Was Priscillian a Modalist Monarchian?[1]

Tarmo Toom
Catholic University of America

As the first Christian bishop executed by his Christian episcopal opponents through a secular court, Priscillian of Avila has stirred the interest and imagination of many scholars.[2] A well-known problem with reconstructing both Priscillian's life and theology is that, apart from some authentic treatises, most of the information about him comes from the polemical statements of his sworn enemies, such as Ithacius of Ossonuba.[3] Sulpicius Severus contended that Ithacius was a "worthless . . . bold, loquacious, impudent, and extravagant man," and yet he "poured forth entreaties full of ill-will and accusations against Priscillian."[4] Although Ithacius's book is lost, writers such as Filaster, Sulpicius Severus, Orosius, Jerome, Consentius, Augustine, Leo the Great, Vincent of Lérins, Prosper of Aquitaine, Hydatius,

[1] "Modalist monarchianism" is a modern designation. The opponents of Priscillian preferred to call him "Sabellian" after a 3rd-cent. figure Sabellius. Sabellius allegedly taught that the distinction between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is only nominal (Epiphanius, *Pan*. 62). Heresiological categories—some ancient, others modern—have been part of the anti-Priscillianist rhetoric as well as of the counter-accusations that Priscillian himself employed against his opponents (see, e.g., *Tract*. 1.357–79; 2.94–109 in *Priscillian of Avila: The Complete Works* [ed. and trans. Marco Conti; Oxford Early Christian Texts; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010] 54–55, 74–75).

[2] An almost thirty-page multilingual bibliography can be found in Andrés Olivares Guillem, *Prisciliano a través del tiempo. Historia de los estudios sobre el priscilianismo* (Galicia hisórica; Madrid: Fundación Pedro Barrié de la Maza, 2004) 265–91. One should also consult Sylvain Jean Gabriel Sanchez's fascinating "L'historiographie du priscillianisme (1559–2012)" and "Bibliographie chronologique des études scientifiques sur le priscillianisme," accessed July 12, 2012, at http://sjgsanchez.free.fr/historiogsanchez.pdf and http://sjgsanchez.free.fr/bibliogchrono.pdf, respectively.

[3] Ernest-Charles Babut, *Priscillien et le Priscillianisme* (Paris: H. Champion, 1909) 33–56, but see the analysis in Virginia Burrus, *The Making of a Heretic: Gender, Authority, and the Priscillianist Controversy* (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 24; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995) 126–59.

[4] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron*. 2.49–50.

HTR 107:4 (2014) 470–84

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Isidore of Seville received their information about Priscillian mostly from Ithacius's book or from the readers of his book.[5] Later perceptions of Priscillian (and Priscillianists[6]) have, no doubt, been influenced by what these prominent figures reiterated following Ithacius.[7]

Since Priscillian's alleged Manichaeism, practice of magic, justifying the reading of apocryphal texts, and getting Procula pregnant have received more press than his theology, this article will investigate the allegation that Priscillian was a modalist monarchian / patripassian[8] in the light of his authentic treatises.[9] I have no intention of becoming a defense lawyer for Priscillian and rehabilitating him in all respects,[10] but I do argue that his Trinitarian statements are not modalist. If one does not read Priscillian in the light of the ready-made categories of heresiologists, perhaps his theological astuteness and the originality of his thought can be partially salvaged.

After Priscillian had managed to agitate some churchmen against himself by his unusual ascetic practices and interest in esoteric teachings, doctrinal accusations

[5] Filaster of Brescia, *Div. her.* 61 and 84; Sulpicius Severus, *Chron.* 2.46–51; Orosius, *Comm.*; among other loci and if he knew Ithacius's book at all, Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 121 (122–23) (Jerome was Pope Damasus's secretary at the time of Priscillian's visits to Rome); Consentius, *Ep.* 11* and 12*; Augustine, *Priscill.* and *Haer.* 70 (the bishop of Hippo says explicitly, "Now that I hear from you [i.e., Orosius] what they hold . . ." [*Priscill.* 1.1]); Leo the Great, *Ep.* 15; Vincent of Lérins, *Comm.* 24–25; Prosper of Aquitaine, *Chronicon* 734 (and 736); Hydatius, *Chronicon* 13b, 16, 32 (not to be confused with Hydatius of Mérida); and Isidore of Seville, *Vir. ill.* 15. For details, see Guillem, *Prisciliano a través del tiempo*, 38–71 and Sylvain Jean Gabriel Sanchez, *Priscillien, un chrétien non conformiste. Doctrine et pratique du priscillianisme du IVe au VIe siècle* (ThH 120; Paris: Beauchesne, 2009) 88–131.

[6] The earliest use of the designation "Priscillianista" is found in the title of Orosius's *Commonitorium* (414 C.E.).

[7] "Chaque polémiste a repris les accusations de ses prédécesseurs, sans se soucier d'en vérifier la crédibilité" (Each polemist repeated the accusations of his predecessors, without bothering to check the credibility [of these accusations]) (Sanchez, *Priscillien*, 179).

[8] Modalist monarchianism is an early Trinitarian view that attempted to rescue Christian monotheism by refusing to posit a separate divine being besides God the Father either from eternity or from the time of creation. The names "Father," "Son," and "Spirit" were believed to refer only to the temporary modes of God's economic activity (Hippolytus[?], *Noet.*; *Haer.* 9; Tertullian, *Prax.*). Patripassianism, a variant of modalist monarchianism, taught that God the Father was born, suffered, and died (Tertullian, *Praescr.* 7).

[9] Among more recent authors, Escribano does not attempt to distinguish between the writings of Priscillian and Priscillianists (M. Victoria Escribano, "Heresy and Orthodoxy in Fourth-Century Hispania: Arianism and Priscillianism," in *Hispania in Late Antiquity* [ed. and trans. Kim Bowes and Michael Kulikowski; The Medieval and Early Modern Iberian World 24; Leiden: Brill, 2005] 121–49). Sanchez makes a distinction between the original, first-generation Priscillians (*les priscilliens*) and later Priscillianists (*les priscillianistes*) (*Priscillien*, 14) and thus considers all Würzburg *Tractates* together as the earliest extant writings of Priscillians. This article, however, operates with the distinction between Priscillian's authentic writings and the writings of Priscillians/ Priscillianists (see n. 22).

[10] In one of the most recent comprehensive assessments of Priscillian (see n. 5), Sanchez argues that although Priscillian undoubtedly demonstrated his interest in and knowledge of esoteric teachings, he was neither a gnostic nor a Manichaean. These were primarily his ascetic practices, combined with a certain dualism that caused the accusation of Manichaeism.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

started to fly. However, Priscillian makes it very clear that he was not condemned at a council that he did not attend—the Council of Saragossa in 380 C.E.:[11] "None was accused, none was found guilty, none was condemned, no crime was ascribed to our name, intention, and way of life."[12] Despite Sulpicius Severus's contrary claim,[13] the acts of this council do not mention either Priscillian's name or his Trinitarian theology.[14] Chadwick, too, points out that the bishops at Saragossa "conspicuously fail to mention dogmatic deviation as the ground for alarm."[15] Recently, Marco Conti, a translator of the works of Priscillian into English, has made a plea for paying more serious attention to "the actual content of the Priscillianist literary corpus," instead of continuously repeating the hostile distortions of his opponents.[16] He estimates that Priscillianist writings are "largely orthodox and apparently unexceptionable."[17] However, for Conti, this observation does not extend to Priscillian's Trinitarian theology.

One of the most intriguing things in the authentic works of Priscillian is an early declaratory creed.[18] It is the oldest extant Spanish creed[19] and is found in *Tract*. 2.47–67 of the fifth–sixth century Würzburg Manuscript, which was discovered in 1886.[20] The treatise itself is titled *Priscillian's Book to Bishop Damasus* (*Priscilliani liber ad Damasum Episcopum*) and it comes from the years 381–382 C.E.[21] Although the Würzburg Manuscript does not contain the name Priscillian, *Tract*. 2 is arguably one of the authentic works of the bishop of Avila.[22] The creed is written with the

[11] For the Council of Saragossa Sanchez prefers the date 379 C.E. (*Priscillien*, 32–35).

[12] Priscillian, *Tract*. 2.28–29; see also 2.111, 125–26, and 180–81. The fact that Priscillian could easily continue his episcopal duties in Spain after he was reinstated by Macedonius adds credence to the possibility that he was not officially condemned and deposed in the first place.

[13] Sulpicius Severus, *Chron*. 2.47.

[14] Felix Rodríguez, "Concilio I de Zaragoza. Texto crítico," in *I Concilio Caesaraugustano. MDC aniversario* (ed. Guillermo Fatás Cabeza; Zaragoza, Spain: Institución Fernando el Católico, 1981) 9–25. It is not known whether any specific accusations of heresy were made at the Council of Bordeaux (384 C.E.[?]). The acts of this council are not extant and Sulpicius Severus does not mention any theological issues in connection with this council either (*Chron*. 2.49).

[15] Henry Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976) 23.

[16] Conti, *Priscillian of Avila*, 9–13.

[17] Ibid., 7. Burrus has argued earlier that although the content of the extant works of Priscillian might be theologically ambiguous, "blatant Gnostic, Manichean, or monarchian errors are elusive, if not altogether absent" (*The Making of a Heretic*, 3).

[18] Some of the creedal clauses (incarnation, crucifixion, death, resurrection, ascension) are also listed in the given order in Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.41–43. Another partial mini-creed is found in *Tract*. 3.98–101.

[19] Georg Ludwig Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche* (Breslau: Morgenstern, 1897; repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1962) 64 n. 129. The page number is taken from the reprinted edition.

[20] *Priscilliani quae supersunt. Maximam partem nuper detexit adiectisque commentariis criticis et indicibus primus* (ed. Georg Schepss; CSEL 18; Prague: Tempsky, 1889]).

[21] Conti, *Priscillian of Avila*, 17.

[22] Ibid., 15–17, 268, 278, and 300. Morin attributes *Tract*. 2 to Priscillian's friend Instantius, but

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

aim to prove that Priscillian and his compatriots' "faith and way of life" (fide et uita nostra) are blameless.[23]

The Creed of Priscillian of Avila:[24]

(Credentes) unum Deum Patrem omnipotentem (1 Cor 8:6)
et unum Dominum Iesum Christum (1 Cor 8:6)
natum ex Maria Virgine ex Spiritu Sancto (Isa 7:14; Matt 1:23; Luke 1:35)
passum sub Pontio Pilato crucifixum (Isa 53:12; Luke 22:37)
sepultum, tertia die resurrexisse (Zeph 3:8)
ascendisse in caelos (Acts 1:9)
sedere ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis (Acts 7:55)
inde venturum et iudicaturum de vivis et mortuis (Acts 1:11)
(credentes) in sanctam ecclesiam
sanctum Spiritum
baptismum salutare (John 3:5)
(credentes) remissionem peccatorum (1 John 2:12)
(credentes) in resurrectionem carnis (Exod 3:6; Matt 22:31-2; Luke 20:38)[25]

Priscillian's *Tract*. 2 quotes a considerable amount of Scripture.[26] The creed of Priscillian is given together with a running commentary; that is, most of the articles of the creed are backed up by scriptural quotes, which are introduced by the formula "as is written" (sicut scribtum est).[27]

---

his proposal has not found general acceptance (Germain Morin, "*Pro Instantio*. Contre l'Attribution à Priscillien des opuscules du manuscrit de Würzburg," *RBén* 30 [1913] 153–73). In *Vir. ill*. 121, Jerome says that Priscillian authored "many short writings" (multa opuscula) (see Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.4–5), but among the extant works attributed to him, only a few treatises in the Würzburg Manuscript (i.e., *Tract*. 1–3 and 11—*Tract*. 4–10 being by anonymous Priscillianist author[s]—his *Canones* in an edited version, and an obscure fragment of his letter in Orosius's *Commonitorium*) are arguably genuine.

[23] Priscillian, *Tract*. 2.194. Sulpicius Severus agrees that Priscillian and his companions "set out for Rome in order that before Damasus . . . they might clear themselves of the charges brought against them" (*Chron*. 2.48).

[24] Priscillian, *Tract*. 2.47–67. The Latin text and references are taken from Conti, *Priscillian of Avila*, 70–72. I have added the reference to Acts 1:9 in line 6.

[25] "(Believing) in one God, the Father Almighty, and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, who was born of the Virgin Mary through the Holy Spirit, who suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, buried, on the third day arose again, ascended into the heavens, is seated on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty, whence he will come and judge the living and the dead, (believing) the holy church, the Holy Spirit, the saving baptism, (believing) in the remission of sins, (believing) in the resurrection of the flesh."

[26] See Sanchez, *Priscillien*, 265–69.

[27] The way Priscillian combines his creed with Scripture is rather interesting. He uses the beginnings of the independent clauses of 1 Cor 8:6 as the first two articles of his creed, adds the phrase "sicut scribtum est," and then quotes the rest of these clauses. The resulting statement is: "*Believing in one God, the Father Almighty*, 'from whom'—as it is written—'all things are and we through him,' *and in one Lord, Jesus Christ*, 'through whom'—as it is written—'all things are and we through him' (*Credentes* 'unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem,' *sicut scribtum est*: 'ex quo omnia et nos per ipsum,' 'et unum Dominum Iesum Christum,' *sicut scribtum est*, 'per quem omnia et nos per ipsum')" (I have added the emphases in Latin in order to highlight the words of 1 Cor 8:6).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Priscillian's creed is thereby an important example of the widespread conviction that a creed is a summary of Scripture.[28]

Priscillian was convinced that the creed was something that Christ "handed over to his apostles" (qui apostolis suis symbolum tradens).[29] For this reason, Priscillian's creed cannot really be called his "private creed."[30] Chadwick judges that "it is safe to assume that [the creed] is far from a private invention of Priscillian himself."[31] In other words, Priscillian's creed was not "fabricated" for a particular occasion and should therefore not be taken as a mere sorry attempt of a "heretic" to come clean in the eyes of Pope Damasus. Priscillian appeals to his creed as to something authoritative, received, and universally acknowledged. If the creed had been his own clever invention, his Spanish opponents would have definitely dismissed it as such.

Nevertheless, in creedal scholarship, the evaluations of his creed are too often influenced by a cold calculation that Priscillian was a heretic,[32] perhaps even worthy of his death sentence. Accordingly, it seems reasonable to ignore both his creed and apologetic explanations, or to take these as a clever cover-up.[33] Priscillian, of course, flatly denies that his confession does not match with what he believes by citing Rom 10:10 ("We confirm with our mouth what we believed with our heart").[34]

While in Rome, Priscillian submitted his letter, which included the creed (i.e., *Tract*. 2), to Pope Damasus. Rufinus later said that "if someone of doubtful identity turns up, he can be asked for his password [i.e., the creed], and will be revealed as

[28] Among other Latin authors, Anon. *Exp. sym*. 5; Augustine, *Sym*b. 1, *s*. 212.2; Niceta of Remesiana, *Symb*. 34; Rufinus, *Exp. sym*. 18; and Quodvultdeus, *Symb*. 1.4.7, 2.1.1.

[29] Priscillian, *Tract*. 3.101.

[30] The designation "private creed" is often used to speak about the creeds by which theologically suspect people, or even quite "orthodox" ones, confessed their faith. See the long list of the so-called *Privat-Symbole* in Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole*, 253–363.

[31] Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila*, 87. Kinzig and Vincent point out that, in connection with creeds, the word "author" has to be used in a loose sense anyway (Wolfram Kinzig and Markus Vincent, "Recent Research on the Origin of the Creed," *JTS* 50 [1999] 535–59, at 556).

[32] E.g., John Norman Davidson Kelly, *The Early Christian Creeds* (3rd ed.; London: Longman, 1972) 361. Sanchez, however, wisely does not want to be entangled in the unhelpful categories of heterodoxy/orthodoxy at all as he analyzes Priscillian's theology (*Priscillien*, 13, 426–37). Indeed, such retrospective categories are not particularly beneficial, because Trinitarian controversies continued long after the Council of Constantinople (381 C.E.) and thus, it was not entirely certain what the "orthodoxy" would eventually be. For this reason, I have used polemical designations, such as "modalist" or "pro–Nicene," merely to identify certain ancient theological positions without making an additional claim that any of these positions should be taken as absolutely normative.

[33] To assert that someone's "secret doctrinal deviance" is hidden "behind false appearances of conformity" (Burrus, *Making of a Heretic*, 16) is an age-old strategy in polemical put-downs. In Priscillian's case, this argument evidently began with Hydatius's and Ithacius's claim that Priscillian was a "closet" Manichaean (Priscillian, *Tract*. 2.141–45; Sulpicius Severus, *Chron*. 2.46). Augustine, in turn, contends that "none is comparable to them [i.e., Priscillianists] in deceitfulness" (*Ep*. 237.3).

[34] Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.14–15 ("ostenderemus ore quod credebamus in corde"); cf. 2.10; 3.236–37. For what it is worth, Priscillian seems never to have understood himself as anything other than "orthodox" and always confessed the catholic faith (*Tract*. 1.5, 49; 2.68, 160, 170–71).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

friend or foe."[35] Priscillian was doing just that: he presented a creed in order to be recognized as a (theological) "friend."

It is almost as if Priscillian invited Pope Damasus to compare his creed with that "which was left to you [i.e., Pope Damasus] by the apostles."[36] Exactly with which creed Pope Damasus was supposed to compare it is hard to say. Apparently it was not the so-called *Fides Damasi*, which originated in Gaul towards the end of the fifth century and is closer to the Nicene and Athanasian creeds than to the Old Roman Creed. The late fourth-century *Tomus Damasi*,[37] in turn, consists of twenty-four anathemas. Although these anathemas address several issues that are directly connected with creedal clauses, they do not enable explicit comparison. Therefore, the closest one can get to the creed used in Rome in the 380s is that which is reconstructed on the basis of Rufinus of Aquileia's *Exposition of the Apostles' Creed* (*Expositio symboli Apostolorum*). Keeping this Old Roman Creed in mind, I argue that Priscillian's Trinitarian theology, which is advocated in his creed and other authentic writings, should not be dubbed "modalist monarchian."[38]

In the first two creedal clauses, Priscillian is following closely the wording of 1 Cor 8:6 ("[there is but] one God the Father . . . and one Lord Jesus Christ" [unus Deus Pater . . . et unus Dominus Iesus Christus]).[39] Hence Priscillian's double mentioning of the word "one" (unus) and arguably also the omission of the Latin preposition "in" (in), which was characteristic of creeds when referring to the divine persons.[40] For comparison, most early regional variants of the Apostles' Creed say, "I believe in God the Father" (Credo in Deum Patrem), with the preposition "in" (in), and without the word "one" (unum [accusative]).[41] The word "one" in front of the clauses "God the Father Almighty" (Deum Patrem Omnipotentem) and the "Lord Jesus Christ" (Dominum Iesum Christum) is also missing from other extant Spanish creeds, but Priscillian's direct dependence on 1 Cor 8:6 explains this idiosyncrasy satisfactorily. In addition, it should be noted that the use of the word "one" in front of the Father and the Son was characteristic of Greek creeds

[35] Rufinus, *Exp*. 2.

[36] Priscillian, *Tract*. 2.176–78.

[37] Arnobius the Younger, *Confl*. 2.32; Theodoret, *Hist*. *eccl*. 5.11.

[38] Sanchez, too, judges that although Priscillian's Trinitarian theology lacks precision, it cannot be called "monarchian" or "Sabellian" (*Priscillien*, 160, 166, and 172). However, and despite stating that "Priscillien soit resté fidèle au Symbole des apôtres" (Priscillian remained faithful to the Apostles' Creed), his analysis neither focuses on Priscillian's creed nor is limited to Priscillian's authentic treatises (ibid., 179).

[39] 1 Cor 8:6 is cited in Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.65–67; 2.47–49; see also Eph. 4:5–6 ("One Lord . . . one God and Father of all" [unus Dominus . . . unus Deus et Pater omnium]), which is cited partially in Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.29.

[40] See Rufinus, *Exp*. 36.

[41] See the comparative chart in Liuwe H. Westra, *The Apostles' Creed: Origin, History, and Some Early Commentaries* (Instrumenta patristica et mediaevalia 43; Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2002) 222–23.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and rules of faith.[42] Accordingly, the opening clauses in the earliest example of a Spanish declaratory creed are actually closer to the Latin text of the Nicene Creed ("Credimus in *unum* Deum Patrem Omnipotentem . . . et in *unum* Dominum Iesum Christum") [emphases mine] than to the Apostles' Creed ("Credo in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem . . . et in Christum Iesum Filium eius unicum Dominum nostrum").[43]

Priscillian's creed uses the adjective "Almighty" (Omnipotens) twice in connection with "God the Father" (Deus Pater). The Priscillianist *Tract*. 6.114, in turn, applies the adjective not only to God the Father, but also to God the Son. This is significant because the "real" modalist monarchians refused to denote the Son with the name "Almighty."[44] However, Priscillian and the Priscillianists were not identifying the Father with the Son through a common adjective, but rather affirming that the Father and the Son share all divine attributes.[45]

A curious fact is that Priscillian's creed does not call Jesus Christ "Son" (Filius), although all other extant early Latin creeds do. This omission can be interpreted in the sense that the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ, who were the "one God" (unus Deus), became incarnated, suffered, died, and were called "Son."[46] Yet this tempting interpretation should be rejected because, in his authentic treatises, Priscillian says clearly that it was the Son (and not the Father or the whole Godhead) who became incarnate. "Christ God, *Son of God* [my emphasis] and Savior, was born, suffered in the flesh" (Christus Deus, Dei Filius Saluator natus in carne passus).[47] For this reason, the absence of the word "Son" (Filius) from Priscillian's creed, too, must be explained with the wording of 1 Cor 8:6, rather than with his allegedly cunning attempt to avoid mentioning the word "Son" before the incarnation.

Likewise, the absence (or omission)[48] of the word "only" (unicum) (or "only-begotten" [unigenitum]) from the second clause is explained by the use of 1 Cor 8:6. Priscillian may have considered the word "unicus" redundant because of the presence of the word "one" (unus)—although Greek creeds certainly did

[42] Already *1 Clem*. 46.5 repeats the word "one" three times: "Have we not one [ἕνα] God, and one [ἕνα] Christ, and one [ἓν] Spirit of grace which has been poured upon us?"

[43] See the comparative chart in Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 226–27, and 228 n. 472. It is plausible that Priscillian knew the Latin translation of the Nicene Creed, because it could be found in Hilary of Poitiers's *Coll. antiar.* B II 9.11.1 (356–357 C.E.), and then, in his *Syn*. 84 (358 C.E.). Priscillian had at least some knowledge of Hilary's writings (see n. 52).

[44] Tertullian, *Prax*. 17.

[45] Pricillian says nothing about the unshared attribute "paternity" though.

[46] This would be the modalist position described in Hippolytus(?), *Haer*. 9.10.

[47] Priscillian, *Tract*. 3.100; see also 1.247–48; as well as John 1:14 ("The Word was made flesh") in *Tract*. 1.41 and 1 John 4:2 ("The one who denies that Christ came in the flesh is the anti-Christ") in *Tract*. 1.74–75, 346–47, 512; and 3.162–63. When Priscillian uses his favorite phrase, "Christ God" (Christus Deus), in *Tract*. 2.107 (see Sanchez, *Priscillien*, 162–66), he adds an epexegetic "Son of God" (Dei Filius). Although Christ is God, he is not "God the Father" (Deus Pater) (e.g., the first clause of the creed and *Tract*. 1.65), but "the Son of God" (Filius Dei).

[48] All extant early Spanish creeds, except that of Priscillian, include the word "unicum" (Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 226).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not. Nevertheless, there is no reason here for an argument that the absence of the word "unicum" (or "unigenitum") has something to do with the later Priscillianist teaching of the Son being "unbegettable" (innascibilis), which was condemned at the Council of Toledo (400 C.E.).[49] It may be that the originally rhetorical juxtaposition (antithesis) in the Priscillianist *Tract*. 6.9—the "unbegettable is born" (innascibilis nascitur)[50]—developed into one-sided dogma among certain Priscillianists . . . or in the theological imagination of anti-Priscillianists. First, the unbegottenness/begottenness distinction, which played such a crucial role in heteroousian polemics,[51] seems not to have been a concern for Priscillian.[52] Second, perhaps certain Priscillianists later deliberated that Christ *as the eternal God* could be said to be "unbegettable." Chadwick has pointed out that the Old Latin version of 1 Pet 1:20 reads indeed that Christ, the Son of God, "remains in the Father without beginning" (sine initio manens in Patre).[53] Calling the Son "innascibilis" could have been, in fact, an ingenious, Priscillianist way of making the anti-Arian argument that the eternal Son of God did not have a temporal beginning.

This takes us to another possible reason for Priscillian's preference for the double "unum" formula in his creed—his reaction to subordinationists. The bishop of Avila does not demonstrate good knowledge of Arian theology.[54] "Arianism is a distant cloud on his horizon."[55] Yet, in the larger anti-Arian Spanish milieu (e.g., Hosius of Cordoba [despite the embarrassing incident at the Council of Sirmium], Gregory of Elvira, Himerius of Tarragona, Audentius of Toledo, as well as Priscillianists),[56] Priscillian's affirmation of the divinity of the Son as well as of monotheism makes good sense. He contends that Arians err by "dividing what is one and by desiring many Gods" (qui diuidentes quod unum est et plures uolentes Deos) and fail to

[49] *Exemp. prof.* 28–29, 37, 55; see Orosius, *Comm.* 2; Hilary of Poitiers, *Syn.* 38 (*Anathema* 26).

[50] See Reinhard M. Hübner, *Der paradox Eine. Antignostischer Monarchianismus in zweiten Jahrhundert* (VC Supplements, Texts and Studies of Early Christian Life and Language 50; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 66–68.

[51] Heteroousians contended that since the essence of God the Father was "unbegottenness," the only-*begotten* Son could in no way be said to be coessential with the Father.

[52] Some of the Trinitarian theology found in the Würzburg Manuscript could be coming from Hilary of Poitiers's *De Trinitate* (see CSEL 18, 168). For a much more cautious revision of the given references see Maria Veronese, "Le citazioni del 'De Trinitate' di Ilario nella raccolta attributa a Priscilliano," *Vetera Christianorum* 40 (2003) 133–57 (a proposed new index is on pages 155–57). In *Trin.* 4.33, Hilary, who certainly made a distinction between unbegottenness and begottenness, reserves the designation "innascibilitas" exclusively to God the Father (see also 3.3 and 9.31). Priscillian, however, does not use the word "innascibilitas" in his extant authentic writings.

[53] Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila*, 88–89.

[54] It is difficult to say whom exactly the generic term "Arrianae" denotes. I have not used quotation marks for this term in my translation, because it is the designation that Priscillian actually uses (e.g., *Tract.* 1.374; 2.81).

[55] Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila*, 88.

[56] See Escribano, "Heresy and Orthodoxy in Fourth-Century Hispania," 121–49, who looks at Priscillianism as a continuation of the Arian controversy under a different name. That is, Escribano depicts Priscillianists as rigorist anti-Arians.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

learn from Scripture that God is one.[57] In addition, Priscillian condemns certain Arian "mutants" called Binionites, who "divide the substance united in the power of God" (diuidunt unitam in Dei uirtute substantiam).[58] In opposition to Arians/Binionites, Priscillian stands by "the faith of one God" (fides unius Dei).[59]

While upholding monotheism and following the wording of 1 Cor 8:6, Priscillian makes the most of 1 Cor 12:3, which says that a person can say "Jesus is Lord" (Iesus Dominus) only in the Holy Spirit.[60] This Scripture, which confesses the Son to be the Lord, is not thereby denying the Lordship of the Father or the Holy Spirit. Likewise, Priscillian's statement "but our God is Jesus Christ" (nobis autem Deus Christus Iesus est) is not necessarily a modalist monarchian denial of the Trinitarian persons, but rather an affirmation of the divinity of Jesus Christ.[61] Does not Scripture say that "the one who confesses the Son has both the Son and the Father"?[62] A good clue as to how Priscillian's statement has to be taken is found in *Tract*. 1.535, "There is no other God . . . but Christ God, Son of God" (nullum alium Deum esse . . . nisi Christum Deum Dei Filium), which teaches that the Son of God is the one God, yet still as the Son.[63]

Conti's contention that a monarchian Priscillian teaches "a single *person* [my emphasis] assuming the aspects and roles of the Son and the Holy Spirit" is supported neither by the given reference (*Tract*. 11.1–15), Priscillian's creed, nor what is said in his other authentic treatises.[64] To identify the Father with the Son as one person and to identify the Father and the Son with the one God are not the same

[57] Priscillian, *Tract*. 2.81–85; see also 1.374.

[58] *Tract*. 1.31–33; also 2.12; 3.103–5.

[59] *Tract*. 3.99. Consider the eight scriptural proof texts in *Tract*. 1.29–40, which constitute the theological starting point for a convinced monotheist Priscillian.

[60] E.g., *Tract*. 1.510–11; 2.169–70; and 3.164–65.

[61] *Tract*. 1.409–10; see also *Tract*. 2.107–9; Priscillian(ist) *Tract*. 5.91–92. A modification that Priscillian introduces to Rev 19:10—instead of "Worship God!" one reads "Worship God Jesus!"—is arguably about Jesus's divinity as well, rather than teaching modalist monarchianism (Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.524). In Sanchez's assessment Priscillian "propose une vision *égalitaire* des personnes divines, tout en affirmant la concentration de la Trinité entière dans le personne du Christ" (offers an egalitarian hindsight of the divine persons, while affirming the concentration of the whole Trinity in the person of Christ) (*Priscillen*, 158–59).

[62] 1 John 2:23, cited in Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.77–78.

[63] Priscillian's emphasis on Christ's divinity fits well with his condemnation of Photinus, who is blamed for not recognizing God in Jesus Christ (*Tract*. 2.85–89). In *Tract*. 1.375, Priscillian condemns certain Homuncionites for the same reason.

[64] Conti, *Priscillian of Avila*, 301. After all, Priscillian does not employ the *persona*-language (see Ronald. E. Heine, "The Christology of Callistus," *JTS* 49 [1998] 56–91, esp. 72–74). Nevertheless, following the self-perpetuating scholarly consensus, Conti asserts that by condemning Arianism and the theology of the Binionites, Priscillian "is actually proclaiming his own monarchianism" (Conti, *Priscillian of Avila*, 270; see also 300). True, Conti qualifies his assertion by saying that Priscillian's monarchianism "appears to be substantially moderate," but he does not explain what this "substantially moderate" monarachianism amounts to. He only juxtaposes it to a "rigid and extreme form of monarchianism" associated with Photinus (Conti, *Priscillian of Avila*, 271; see also 288). I find it odd that even when that which heresiologists have said is denounced as hostile

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

thing. Moreover, Priscillian's simultaneous affirmation of monotheism and Christ's divinity does not make him a modalist heretic. His theology seems compatible with the pro–Nicene Trinitarian theology[65] as it might have been understood in Spain in the 380s.

Once again, although *Tract*. 11.10–11 is said to be "unhesitating in its monarchian theology,"[66] or "unquestionably and consistently monarchian,"[67] the claim that the Father of the Son is in the Son and vice versa (Patrem Fili in Filio et Filium Patris in Patre)[68] is not so clearly modalist monarchian after all because this suspicious phrase includes both identification and differentiation. Furthermore, the distinction seems *not* to be merely nominal, as Orosius wanted everyone to believe,[69] because, in the same treatise, Priscillian considers the one work of the one God to be one yet threefold—"the Holy Spirit [is found] united in the work of the two" (unitus in opus duorum Sanctus Spiritus inueneris).[70] In John 10:37, Jesus challenges the agnostics, "If I am not doing the works of my Father, then do not believe in me." Priscillian, who does his best to follow Scripture and evidently the Trinitarian specialist Hilary of Poitiers as well, teaches that the Father is in the Son and vice versa, because the work they do is one.[71] In *Tract*. 1.50–51, Priscillian argues that Christ "showed who he was [i.e., God] with his works" (cum operibus quis esset ostenderet).

Just as the work of the Father and the Son is one, so is their mysterious singular name. With the help of a singular name found in Matt 28:19,[72] Priscillian argues for the equal divinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. This singular name is allegedly "God" (Deus)[73] rather than "Beginning" (Principium), as Chadwick has suggested.[74] Here is another indication that Priscillian was following as well as he could the theology of the divine name/nature developed by a definite non-modalist/

---

and not always trustworthy, their classification of Priscillian as a modalist monarchian still secretly guides the attempts at critical reconstruction of his theology.

[65] Since pro-Nicene theology is not a monolithic phenomenon, it would be better to emphasize "family resemblance" (Wittgenstein) and say "pro-Nicene theologies."

[66] Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila*, 68.

[67] Conti, *Priscillian of Avila*, 300.

[68] Priscillian, *Tract*. 11.10–11 as compared to John 14:11 ("I am in the Father and the Father is in me"). Parallel passages, such as John 10:30 ("I and the Father are one") and 17:21 ("Father, just as you are in me and I am in you"), are cited in Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.59–60.

[69] Orosius, *Comm*. 2. Orosius's information does not match what one finds in the extant authentic treatises of Priscillian. However, since he does cite a fragment of an authentic letter, which is otherwise unknown, Orosius may have had access to documents about which we know nothing.

[70] Priscillian, *Tract*. 11.14, as compared to John 5:17, 19 ("My Father is always at his work to this very day, and I, too, am working. . . . The Son can do . . . only what he sees his Father doing").

[71] E.g., Hilary of Poitiers, *Trin*. 2.28; 4.21; 6.34; 7.21, 26, 36; 8.31; 9.17. The argument is that the divine work of the Son and the Spirit imply their divinity.

[72] Cited in Priscillian, *Tract*. 2.70–71, 108–9.

[73] *Tract*. 1.420; 3.108.

[74] Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila*, 101, who arguably bases it on Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.235 and on the Priscillianist *Trin. f. cath*. 384–85.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

non-monarchian Hilary of Poitiers.[75] That is, by attributing the single name to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, Priscillian is affirming their equal divinity rather than their hypostatic sameness.[76] The words in *Tract*. 3.102–3, "[The symbol proclaimed the Son] by showing the name of the Father in himself . . . and the Father by showing the name of the Son" (monstrans nomen Patris Filium itemque Fili Patrem), should be interpreted accordingly: "[The symbol proclaimed the Son] showing the name of the Father [which is Deus] in himself." Such an interpretation makes much more sense in the context of Priscillian's authentic treatises than any modalist monarchian interpretation. After all, the sentence has two subject-referents.

Next, Priscillian also mentions the singular power (potestas) in *Tract*. 2.72, which is an argument found in the works of various pro-Nicene patristic authors.[77] First Corinthians 1:24 calls the Son "the power [uirtus] of God."[78] If the Son is the "uirtus" of God, and if God acts by his "uirtus," the Son is inevitably involved in all *ad extra* works that God does. Because the characteristic works of God are the results of God's power and because God's power belongs to God's nature, these characteristic works testify to the co-eternity and consubstantiality of the Father and the Son (and the Holy Spirit).[79] Priscillian adds—and this is significant—that this singular power of the one God is "threefold" (trina).[80] There is no modalist collapsing of the equally divine persons into one.

In *Tract*. 1.46–48, one finds the earliest attestation of the Johannine Comma (1 John 5:7–8).[81] The unique wording of the Priscillian textual variant, which is followed by some manuscripts of the Vulgate, indicates that the unity of the three divine persons (Pater, Uerbum et Spiritus) is "in Christ Jesus" (et haec tria unum sunt in Christo Iesu).[82] Although it does not say "these three are Jesus Christ" (et haec tria sunt Christus Iesus), the phrase certainly lends itself to a modalist monarchian interpretation.[83] But is such an interpretation fair, necessary or the only possible one? Perhaps Priscillian's statement has something to do with the

[75] Hilary, *Trin*. 1.27; 2.1; 5.38; 7.9, 7.12; see Tarmo Toom, "Hilary of Poitiers' *De Trinitate* and the Name(s) of God," *VC* 64 (2010) 456–79.

[76] See Sanchez, *Priscillien*, 163.

[77] See Michel René Barnes, *The Power of God: Δύναμις in Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Theology* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2001).

[78] Cited in Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.475. In *Tract*. 5.59, one finds the phrase "when the Word of the divine power [Conti: virtue] appeared" (cum enim uerbum diuinae uirtutis apparuit), which suggests that "uirtus" is synonymous with "Deus."

[79] E.g., Hilary, *Trin*. 5.4, 8.32, 9.1, and 9.12.

[80] Priscillian, *Tract*. 2.72; see also Marius Victorinus, *Adv. Ar*. 1.50 and 56; Augustine, *Ord*. 2.5.16.

[81] "And there are three who testify in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, and these three are one in Jesus Christ."

[82] This is found neither in (late) Greek textual variants (manuscripts 61, 88, 629, and 635) nor in Greek Trinitarian theology, where the Father is always the principle of the unity within the Trinity.

[83] According to Orosius, Priscillianists taught that "this Father, Son, Holy Spirit—with the 'and' removed—is Christ alone" (*Comm*. 2; but the Priscillianist *Trin. f. cath*. 337–38 has all the "ands" that one wants).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ambiguous word "beginning" (principium).[84] Priscillianists certainly claimed that Christ was the "principium,"[85] "the origin of all" (origo omnium),[86] yet himself "without beginning" (sine principio).[87] Were they saying that Jesus Christ was the causal principle within the Godhead?[88] If so, Priscillianists would clearly contradict Hilary, who calls the Father "the source of all [things]" (origo omnium).[89] But this does not seem to be the case, because as the context suggests, the issue is again the eternity of the Son (i.e., the Son being without temporal beginning) rather than the sorting out of causality within the Godhead.[90] Priscillian seems not to address the issue of causality within the Godhead at all. I have not found in his authentic treatises the doctrine of the monarchy of the Father—unless the cryptic phrase "the Son was in debt to the Father in the operation of the Holy Spirit" (Filius Patri in operatione Sancti Spiritus deberet) has something to do with it.[91] So, if there is anything to criticize in his "faulty" Trinitarian theology, then it would be the lack of clarity about the intra-Trinitarian relationships/causality. However, such deficiency in no way makes Priscillian a deliberate modalist monarchian.

As is evident from the discussion so far, Priscillian was deeply convinced of the oneness of (a "threefold") God. In *Tract*. 3.99, Priscillian explicitly calls the belief in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit "the faith in one God" (fides unius Dei). He seems to have been promoting a sort of "triadic unitarianism."[92] The obvious problem is that monarchians of all sorts argued precisely for the oneness of God.[93] Although what modalist monarchianism exactly taught is debated,[94] as a heresiological category, it stands for a teaching that "Christ was the Father Himself, and that the Father Himself was born, and suffered, and died" (Τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν

[84] Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.235.

[85] The Priscillianist *Tract*. 6.109; 7.12–13, as compared to Rev 22:13 ("I am . . . the first and the last"). A Latin rendering of John 8:25, too, calls the Son "principium"; see Tertullian, *Herm*. 19–20.

[86] The Priscillianist *Tract*. 6.42.

[87] *Tract*. 6.43. Referring to the Son (i.e., the eternal Word), Hilary, for example, says, "He was already with God without a beginning, who was before beginning" (Iam sine principio est apud Deum, quod erat ante principium) (*Trin* 2.14).

[88] Several anti-Nicene theologians argued that to call the Son consubstantial (homoousios) with the Father was to introduce two first principles into the Godhead.

[89] Hilary, *Trin*. 2.1 and 2.6. First Corinthians 8:6 has "Deus Pater ex quo omnia."

[90] Perhaps the phrase in *Tract*. 6.42 "[Christ is] the origin of all" (origo omnium) can also be understood in the sense that Christ *as God* is the "origin" of what came to exist; see also *Tract*. 1.40–41.

[91] *Tract*. 11.4–5. The monarchy of the Father is a doctrine that understands the Father as the source of everything that exists (*monos* ["only" or "single"] + *archē* ["principle"]).

[92] This is a neat term used by Daniel H. Williams, "Monarchianism and Photinus of Sirmium as the Persistent Heretical Face of the Fourth Century," *HTR* 99 (2006) 187–206, at 196.

[93] Hippolytus(?), *Noet*. 8. Hübner contends that monarchiansim was, in fact, the original anti-gnostic "orthodoxy" (*Paradox Eine*, 95–129, 207–40).

[94] Noetus, Sabellius, Praxeas (if not a pseudonym), and Callistus may well have had their theological differences (Heine, "Christology of Callistus," 56–91).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

εἶναι τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Πατέρα γεγεννῆσθαι καὶ πεπονθέναι καὶ ἀποτεθνηκέναι).[95]

This takes us to yet another aspect of monarchianism—patripassianism. According to Tertullian, patripassianists "put to flight the Paraclete and crucified the Father" (Paracletum fugauit et Patrem crucifixit).[96] Yet again, this is not at all what Priscillian is advocating in his creed and authentic treatises.[97] It should count for something that, in *Tract*. 1.54–67 (and again in 1.374), Priscillian condemns patripassians right after Binionites.[98] He pities patripassians because they fail to understand that belief in the divine *Son* gives life.[99] Another proof text that Priscillian mentions is Matt 8:29 ("Jesus, *Son* [emphasis mine] of the living God"), which definitely does not identify the Son with the one of whom the Son is a son.[100] The third proof text asserts the unity of God, but the phrase, "I and the Father *are* [emphasis mine] one" (John 10:30) would be redundant if the Son and the Father were not somehow distinct.[101] In all fairness, while trying to reconstruct the teaching of Priscillian, one should balance passages that emphasize the oneness of God with passages that presuppose a distinction between the Father and the Son. For example, *Tract*. 1.247–48 postulates a distinction between "the true Father" and "Christ God, Son of God." So does *Tract*. 11.4, which does not call the Father "Son," but says "because you are Father to the Son" (quod Pater Filio). Priscillian adds that the only God is "invisible in the Father, visible in the Son" (inuisibilis in Patre, uisibilis in Filio).[102] He is claiming that the Father was seen in the incarnated Son and not that the Father became the Son in the incarnation.

[95] Hippolytus(?), *Noet*. 1.2; see also Hippolytus(?), *Haer*. 9.2–7; Tertullian, *Prax*. 1–2; Filaster, *Div*. *her*. 53–54; Augustine, *Haer*. 36 and 41.

[96] Tertullian, *Prax*. 1. Slusser argues that patripassianism was history already in the middle of the third century (Michael Slusser, "The Scope of Patripassianism," *StPatr* 17 [1982] 169–75).

[97] "Priscillian of Avila has been suspected of patripassianism, but none of the texts ascribed to him say that the Father suffered" (Slusser, "Scope of Patripassianism," 173).

[98] Veronese finds it suspicious that Priscillian does not refer to those parts of Hilary's *De Trinitate* (e.g., 1.16) where Sabellians are condemned. She thinks that Priscillian's occasional, selective quoting from Hilary's *De Trinitate* is simply part of the clever masquerading of his heretical doctrines (Veronese, "Le citazioni del 'De Trinitate' di Ilario nella raccolta attributa a Priscilliano," 154–55). Yet, once again, there is no similarity between what is condemned in Hilary's *Trin* 1.16 and what Priscillian is teaching.

[99] Priscillian, *Tract*. 2.89–91, which quotes John 3:36 ("Whoever believes in the Son has life") and 1 John 5:12 ("He who has the Son has life").

[100] Priscillian, *Tract*. 2.91–94.

[101] This is argued already by Hippolytus(?), *Noet*. 7.

[102] *Tract*. 11.13–14. Again, one has to disagree with Conti, who thinks that the opening lines of the Priscillianist *Trin*. *f*. *cath*. reveal the author's "typically monarchian conception of the Trinity: the invisible God showed himself to human beings in the Son" (*Priscillian of Avila*, 308). The contention that God was seen in the incarnated Son is entirely biblical and appropriate. While most of the other early Latin creeds did not do this, the Creed of Aquileia added the words "inuisibilem et impassibilem" to the clause about the Father in the Old Roman Creed precisely because of modalist monarchians (Rufinus, *Exp*. 5). The bishop of Aquileia explained that, in order to avoid

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

After distinguishing between the Father and the Son as much as his idea of the oneness of God allows, Priscillian makes a clearly anti-patripassian statement: "There is no other God but Christ God, Son of God, who was crucified for us" (nullum alium Deum esse . . . nisi Christum Deum Dei Filium qui pro nobis crucifixum).[103] This should be taken as a Christological rewording of the Shema (Deut 6:4 ["Hear, Israel, the Lord your God is one (God)"]).[104] Once again, Priscillian does not say that the Father suffered and was crucified; for him, it is always the enfleshed Son of God who suffered and was crucified.[105] A clear example is found in the above-cited *Tract*. 3.99–100, where Priscillian mentions the singular name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit who are the "one God," and then adds that "Christ God, the Son of God and Savior" (Christus Deus Dei Filius Saluator) was born, suffered and raised.[106] Priscillian also ties the second clause of the creed "and one Lord Jesus Christ" (et unum Dominum Iesum Christum) with the middle section of the creed by paraphrasing Isa 35:4 and identifying the subject as follows "Neither a messenger nor an angel, but the Lord [Dominus] himself will come and save us."[107] Such teaching is in full accordance with the Christian faith expressed in the Apostles' Creed.

More evidence about the Trinitarian doctrine of later Priscillianists can be found in the spurious *On the Trinity of the Catholic Faith* (*De Trinitate fidei catholicae*).[108] However, this is not an authentic writing of Priscillian, and therefore its allegedly modalist monarchian passages provide evidence only about the doctrine of later Priscillianists.[109] Accordingly, *De Trinitate fidei catholicae* should not be used as an inerrant template for explicating Priscillian's creed in *Tract*. 2 and/or his Trinitarian theology. Chadwick rightly cautions that "only the Würzburg tractates provide a wholly secure criterion by which the doctrine of the movement can be assessed,"[110] and I would add that only (or, perhaps primarily) the *authentic*

"doctrinal novelties," local creeds provided certain additions that were not to be found in the creed of Rome (*Exp*. 3).

[103] Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.535–36 (and 1.347–48).

[104] *Tract*. 1.37; 2.83–84, as compared to Isa 45:21 ("I am God and there is no other who is just but me"), which is cited in Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.33–34.

[105] *Tract*. 1.27. Compare the modalist monarchian view in Tertullian, *Prax*. 1: "[Praxeas] says that the Father himself came down into the Virgin, was himself born of her, himself suffered, indeed was himself Jesus Christ" (ipsum dicit Patrem descendisse in uirginem, ipsum ex ea natum, ipsum passum, denique ipsum esse Iesum Christum).

[106] E.g., Priscillian, *Tract*. 1.470 and the Priscillian(ist) *Tract*. 4.74; 5.12; 6.31, 107.

[107] *Tract*. 1.525–26. In creeds, the title "Lord" is associated with Jesus Christ.

[108] The Latin text and an English translation are available in Conti, *Priscillian of Avila*, 212–49 and a comparison of this treatise with the Würzburg tractates in Germain Morin, "Traité priscillianiste inédit sur la Trinité," in *Études, textes, découvertes. Contributions à la littérature et à l'histoire des douze premiers siècles* (Anecdota Manichaeism 2/1; Paris: Picard, 1913) 151–205.

[109] In studying Priscillians and Priscillianists (see n. 9), Sanchez acknowledges the important change of doctrine and practice in about 400 C.E. (*Priscillien*, 14).

[110] Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila*, 57.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Würzburg tractates provide a wholly secure criterion by which the doctrine of Priscillian can be assessed.

The case of Priscillian shows, yet once again, how precarious it is to reconstruct someone's theology merely on the basis of polemical texts, antagonistic accounts, and malicious rhetoric. This article has assessed Priscillian's Trinitarian theology and ascertained that according to his authentic texts, especially his *Tract*. 2 together with the declaratory creed, Priscillian's teaching cannot be identified with third-century modalist monarchianism. He may have been open to apocryphal literature and to the rigorous asceticism it promoted,[111] and even been interested in esoteric speculations,[112] but his Trinitarian theology should cause no serious alarm.

[111] Priscillian, *Tract*. 3.

[112] E.g., *Tract*. 1.81–375. Accusations in Manicheism and sorcery, to which Priscillian allegedly admitted while being tortured (Ambrose, *Exp*. *Ps*. 118.12.20; Sulpicius Severus, *Chron*. 2.50), were basically crimes that were known to get one executed (Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila*, 138–44).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816014000376 Published online by Cambridge University Press