea: Praeparatio Evangelica*. Vol. 3 (in 2 vols). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goold, G.P., ed., Colson, F.H. and Whitaker, G.H., tr. (1929-1939) *Philo*. vols. 1-8. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Heikel, I.A., ed. (1902) *Eusebius Werke. De laudibus Constantini*. Band. 1. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Heikel, I.A., ed. (1913) *Eusebius Werke. Demonstratio Evangelica*. Band. 6. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Nuffelen, P. V. (2013) "The Life of Constantine: The Image of an Image," in: *Eusebius of Caesarea: Traditions and Innovations*. Washington: Center for Hellenic Studies.
- Pohlenz, M. (1965) *Die Begründung der abendlandischen Sprachlehre durch die Stoa*. Hildesheim: Kleine Schriften.
- Rapp, C. (1998) "Comparison, Paradigm and The Case of Moses in Panegyric and Hagiography," in: *The propaganda of power: the role of panegyric in late antiquity*, ed. Mary Whitby. Leiden: Brill.
- Wilson, A. (1998) "Biographical Models: the Constantinian period and beyond," in: *Constantine: history, historiography and legend*, Samuel N.C.Lieu and Dominic Montserrat, eds. London-New York: Routledge.
- Winkelmann, F., ed. (1975) *Eusebius Werke. Eusebius Caesariensis. Vita Constantini*. Bd. 1.1, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Wolfson, H. A. (1962) *Philo Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Prikhodko M. (2023) "'Life of Constantine' by Eusebius of Caesarea as 'Sacred History': A Typology of Moses-Constantine," *Vestnik Pravoslavnogo Sviato-Tikhonovskogo gumanitarnogo universiteta*. Seria I: Bogoslovie. Filosofija. Religiovedenie. Vol. 109, 9-27 (In Russian). Приходько М.А. (2023) «Жизнь Константина Евсевия Кесарийского как священная история: типология Моисея-Константина». *Вестник ПСТГУ. Серия I: Богословие. Философия. Религиоведение*. Вып. 109, 9-27.