PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON THEOLOGY, RELIGION, CULTURE, AND HUMANITIES
Vol. 2, No. 1, June 2025 (15-26)

Arius' Christology and the Question of Redemption

Markus Schmidt[a,1]
[a] *Faculty of Catholic Theology, Universität Innsbruck, Austria*

[1]Corresponding Email: markus.schmidt@uibk.ac.at
DOI: https://doi.org/10.24071/tic.v2i1.12035

Abstract

The Ancient Church celebrated the Council of Nicaea in 325. The main reason was to address the Christology of the presbyter Arius of Alexandria (Egypt), who promoted his unorthodox ideas about Jesus of Nazareth in view of his pastoral work. His Christological teachings became widespread and influenced faithful and clerics. As a result, they threatened the apostolic faith of the Church. Arius teaches that the Son of God cannot be God in the full sense of the word. He differs from the Father because he is not eternal or co-eternal and does not have his being with the Father. The Son did not exist before his generation, but was begotten before all things. Arius, thus, emphasizes God as a monad and the source of all beings. Therefore, the soteriological question arises how Jesus Christ can be the redeemer if he is not God. Arius' Christological concept cannot answer this question because in this view, Christ, without being God, cannot work out redeeming humanity. What needs redeeming is the human sin against God. For that, one must bridge the absolute abyss between God and humanity, but a human being cannot cross that boundary between God and humanity. Only God, as God, can perform this redemption, but for Arius, Jesus Christ is not God in the full sense of the word. Because of that, the Jesus Christ of Arius' teachings cannot save humanity. As a result, the soteriological consequence of Arius' Christology is tragic: because Christ is not God, he cannot be the redeemer. He cannot bridge the abyss between God and humanity. Thus, there is no way that human beings can win reconciliation with God because Jesus Christ is not the Messiah. Humanity will remain in its sinful state.

Keywords

Arius, Arianism, Christology, Soteriology, redemption, Council of Nicaea.

INTRODUCTION

In the year 325, the Emperor Constantine gathered significant bishops at Nicaea to celebrate the first ecumenical council. One reason included discussing the teachings of the presbyter Arius of Alexandria, who promoted unorthodox

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA 4.0

Christological ideas.[1] His concept attempted to understand Jesus Christ from a pastoral point of view. Arius' Christological teaching spread out and influenced clerics and faithful alike.[2] That resulted in risking the unity of the Church.[3]

The second aim of the council intended to agree on a common Easter date, which Christians still debated. It, thus, appeared pressing to solve this disunity because it did not support the trustworthiness of the Christian message. This point, however, will not occupy us further because I want to focus on the Christological issue of the council.

In what follows, I intend to reflect on the soteriological implications that Arius' Christology poses. First, I plan to present the Christological concept of Arius. Afterwards, a section of reflecting on the consequences of soteriology follows. A conclusion will round up my paper.

ARIUS' CHRISTOLOGY

We have only three texts that we can confidently ascribe to Arius. These three texts, thus, present his thinking and are the following documents: (1) the confession of faith for bishop Alexander of Alexandria, (2) the letter to bishop Eusebius of

[1] For an in-depth study, see Thomas Böhm, Die Christologie des Arius: Dogmengeschichtliche Überlegungen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Hellenisierungsfrage, Studien zur Theologie und Geschichte 7 (St. Ottilien: EOS, 1991).

[2] Vladimir Latinovic argues that Arius was a conservative theologian, in contrast to the innovators Alexander and Athanasius, to understand the influence and fast dissemination of Arius' ideas. See Vladimir Latinovic, "Arius Conservativus? The Question of Arius' Theological Belonging", in *Papers Presented at the Seventeenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 2015*, ed. Markus Vinzent, Studia Patristica, 95 vol. 21 (Leuven: Peeters, 2017), 27–41.

[3] For a magisterial overview of the fourth century doctrinal crisis, see Manlio Simonetti, *La crisi ariana nel IV secolo*, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 11 (Roma: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1975), and Richard Patrick Crosland Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988). Cf. also Henry Melvill Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism: Chiefly Referring to the Character and Chronology of the Reaction Which Followed the Council of Nicaea*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1900), https://www.ntslibrary.com/PDF Books/Studies of Arianism - Gwatkin.pdf; Charles Kannengiesser, "Bulletin de Théologie Patristique: 2ème Section: crise arienne", *Recherches de Sience Religieuse* 70, no. 4 (1982): 597–612, https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k9817707h/; Adolf Martin Ritter, "Arius Redivivus? Ein Jahrzwölft Arianismusforschung", *Theologische Rundschau* 55, no. 2 (1990): 153–87, https://www.jstor.org/stable/26153421; Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams, eds., *Arianism After Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflict* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993). An in-depth survey of the history of interpretation of Arius provides Maurice F. Wiles, *Archetypal Heresy: Arianism Through the Centuries*, reprint of the first edition in 1996 with minor corrections (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Nicomedia, and (3) the confession of faith for the Emperor Constantine in 327 (or 335). Another document exists, which is called Thalia . It includes in some respect the most relevant evidence to understand Arius' independent thinking on Christology. All other texts that have come to us are reports from the enemies of Arius, like, for instance, Athanasius , and, thus, might represent his ideas distorted or one-sided. Rowan Williams still warns that "we should be equally cautious about totally rejecting those allusions to Arius' theology which correspond to nothing in his own undoubted works—simply because the latter are so limited and fragmentary."

We will now analyse the four texts to explore the Christology Arius has promoted. Our starting point is the confession of faith which Arius presented to bishop Alexander of Alexandria.

The confession of faith of Arius and his followers to Alexander of Alexandria

Arius and his Alexandrian supporters presented a statement of faith to bishop Alexander of Alexandria, probably between 318 and 320. Athanasius preserved the letter in *De Synodis* 16.2–6 and Epiphanius in *Panarion* 69.7–8. There also exist two Latin translations by Hilary in his *De Trinitate* 4.12-13 and 6.5-6, but without the greetings at the end. Hans-Georg Opitz published the modern edition of the primary Greek text.[4]

In his creed, Arius clarified his teachings and added the names of five presbyters/priests, six deacons, and several bishops, who supported his statement.[5] Rowan Williams characterizes this writing: "The letter to Alexander is elaborate, even diffuse, a statement which explicitly claims to be within a tradition shared with its recipient and potential audience."[6] This claim of being in line with the tradition is confirmed when compared to the creed of the Antiochene Council of 325. Regarding the Father, both texts are similar, but differ substantially regarding the Christological section, except some positive aspects of the Son. One may note that Arius bases his text more on the tradition of the ecclesial teachings whereas the Antiochene text has

[4] See Hans-Georg Opitz, ed., *Athanasius Werke: III.1: Urkunden zur Geschichte des Arianischen Streites 318–328*, vol. 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1934), 12–13, Urkunde 6 (hereafter cited as AW 3.1.page).

[5] See https://www.fourthcentury.com/urkunde-6/. The names of the supporters are: Arius himself; the priests Aethales, Achilles, Carpones, Sarmatas, and Arius (not the author of the statement); the deacons Euzoios, Lucius, Julius, Menas, Helladius, and Gaius; the bishops Secundas of the Pentapolis, Theonas of Libya, and Pistus, the future bishop of Alexandria. It is, however, doubtful that the names of the bishops are authentic, see Williams, *Arius*, 95; AW 3.1.13, text-critical apparatus to line 23/24.

[6] Williams, 96.

its basis more in the Scriptures. That might be because of tactical reasons, as Williams suspects.[7] It is apparent that both documents ground their statements on common conventions.

Now, let us turn to the text of Arius' statement of faith. Arius opens the letter by referring to the forefathers from whom the signatories have their faith. He also mentions that they have received the faith from Alexander of Alexandria, who is his bishop.

After this introduction, Arius explains their faith. He starts the exposition with God the Father, but without calling God the Father. The context, however, is clear that it is the Father whom Arius describes. Arius and the signatories "acknowledge one God, the only unbegotten (*agennētos*), the only eternal (*aïdios*), the only one without cause or beginning (*anarchos*), the only true, the only one possessed of immortality, the only wise, the only good, the only sovereign, judge of all things, controller of all things, administrator of all things, immutable and unchanging, righteous and good, the God of the Law and the prophets and the New Covenant, the begetter of his only Son before endless ages"[8].

This description of God did not cause problems because it follows the ecclesial tradition. The exposition about the faith in God the Father, therefore, insists on the orthodoxy of their faith having a traditional characteristic. Williams suggests that Arius' statement of faith includes elements of an official Alexandrian creed because of the parallels with terms bishop Alexander uses.

When Arius turns to the faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, his theology sharply differs from tradition. He acknowledges that all that exists is made through the Son. The Father begets the Son and gives him subsistence by his free will. The Son is immutable and unchanging, and God created him perfectly, "but not like one among other creatures" [9]. Neither does he emanate from the Father, nor is he consubstantial with the Father. The Son does also not split up the divine monad into two. Arius states that the Son "was created by the will of God before all times and all ages, receiving from the Father his life and his existence, the Father making the Son's glories exist alongside himself. For the Father in giving him the inheritance of all

[7] See Williams, 96.
[8] Williams, *Arius* 270; cf. AW 3.1.12.
[9] Williams 270; cf. AW 3.1.12.

things did not deprive himself of what he has self-sufficiently (*agennētōs*) in his own life; for he is the source of everything."[10]

Arius states clearly here that the Son is not of the same substance as the Father. There is no other source than the Father. He begets the Son, but the Son is yet a creature, although before all other creatures and not like one among other generated things. The Son, thus, stands between God and all other creatures, belonging more to the generated things than to God.

Arius continues with the statement and reflects that there are three subsisting realities. He explains that

> God, being the cause of all things, is without beginning and supremely unique (*monōtatos*), while the Son, timelessly (*achronōs*) begotten by the Father, created and established before all ages, did not exist prior to his begetting, but was timelessly begotten before all things; he alone was given existence [directly] by the Father. For he is not eternal or co-eternal or equally self-sufficient (*sunagennētos*) with the Father, nor does he have his being alongside the Father [...]. But it is God [only], as monad and first principle of all things, who exists in this way before all things.[11]

To affirm his Christology, Arius reminds Alexander of his teaching. Bishop Alexander himself has been preaching in Church that the Father exists before the Son.[12] Thus, Arius teaches what he has learned from Alexander, his bishop. Further, Arius argues against the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, because, in this case, the Father would be "compound and divisible and changeable and material; [...] the God who is without a body is undergoing the experience proper to a body."[13]

In his statement of faith, Arius emphasizes his orthodoxy which he has learned from teachers of the past and from the public preaching of his bishop Alexander, "yet at the same time arguing clearly and pertinaciously for a distinctive and controversial interpretation of the faith received"[14].

[10] Williams 271; cf. AW 3.1.13.
[11] Williams 271; cf. AW 3.1.13.
[12] See Williams 271; cf. AW 3.1.13.
[13] Williams 271; cf. AW 3.1.13.
[14] Williams, 271.

The letter to bishop Eusebius of Nicomedia

Arius sent this letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia, who is his supporter. The date of the writing is hard to determine. Indications, however, point to the time when the controversy was most intense in the eastern Mediterranean (maybe 321–323). It is impossible to be more precise.[15]

Theodoret in his *Historia ecclesiastica* 1.5 and Epiphanius in his *Panarion* 69.6 preserved the letter. Léon Parmentier presents a modern text-critical edition of the writing.[16]

In the opening of his letter to Eusebius, Arius laments that Alexander, his bishop, unjustly persecutes him because of his teaching the truth. He also states that Eusebius is orthodox and defending the truth, too. Then, Arius presents Alexander's teaching, with which he will never agree. After having mentioned some teachings of heretics, he confirms what he had been teaching and continues to do so: "that the Son is not unbegotten, nor a part of an unbegotten entity in any way, nor from anything in existence, but that he is subsisting in will and intention before time and before the ages, full 'of grace and truth', God, the only-begotten, unchangeable. Before he was begotten, or created, or defined, or established, he did not exist. For he was not unbegotten."[17] In other words, Arius teaches that the Son is not eternal like the Father, but has a beginning. The reason for this arguing is that the Son "is not a portion of God nor of anything in existence"[18].

Williams characterizes the letter as "largely couched in negative terms"[19]. The negative terms are understandable because the letter is a lamentation about Arius' unjust persecution by his bishop. The text repudiates the teachings of Alexander and his allies in Palestine and Syria. Arius argues that the conviction of his bishop is inadmissible. That also is not surprising because he teaches the opposite of his bishop.

[15] See https://www.fourthcentury.com/urkunde-1/. Opitz dates the letter around 318, which seems too early, see AW 3.1.1.

[16] Léon Parmentier, ed., *Theodoret Kirchengeschichte*, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 44 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1954), 25–26, https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112486023. Opitz also presents a text-critical version, but from 1934: AW 3.1.1–3.

[17] https://www.fourthcentury.com/urkunde-1/.

[18] https://www.fourthcentury.com/urkunde-1/.

[19] Williams, *Arius*, 97.

The letter of Arius and Euzoius to the Emperor Constantine in 327

Arius and Euzoius sent their letter with their confession of faith to the Emperor Constantine at the end of 327[20]. It appears to be a response to an invitation of Constantine to come to his court. Ancient sources of the letter are Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1.26.2–7 and Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 2.27.6–10. A modern text-critical edition provides Günther Christian Hansen.[21]

In this letter, Arius and Euzoius state their faith in God, the almighty Father, and his Son Jesus Christ, the divine Word, begotten by the Father. Everything in heaven and on earth is through the Son. He became flesh, suffered, died, and rose again. He descended into heaven and will come again to judge the living and the dead. They confess their faith in the Holy Spirit, the flesh's resurrection, and the eternal life, the Kingdom of God to come, and the one catholic Church of God.

In the second part of their letter, Arius and Euzoius emphasize that their faith is based on the Scriptures and the tradition of the catholic Church. On that basis, they turn to the emperor with their plea:

> So we entreat you in your devoutness, most God-beloved emperor, that we, who are clerics holding the faith and sentiments of the Church and the holy Scriptures, may be united to our mother the Church through your peacemaking and reverent devoutness, with all questions put aside, and all the word-spinning arising from these questions, so that both we and the Church, being at peace with each other, may all make together the proper and accustomed prayers for your peaceful and devout rule, and for all your family.[22]

The letter is plain and brief, avoiding everything that could cause disputes. Williams characterizes the text as "almost entirely colourless in terms of the debates that had divided eastern Christianity in the century or so leading up to it"[23]. One can describe it as "a studiedly uncontroversial composition"[24], which is no surprise for

[20] Or maybe in 335, see Williams, 95.

[21] Sokrates, *Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Günther Christian Hansen, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, N.F. 1 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995) (hereafter cited as SK). Opitz also presents a text-critical version, but from 1935, see Hans-Georg Opitz, ed., *Athanasius Werke: III.1: Urkunden zur Geschichte des Arianischen Streites 318–328*, vol. 2 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1935), 64, Dokument 30.

[22] Williams, *Arius*, 278–79.; cf. SK 1.26.6–7.

[23] Williams, 97.

[24] Williams, 279.

someone who begs for amnesty. Thus, the letter adds almost nothing for us to understand Arius' theology of the Son. What we may learn is that he believes in three different divine hypostases, which truly (ἀληθῶς, alēthōs) exist.

The Thalia

Athanasius presents two accounts of the Thalia, one in *Contra Arianos* I.5–6 and the other in *De Synodis* 15. Brennecke et al. present a modern text-critical edition of *De Synodis*.[25] The text *De Synodis* dates back to 359–362, the bulk stemming from 359.[26]

The version of the Thalia in *Contra Arianos* I.5–6 is a mixture of verse and prose. That could mean that the text was not pure verse in the original or that Athanasius paraphrased the text. In contrast, the second version in *De Synodis* 15 is entirely metrical, although not regularly. Athanasius' comments do not interrupt it, and its vocabulary is distinctive, "almost incantatory"[27]. This version does not provide the entire text of the Thalia, but presumes to represent the distinctive theological thoughts of Arius. The text does not flow because its argumentation breaks at several points, which suggests that the text suffers from some essential omissions. This diffuse style often used by polemics at the time should make us hesitant discarding the text. Therefore, the version of the Thalia in *De Synodis* can still count as a direct quotation, which we cannot say about the text in *Contra Arianos*.[28] Thus, we will focus on the more reliable version in *De Synodis*.

The Thalia appears as apologia, in which Arius explains his theological ideas.[29] He states God is unbegotten and has no one equal to him. No one shares his glory. Arius clarifies the difference between God and the Son, who is begotten by nature and has a beginning. In contrast, God is eternal and has established the Son as a creature before all other creatures. The Son possesses nothing proper to God because he is not consubstantial to God, whom to the Son is invisible. God, thus, is a monad. One can

[25] Hanns Christof Brennecke, Uta Heil, and Annette von Stockhausen, eds., *Athanasius Werke: II: Die "Apologien"* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006), 231–78; *De Synodis* 15: 242–243.

[26] See https://www.fourthcentury.com/athanasius-on-nicaea-2/, visited 10 Sept 2025. Brennecke, Heil, and Stockhausen, 242, Fn. 5, states that the date is not handed down to us.

[27] Williams, *Arius*, 99.

[28] See Williams, 99. Both texts, however, stem from the same source, see Karin Metzler, "Ein Beitrag zur Rekonstruktion der 'Thalia' des Arius", in *Ariana Et Athanasiana: Studien zur Überlieferung und zu philologischen Problemen der Werke des Athanasius von Alexandrien*, ed. Karin Metzler and Frank Simon, Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 83 (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1991), 13–45.

[29] See Williams, *Arius*, 99.

also think of him as radiance and light. The Son cannot understand God, who is higher than the Son. He even does not know his own substance. He exists because of the Father's will.

What is striking is the Son's ignorance of the Father. This theme is dominant and distinctive of the Thalia. Nowhere in Arius' letters and fragments of his supporters do we find parallels. The argument depends on the Son's createdness. The ignorance of the Son regarding the Father is an effect of his being created. That implies that he cannot be like the Father who is eternal and uncreated. The Son even needs God's grace, like every creature, to perform the Father's will, through whom he exists.

Arius aims to witness that God is independent and unique. Williams explains: "To understand his liberty, it was necessary to affirm his freedom from created intellection, his unconditioned nature, and his absolute uniqueness. Such philosophical points as Arius deploys are used precisely to safeguard this central concern."[30] Before we reflect on the consequences of this theology, it will help to summarize the distinct theological ideas Arius presents.

Arius' distinctive theological characteristics

Arius' theological thoughts can be summarized in four points:

(1) God is simple, no plurality is within him. He is a monad, self-subsistent, and unbegotten. God is eternal and does not share his substance with anyone. He is utterly independent and unique.

(2) The Son truly (ἀληθῶς, alēthōs) subsists and is distinct from God. God freely creates the Son before all things and ages. Thus, the Son is not eternal like God, who exists prior to the Son.

(3) The Son is unchangeable by the will of God, who made him a perfect creature, and inherits all things and glories he can ever receive as a created being. The glory of God, however, is not lessened.

(4) The role of the Holy Spirit is not explored, but the Catholic faith teaches three divine subsistents (*hypostaseis*).

Arius thinks God as eternal and self-subsistent, but God does not share these characteristics with the Son, who is not consubstantial to God. This concept of God and the Son has serious effects on Soteriology.

[30] Williams, 107.

CONSEQUENCE FOR SOTERIOLOGY

Arius defends with his writings himself as a teacher. He wants to "develop a biblically-based *and* rationally consistent catechesis"[31], and emphasizes that his ideas are based on Scripture, tradition, and reason. Athanasius, however, dismisses his arguments and ideas.[32] Although he is polemic in his writings and may sometimes be too sharp, he recognizes the soteriological problems Arius poses with his Christology. The salvific question, especially, is how Jesus Christ can be the redeemer if he is not entirely God.

Athanasius' answer[33] to the soteriological challenge Arius develops with his Christological concept has been influential until the presence. I still find his argumentation convincing, especially when I have discovered that it is the same argumentation I follow in my theological reflection regarding Arius' Christology.

It is essential to remember that Arius calls the Son a god, but not in the strict sense of the word. The Son is god only by participation. Arius qualifies the account of the Son as a creature with his utter uniqueness, which means he is not like any other creature. One can turn it as one like the Son remains a creature. Arius' Christological concept, therefore, cannot answer the soteriological question because in this view, Christ, being less than fully divine, cannot work out redeeming humanity. What needs redeeming is the human sin against God. For that, one must bridge the absolute abyss between God and humanity, but a human being cannot cross that boundary between God and human beings. Only God, as God, can perform this redemption, but for Arius, Jesus Christ is not God in the full sense of the word. Because of that, the Jesus Christ of Arius' teachings cannot save humanity.

CONCLUSION

The soteriological consequence of Arius' Christology must be characterized as a tragedy: because Christ is not God in the strict sense of the word but a creature, although utterly different from all other creatures, he cannot be the redeemer. The Son lacks the ability to bridge the abyss between God and humanity because of his createdness. Therefore, there is no way that human beings can win reconciliation with

[31] Williams, *Arius* 111; emphasis original.

[32] Wiles, *Archetypal Heresy*, 9–26., offers a more sympathetic reconstruction viewing "the initial impetus of Arianism in a more positive light" (9).

[33] See Athanasius, *De Synodis* 51.

God through the Son because Jesus Christ can not communicate redemption to creation. Humanity will remain in its sinful state.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barnes, Michel R., and Daniel H. Williams, eds. Arianism After Arius: Essays on the Development of the Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflict. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.

Böhm, Thomas. Die Christologie des Arius: Dogmengeschichtliche Überlegungen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Hellenisierungsfrage. Studien zur Theologie und Geschichte 7. St. Ottilien: EOS, 1991.

Brennecke, Hanns Christof, Uta Heil, and Annette von Stockhausen, eds. Athanasius Werke: II: Die "Apologien". Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006.

Fernández, Samuel, ed. Fontes Nicaenae Synodi: The Contemporary Sources for the Study of the Council of Nicaea (304–337). Contexts of Ancient and Medieval Anthropology 10. Paderborn: Brill Schoningh, 2024.

Gwatkin, Henry Melvill. Studies of Arianism: Chiefly Referring to the Character and Chronology of the Reaction Which Followed the Council of Nicaea. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1900. https://www.ntslibrary.com/PDF Books/Studies of Arianism - Gwatkin.pdf.

Hanson, Richard Patrick Crosland. The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318–381. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.

Kannengiesser, Charles. "Bulletin de Théologie Patristique: 2ème Section: crise arienne". Recherches de Sience Religieuse 70, no. 4 (1982): 597–612. https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k9817707h/.

Latinovic, Vladimir. "Arius Conservativus? The Question of Arius' Theological Belonging". In Papers Presented at the Seventeenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 2015, edited by Markus Vinzent, 27–41. Studia Patristica, 95 vol. 21. Leuven: Peeters, 2017.

Metzler, Karin. "Ein Beitrag zur Rekonstruktion der 'Thalia' des Arius". In Ariana Et Athanasiana: Studien zur Überlieferung und zu philologischen Problemen der Werke des Athanasius von Alexandrien, edited by Karin Metzler and Frank Simon, 13–45. Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 83. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1991.

Opitz, Hans-Georg, ed. Athanasius Werke: III.1: Urkunden zur Geschichte des Arianischen Streites 318–328. Vol. 1. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1934.

————, ed. Athanasius Werke: III.1: Urkunden zur Geschichte des Arianischen Streites 318–328. Vol. 2. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1935.

Parmentier, Léon, ed. Theodoret Kirchengeschichte. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte 44. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1954. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783112486023.

Ritter, Adolf Martin. "Arius Redivivus? Ein Jahrzwölft Arianismusforschung". Theologische Rundschau 55, no. 2 (1990): 153–87. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26153421.

Simonetti, Manlio. La crisi ariana nel IV secolo. Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 11. Roma: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1975.

Sokrates. Kirchengeschichte. Edited by Günther Christian Hansen. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, N.F. 1. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995.

Wiles, Maurice F. Archetypal Heresy: Arianism Through the Centuries. Reprint of the first edition in 1996 with minor corrections. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Williams, Rowan. Arius: Heresy and Tradition. 2nd ed. London: SCM Press, 2001.