

Arius

Arius (/əˈraɪəs, ˈɛəri-/; Koinē Greek: Ἄρειος, *Áreios*; 250 or 256 – 336) was a Cyrenaic presbyter, ascetic, and priest best known for the doctrine of Arianism.^{[1][2]} His teachings about the nature of the Godhead in Christianity, which emphasized God the Father's uniqueness and Christ's subordination under the Father,^[3] and his opposition to what would become the dominant Christology (Homoousian Christology) made him a primary topic of the First Council of Nicaea convened by Emperor Constantine the Great in 325.

After the Roman Emperors Licinius and Constantine legalized and formalized Christianity, Constantine sought to unify the newly recognized Church and remove theological divisions.^[4] The Christian Church was divided by disagreements on Christology - specifically about the nature of the relationship between the first and second persons of the Trinity. Homoousian Christians, including Athanasius of Alexandria, used Arius and Arianism as epithets to describe those who disagreed with their doctrine of coequal Trinitarianism, a Christology representing God the Father and Jesus Christ the Son as "of one essence" ("consubstantial") and coeternal.

Negative writings describe Arius's theology as one imputing there was a time before the Son of God existed—that is, when only God the Father existed. Despite concerted opposition, Arian Christian churches persisted for centuries throughout Europe (especially in various Germanic kingdoms), the Middle East, and North Africa. They were suppressed by military conquest or by voluntary royal conversion between the fifth and seventh centuries.

The Son's precise relationship with the Father had been discussed for decades before Arius's advent; Arius intensified the controversy and carried it to a Church-wide audience, where others like Eusebius of Nicomedia proved much more influential in the long run. In fact, some later Arians disavowed the name, claiming not to have been familiar with the man or his specific teachings.^{[5][6]} However, because the conflict between Arius and his foes brought the issue to the theological forefront, the doctrine they said he proclaimed—though he had definitely not originated—is generally labeled as "his".

Early life and personality

Arius



Arius arguing for the supremacy of God the Father, and that the Son had a beginning as a true Firstborn

Born	256 <div>Ptolemais, Cyrenaica, Roman Empire (modern-day Tolmeita, Libya)</div>
Died	336 (aged 80) <div>Constantinople, Thracia, Roman Empire (modern-day Istanbul, Turkey)</div>
Occupation	Presbyter
Notable work	<i>Thalia</i>
	Theological work
Era	3rd and 4th centuries AD
Language	Koine Greek

Reconstructing the life and doctrine of Arius has proven to be a difficult task, as none of his original writings survive. Emperor Constantine ordered their burning while Arius was still living, and any that survived this purge were later destroyed by his orthodox opponents. Those works which have survived are quoted in the works of churchmen who denounced him as a heretic. This leads some—but not all—scholars to question their reliability.^[7]

Tradition or movement	<u>Arianism</u>
Notable ideas	<u>Subordinationism</u>

His father's name is given as Ammonius. Arius is believed to have been a student at the exegetical school in Antioch, where he studied under Saint Lucian.^[8] Having returned to Alexandria, Arius, according to a single source, sided with Meletius of Lycopolis in his dispute over the re-admission of those who had denied Christianity under fear of Roman torture, and was ordained a deacon under the latter's auspices. He was excommunicated by Bishop Peter of Alexandria in 311 for supporting Meletius,^[9] but under Peter's successor Achillas, Arius was re-admitted to Christian communion and in 313 made presbyter of the Baucalis district in Alexandria.

Although his character has been severely assailed by his opponents, Arius appears to have been a man of personal ascetic achievement, pure morals, and decided convictions. Paraphrasing Epiphanius of Salamis, an opponent of Arius, Catholic historian Warren H. Carroll describes him as "tall and lean, of distinguished appearance and polished address. Women doted on him, charmed by his beautiful manners, touched by his appearance of asceticism. Men were impressed by his aura of intellectual superiority."^[10]

Though Arius was also accused by his opponents of being too liberal and too loose in his theology, engaging in heresy (as defined by his opponents), some historians argue that Arius was actually quite conservative,^[11] and that he deplored how, in his view, Christian theology was being too freely mixed with Greek paganism.^[12]

The Arian controversy

Beginnings

The Trinitarian historian Socrates of Constantinople reports that Arius sparked the controversy that bears his name when Alexander of Alexandria, who had succeeded Achillas as the Bishop of Alexandria, gave a sermon stating the similarity of the Son to the Father. Arius interpreted Alexander's speech as being a revival of Sabellianism, condemned it, and then argued that "if the Father begat the Son, he that was begotten had a beginning of existence: and from this it is evident, that there was a time when the Son was not. It therefore necessarily follows, that he [the Son] had his substance from nothing."^[13] This quote describes the essence of Arius's doctrine.

Socrates of Constantinople believed that Arius was influenced in his thinking by the teachings of Lucian of Antioch, a celebrated Christian teacher and martyr. In a letter to Patriarch Alexander of Constantinople Arius's bishop, Alexander of Alexandria, wrote that Arius derived his theology from Lucian. The express purpose of the letter was to complain about the doctrines that Arius was spreading, but his charge of heresy against Arius is vague and unsupported by other authorities. Furthermore, Alexander's language, like that of most controversialists in those days, is quite bitter and abusive. Moreover, even Alexander never accused Lucian of having taught Arianism; rather, he

accused Lucian *ad invidiam* of heretical tendencies—which apparently, according to him, were transferred to his pupil, Arius.^[14] The noted Russian historian Alexander Vasiliev refers to Lucian as "the Arius before Arius".^[15]

Supporters

Arius enjoyed significant support and the dispute spread to other areas in the empire. He also had the support of perhaps the two most important church leaders of that time:

Eusebius of Nicomedia

Eusebius of Nicomedia “was a supporter of Arius as long as Arius lived” (RPC Hanson, pages 30, 31). “The conventional picture of Eusebius is of an unscrupulous intriguer” (RPC Hanson, page 27). “This is of course because our knowledge of Eusebius derives almost entirely from the evidence of his bitter enemies.” (page 27). Hanson mentions several instances displaying Eusebius’ integrity and courage (page 28) and concludes, “Eusebius certainly was a man of strong character and great ability” (page 29). “It was he who virtually took charge of the affairs of the Greek speaking Eastern Church from 328 until his death” (page 29). He encouraged the spread of the Christian faith beyond the frontiers of the Roman Empire. The version of the Christian faith which the missionaries spread was that favoured by Eusebius and not Athanasius. This serves as evidences of his zeal. (Hanson, page 29).

Eusebius of Caesarea

“Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea in Palestine [the church historian] was certainly an early supporter of Arius” (RPC Hanson, page 46). “He was universally acknowledged to be the most scholarly bishop of his day” (page 46). “Eusebius of Caesarea ... was one of the most influential authors of the fourth century” (page 860). “Neither Arius nor anti-Arians speak evil of him” (page 46). “He was made bishop of Caesarea about 313, attended the Council of Nicaea in 325” (page 47).

“We cannot accordingly describe Eusebius (of Caesarea) as a formal Arian in the sense that he knew and accepted the full logic of Arius, or of Asterius' position. But undoubtedly, he approached it nearly” (page 59).

Origen and Arius

Like many third-century Christian scholars, Arius was influenced by the writings of Origen, widely regarded as the first great theologian of Christianity.^[16] However, while both agreed on the subordination of the Son to the Father, and Arius drew support from Origen's theories on the *Logos*, the two did not agree on everything. Arius clearly argued that the *Logos* had a beginning and that the Son, therefore, was not eternal, the Logos being the highest of the Created Order. This idea is summarized in the statement "there was a time when the Son was not." By way of contrast, Origen believed the relation of the Son to the Father had no beginning, and that the Son was "eternally generated".^[17]

Arius objected to Origen's doctrine, complaining about it in his letter to the Nicomedian Eusebius, who had also studied under Lucian. Nevertheless, despite disagreeing with Origen on this point, Arius found solace in his writings, which used expressions that favored Arius's contention that the *Logos* was of a different substance than the Father, and owed his existence to his Father's will. However,

because Origen's theological speculations were often proffered to stimulate further inquiry rather than to put an end to any given dispute, both Arius and his opponents were able to invoke the authority of this revered (at the time) theologian during their debate.^[18]

Arius emphasized the supremacy and uniqueness of God the Father, meaning that the Father alone is infinite and eternal and almighty, and that therefore the Father's divinity must be greater than the Son's. Arius taught that the Son had a beginning, contrary to Origen, who taught that the Son was less than the Father only in power, but not in time. Arius maintained that the Son possessed neither the eternity nor the true divinity of the Father, but was rather made "God" only by the Father's permission and power, and that the Logos was rather the very first and the most perfect of God's productions, before ages.^{[19][20]}

Initial responses

The Bishop of Alexandria exiled the presbyter following a council of local priests. Arius's supporters vehemently protested. Numerous bishops and Christian leaders of the era supported his cause, among them Eusebius of Nicomedia, who baptized Constantine the Great.^[21]

First Council of Nicaea



The Council of Nicaea, with Arius depicted beneath the feet of the Emperor Constantine and the bishops

The Christological debate could no longer be contained within the Alexandrian diocese. By the time Bishop Alexander finally acted against Arius, Arius's doctrine had spread far beyond his own see; it had become a topic of discussion—and disturbance—for the entire Church. The Church was now a powerful force in the Roman world, with Emperors Licinius and Constantine I having legalized it in 313 through the Edict of Milan. Emperor Constantine had taken a personal interest in several ecumenical issues, including the Donatist controversy in 316, and he wanted to bring an end to the Christological dispute. To this end, the emperor sent Hosius, bishop of Córdoba to investigate and, if possible, resolve the controversy. Hosius was armed with an open letter from the Emperor: "Wherefore let each one of you, showing consideration for the other, listen to the impartial exhortation of your fellow-servant." However, as the debate continued to rage despite Hosius's efforts, Constantine in AD 325 took an unprecedented step: he called a council to be composed of church prelates from all parts of the empire to resolve this issue, possibly at Hosius's recommendation.^[14]

All secular dioceses of the empire sent one or more representatives to the council, save for Roman Britain; the majority of the bishops came from the East. Pope Sylvester I, himself too aged to attend, sent two priests as his delegates. Arius himself attended the council, as did his bishop, Alexander. Also there were Eusebius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Nicomedia and the young deacon Athanasius, who would become the champion of the Trinitarian view ultimately adopted by the council and spend most of his life battling Arianism. Before the main conclave convened, Hosius initially met with Alexander and his supporters at Nicomedia.^[22] The council was presided over by the emperor himself, who participated in and even led some of its discussions.^[14]

At this First Council of Nicaea, 22 bishops, led by Eusebius of Nicomedia, came as supporters of Arius. Nonetheless, when some of Arius's writings were read aloud, they are reported to have been denounced as blasphemous by most participants.^[14] Those who upheld the notion that Christ was co-eternal and consubstantial with the Father were led by the bishop Alexander. Athanasius was not allowed to sit in on the Council because he was only an arch-deacon. However, Athanasius is seen as doing the legwork and concluded (according to Bishop Alexander's defense of Athanasian Trinitarianism and also according to the Nicene Creed adopted at this Council)^{[23][24]} that the Son was of the same essence (homoousios) with the Father (or one in essence with the Father), and was eternally generated from that essence of the Father.^[25] Those who instead insisted that the Son of God came after God the Father in time and substance were led by Arius the presbyter. For about two months, the two sides argued and debated,^[26] with each appealing to Scripture to justify their respective positions. Arius argued for the supremacy of God the Father, and maintained that the Son of God was simply the oldest and most beloved creature of God, made from nothing, because of being the direct offspring. Arius taught that the pre-existent Son was God's first production (the very first thing that God actually ever did in his entire eternal existence up to that point, before all ages. Thus he insisted that only God the Father had no beginning, and that the Father alone was infinite and eternal. Arius maintained that the Son had a beginning. Thus, said Arius, only the Son was directly created and begotten of God; furthermore, there was a time that he had no existence. He was capable of his own free will, said Arius, and thus "were He in the truest sense a son, He must have come after the Father, therefore the time obviously was when He was not, and hence He was a finite being."^[27] Arius appealed to Scripture, quoting verses such as John 14:28: "the Father is greater than I",^[28] as well as Colossians 1:15: "the firstborn of all creation."^[29] Thus, Arius insisted that the Father's Divinity was greater than the Son's, and that the Son was under God the Father, and not co-equal or co-eternal with him.

According to some accounts in the hagiography of Nicholas of Myra, debate at the council became so heated that at one point, Nicholas struck Arius across the face.^{[30][31]} The majority of the bishops ultimately agreed upon a creed, known thereafter as the Nicene creed. It included the word *homoousios*, meaning "consubstantial", or "one in essence", which was incompatible with Arius's beliefs.^[32] On June 19, 325, council and emperor issued a circular to the churches in and around Alexandria: Arius and two of his unyielding partisans (Theonas and Secundus)^[32] were deposed and exiled to Illyricum, while three other supporters—Theognis of Nicaea, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Maris of Chalcedon—affixed their signatures solely out of deference to the emperor. The following is part of the ruling made by the emperor denouncing Arius's teachings with fervor.



Greek icon of Arius getting slapped by Nicholas of Myra

In addition, if any writing composed by Arius should be found, it should be handed over to the flames, so that not only will the wickedness of his teaching be obliterated, but nothing will be left even to remind anyone of him. And I hereby make a public order, that if someone should be discovered to have hidden a writing composed by Arius, and not to have immediately brought it forward and destroyed it by fire, his penalty shall be death. As soon as he is discovered in this offense, he shall be submitted for capital punishment [...]

— Edict by Emperor Constantine against the Arians^[33]

Exile, return, and death

The homoousian party's victory at Nicaea was short-lived, however. Despite Arius's exile and the alleged finality of the Council's decrees, the Arian controversy recommenced at once. When Bishop Alexander died in 327, Athanasius succeeded him, despite not meeting the age requirements for a hierarch. Still committed to pacifying the conflict between Arians and Trinitarians, Constantine gradually became more lenient toward those whom the Council of Nicaea had exiled.^[14] Though he never repudiated the council or its decrees, the emperor ultimately permitted Arius (who had taken refuge in Palestine) and many of his adherents to return to their homes, once Arius had reformulated his Christology to mute the ideas found most objectionable by his critics. Athanasius was exiled following his condemnation by the First Synod of Tyre in 335 (though he was later recalled), and the Synod of Jerusalem the following year restored Arius to communion. The emperor directed Alexander of Constantinople to receive Arius, despite the bishop's objections; Bishop Alexander responded by earnestly praying that Arius might perish before this could happen.^[34]

Modern scholars consider that the subsequent death of Arius may have been the result of poisoning by his opponents.^{[35][36]} In contrast, some contemporaries of Arius asserted that the circumstances of his death were a miraculous consequence of Arius's heretical views. The latter view was evident in the account of Arius's death by a bitter enemy, Socrates Scholasticus:

It was then Saturday, and Arius was expecting to assemble with the church on the day following: but divine retribution overtook his daring criminalities. For going out of the imperial palace, attended by a crowd of Eusebian partisans like guards, he paraded proudly through the midst of the city, attracting the notice of all the people. As he approached the place called Constantine's Forum, where the column of porphyry is erected, a terror arising from the remorse of conscience seized Arius, and with the terror a violent relaxation of the bowels: he therefore enquired whether there was a convenient place near, and being directed to the back of Constantine's Forum, he hastened thither. Soon after a faintness came over him, and together with the evacuations his bowels protruded, followed by a copious hemorrhage, and the descent of the smaller intestines: moreover portions of his spleen and liver were brought off in the effusion of blood, so that he almost immediately died. The scene of this catastrophe still is shown at Constantinople, as I have said, behind the shambles in the colonnade: and by persons going by pointing the finger at the place, there is a perpetual remembrance preserved of this extraordinary kind of death.^[37]

The death of Arius did not end the Arian controversy, which would not be settled for centuries in some parts of the Christian world.

Arianism after Arius

Immediate aftermath

Historians report that Constantine, who had not been baptized for most of his lifetime, was baptized on his deathbed in 337 by the Arian bishop, Eusebius of Nicomedia.^{[14][38]}

Constantius II, who succeeded Constantine, was also an Arian sympathizer.^[39] Under him, Arianism reached its high point at the Third Council of Sirmium in 357. The Seventh Arian Confession (Second Sirmium Confession) held, regarding the doctrines *homoousios* (of one substance) and *homoiousios* (of similar substance), that both were non-biblical; and that the Father is greater than the Son, a confession later dubbed the Blasphemy of Sirmium:

But since many persons are disturbed by questions concerning what is called in Latin *substantia*, but in Greek *ousia*, that is, to make it understood more exactly, as to 'coessential', or what is called, 'like-in-essence', there ought to be no mention of any of these at all, nor exposition of them in the Church, for this reason and for this consideration, that in divine Scripture nothing is written about them, and that they are above men's knowledge and above men's understanding.^[40]



Constantine I burning Arian books, illustration from a book of canon law, c. 825

Following the abortive effort by Julian the Apostate to restore paganism in the empire, the emperor Valens—himself an Arian—renewed the persecution of Nicene bishops. However, Valens's successor Theodosius I ended Arianism once and for all among the elites of the Eastern Empire through a combination of imperial decree, persecution, and the calling of the Second Ecumenical Council in 381 that condemned Arius anew while reaffirming and expanding the Nicene Creed.^{[39][41]} This generally ended the influence of Arianism among the non-Germanic peoples of the Roman Empire.

Arianism in the West

Arianism played out very differently in the Western Empire; during the reign of Constantius II, the Arian Gothic convert Ulphilas was consecrated a bishop by Eusebius of Nicomedia and sent to missionize his people. His success ensured the survival of Arianism among the Goths and Vandals until the beginning of the eighth century, when their kingdoms succumbed to the adjacent Niceans or they accepted Nicean Christianity. Arians continued to exist in North Africa, Spain and portions of Italy until they were finally suppressed during the sixth and seventh centuries.^[42]

In the 12th century, the Benedictine abbot Peter the Venerable described the Islamic prophet Muhammad as "the successor of Arius and the precursor to the Antichrist".^[43] During the Protestant Reformation, a Polish sect known as the Polish Brethren were often referred to as Arians due to their antitrinitarian doctrine.^[44]



The Arian Baptistery erected by Ostrogothic king Theodoric the Great in Ravenna, Italy, around 500

Arianism today

There are several contemporary Christian and Post-Christian denominations today that echo Arian thinking.

Members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (LDS Church) are sometimes accused of being Arians by their detractors.^[45] However, the Christology of the Latter-day Saints differs in several significant aspects from Arian theology.^[46]

The Jehovah's Witnesses teach that the Son is a created being, and is not actually God.

Some Christians in the Unitarian Universalist movement are influenced by Arian ideas. Contemporary Unitarian Universalist Christians often may be either Arian or Socian in their Christology, seeing Jesus as a distinctive moral figure but not equal or eternal with God the Father; or they may follow Origen's logic of Universal Salvation, and thus potentially affirm the Trinity, but assert that all are already saved.

Arius's doctrine

Introduction

In explaining his actions against Arius, Alexander of Alexandria wrote a letter to Alexander of Constantinople and Eusebius of Nicomedia (where the emperor was then residing), detailing the errors into which he believed Arius had fallen. According to Alexander, Arius taught:

That God was not always the Father, but that there was a period when he was not the Father; that the Word of God was not from eternity, but was made out of nothing; for that the ever-existing God ('the I AM'—the eternal One) made him who did not previously exist, out of nothing; wherefore there was a time when he did not exist, inasmuch as the Son is a creature and a work. That he is neither like the Father as it regards his essence, nor is by nature either the Father's true Word, or true Wisdom, but indeed one of his works and creatures, being erroneously called Word and Wisdom, since he was himself made of God's own Word and the Wisdom which is in God, whereby God both made all things and him also. Wherefore he is as to his nature mutable and susceptible of change, as all other rational creatures are: hence the Word is alien to and other than the essence of God; and the Father is inexplicable by the Son, and invisible to him, for neither does the Word perfectly and accurately know the Father, neither can he distinctly see him. The Son knows not the nature of his own essence: for he was made on our account, in order that God might create us by him, as by an instrument; nor would he ever have existed, unless God had wished to create us.

— Socrates Scholasticus (Trinitarian)^[47]

Alexander also refers to Arius's poetical *Thalia*:

God has not always been Father; there was a moment when he was alone, and was not yet Father: later he became so. The Son is not from eternity; he came from nothing.

— Alexander (Trinitarian)^[10]

The Logos

The question of the exact relationship between the Father and the Son (a part of the theological science of Christology) had been raised some fifty years before Arius, when Paul of Samosata was deposed in 269 for agreeing with those who used the word *homoousios* (Greek for 'same substance') to express the relation between the Father and the Son. This term was thought at that time to have a Sabellian tendency,^[48] though—as events showed—this was on account of its scope not having been satisfactorily defined. In the discussion which followed Paul's deposition, Dionysius, the Bishop of Alexandria, used much the same language as Arius did later, and correspondence survives in which Pope Dionysius blames him for using such terminology. Dionysius responded with an explanation widely interpreted as vacillating. The Synod of Antioch, which condemned Paul of Samosata, had expressed its disapproval of the word *homoousios* in one sense, while Bishop Alexander undertook its defense in another. Although the controversy seemed to be leaning toward the opinions later championed by Arius, no firm decision had been made on the subject; in an atmosphere so intellectual as that of Alexandria, the debate seemed bound to resurface—and even intensify—at some point in the future.

Arius endorsed the following doctrines about the Son or the Word (*Logos*, referring to Jesus):

1. that the Word (*Logos*) and the Father were not of the same essence (*ousia*);
2. that the Son was a created being (*ktisma* or *poiema*); and
3. that the worlds were created through him, so he must have existed before them and before all time.
4. However, there was a "once" [Arius did not use words meaning 'time', such as *chronos* or *aion*] when he did not exist, before he was begotten of the Father.

Extant writings

Three surviving letters attributed to Arius are his letter to Alexander of Alexandria,^[49] his letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia,^[50] and his confession to Constantine.^[51] In addition, several letters addressed by others to Arius survive, together with brief quotations contained within the polemical works of his opponents. These quotations are often short and taken out of context, and it is difficult to tell how accurately they quote him or represent his true thinking.

The *Thalia*

Arius's *Thalia* (literally, 'Festivity', 'banquet'), a popularized work combining prose and verse and summarizing his views on the Logos,^[52] survives in quoted fragmentary form. In the *Thalia*, Arius says that God's first thought was the creation of the Son, before all ages, therefore time started with the creation of the *Logos* or Word in Heaven (lines 1–9, 30–32); explains how the Son could still be God, even if he did not exist eternally (lines 20–23); and endeavors to explain the ultimate incomprehensibility of the Father to the Son (lines 33–39). The two available references from this work are recorded by his opponent Athanasius: the first is a report of Arius's teaching in *Orations Against the Arians*, 1:5-6. This paraphrase has negative comments interspersed throughout, so it is difficult to consider it as being completely reliable.^[53]

The second quotation is found on page 15 of the document *On the Councils of Arminum and Seleucia*, also known as *De Synodis*. This second passage is entirely in irregular verse, and seems to be a direct quotation or a compilation of quotations;^[54] it may have been written by someone other than Athanasius, perhaps even a person sympathetic to Arius.^[5] This second quotation does not contain several statements usually attributed to Arius by his opponents, is in metrical form, and resembles other passages that have been attributed to Arius. It also contains some positive statements about the Son.^[55] But although these quotations seem reasonably accurate, their proper context is lost, so their place in Arius's larger system of thought is impossible to reconstruct.^[54]

The part of Arius's *Thalia* quoted in Athanasius's *De Synodis* is the longest extant fragment. The most commonly cited edition of *De Synodis* is by Hans-Georg Opitz.^[56] A translation of this fragment has been made by Aaron J. West,^[57] but based not on Opitz' text but on a previous edition: "When compared to Opitz' more recent edition of the text, we found that our text varies only in punctuation, capitalization, and one variant reading (χρόνω for χρόνοις, line 5)."^[58] The Opitz edition with the West translation is as follows:



Ceiling mosaic of the Arian Baptistery, in Ravenna, Italy, depicting the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost present, with John the Baptist

Αὐτὸς γοῦν ὁ θεὸς καθὼ
ἐστὶν ἄρρητος ἅπασιν
ὑπάρχει.

ἴσον οὐδὲ ὅμοιον, οὐχ
ὁμόδοξον ἔχει μόνος οὗτος.
ἀγέννητον δὲ αὐτὸν φάμεν
διὰ τὸν τὴν φύσιν γεννητόν·
τοῦτον ἄναρχον ἀνυμνοῦμεν
διὰ τὸν ἀρχὴν ἔχοντα,
αἰδῖον δὲ αὐτὸν σέβομεν διὰ
τὸν ἐν χρόνοις γεγαότα.
ἀρχὴν τὸν υἱὸν ἔθηκε τῶν
γενητῶν ὁ ἄναρχος
καὶ ἦνεγκεν εἰς υἱὸν ἑαυτοῦ
τόνδε τεκνοποιήσας,
ἴδιον οὐδὲν ἔχει τοῦ θεοῦ
καθ' ἰδιότητα, οὐδὲ γὰρ
ἐστὶν ἴσος, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ὁμοούσιος
αὐτῷ.
σοφὸς δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, ὅτι
τῆς σοφίας διδάσκαλος
αὐτός.

ικανὴ δὲ ἀπόδειξις ὅτι ὁ
θεὸς ἀόρατος ἅπασιν,
τοῖς τε διὰ υἱοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ τῶ
υἱῷ ἀόρατος ὁ αὐτός.
ῥητῶς δὲ λέγω, πῶς τῷ υἱῷ
ὁρατὸν ὁ ἀόρατος·
τῇ δυνάμει ἢ δύναιται ὁ θεὸς
ἰδεῖν· ἰδίους τε μέτροις
ὑπομένει ὁ υἱὸς ἰδεῖν τὸν

... And so God Himself, as he
really is, is inexpressible to
all.

He alone has no equal, no
one similar, and no one of the
same glory.

We call him unbegotten, in
contrast to him who by nature
is begotten.

We praise him as without
beginning in contrast to him
who has a beginning.

We worship him as timeless,
in contrast to him who in time
has come to exist.

He who is without beginning
made the Son a beginning of
created things

He produced him as a son for
himself by begetting him.

He [the son] has none of the
distinct characteristics of
God's own being

For he is not equal to, nor is
he of the same being as him.

God is wise, for he himself is
the teacher of Wisdom

Sufficient proof that God is
invisible to all:

He is invisible both to things
which were made through the

πατέρα, ὡς θέμις ἐστίν.
 ἦγουν τριάς ἐστι δόξαις οὐχ ὁμοίαις,
 ἀνεπίμικτοι ἑαυταῖς εἰσιν αἱ ὑποστάσεις
 αὐτῶν,
 μία τῆς μιᾶς ἐνδοξοτέρα δόξαις ἐπ' ἄπειρον.
 ξένος τοῦ υἱοῦ κατ' οὐσίαν ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι
 ἀναρχος ὑπάρχει.
 σύνες ὅτι ἡ μονὰς ἦν, ἡ δυὰς δὲ οὐκ ἦν,
 πρὶν ὑπάρξει.
 αὐτίκα γοῦν υἱοῦ μὴ ὄντος ὁ πατήρ θεός
 ἐστι.
 λοιπὸν ὁ υἱὸς οὐκ ὦν (ὑπῆρξε δὲ θελήσει
 πατρῶα)
 μονογενῆς θεός ἐστι καὶ ἐκατέρων
 ἀλλότριος οὗτος.
 ἡ σοφία σοφία ὑπῆρξε σοφοῦ θεοῦ θελήσει.
 ἐπινοεῖται γοῦν μυρίαίς ὅσαις ἐπινοίαις
 πνεῦμα, δύναμις, σοφία,
 δόξα θεοῦ, ἀλήθειά τε καὶ εἰκῶν καὶ λόγος
 οὗτος.
 σύνες ὅτι καὶ ἀπαύγασμα καὶ φῶς
 ἐπινοεῖται.
 ἴσον μὲν τοῦ υἱοῦ γεννᾶν δυνατός ἐστιν ὁ
 κρείττων,
 διαφορώτερον δὲ ἢ κρείττονα ἢ μείζονα
 οὐχί.
 θεοῦ ἢ θελήσει ὁ υἱὸς ἡλικός καὶ ὅσος ἐστίν,
 ἐξ ὅτε καὶ ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ἀπὸ τότε ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ
 ὑπέστη,
 ἰσχυρὸς θεὸς ὦν τὸν κρείττονα ἐκ μέρους
 ὑμνεῖ.
 συνελόντι εἰπεῖν τῷ υἱῷ ὁ θεός ἄρρητος
 ὑπάρχει·
 ἔστι γὰρ ἑαυτῷ ὃ ἐστι τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἄλεκτος,
 ὥστε οὐδὲν τῶν λεγομένων κατὰ τε
 κατάληψιν συνίει ἐξειπεῖν ὁ υἱός.
 ἀδύνατα γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸν πατέρα τε ἐξιχνιάσει,
 ὃς ἐστὶν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ.
 αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ οὐσίαν οὐκ
 οἶδεν,
 υἱὸς γὰρ ὦν θελήσει πατρὸς ὑπῆρξεν
 ἀληθῶς.
 τίς γοῦν λόγος συγχωρεῖ τὸν ἐκ πατρὸς
 ὄντα
 αὐτὸν τὸν γεννήσαντα γινῶναι ἐν καταλήψει;
 δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι τὸ ἀρχὴν ἔχον, τὸν ἀναρχον,
 ὡς ἔστιν,
 ἐμπερινοῆσαι ἢ ἐμπεριδράξασθαι οὐχ οἶόν
 τέ ἐστιν.

Son, and also to the Son himself.

I will say specifically how the invisible is seen by the Son:

by that power by which God is able to see, each according to his own measure, the Son can bear to see the Father, as is determined

So there is a Triad, not in equal glories. Their beings are not mixed together among themselves. As far as their glories, one infinitely more glorious than the other.

The Father in his essence is a foreigner to the Son, because he exists without beginning.

Understand that the Monad [eternally] was; but the Dyad was not before it came into existence.

It immediately follows that, although the Son did not exist, the Father was still God.

Hence the Son, not being [eternal] came into existence by the Father's will,

He is the Only-begotten God, and this one is alien from [all] others

Wisdom came to be Wisdom by the will of the Wise God.

Hence he is conceived in innumerable aspects.

He is Spirit, Power, Wisdom, God's glory, Truth, Image, and Word.

Understand that he is also conceived of as Radiance and Light.

The one who is superior is able to beget one equal to the Son,

But not someone more important, or superior, or greater.

At God's will the Son has the greatness and qualities that he has.

His existence from when and from whom and from then – are all from God.

He, though strong God, praises in part his superior.

In brief, God is inexpressible to the Son.

For he is in himself what he is, that is, indescribable,

So that the son does not comprehend any of these things or have the understanding to explain them.

For it is impossible for him to fathom the Father, who is by himself.

For the Son himself does not even know his own essence,

For being Son, his existence is most certainly at the will of the Father.

What reasoning allows, that he who is from the

Father

should comprehend and know his own parent?

For clearly that which has a beginning

is not able to conceive of or grasp the existence of that which has no beginning.

A slightly different edition of the fragment of the *Thalia* from *De Synodis* is given by G.C. Stead,^[59] and served as the basis for a translation by R.P.C. Hanson.^[60] Stead argued that the *Thalia* was written in anapestic meter, and edited the fragment to show what it would look like in anapests with different line breaks. Hanson based his translation of this fragment directly on Stead's text.

See also

- [Anomoeanism](#)
- [Arian controversy](#)
- [Arianism](#)
- [Semi-Arianism](#)
- [Nontrinitarianism](#)
- [Oneness Pentecostalism](#)
- [Unitarianism](#)

- First Council of Nicaea

References

1. Torkington 2011, p. 113.
2. Anatolios 2011, p. 44, "Arius, who was born in Libya, was a respected ascetic and presbyter at the church of the Baucalis in Alexandria and was the founder of Arianism".
3. Williams 2002, p. 98.
4. Handwerk, Brian (May 2006). "Constantine the Great Rules" (https://web.archive.org/web/20140826113219/http://www.nationalgeographic.com/lostgospel/timeline_10.html). *National Geographic*. Archived from the original (http://www.nationalgeographic.com/lostgospel/timeline_10.html) on August 26, 2014. Retrieved September 23, 2014.
5. Hanson 2007, pp. 127–128.
6. Kopeck, M R (1985). "Neo Arian Religion: Evidence of the Apostolic Constitutions". *Arianism: Historical and Theological Reassessments*: 160–162.
7. Dennison, James T Jr. "Arius "*Orthodoxos*"; Athanasius "*Politicus*": The Rehabilitation of Arius and the Denigration of Athanasius" (<http://www.kerux.com/documents/keruxv17n2a5.htm>). Lynnwood: Northwest Theological Seminary. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
8. O'Carroll 1987, p. 23.
9. The Encyclopedia Americana 1997, p. 297.
10. Carroll 1987, p. 10.
11. Williams 2002, p. .
12. Williams 2002, p. 235.
13. Socrates. "The Dispute of Arius with Alexander, his Bishop." (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf202.ii.iv.v.html>). *The Ecclesiastical Histories of Socrates Scholasticus*. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
14. Vasiliev, AI (1928). "The empire from Constantine the Great to Justinian" (<http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/vasilief/arianism-council-nicaea.asp>). *History of the Byzantine Empire*. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
15. Vasiliev, AI (1928). *History of the Byzantine Empire* (<http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/vasilief/arianism-council-nicaea.asp>). Retrieved 2 May 2012. "This school, as A. Harnack said, is the nursery of the Arian doctrine, and Lucian, its head, is the Arius before Arius"
16. Moore, Edward (2 May 2005). "Origen of Alexandria" (<http://www.iep.utm.edu/origen-of-alexandria/>). *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. The University of Tennessee at Martin. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
17. Origen. "On Christ" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf04.vi.v.ii.ii.html>). De Principiis. Retrieved 2 May 2012. "Wherefore we have always held that God is the Father of His only-begotten Son, who was born indeed of Him, and derives from Him what He is, but without any beginning"
18. "Arius of Alexandria, Priest and Martyr" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20120425215634/http://www.arian-catholic.org/arian/arius.html>). *Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church (Arian Catholic)*. Archived from the original (<http://www.arian-catholic.org/arian/arius.html>) on 25 April 2012. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
19. Kelly 1978, Chapter 9
20. Davis 1983, pp. 52–54
21. Rubenstein 2000, p. 57.
22. Photius. "Epitome of Chapter VII" (<http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/fathers/philostorgius.html>). *Epitome of Book I*. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
23. Athanasius, Discourse 1 Against the Arians, part 9, <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/28161.htm>

24. Athanasius, *De Decretis*, parts 20 and 30, <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/2809.htm>
25. Matt Perry - Athanasius and his Influence at the Council of Nicaea (<http://www.quodlibet.net/article/s/perry-athanasius.shtml>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20140407062158/http://www.quodlibet.net/articles/perry-athanasius.shtml>) 2014-04-07 at the [Wayback Machine](#) - QUODLIBET JOURNAL - Retrieved 29 May 2014.
26. *Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society* 1963, p. 477.
27. *McClintock & Strong* 1982, p. 45.
28. [John 14:28](https://bible.oremus.org/?passage=John%2014:28&version=nrsv) (<https://bible.oremus.org/?passage=John%2014:28&version=nrsv>)
29. [Colossians 1:15](https://bible.oremus.org/?passage=Colossians%201:15&version=nrsv) (<https://bible.oremus.org/?passage=Colossians%201:15&version=nrsv>)
30. Bishop Nicholas Loses His Cool at the Council of Nicaea (<http://www.stnicholascenter.org/Brix?pageID=57>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20110101194431/http://www.stnicholascenter.org/Brix?pageID=57>) 2011-01-01 at the [Wayback Machine](#). From the St. Nicholas center. See also *St. Nicholas the Wonderworker* (<http://ocafs.oca.org/FeastSaintsLife.asp?FSID=103484>) Archived (<https://web.archive.org/web/20120910163113/http://ocafs.oca.org/FeastSaintsLife.asp?FSID=103484>) 2012-09-10 at the [Wayback Machine](#), from the website of the [Orthodox Church in America](#). Retrieved on 2010-02-02.
31. SOCKEY, DARIA (5 December 2012). "In this corner, St. Nicholas!" (<https://catholicexchange.com/in-this-corner-st-nicholas/>). *Catholic Exchange*. Retrieved 27 February 2022.
32. *Carroll* 1987, p. 12.
33. Athanasius (23 January 2010). "Edict by Emperor Constantine against the Arians" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20110819215807/http://www.fourthcentury.com/index.php/urkunde-33>). *Fourth Century Christianity*. Wisconsin Lutheran College. Archived from the original (<http://www.fourthcentury.com/index.php/urkunde-33>) on 19 August 2011. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
34. Draper, John William (1875). *The History of the Intellectual Development of Europe* (<https://archive.org/details/ahistoryintelle00drapgoog>). pp. 358 (<https://archive.org/details/ahistoryintelle00drapgoog/page/n372>)–359., quoted in "The events following the Council of Nicaea" (http://www.smyrna.org/Books/Formulation_of_the_Trinity/The_Formulation_of_the_Trinity.htm). *The Formulation of the Trinity*. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
35. *Kirsch* 2004.
36. *Freeman* 2005.
37. Socrates. "The Death of Arius" (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf202.ii.iv.xxxviii.html>). *The Ecclesiastical Histories of Socrates Scholasticus*. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
38. Scrum, D S. "Arian Reaction - Athanasius" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20120303051501/http://www.tlogical.net/bioarius.htm#8>). *Biography of Arius*. Archived from the original (<http://www.tlogical.net/bioarius.htm#8>) on 3 March 2012. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
39. *Jones* 1986, p. 118 (<https://archive.org/details/laterromanempire01jone/page/118>).
40. "Second Creed of Sirmium or "The Blasphemy of Sirmium" " (<http://www.fourthcentury.com/index.php/second-creed-of-sirmium-or-the-blasphemy-of-sirmium/>). *Fourth Century Christianity*. Retrieved 2017-03-09.
41. *Freeman* 2009.
42. "Arianism" (<https://www.questia.com/read/101229880>). *The Columbia Encyclopedia*. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
43. Kritzeck, James (2015) [1964]. *Peter the Venerable and Islam*. Princeton Studies on the Near East. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press. pp. 145–146. ISBN 9780691624907.
44. Wilbur, Earl Morse (1977). "The Socinian Exiles in East Prussia" (<http://www.pacificuu.org/wilbur/ahu/book2/39.htm>). *A History of Unitarianism in Transylvania, England, and America*. Boston: Beacon Press.

45. Tuttle, Dainel S (1981). "Mormons" (<http://www.olivercowdery.com/smithhome/1880s-1890s/1891ERK.htm>). *A Religious Encyclopedia*: 1578.
46. "Are Mormons Arians?" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20120301105222/http://www.libertypages.com/clark/10695.html>). *Mormon Metaphics*. 19 January 2006. Archived from the original (<http://www.libertypages.com/clark/10695.html>) on 1 March 2012. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
47. Socrates. "Division begins in the Church from this Controversy; and Alexander Bishop of Alexandria excommunicates Arius and his Adherents." (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf202.ii.iv.vi.html>). *The Ecclesiastical Histories of Socrates Scholasticus*. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
48. Saint Athanasius 1911, p. 124, footnote.
49. Preserved by Athanasius, *On the Councils of Arminum and Seleucia*, 16; Epiphanius, *Refutation of All Heresies*, 69.7; and Hilary, *On the Trinity*, 4.12)
50. Recorded by Epiphanius, *Refutation of All Heresies*, 69.6 and Theodoret, *Church History*, 1.5
51. Recorded in Socrates Scholasticus, *Church History* 1.26.2 and Sozomen, *Church History* 2.27.6-10
52. Arius. "Thalia" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20120428043554/http://fourthcentury.com/index.php/arius-thalia-intro>). *Fourth Century Christianity*. Wisconsin Lutheran College. Archived from the original (<http://www.fourthcentury.com/index.php/arius-thalia-intro/>) on 28 April 2012. Retrieved 2 May 2012.
53. Williams 2002, p. 99.
54. Williams 2002, pp. 98–99.
55. Stevenson, J (1987). *A New Eusebius*. London: SPCK. pp. 330–332. ISBN 0-281-04268-3.
56. Opitz, Hans-Georg (1935). *Athanasius Werke* (<https://archive.org/details/AthanasiusWerkell>). pp. 242 (<https://archive.org/details/AthanasiusWerkell/page/n241>)–243. Retrieved 16 August 2016.
57. West, Aaron J. "Arius - Thalia" (<https://web.archive.org/web/20120428043554/http://fourthcentury.com/index.php/arius-thalia-intro>). *Fourth Century Christianity*. Wisconsin Lutheran College. Archived from the original (<http://www.fourthcentury.com/index.php/arius-thalia-intro/>) on 2012-04-28.
58. West, Aaron J. "Arius – Thalia in Greek and English" (<http://www.fourthcentury.com/index.php/arius-thalia-greek>). *Fourth Century Christianity*. Wisconsin Lutheran College. Retrieved 16 August 2016.
59. Stead 1978, pp. 48–50.
60. Hanson 1988, pp. 14–15.

Works cited

- *"Babylon the Great Has Fallen!" God's Kingdom Rules!*. Watch Tower Bible & Tract Society. January 1, 1963. ISBN 0854830138.
- *The Encyclopedia Americana*. Vol. 2 (International ed.). Grolier Academic Reference. December 1997. ISBN 9780717201297.
- Saint Athanasius (1911). *Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in Controversy with the Arians* (https://www.google.com/books/edition/_/lquqAQAACAAJ?sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjEt4WooqD2AhUcp3IEHVVUAbgQre8FegQIJhA_). Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Anatolios, Khaled (October 2011). *Retrieving Nicaea: The Development and Meaning of Trinitarian Doctrine* (https://www.google.com/books/edition/Retrieving_Nicaea/l6VzBQAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=0). Grand Rapids: Baker Academic. ISBN 978-0-8010-3132-8.
- Carroll, Warren H. (1987). *A History of Christendom: The Building of Christendom* (https://www.google.com/books/edition/The_Building_of_Christendom/5nXYAAAAMAAJ?hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahU

- [KEwi_8_el7Z32AhWeoXIEHWG-CgcQiqUDegQICBAC](#)). Christendom college Press. ISBN [0317604929](#).
- Davis, Leo Donald (1983). *The first seven ecumenical councils (325-787) : their history and theology* (https://archive.org/details/firstsevenec_davi_1990_000_6702418/page/52). Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press. ISBN [978-0-8146-5616-7](#).
 - Freeman, Charles (2005). *The Closing of the Western Mind* (<https://archive.org/details/closingofwester00char>) (1st Vintage Books ed.). New York: Vintage Books. ISBN [1-4000-3380-2](#).
 - Freeman, Charles (5 February 2009). *A.D. 381: Heretics, Pagans, and the Christian State* (https://www.google.com/books/edition/A_D_381/1zilDwAAQBAJ?hl=en&gbpv=0). Abrams. ISBN [978-1-59020-522-8](#).
 - Hanson, Richard Patrick Crosland (1988). *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381* (https://www.google.com/books/edition/_/wkbZAAAAMAAJ?sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwj5l_-7qpn2AhUdmXIEHYr0CklQ7_IDegQIBBAD). T. & T. Clark. ISBN [978-0-567-09485-8](#).
 - Hanson, Richard Patrick Crosland (2007). *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy, 318-381*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic. ISBN [978-0-8010-3146-5](#).
 - Jones, Arnold Hugh Martin (1986). *The later Roman Empire, 284-602 : a social economic and administrative survey* (<https://archive.org/details/laterromanempire01jone>). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. ISBN [978-0-8018-3284-0](#).
 - Kelly, J. N. D. (1978). *Early Christian doctrines*. San Francisco: HarperCollins. ISBN [978-0-06-064334-8](#).
 - Kirsch, Jonathan (2004). *God against the gods : the history of the war between monotheism and polytheism* (https://archive.org/details/isbn_9780965916776). New York: Viking Compass. ISBN [978-0-9659167-7-6](#).
 - McClintock, John; Strong, James (1982). *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature: New - Pes* (https://www.google.com/books/edition/Cyclopedia_of_Biblical_Theological_and_E/-BRJnQEACAAJ?hl=en). Vol. 7 (2nd ed.). Baker Academic. ISBN [0801061237](#).
 - O'Carroll, Michael (1987). *Trinitas*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press. p. 23. ISBN [0-8146-5595-5](#).
 - Rubenstein, Richard E. (2000). *When Jesus Became God: The Struggle to Define Christianity During the Last Days of Rome* (https://www.google.com/books/edition/When_Jesus_Became_God/CUxsmAEACAAJ?hl=en). Harcourt. ISBN [978-0-15-601315-4](#).
 - Stead, G. C. (1978). "The "Thalia" of Arius and the Testimony of Athanasius" (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/23960253>). *The Journal of Theological Studies*. **29** (1): 20–52. doi:10.1093/jts/XXIX.1.20 (<https://doi.org/10.1093%2Fjts%2FXXIX.1.20>). ISSN [0022-5185](#) (<https://www.worldcat.org/issn/0022-5185>). JSTOR [23960253](#) (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/23960253>).
 - Torkington, David (3 February 2011). *Wisdom from Franciscan Italy: The Primacy of Love* (https://www.google.com/books/edition/Wisdom_from_Franciscan_Italy/sN84PdvVT00C?hl=en&gbpv=0). John Hunt Publishing. ISBN [978-1-84694-442-0](#).
 - Williams, Rowan (24 January 2002) [1987]. *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (<https://www.google.com/books/edition/Arius/5QoRowuRAWMC?hl=en&gbpv=0>) (Revised ed.). Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing. ISBN [978-0-8028-4969-4](#).

General references

Primary sources

