

R

RABBŪLAS, bishop of Edessa, 412-435.

The name in Syriac is *Rabbūlā*, ܪܒܘܠܐ, which the western Syrians pronounced *Rabūlō*. The chief authorities for the life of Rabbūlas are (1) a panegyric in Syriac, compiled soon after his death by a contemporary cleric, himself a native of Edessa, extant in a MS. of the 6th century, of which Bickell has furnished a German translation in Thalhofer's *Ausgewählte Schriften der Kirchenväter* (vol. x. pp. 56-68), and (2) the later and less trustworthy biography of Alexander the founder of the Akoimetæ. According to the panegyrist, Rabbūlas was born in the city of Kenneschrin, known by the Greeks as Chalcis, in Osrhoene, of rich and noble parentage. His father was a heathen priest, but his mother was a Christian. He received a liberal education, and was well versed in pagan literature. On his father's death he inherited a considerable fortune, and was chosen prefect of his native city. At this time he was still a heathen, and for a long time resisted his mother's entreaties to become a Christian. He yielded however so far as to take a Christian wife, and in due time he was brought to embrace the true faith. Various instrumentalities contributed to his conversion. The panegyrist attributes it to his intercourse with Eusebius of Chalcis and Acacius of Beroea, and to two remarkable miracles witnessed by him. The biographer of Alexander, on the other hand, ascribes it to the influence of his teaching. Both accounts probably are substantially true. On his conversion Rabbūlas went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem and was baptized in the river Jordan, having previously renounced his property and manumitted his slaves. His wife and daughters and all the females of his household devoted themselves to a religious life, and Rabbūlas himself retired to the monastery of St. Abraham at Chalcis. The discipline here enforced not being severe enough for his newly-awakened religious enthusiasm he left the monastery for a cave in an adjacent mountain side, but at the request of his brother he returned to the monastery. The see of Edessa having become vacant in 412 by the death of Diogenes, Rabbūlas was appointed his successor by a synod meeting at Antioch. His episcopate was a powerful one, characterised by great activity and zeal, which was not always exhibited in a gentle or conciliatory manner. His temper was fiery, and Ibas does not scruple to call him the tyrant of his city, who lorded it over all, and violently persecuted those who opposed his imperious will (Labbe, iv. 663). His panegyrist describes him in more favourable terms as manifesting earnest solicitude for the discipline of his clergy and the spiritual health of his flock. The sick and poor of his city, especially widows and orphans, were the objects of his unremitting care. Edessa was famous for its intellectual activity; the children of the higher classes, still chiefly heathen, were sent to its

schools from great distances for education. These, according to his biographer of Alexander, Rabbūlas used to gather together twice a month and instructed them in the principles of the Christian faith and caused them to be baptized (*Acta Sanctorum*, i. 1020-1029). By the force of his character Rabbūlas became the leading prelate of the Oriental Church, regarded, according to the exaggerated language of the biographer of Alexander, as "the common master of Syria, Armenia, Persia, nay of the whole world."

The theological position of Rabbūlas in the early part of his career was not altogether consistent. The author of the panegyric describes him as having steadily opposed the doctrines of Nestorius from the very first. But the church of Edessa, together with the East generally, followed the teaching of Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, in which these doctrines were virtually contained, and Ibas, who having been a presbyter of his church must have spoken from personal knowledge, tells us that Rabbūlas was no exception. He speaks of him as having been a diligent student of Theodore's writings, and an attentive listener to his discourses, testifying his approbation by applause. By degrees however Rabbūlas veered round, and after some vacillation ended as the most vehement and uncompromising opponent of Theodore's teaching, using his utmost endeavours to bring about the complete suppression of his works. Ibas ascribes this change of opinion to personal pique, from his having been publicly rebuked by Theodore at a synod. This story may safely be regarded as an exaggeration, but it indicates a divergence of views regarded by the elder teacher of so much importance as to deserve a public reprimand. (IBAS, *Epist. ad Marium*, Labbe, iv. 666; Liberat, *Breviar.* c. 10, Labbe, v. 752.) This growing separation from Theodore's school of doctrine is strongly exhibited in a letter to Andrew of Samosata, written in the winter preceding the Council of Ephesus, 430-431, a fragment of which is printed by Overbeck among the Syriac documents published in his edition of Ephrem Syrus (Oxford, 1865). Rabbūlas here upbraids Andrew for having attacked Cyril in a manner which led him at first to ascribe the document to Nestorius himself. From Andrew's reply we learn, what is also stated by Theodorus Lector (lib. ii. p. 565), that Rabbūlas's fiery zeal for the orthodox faith had caused him publicly to anathematize Andrew before his congregation at Edessa. Not content with this Rabbūlas, according to the panegyrist, when visiting Constantinople took the opportunity of having to preach in the presence of Nestorius to denounce his doctrine. After this undisguised manifestation of his theological views, it is somewhat surprising to find Rabbūlas at the council of Ephesus ranging himself with the Orientals and joining them in their opposition to Cyril. His signature appears to the letter to the clergy and laity of Hierapolis (Baluz. col. 705) and to that addressed to the deputies despatched by the Orientals to Constantinople (*ib.* 725), in both of which the heretical nature of Cyril's teaching and the illegality of the actions of the council are asserted. From this temporary vacillation, to be attributed perhaps to his reluctance to separate himself from his patriarch and com-

provincial prelates, Rabbūlas speedily recovered. A visit to Constantinople in the winter succeeding the council, 431-432, when he had an opportunity of conferring with Nestorius's successor in the see, the wise and pious Maximian, confirmed him in his opposition to the Nestorian doctrine, which he returned to his diocese determined to eradicate. This was no easy task. No doctrine was more firmly planted among the clergy of Osrhoene and of the East generally. The dogma identified with the name of Nestorius, as having been formulated by him and pushed to an extreme, was not originated by him. It was to be found substantially in the writings of Diodore of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia. The defenders of Nestorius and of his doctrines claimed, not without good reason, to be the disciples of these great men, whose names were universally revered through the East. To denounce Nestorianism and to accept Cyril's anathemas was to repudiate the teaching of theologians whom they had been taught to regard with veneration as infallible guides. Rabbūlas saw clearly that if the Nestorian doctrine was to be combated effectually among his clergy, it was not enough to denounce the actual teaching of Nestorius and prohibit the reading of his writings. The evil must be attacked at its source in the heretical works of Diodore and Theodore. To this end therefore he laboured with fierce unremitting zeal, in the midst of a recalcitrant clergy. To aid him in his object he called in the strong will and unscrupulous pen of Cyril. He appears to have been the first to open Cyril's eyes to the character of Theodore's writings, as the true fountain of Nestorius's teaching. The heresy would never be crushed so long as, while the doctrine of Nestorius was condemned and his writings prohibited, works in which the same heterodox tenets were declared, often in more offensive terms, were suffered to be circulated, without censure, and even recognized as theological authorities. Nestorianism might be repudiated in name, but an equally deadly crypto-Nestorianism was dominant in the East, sheltering itself under these two great names. To root out the error effectually the writings of these men must be subjected to the same sweeping enactment as those of Nestorius their disciple. We have a letter from Rabbūlas to Cyril (Labbe, v. 469), denouncing Theodore as the author of the heresy of Nestorius, which denied that Mary was truly the mother of God, thus laying snares of perdition for the unwary. These were all the more dangerous as Theodore had never ventured to propound these dogmas in his public teaching, but committed them to his books, which were recommended to general perusal by the persuasiveness of his tongue and his popularity as a preacher. These books however were treasures of impiety, containing arguments from hell which it was unsafe to write down, and which his adherents sought to keep secret for fear of offending the pious ears of the orthodox. That Rabbūlas' words fell on receptive soil is shown by Cyril's reply, of which a fragment is preserved (*ibid.*), lauding Rabbūlas as "the pillar and ground of the truth to all the easterns," for his zeal in expelling the blasphemy of the new and abominable heresy of Nestorius, as a pestiferous malady, and indicating Theodore, though guarding himself from mentioning so

generally revered a name, as "the Cilician," from whose root this impiety proceeded. The suppression of these writings, so fatal to the establishment of his own system of doctrine, became a chief object with Cyril. An extension of the Imperial decree was obtained comprising "the sacrilegious books" of Diodore and Theodore in the same condemnation previously passed on the writings of Nestorius (Labbe, v. 471, cf. *ib.* iii. 1209). It prohibited their perusal, and ordered them to be publicly burnt, and threatened all who disregarded the decree with confiscation. This decree carried out on a general scale the line of action previously inaugurated by Rabbūlas in his own diocese, where a most determined persecution had been set on foot of the crypto-Nestorians, *i.e.* of all who were unwilling to accept Cyril's anathematisms, or to repudiate the doctrine of their venerated masters Diodore and Theodore. The letter of Ibas to Maris describes the violent and audacious conduct of Rabbūlas, *ὁ πάντα τολμῶν*, in publicly anathematizing Theodore before the church "punishing not the living only, but those also who had long since gone to God," and hunting up his works for the purpose of destruction (Labbe, iv. 663). A similar picture of Rabbūlas' violence is given us in a letter of Andrew of Samosata, written to his metropolitan Alexander of Hierapolis shortly after Easter, 432. Andrew complains that Rabbūlas was dealing with a high hand in Edessa, openly anathematizing Theodore's teaching of one nature in Christ, persecuting all the orthodox, excommunicating all who refused to accept the Cyrillian dogmas, as well as those who read Theodore's books, which he was everywhere committing to the flames. He had been asked by the oppressed party how long they were to endure this tyrannical treatment, and if they would not be right in separating from Rabbūlas, and he requests Alexander's advice on the point. (Baluz. c. xliii. col. 748). Alexander's answer is not preserved. Measures however were speedily taken in the direction indicated by Andrew. A synod was summoned at Antioch by the patriarch John, by which letters were despatched to the bishops of Osrhoene desiring them, if the reports of his tyrannical conduct were true, to suspend communion with Rabbūlas until the matter had been fully investigated, and he had either cleared himself or submitted to ecclesiastical discipline for his fault (*ib.* c. xlv. col. 749). Meanwhile Rabbūlas was corresponding with Cyril on the terms of reconciliation between himself and the East. The two uncompromising prelates were fully agreed that nothing short of complete submission on the part of the Orientals and the withdrawal of the condemnation of Cyril's anathematisms could be accepted. We have a letter of Cyril's to Rabbūlas (Baluz. c. cviii. col. 812) written in 432, expressing the impossibility of his accepting the proposition communicated by Acacius that Cyril should repudiate all that he had previously written on the subject, to leave a clear field for the reconciliation of the church. As we know, the reconciliation was effected in the spring of 433. Andrew of Samosata, long one of the most determined opponents of the Cyrillian dogmas, by which he had, as we have seen, incurred the open denunciation of Rabbūlas, having become convinced of his orthodoxy by the perusal of his manifesto, at once

left his diocese for Edessa to make reparation to his former antagonist, and satisfy him of his orthodoxy. On his way he was arrested by sickness. Whether he ever reached Edessa is uncertain. Alexander's anger having been aroused, Andrew wrote to the oekonomi of Hierapolis to justify himself. He had not yet seen Rabbūlas, but he accepted communion with him, together with Cyril, and embraced the peace of the church (*ib. cc. ci. cvi.*; col. 807-810).

The celebrated letter of Ibas, at that time a presbyter of the church of Edessa, written to Maris in this year 433 (Labbe, iv. 662), presents a highly coloured picture of the violent conduct of Rabbūlas in his determination to rid his diocese of heretical taint. It is needless to repeat what may be found in another place (IBAS, Vol. III. p. 192). Bickell calls attention to the fact that, however tyrannical his proceedings may have been, the acts of the "Latrocinium" prove that he cannot be rightly charged with the banishment of Barsumas, the learned head of the famous theological school of Edessa, and afterwards bishop of Nisibis (Thalhofer, *Ausgewählte Schriften, u. s.*).

Not content with eradicating the doctrines of Theodore in his own diocese Rabbūlas, in conjunction with Acacius of Melitene, wrote to warn the Armenian bishops of the poison of the Nestorian heresy which was being offered to them in the writings of Diodore and Theodore. Perplexed at this denunciation of those whom they had looked up to with reverence as the great teachers of the church, which their Cilician brethren had informed them was the result of personal jealousy, they summoned a synod, and despatched two presbyters, Leontius and Aberius, to Proclus, who in April 434 had succeeded Maximian on the throne of Constantinople, taking with them the opposing documents, and entreating the patriarch to indicate which was the true orthodox teaching. Proclus replied in his celebrated "Tome" on the Incarnation, in which he condemned Theodore's opinions but without naming him, a precaution which was counteracted by the officiousness of the messengers who conveyed the document (*Liberat. Breviar. c. 10, ap. Labbe, v. 752; Garnerii Praefat. in Mar. Mercat. p. lii. ed. Par. 1673*). The fiery old man did not long survive this letter. His death is placed Aug. 7, 435, after an episcopate of nearly a quarter of a century. According to Theodorus Lector (*lib. ii. p. 665*) he was blind before his death. He was succeeded by his presbyter Ibas, the ardent champion of the doctrines Rabbūlas had spent so much energy in exterminating. His name continued in high honour in his former diocese. In the proceedings against Ibas at Edessa we learn from the Acts of the Latrocinium that the prayers of Rabbūlas as a saint were invoked against his heretical successor by the excited mob (*Martin, Actes du Brigandage, pp. 20, 31*).

Nearly all the few surviving works of Rabbūlas have been printed by Overbeck in the original Syriac text, in his edition of Ephrem Syrus, Oxford, 1865, pp. 210-248; 362-378. They comprise (1) the scanty remains of the 640 letters which, according to his biographer, he wrote to the emperor, bishops, prefects, and monks. These consist of (a) a fragment of a letter to Andrew of Samosata, (b) two long frag-

ments of a letter to Gemellinus, bishop of Pharan, against certain monks who regarded the Eucharist as ordinary bread and wine, (c) the letter to Cyril against Theodore, with Cyril's answer (given in Latin, but with variations, Labbe, v. 469). (2) A dogmatic sermon preached at Constantinople, imperfect at the end. (3) Canons for the regulation of the lives of the secular and regular clergy. These last are given in the Greek version, Migne, *Patrol. Gr. lxxvii. 1474*; and by Mai, *Script. Vet. Nov. Collect., x. part. ii. p. 6*. (4) Hymns for liturgical use addressed to the Mother of God, Saints and Martyrs, on Repentance, the Cross, the Resurrection, the Footwashing, the Eucharist, etc. (See Wright's Catalogue of Syriac MSS.) (*Cave, Hist. Lit. i. 420; Bickell ap. Thalhofer Ausgewählte Schriften der Kirchenväter, band x. 56-68; Tillemont, Mém. Eccles. xiv. 504-506, 563-565; Schröckh, xviii. 262, 306 ff.*) [E. V.]

RACIMIR. [SUINTHILA.]

RADEGUNDIS, ST., queen of Clotaire I. and founder of the nunnery of Sainte-Croix, at Poitiers, was the daughter of a Thuringian prince named Bertharius, and was born in 519. When the plunder was divided after the successful invasion of her country by the three Frank kings, Theoderic, Theodebert, and Clotaire the young princess, now about ten years old, fell to the share of the last, and was sent to Aties, on the Somme, one of the royal residences, to be educated. Destined to be the king's bride, she was sedulously instructed in all the learning, both religious and secular, which France at that day possessed, but seems early to have developed an eager inclination towards the ascetic side of Christianity, and a strong distaste for marriage.

After her espousal by Clotaire her austerities and religious exercises were so incessant that it was commonly said the king had wedded a nun (*Venant, Fort. Acta S. Rad. cap. i.*). Abhorring the married state from the first, she seems to have been finally decided to escape from it, by her husband's treacherous murder of her brother. Withdrawing to Noyon, on the pretext of some religious observance, she besought the bishop Medardus to consecrate her as a deaconess. The bishop hesitated, and some Frank nobles present even dragged him from the altar; but at length the queen's urgency overcame his irresolution, and she obtained her desire. She then escaped from her husband's territory to the sanctuary of St. Martin of Tours, and thence to St. Hilary's, at Poitiers. Here she founded her monastery within a mile or two of the city; finally, with the consent of Clotaire, from whom the exhortations of the bishops wrung a reluctant acquiescence in the loss of his bride. Clerks were sent by her to the East for wood of the true cross, to sanctify it, and the rule of St. Caesarius and St. Caesaria of Arles was adopted for its government. Here she passed the remainder of her life, first as abbess, then as simple nun, under the rule of another. We happen to be very well informed about the beginnings of this institution from the two lives of Radegund, one by Venantius Fortunatus, her intimate friend (*Patr. Lat. lxxii. 651*), the other by one of her nuns called Baudonivia (*ibid. 663*), and

also from the fact that in Gregory's time, after Radegund's death, the attention of all France was drawn to the spot by the scandalous outbreak of a body of the nuns, headed by Chrochildis, a natural daughter of King Charibert I. After a residence of about thirty-seven years, spent in the mingled religious exercises and literary studies enjoined by the Caesarian rule, she died Aug. 13, 587, and was buried by Gregory of Tours, whose account of the matter is interesting (*De Glor. Conf.* cap. cvi.). In addition to the authorities above referred to, see Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* iii. 4, 7; vi. 29, 34; vii. 36; ix. 2, 39-43; x. 15; and *De Glor. Mart.* cap. v.; Venant. Fort. *Carmina* passim; Boll. *Acta SS.* Aug. iii. 46 sqq.; *Hist. Litt.* iii. 346. Her story is told in lively fashion by Auguste Thierry in his *Récits des Temps Mérovingiens*, v.

[S. A. B.]

RADO, eleventh abbat of St. Vedastus at Arras A.D. 795-815, and archicancellarius of Charles the Great (Mabillon, *De re Dipl.* 118, 122; see also pp. 404, 520, 521, 522, 524 for documents of state countersigned by him). He was a friend and correspondent of Alcuin, whom he persuaded to write the life of St. Vedastus, to be found with a preface letter to Rado in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* ci. 663. He also composed at the request of the abbat and his monks some masses and various dedicatory verses for a copy of the Scriptures and the shrines in the monastery church of St. Peter, which Rado rebuilt. (*Patr. Lat.* c. 215, ci. 731, 741, 211; cf. Ceillier, xi. 190; *Gall. Christ.* iii. 375.)

[S. A. B.]

RAETHUN (Kemb. 177, 210.) [RETHUN.]

RAGNEMODUS (RAGNIMODUS, RAYMOND), twenty-first bishop of Paris, was deacon and priest under St. Germanus, whom he succeeded c. A.D. 577 (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. c. 14; *De Glor. Conf.* c. 89, and *De Mir.* ii. c. 12; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 595). In the disorders prevailing at the period he seems to have sided with Chilperic against Praetextatus, bishop of Rouen (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* v. c. 19), and yet at the council of Paris, A.D. 577, he spoke in favour of the position of Praetextatus (*Ib.* vii. c. 16) and when Chilperic was murdered in A.D. 584 [CHILPERIC I.], the widowed queen Fredegundis fled with her infant and treasure to the bishop for protection (*Ib.* vii. c. 4). Fredegundis may the more readily have taken this step as in A.D. 580 her infant son, Theodoric, had been received from the font by Ragnemodus (*Ib.* vi. c. 27), and in the same year he had taken part in the council of Braine, which had excommunicated her and St. Gregory (*Ib.* vi. c. 50; Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 958). In A.D. 585 he subscribed at the council of Mâcon (Labbe, iv. 988). He was a severe enforcer of discipline, made many pilgrimages to the tomb of St. Martin, and died A.D. 591 (*Gall. Christ.* vii. 21; Duchesne, *Hist. Franc. Scrip.* i. 332 sq.; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxi. 214 et al.; Fleury, *H. E.*, xxxiv.-v.).

[J. G.]

RATBOD (RADBOD), duke of Frisia, was a powerful chief at war against Pippin and Charles Martel and opposed the spread of Christianity [CHARLES MARTEL] (*Gest. Reg. Franc.* c. 50; Fredegar. *Chron.* c. 102, 105; *Ann. Franc.*

A.D. 716). His war with Charles Martel drove St. Boniface from his work, but at Ratbod's death, A.D. 719, the missionary returned [BONIFACIUS MOGUNTINENSIS] (*Vit. S. Bonifacii*, §§ 17, 24, ap. Boll. A. SS. Jun. t. i. 447, 456-8; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxxix. 611, 691; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xii. 46).

[J. G.]

RAURACIUS (RAURACUS), ninth bishop of Nevers, belongs to the middle of the seventh century. He was at the council of Châlons A.D. 650, and wrote a letter still extant (Duchesne, *Hist. Franc. Scrip.* i. 884; Canisius, *Thes.* i. 646; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lxxxvii. 259) to Desiderius, bishop of Cahors, recommending some friends to his good offices (*Gall. Christ.* xii. 627; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 583; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 734). Rauracus buried St. Austregisilus, bishop of Bourges, A.D. 624. (Boll. A. SS. Mai. v. 63*.)

[J. G.]

RAVENNIUS, archbishop of Arles in succession to Hilary. *Gall. Christ.* (i. 531) numbers him as fifteenth bishop, but Gams (*Ser. Episc.* 493) as thirteenth. Of his birth and family we have no account. We find him first a priest at Arles, in much favour with Hilary, and sent by him to Rome to sustain his suit with St. Leo regarding the metropolitanship over all Gaul. [HILARIUS ARELAT.] (*Vit. S. Hil. Arl.* c. 17; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* i. 1238.) This he did in such a way as to procure the lasting favour and respect of both the prelates, so that St. Hilary designated him his successor at Arles (*Vit. S. Hil. Arl.* c. 19), and St. Leo (*Ep.* 41; Migne liv. 815) heartily approved of the appointment. In the year 449 he was unanimously elected, and "secundum desideria cleri, honoratorum, et plebis unanimiter consecratis" as St. Leo (*Ep.* 40; Migne, liv. 815) wrote to the Gallican bishops; he continued to have great influence both in Gaul and Italy. He was moderate and peace-loving, though rigorous in his own form of life (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, ii. 354). Soon after his election he seems to have consecrated Fonteius bishop of Vaison (*Ib.* ii. 355), or otherwise renewed the quarrel between the sees of Arles and Vienne regarding the office of metropolitan. The suffragan bishops of Arles wrote a letter to St. Leo A.D. 450, in which they related the election of Ravennius, the ancient privileges of Arles, and generally demanded a confirmation to Arles of all ecclesiastical rights (Leo, *Ep.* 65; Migne, liv. 879 sq.). But St. Leo (*Ep.* 66; Migne, liv. 883 sq.) in his reply gave no decision beyond requiring the archbishops of Vienne and Arles each to restrict himself to his own province. In the following year, however, he treated Ravennius as metropolitan by requesting him to announce the time of Easter in 452, yet when St. Leo sent the *Exemplar sententiae* into Gaul it was addressed to Ravennius along with the other Gallican bishops (St. Leo, *Ep.* 103; Migne, liv. 988 sq.), and his name follows that of Rusticus of Narbonne. When the *Tome of S. Leo* was sent him to communicate to the Gallican bishops (St. Leo, *Ep.* 67; Migne, liv. 886), he called and presided at the provincial council of Arles, A.D. 451 (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1010, A.D. 452), and he headed the bishops in their synodical letter to the pope, in which c. Dec. A.D. 451 they express their approval of his letter to Flavian (S. Leo, *Ep.* 99; Migne, liv. 966; *Hist.*

Litt. de la France, ii. 320-21). He presided again in the council of Arles, c. A.D. 455 (Labbe, *Conc.* iv. 1023-25; *Hist. Litt.* ii. 456), but we hear no more of his activity, and he died, c. A.D. 461. (The date of the council and of Ravenius's death are not exactly fixed. Fleury, *H. E.* xxix. 16; *Hist. Litt.* ii. 456.) Beyond his letters to St. Leo, mentioned above, he has left no writings. The Life of St. Hilary of Arles, which has been attributed to him under the name of Reverentius, is now generally ascribed to Honoratus of Marseilles. [HONORATUS (14).] (Fleury, *H. E.* xxvii.-ix.; Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 449-453; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* viii. 437 sq., x. 215 sq., 708 sq.; Fabricius, *Bib. Lit.* vi. 60.)

[J. G.]

REATHUN (Kemble, *C. D.* 209.) [RETHUN.]

RECCARED (1) I. (the uniform spelling in coins and inscriptions), younger son of LEOVIGILD by his first marriage. A sufficient account of his parentage and life till the death of his father will be found under LEOVIGILD and HERMENIGILD. Between April 12th and May 8th, A.D. 586 (Hübner, *Insc. Hisp.* n. 155; Tejada y Ramiro, ii. 217), he succeeded his father without any opposition, having been already associated with him in the kingdom, and the power of the nobles having been broken by the severe measures of the last reign. He first secured his position at home and abroad. He allied himself with his stepmother Goisvintha, the mother of Brunichilde, and grandmother of CHILDEBERT II. By her advice he sent ambassadors to Childebert and his uncle GUNTRAM (2), proposing peace and a defensive alliance. The first were favourably received, the second were detained at Mâcon, were not allowed to approach Guntram, and their proposals were rejected. This rejection was followed by a prohibition of all intercourse between Septimania and Burgundy.

Then followed the great event of Reccared's reign, his conversion from Arianism to Catholicism. Unfortunately we can only conjecture his motives for this momentous step, whether, as Dahn supposes, he was actuated mainly by political reasons, the desire to conciliate the Roman and Suevic populations, to remove the chief obstacle to union between the latter and their Gothic kinsfolk, and to deprive the Byzantines in the south of a lever for working on the feelings of their fellow catholics, and the hope of strengthening the throne against the nobles by an alliance with the catholic episcopate, or whether he yielded to the influence of the catholic leaders such as Leander or Masona. Soon after his accession, Sisbert, the slayer of Hermenigild, was put to death, and in January 587 the king declared himself a catholic; and, convening a synod of the Arian bishops, induced them and the mass of the Gothic and Suevic nations to follow his example. Some of the Arians did not submit quietly, and the next three years witnessed several dangerous risings, headed by coalitions of Arian bishops and ambitious nobles. Perhaps, from the geographical situation, the most formidable was that in Septimania, which was headed by bishop Athaloc, who, from his ability, was considered a second Arius. Amongst the secular leaders of the insurrection the counts GRANISTA and Wildigern are named. They ap-

pealed for aid to Guntram, whose desire for Septimania was stronger than his detestation of Arianism, and the dux Desiderius was sent with a Frankish army. However Reccared's army defeated the insurgents and their allies with great slaughter, Desiderius himself being among the slain. (Paul. Em. 19; J. Biel.; Greg. T. ix. 15.) The next conspiracy broke out in the West. It was headed by Sunna, the Arian bishop of Merida, and Count Seggo. If Paulus Emeritanus is to be trusted, Witteric the future king was one of the conspirators, to whom it had been assigned to kill bishop MASONA. His attempt being miraculously frustrated, he revealed the whole plot to Masona and to Claudius the dux Lusitaniae, who put down the attempted rising, Sunna being banished to Mauritania and Seggo to Galicia, the latter having his hands cut off. In the latter part of 588 a third conspiracy was formed, headed by the Arian bishop Uldila and the queen dowager Goisvintha, but they were detected, and the former banished. Goisvintha died, whether by a natural death or by her own hand is uncertain. One more conspiracy, immediately after the council of Toledo, was headed by the dux Argimund, but it was detected; his accomplices were executed, and he himself was beaten, and paraded on an ass through Toledo with his right hand struck off and his head shaven.

To return to Reccared's relations with the Franks. After his conversion he again sent to Guntram and Childebert in A.D. 587. The implacable Guntram refused to receive the embassy, asking how could he believe those by whose machinations his niece INGUTHIS had been imprisoned and banished, and her husband slain? Childebert gave them a better reception. He and his mother Brunichilde accepted the present of 10,000 solidi, and were satisfied with Reccared's declarations that he was guiltless of the death of Ingunthis. They also favourably received the request of Reccared for the hand of her sister Chlodosinda, but said they could not give her in marriage without Guntram's approval. This Guntram at first refused, but consented if Childebert faithfully performed the stipulations of the treaty of Andelot (Easter 588). The marriage, however, never took place, or the bride must have died immediately, as Baddo was the wife of Reccared in May 589. In the spring of 589 Guntram, perhaps in concert with Goisvintha, made one more attempt on Septimania. Carcassonne was betrayed to his dux Austroaldus, and an army under Boso's command was sent to reduce the other cities; but they were surprised, and defeated with great loss by the Goths under Claudius the dux Lusitaniae. They lost all their baggage, and all the infantry were taken prisoners. Gregory admits a loss of 5000 slain and 2000 captured, while Jo. Biel. puts the number of Goths at only 300, and that of the Franks at 60,000, and declares that most of them were slain. After this we hear nothing further of relations with Franks, whether friendly or hostile. The rest of Reccared's reign was peaceful, with the exception of some expeditions against the Romans on the south and the Basques on the north.

Third Council of Toledo.—This, the most important of all the Spanish councils, assembled

by the king's command in May, A.D. 589. On the 4th the king shortly declared his reasons for convening them, and the next three days were spent in prayer and fasting. Reccared, in a short speech, referred the assembly to a *tomus* for the business to be transacted, and it was accordingly read by a notary. After reciting that, though God had raised him to the throne for the welfare of his people, he knew that he was mortal, and that everlasting happiness could be secured only by the profession of the true faith, there followed an orthodox confession of belief. He then declared that God had inspired him to lead the Goths back to the true faith, from which they had hitherto been led astray by false teachers. Not only the Goths but the Suevi, who by the fault of others had been led into heresy, had been brought back by his exertions. These noble nations he offered to God by the hands of the bishops, whom he called on to complete the work he had begun. He then anathematized Arius and his doctrine, and declared his acceptance of the councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, and all other councils that agreed with these. He then pronounced an anathema on all who returned to Arianism after being received into the church by the chrism, or the laying on of hands; then followed the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople and the definition of Chalcedon, and the *tomus* concluded with the signatures of Reccared and Baddo his queen. It was received with acclamation from the whole synod. Its praises of Reccared, its numerous scriptural quotations, and the clearness with which the Catholic and Arian doctrines are defined show that it was the work of a theologian, probably of either bishop Leander or abbat Eutropius, who had the chief management of the council (Jo. Biel.). One of the catholic bishops then called on the bishops, clergy, and Gothic nobles who had been converted to declare publicly their renunciation of Arianism and their acceptance of Catholicism. They replied that though they had done so already when, following the king, they had gone over to the church, they would comply. Then followed twenty-three anathemas directed against Arius and his doctrines in general and in detail, succeeded by the creeds of Nice and Constantinople, and the definition of Chalcedon, and the whole was subscribed by eight Arian bishops and their clergy, and by all the Gothic nobles. The bishops were Ugnas of Barcelona, Ubligiscus of Valencia, Murila of Palencia, Sunnila of Viseo, Gardingus of Tuy, Bechila of Lugo, Argiovitus of Oporto, and Froisclus of Tortosa. The names of at least six of the eight show their Gothic descent. It is remarkable that five come from sees within the former Suevic kingdom, probably showing that Leovigild, after his conquest, had displaced the Catholic by Arian bishops. Reccared then addressed the council again, calling on them with his license to draw up such canons as were requisite, and in particular one directing that the creed should be recited at the time of Holy Communion, that henceforward no one should be able to plead ignorance as an excuse for misbelief. Then followed twenty-three canons with a confirmatory edict of the king. The first confirmed the decrees of previous councils and synodical letters of the popes; the second directed the recitation

of the creed of Constantinople at the Communion; the third forbade the alienation of church property by bishops; the fourth permitted a bishop, with the consent of his council, to convert one parochial church into a monastic; by the fifth, the Arian bishops, priests, and deacons, who had been converted, were forbidden to live with their wives; by the sixth, freedmen who had been duly manumitted were to remain free, but they and their descendants were to be under the protection of the church; the seventh directed the Scriptures should be read at a bishop's table during meals; the eighth, with the king's approval, forbade any one from claiming as an alleged gift from the king clerics belonging to a family which formed part of the king's property, and ordered that they should pay their poll-tax to the church to which they were attached; by the ninth, the former Arian churches were transferred to the bishops of their dioceses; the tenth forbade widows who wished to remain single being forced to remarry, and in like manner it was forbidden to compel virgins to marry against their own or their parents' will; the eleventh and twelfth related to penitents; the thirteenth forbade clerics to proceed against clerics before lay tribunals; the fourteenth forbade Jews to have Christian wives, concubines, or slaves, ordered the children of such unions to be baptized, and disqualified Jews from any office in which they might be required to punish Christians—Christian slaves whom they had circumcised, or made to share in their rites, were to be *ipso facto* free; the fifteenth related to churches founded or endowed by slaves of the fisc; the sixteenth ordered bishops, in conjunction with the civil governor, to seek out and destroy idols in their dioceses; the seventeenth was directed against child murder; the eighteenth ordered that a synod of each province should be held every year on November 1st, which the judicial and fiscal officers were to attend, and the bishops were to observe their behaviour to the people under them, and if necessary warn them to alter their conduct, and, if they refused, to inform the king; the nineteenth directed that the control of churches should be with the bishop, not the founder; the twentieth forbade bishops levying exactions on their clergy; the twenty-first forbade civil authorities from laying burdens on clerics or the slaves of the church or clergy; the twenty-second forbade wailing at funerals; the twenty-third forbade celebrating saints' days with indecent dances and songs.

The canons were subscribed first by the king himself, and then by five out of the six metropolitans, of whom Masona signs first, and Pantardus of Braga signs for Nitigisius of Lugo as well as for himself. The metropolitan of Tarraconensis was absent, but, according to one MS., signed by proxy. Sixty-two bishops signed in person, and five, besides Nitigisius, by proxy. All the bishops of Tarraconensis and Septimania appeared personally or by proxy. In the remaining provinces several were missing. The absence of Licinian of Carthage, and Severus of Malaga, is explained by the fact, that these cities were in the hands of the Byzantines. In five cases, Valencia, Tuy, Oporto, Tortosa, and Lugo, both Arian and Catholic bishops

appear in possession of the same see. The proceedings were closed by a homily by Leander on the conversion of the Goths.

At the council of Toledo our best authority, Joannes of Biclara, breaks off, and the information for the rest of Reccared's reign is most scanty. He is praised by Isidore for his peaceful government, for his clemency, and his generosity. He restored various properties, both ecclesiastical and private, which had been confiscated by his father, and founded many churches and monasteries.

A letter of Reccared's to Gregory the Great is preserved among the letters of the latter, but Gams considers it a forgery founded on the genuine letter of Gregory to Reccared, written in August, A.D. 599 (Gregorius, *Epp.* ix. 61, 121). He had sent certain abbats to Rome with presents, but disheartened by a shipwreck, they had returned to Spain. Gregory extols him for not only embracing the true faith, but inducing his people to do the same. He also praises him for refusing the bribes offered by the Jews for procuring the repeal of a law against them. He sends him a piece of the true cross, some fragments of the chains of St. Peter, and some hairs of St. John Baptist. He refuses his request to procure for him from Constantinople a copy of the treaty concluded between Justinian and Athanagild, in the first place, as the record office at Constantinople had been burnt; and, in the next place, because Reccared ought to have in his own possession the documents that were unfavourable to him. Reccared died at Toledo in A.D. 601, after a reign of 15 years, after publicly confessing his sins. He was succeeded by his son Leova II. then a youth of about eighteen, whose mother was a person of low birth, and who was probably illegitimate. He was dethroned in A.D. 603 by Witteric, and his right hand cut off, and died in consequence soon afterwards.

Laws.—In a palimpsest from Corbei, now in the National Library at Paris, fragments of an ancient Gothic code are contained which have been edited by F. Bluhme. This must be later than A.D. 506, as c. 285 contains an extract from the *Visigothic Lex Romana* of that date, and before Kindasvinth. Further, the author must have been a king whose father was also a lawgiver (c. 277). There is no king in the period mentioned complying with this condition except Reccared I. The direct evidence of his promulgating a code rests indeed only on the late authority of Lucas of Tuy, who gives the sixth year of his reign = A.D. 591, as the date of its composition, but a Jew-law of Reccared's is referred to by Sisebut (Bluhme, xiv.). This code consisted of at least 336 chapters, and may have contained many more. Of these, in the palimpsest, fifty-five are preserved, some in a perfect condition, while of others only a few words are left.

Sources.—Joannes Biclarensis's *Chronicon* down to A.D. 589; Isidorus, *de Reg. Goth.*; Paulus Emeritanus, *De Vit. et Mir. Patr. Em.* 16-19; Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* ix. 1, 15, 16, 20, 31, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxii. 868, lxxxiii. 1071, lxxx. 151, lxxi. 481; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Canones de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 213.

Coins in Florez, *Medallas*, iii. 191, and Heiss, *Monnaies des Rois Wisigoths*, 87.

Literature.—Dahn, *Könige der Germanen*, v.; Helfferich, *Entstehung und Geschichte des Westgothen-Rechts*; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. (2). [F. D.]

RECCARED (2) II., succeeded his father SISEBUT in A.D. 621, being then a minor, and died a few days afterwards. (Isidorus, *de Reg. Goth.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxiii. 1074.) [F. D.]

RECCESVINTH, spelt always with double c in coins (Heiss, *Monnaies des Rois Visigoths*, 121) and inscriptions (Hübner, *Insc. Hisp. Chr.* 117, 143, 159, 175), king of Spain, was associated in the kingdom by his father KINDASVINTH, on January 22 (Julianus, *Vita Ildephonsi*, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcvi. 44), being the day of St. Vincent, Kindasvinth's patron saint (Braulio, *Ep.* 33), A.D. 649, on the petition of bishops BRAULIO of Saragossa and Eutropius, and Celsus, the governor of the district in which Saragossa lay (Braulio, *Ep.* 37), and became sole king on his father's death in A.D. 653. Soon after his accession a formidable insurrection of the Basques broke out, headed by a Gothic noble named Froya. They penetrated as far as Saragossa, and committed great atrocities. There, however, they were totally defeated by Reccesvinth and their leader slain (Tayo, *Ep. ad Quiricum* i.), not without heavy loss on the part of the victors (Isidorus Pac.). Reccesvinth on his becoming sole king relaxed his father's iron rule. He submitted to the council that assembled soon after he became sole king, a nice question of casuistry, namely, whether the oath taken by the nation never to pardon those who had plotted the murder of the king or the ruin of the nation (cf. the first canon of the seventh Council of Toledo) was absolutely binding under all circumstances.

By a decree of the same council, and a law promulgated by the king, a distinction was drawn between the personal and official capacity of the king, and it was implied that previous kings had increased their property by unjust exactions and confiscations. It was accordingly enacted that while all the property which had belonged to Kindasvinth before his accession should pass to his sons, as belonging to him in his personal capacity, all that he had acquired after his accession should devolve on Reccesvinth in right of his crown, and that he should thereout make satisfaction to those whom he considered to have been unjustly treated, and apply the rest to the service of the state. It appears by this law that Kindasvinth left other sons besides Reccesvinth, but as their names are unfortunately omitted, we cannot test the truth of the legend tracing the descent of RODERIC and PELAYO from Kindasvinth.

Four councils were held in this reign. In December, A.D. 653, the eighth council assembled at Toledo. This council was in many ways remarkable. Its composition, and the combination of civil and ecclesiastical business gave it the character of a diet as well as that of a synod. It was the first council the decrees of which were signed by others than bishops or their representatives. Eleven abbats, an arch-priest, and a primicerius sign before the representatives of absent bishops, and then follow the signatures of seventeen of the great court digni-

aries, a nobility of office growing up as in other Teutonic countries beside the more ancient nobility of birth. Thus it was in some measure not only more representative of the church than any previous council, but it also contained a lay element. The king, after commending himself to the prayers of the council, in a short speech referred them to a *tomus* for the business he wished them to transact. After a profession of orthodoxy it specially directed their attention to the question already mentioned of the oath, and the repression of Judaism. Some Jews still adhered to their faith, while others had relapsed after baptism. The council, after reciting the Nicene creed with the addition of the *Filioque*, discussed at great length the question propounded, and decided that such an oath, which excluded forgiveness under any circumstances, was not binding; the third canon related to simony, the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh, dealt with the married or unchaste clergy of various ranks, from bishops downward, the eighth forbade the ordination of ignorant persons, and the ninth eating meat in Lent. The tenth regulated the mode of election of a king. He was to be chosen either at the capital or at the place where the last king had died, by the bishops and great officers of the palace; he was to defend the Catholic faith against Judaism and heresy, he was not to oppress his subjects with heavy exactions, only what a king had possessed before his accession was to pass to his heirs, while property acquired during his reign was to belong to his successors. The king was, before his consecration, to swear that he would observe these provisions. The eleventh visited non-observance of the decrees of the council with excommunication, while the twelfth re-enacted the decrees of the fourth Council of Toledo against the Jews.

Two years afterwards the ninth council of Toledo met. It was properly a provincial council, but Tayo and Maurellus the bishops of Saragossa and Urgel attended. Most of the canons relate either to the property or the freedmen of the church, the status of the latter being one of serfdom. The tenth canon not only disqualified the offspring of clerics from inheriting their parents' property, but declared they should be slaves of the church to which their father had belonged, while the seventeenth ordered baptized Jews to celebrate the chief church festivals with the bishops in order to prevent evasion on their part.

In 656 the tenth council, a national one, assembled. The first canon ordered the Annunciation to be commemorated on December 18 instead of March 25, because the latter day always falling in Lent prevented the feast being properly observed, the second visited with deprivation a cleric who violated his oath to the king, the third was directed against nepotism or favouritism on the part of bishops, while the seventh forbade selling Christian slaves to Jews or heathens. This council also dealt with the case of POTAMIUS (2) and the will of RECHIMIR.

After these three councils in three years a strange break occurs, and with one exception no other council was held in the rest of the reign. The causes of this sudden change are unknown. That the king did not prohibit councils is shewn

by the meeting of the council of Merida in A.D. 666; and that he interested himself in church matters by his restoring the province of Merida to its ancient limits [ORONTIUS]; while his munificence to the church, which rested only on the late testimony of Roderic of Toledo, has been proved by the discovery in the treasure-trove of Guarrazar in 1858 of the magnificent crown he had offered. The crown, which is preserved at the Hôtel de Cluny in Paris, is described, with an illustration in *Dict. Christ. Ant.* i. 509. Expressions in the proceedings of the council of Merida (a prayer that victory might be granted to Reccesvint over his enemies, and a direction that every priest should say mass daily for the safety of the king and his army whenever he marched against his enemies) point to foreign war or civil disturbance, and either or both may have been the cause of the cessation of the councils. Reccesvint died on Sept. 1st A.D. 672 at Gerticos near Salamanca (Julianus, *Vita Wambanis*, 3).

The letters interchanged between Reccesvint and Braulio (Braulio, *Epp.* 38-41) show that the former had, like his father, a taste for literature. Like him too he was an active legislator. Not only does the Visigothic Code known as the *Liber Judicum*, or *Codex Visigothorum* (C. V.), contain numerous laws by him, a summary of which is given by Helfferich 172-180, but early in his reign (probably in A.D. 654, v. Helfferich, 181) he issued a code, which alone he declared was thenceforward to have the force of law, all previous laws being repealed (C. V. ii. (1), 9, 12). Of his new legislation by far the most important is the law permitting intermarriage between Goths and Romans (C. V. iii. (1) 2). His father had abolished the dual systems of law, one for the Romans and one for the Goths; Reccesvint completed his work by abolishing the barrier which kept the two races distinct.

Reccesvint re-enacted in his code the laws of RECCARED, SISEBUT, and SISENAND against baptized and unbaptized Jews, and added a stringent prohibition of relapse. The penalty for violating any of these laws was death by stoning or by fire, or if this was remitted, perpetual slavery and forfeiture of all property (C. V. xii. (2), 4, 12). This strange severity is borrowed from the *placitum* of the baptized Jews of Toledo presented (no doubt under compulsion) to Reccesvint in February A.D. 654 (C. V. xii. (2) 6). Admitting their relapse in the past, they swore to be good Christians for the future and to abandon all Jewish rites and practices, pledging themselves that any one who violated the oath should be burnt or stoned by themselves or their sons. Apparently therefore the penalty in question was one imagined by the Jews themselves in their overstrained zeal to show their sincerity and to lull suspicion, and was then adopted by Reccesvint *in terrorem*, while the penalty really intended to be enforced was the slavery or confiscation afterwards mentioned. (Grätz, *Die Westg. Gesetzgebung in Betreff der Juden*, 13, 22.)

Authorities.—The Acts of the eighth, ninth, and tenth councils of Toledo, and of the council of Merida in Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 361, 396, 407, 703; the laws, and the letters of BRAULIO and TAYO already referred to; two sentences in Julianus' *Vita Ildo-*

phonsi and *Historia Wambanis*; Isidorus Pacensis; Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen*, v. 200; Gams, *Kircheng. von Sp.* ii. (2), 126, 143; Helfferich, *Entstehung und Geschichte des Westgothen-Rechts*, ubi supra. [F. D.]

RECHIMIR (RICMER), bishop of Dumium, signs seventh among the suffragans, preceding nineteen others, at the seventh council of Toledo, in October A.D. 646, so that he had then been some time bishop. Florez conjectures that GERMANUS (22) his predecessor died, c. 637 or 8, as no bishop of Dumium appears at the sixth council of Toledo, held in January A.D. 638. He was alive at the eighth council, in November A.D. 653, but apparently in bad health, as abbat Osdulph signs as his deputy. He died soon afterwards, as before the tenth council of Toledo, held in December, A.D. 656, FRUCTUOSUS (2) had succeeded. He was liberal to a fault, giving away in alms the whole revenues of the church, and leaving nothing for its support. He also manumitted a large number of the slaves of the church, and shortly before his death ordered all the furniture and utensils of his official residence to be given to the poor, to whom, by his will, he bequeathed his whole private property. After his death, the church of Dumium complained to king Rekesvinth, who referred the matter to the tenth council, laying before them the wills of Rechimir and of ST. MARTIN (2), the founder. The council decided that the losses of the church furniture and utensils should be made good out of Rechimir's private property, subject to which his will was to be valid. The case of the manumitted slaves was left to the discretion of FRUCTUOSUS. For the whole story compare that of GAUDENCIUS. (*Esp. Sag.* xviii. 41; Tejada y Ramiro, *Col. de Can. de la Igl. Esp.* ii. 358, 386, 420; Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, 2 (2), 132.) [F. D.]

REDEMPTUS, a disciple of St. Isidore of Seville, mentioned as a cleric (*Pat. Lat.* lxxxii. 17, 30, 33, 34, 139) and addressed as an archdeacon (lxxxiii. 905). From Redemptus clericus we have the testimony as that of an eyewitness, of the death of St. Isidore, A.D. 636; and to Redemptus archidiaconus a letter (*Ep.* 7) is addressed by St. Isidore in favour of the Eucharistic use of unleavened bread in the Western church. But it is questioned whether they are one person or two, and the letter is probably not genuine. (Vossius, *Hist. Lat.* lib. ii. 252, ed. Lugd. 1627; De Castro, *Escriit. Espan.* ii. 345, ed. Madrid, 1786; Fabricius, *Bibl. Lat.* ed. Mansi, vi. 60; Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. iv. 327, 349; *Pat. Lat.* lxxxii. 500; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 722.) [J. G.]

REDUX, bishop of Naples, A.D. 581. When Naples was attacked by the Lombards in that year he caused a copy of the *excerpta ex operibus S. Augustini* by St. Eugippius to be made and preserved in the cathedral of Naples, adding his own subscription as a guarantee of its fidelity, cf. *Corp. Scriptt. Ecclesiast. Latinorum*, vol. ix., Eugippii *Opp.* praef. p. xxiv. ed. P. Knoell, Vindobon. 1885. [G. T. S.]

REDWALD (REDUALD, RAEDWALD, REODWALD), king of the East Angles. He was the son of Tytla, son of Wuffa, the first East Anglian king, and so eleventh in descent from Woden

(*M. H. B.* p. 628). Nothing is known of the date of his accession to his throne, but he was certainly a powerful prince very early in the 7th century, and before the death of Ethelbert of Kent had attained such fame as to eclipse that king and obtain the hegemony of all the states south of the Humber except Kent. He is thus the fourth of those rulers to whom later writers gave the name of Bretwalda (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 5). He was on friendly terms, as it would seem, with Ethelbert, and at his court in all probability he was persuaded to receive baptism (*ib.* ii. 15), but on his return home, under the influence of his wife, he relapsed into semi-heathenism, revering Christ as one of his gods, and having a temple dedicated to him in conjunction with the pagan deities (*ib.*). Redwald's great achievement was the defeat and slaughter of Ethelfrith, king of Northumbria, in 617 (*Chr. S. M. H. B.* 308). He had before this received at his court Edwin, son of Ella, the head of the rival family in Northumbria, and whilst in East Anglia Edwin had received the first impressions which inclined him towards Christianity. [EDWIN.] The vision which Edwin saw at Redwald's court has been rationalised in a way that leads to the belief, that Christianity was at least tolerated there (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 12). Ethelfrith tried to induce Redwald to betray or kill Edwin. The East Anglian king long resisted the temptation, but, under a threat of invasion, agreed to the treacherous act. Before it was executed, however, he repented, and turned his arms against Ethelfrith, who perished in a great battle on the east of the river Idle, in Nottinghamshire. Raegenher, a son of Redwald, fell in the battle (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 12). Redwald is supposed to have died about 627; the mission of Felix the apostle of East Anglia, being most probably dated about 631, and the conversion of Earpwald, the first Christian king of the East Angles, some four years earlier. Nothing certain, however, can be affirmed as to this. Earpwald was the son and successor of Redwald, and Sigebert, the successor of Earpwald, is described by Bede (*H. E.* ii. 15, iii. 18), as his brother. It has been doubted whether he was a son or stepson of Redwald, who was at enmity with him. [SIGEBERT.] (See Haddan and Stubbs, iii. 88, 89; *Liber Eliensis*, ed. Stewart, i. 12, 13; *Flor. Wig. M. H. B.* p. 527; *W. Malmesb. i.* § 97.) [S.]

REDWULF, bishop, among the spurious signatures to the council Clovesho in 742 (Kemble, *C. D.* 87). Haddan and Stubbs (iii. 342) consider him the same as Eardulf, bishop of Dunwich. [EARDULF (3).] [C. H.]

REGINUS, count, probably in Africa, about the close of the 5th century, had written some letters, now lost, to Fulgentius of Ruspe [FULGENTIUS (3)] upon two points, (1) as to whether the body of Christ was corruptible or incorruptible, and (2) as to the life a man in arms should lead. Death prevented Fulgentius replying to the second query, which was done by his pupil Ferrandus, but to the first he gives a long reply (Fulgentius *Rusp. Ep.* 18 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxv. 493; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 50). [J. G.]

REGULUS (RULE), abbat or bishop, the leading character in the Scottish *Legend of St. Andrew*, and in the foundation of the town and see of St. Andrews in Fifeshire. The legend in three different forms or stages of development is given by Skene (*Chron.* 138, 183, 375), who also endeavours to explain or interpret it (*Celt. Scot.* i. 296, ii. 261; *Proc. Soc. Ant. Scot.* iv. 300). But Fordun's version (*Scot. Chron.* ii. cc. 58-60, iv. cc. 13, 14) precedes the date of Skene's third legend from the *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. SS. p. h. yem. f. lxxxii.). The later Scotch annalists only amplify details.

In the 4th century, in the reign of Constantius, Regulus, abbat or bishop, was divinely directed to flee from Patrae in Achaia, with the relics of St. Andrew, who had been martyred there, and was afterwards instructed to betake himself with a part of them to the western regions of the world, where a church should be built and dedicated to the honour of the saint. He was thus carried by wind and wave to the coast of Fifeshire, and built his church at Muckross, or Kylrimont, now St. Andrews, where king Hungus, or Ungus, son of Uргуист, received him, presented him with lands, and liberally endowed the church. [HUNGUS.] Fordun says that he continued at St. Andrews for thirty-two years after the shipwreck, and died there, full of days. But in this there is a badly assorted collection of legends, relating first to the legend of St. Andrew by itself, and then attaching to it a legend of the Pictish church and its foundation in Fifeshire in the 8th or 9th century. As connected with Scotland, the foreign element is probably wholly fictitious with its persons and dates, while the main body of the legend may probably rest on historical facts. In seeking for an interpretation of the legend in whole and details, Skene traces the leading features to the time of the Pictish king Ungus I., son of Uргуист, who reigned about A.D. 730-761, and was engaged in war with the Saxons; he further draws attention to the church of Hexham at this same date, and the banishment of bishop Acca from his see A.D. 732. During his exile he may have been at Candida Casa, but more probably was farther distant among the Southern Picts, and leaving there, as he had at Hexham, a church dedicated to St. Andrew, with chapels to St. Michael the Archangel and St. Mary the Virgin. At this time the relics of St. Andrew, which Acca believed he had at Hexham, would naturally be introduced in St. Andrews, and hence the legend takes its origin. As to the original character from which we have the missionary Regulus, Reeves (*Culdees*, pt. iii. § 2) and Skene (*Celt. Scot.* ii. 267) are of opinion that the name has been borrowed from the Irish Kalendar and latinised, the feast of Riagail, abbat of Muicinis in Loch Derg, being on Oct. 16, and that of Regulus of Mucross or St. Andrews on Oct. 17. The legend of St. Regulus would thus refer to some movement in the native Pictish church under the temporary influence of St. Acca when in exile, and the motive of the fictions would be to honour the metropolitan see. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 437 sq.; Lyon, *Hist. St. And.* i. pass.; Grub, *E. H. Scot.* i. 6 sq.; Gordon, *Scotichr.* i. 69 sq.; Moran, *Ir. SS.* 199.) [J. G.]

REMACLUS, ST., tenth bishop of Maestricht, between St. Amandus and St. Theodardus,

and founder of the monasteries of Cougnon, Stavelo and Malmédy, about the middle of the 7th century, was a native of Aquitaine. His first training is ascribed to St. Sulpicius, but at an early age he became a disciple of St. Eligius at Solignac, where he may possibly have been abbat for a time. About 642 he founded the monastery of Cougnon in the diocese of Trèves, and some years later St. Amandus resigned the see of Utrecht in his favour (circ. A.D. 649). We know little of his episcopate except that he assisted St. Sigebert, king of Austrasia, in founding the monasteries of Stavelo and Malmédy in the Ardennes, and after ten years of office resigned the see in his turn to St. Theodardus and ended his days at Stavelo about 668. He is commemorated Sept. 3. The principal authority for his life after the charters of the monasteries (*Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 321 sqq.) is a biography by an anonymous monk of Stavelo, written about the middle of the 9th century, to be found in Mabillon's 2nd vol., and *Boll. Acta SS.* Sept. 1, 692 (cf. Sigeb. *Gembl. Vita S. Sigeb. Reg.* v. 14, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 311; Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 545, 556 and *Boll. ibid. Comm. Praev.* p. 669). [S. A. B.]

REMIGIUS (1), bishop [OCTAVIUS (4)].

REMIGIUS (2) (REMEDIUS, REMI), ST., archbishop of Rheims and called the Apostle of the Franks (circ. A.D. 457-530). He holds an important position in the history of the Western Church, and is honoured as one of the three great patron-saints of France. The exact part he played in the winning of Clovis and his Franks to orthodox Christianity, which probably decided the belief of Western Europe, it is not easy to say, since Gregory's account of these matters, which happened considerably before his time, is plainly not to be trusted for details, and an earlier life which seems to have existed (see *Greg. Tur. Hist. Franc.* ii. 31) was lost before the 9th century. How far Clovis was convinced by the exhortations of either Remigius or Clotilda, or both of them, or how far he saw his advantage in the partizanship of the orthodox clergy in his struggle with the Arian Burgundians and Visigoths, has been much discussed and differently viewed (see CLOVIS, CLOTILDA, and the authorities there referred to). But it must be regarded as a happy event for orthodoxy that a man of ability and force of character to impress a barbarian like Clovis was stationed in the pathway of his conquests. Considering his importance, few details are known of his life. He was born about 435, his mother's name being Cylinia, and the canons notwithstanding, was consecrated to the episcopate in his 22nd year (circ. A.D. 457). The first we hear of intercourse with Clovis is in the latter's campaign against Syagrius (circ. A.D. 486), when the incident of the restoration of the stolen church vessel seems to betoken the existence even at that time of friendly relations. About 492 the king married the Catholic Clotilda, who proved a powerful ally for the bishop. The story of his baptism on Christmas Eve, 496, together with his sister Albofledis, another sister, Lanthchildis, who now renounced her Arianism, and more than 3000 Franks, is well known. "Mitis depone colla, Sicamber, adora quod incendisti,

incende quod adorasti," are the words put by Gregory into Remigius's mouth (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 27). For the fable of the dove descending with the ampulla of holy oil for the consecration, which first appears in Hincmar (*Coron. Regiae*, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* 125, 806; cf. Flodoardus, *Patr. Lat.* cxxxv. 52) and the political uses it subserved, see Herzog (sub nom.). Though the letter variously ascribed to the popes Hormisdas and Symmachus, congratulating Remigius on the happy event, and establishing him papal vicar throughout Clovis's dominions, saving the rights of other metropolitans, is probably spurious (*Patr. Lat.* lxxv. 961-76), the importance of the event seems to have been recognized (see Avitus, *Epist. ad Clov.* Bouquet, iv. 49). And the conversion was sufficiently thorough to resist the sinister omen of Albofledis' death a few days after her baptism. His episcopate is said to have lasted seventy or more years, his death being placed about 530. Though he is believed to have died Jan. 13, his feast has been usually celebrated Oct. 1, on which day several solemn translations of his body were made in after times, notably one on Oct. 2, 1049, in the presence of pope Leo IX. to a new and splendid church (*Boll. Acta SS.* Oct. 1, 59 sqq.; *Gall. Christ.* ix. 13). His cult was fully established in the time of Gregory, who relates miracles performed by him both during his life and after death (*De Glor. Conf.* lxxix.). His piety and vigour were equalled by his learning and eloquence (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 31). Sidonius Apollinaris too speaks in the highest terms of the eloquence of some *Declamations* of Remigius which he had read. None of them however have survived, and his literary remains are represented by four letters (one of them to three bishops, presenting a curious picture of contemporary manners), a spurious will, and a few verses ascribed to him (*Patr. Lat.* lxxv. 961-76; cf. *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 158 sqq.).

The references in Gregory of Tours (*Hist. Franc.* ii. 27, 31, viii. 21, ix. 14, x. 19; *Hist. Epit.* xvi.; *De Glor. Conf.* lxxix.), Sidonius Apollinaris (*Epist.* ix. 7), and Avitus (*Collat. Episc.* sub init.; *Patr. Lat.* lxx. 387), comprise all that is historical about him. The short life by Venantius Fortunatus (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxxviii. 527 sqq.) is little but a tissue of miracles, and the narratives of Hincmar and the later Rheims historians are entirely untrustworthy. Everything both historical and mythical concerning him may be found gathered together in the exhaustive notice of the Bollandists (Oct. 1, 59-187). For the modern accounts of him, and critical estimates, see Potthast's Manual and the authorities quoted in the articles CLOVIS and CLOTILDA. [S. A. B.]

REMIGIUS (3) (REMEDIUS), ST., twenty-ninth bishop of Rouen, between Raginfredus and Magenardus, is said to have been a son of Charles Martel, though his mother's name is unknown. According to Adrevaldus (*De Miraculis S. Benedicti*, cap. xvi., xvii., *Patr. Lat.* cxxiv. 918), he was sent by his half-brother Pippin to obtain the relics of St. Benedict from the monks of Fleury, but was deterred by supernatural manifestations in the saint's church. He was also deputed to urge Desiderius, the Lombard king, to make restitution of property

taken from the Holy See, for which pope Paulus I. renders thanks in a letter to Pippin, written in the year 760 (*Epist.* viii., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xcix. 1152). Remigius co-operated with Pippin in the introduction of the Roman chants and ritual into the French churches. He was present at the Convention of Attigny in 765, and died about 772. He is commemorated Jan. 19. (*Boll. Acta SS.* Jan. ii. 235; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 19-20.) [S. A. B.]

REMIGIUS (4) (REMEDIUS), twenty-third bishop of Strasburg, succeeded Etho in A.D. 778, and in that year dedicated a church in honour of the Blessed Virgin and St. Trophimus; he died A.D. 803, and his feast is April 13 (*Gall. Chr.* v. 784). The *Testamentum Remigii Episc. Argent.*, dated A.D. 778, is a very curious and interesting specimen of early legal conveyancing, based upon the principles of Roman procedure. It is given in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xcvi. 1582 sq.

[J. G.]

RENATUS (1), a monk and layman, of Caesarea in Mauritania, the bearer of a letter to Augustine from Optatus bishop of Mileum, which he delivered to him at Caesarea, A.D. 418. [OPTATUS (9).] A young man, named Vincentius Victor, having met with some remarks by Augustine on the nature of the soul, which displeased him, wrote against them a work in two books, which he addressed to Peter, a Spanish presbyter Renatus having seen this, sent it to Augustine from Caesarea, and Augustine at his earnest request wrote his work on the soul and its origin, of which he addressed the first book to Renatus, A.D. 419 (*Aug. Retract.* ii. 56, *de Anima et orig. ejus* ii. 1, *Ep.* 190).

[H. W. P.]

RENATUS (2), a presbyter of the church of Rome, under the title of St. Clement, who was deputed by pope Leo, together with Julius of Puteoli, and Hilarius the deacon (afterwards Leo's successor) to represent him at the synod of Ephesus (subsequently called the "robbers' synod") in 449. (*Leon. Magn. Ep.* 29 [24].) Renatus died on his voyage out during a temporary halt at Delos. (Labbe, iv. 1079.) It is rather surprising to find a letter addressed to Renatus by Theodoret, after his deposition at that synod, begging him to use his influence with Leo to have the contending parties summoned to the apostolical see to receive judgment on the controverted points, and claiming for himself to be judged by his writings alone. (*Theod. Ep.* 113.) We must suppose either that the superscription of the letter is mistaken, and that it was really addressed to Hilarius; or that Theodoret had received insufficient information with regard to the circumstances of that scandalous assembly, which from the first was a scene of violence and confusion. This is the view taken by Tillemont, in opposition to Quesnel, who discredits the fact of Renatus's death (tom. xv. p. 901, note 21). [E. V.]

RENOVATUS, bishop of Merida, is known only by the *De Vita Patrum Emeritensium*, ch. 2, 21, ascribed to Paulus Diaconus (in *Esp. Sag.* xiii.) A tall and handsome Goth of noble birth, he became abbat of the monastery

of Cauliana, eight miles from Merida on the Gadiana. A curious story is told in ch. 2 (which is of doubtful authenticity, *vid.* Gams, *Kirchg. von Sp.* ii. 2. 117), of his treatment of a gluttonous and thievish monk. He afterwards presided for many years over the church of Merida. Florez places his episcopate between A.D. 616 and A.D. 632. Paulus praises him highly for his learning and virtues. (*Esp. Sag.* xiii. 208.) [F. D.]

REOLUS (REGULUS, RIEUL), twenty-sixth bishop of Rheims. He had aided Nivardus in the administration of the see, and c. 672 became his successor. He was a great builder of monasteries within his diocese, and consolidator of church property; his chief foundation was the Monasterium Orbacense on ground given by Theodoric, A.D. 680. He died, A.D. 698, after a rule of twenty-six years. Before his consecration he had married a daughter of Childeric III., king of France. His feast is Sept. 3. (Floardus, *Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. c. 10, Duchesne, *Hist. Franc. Script.* F. v. 788; Fredegarius Schol. *Chron.* ii. A.D. 680, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. lxxi. 669, giving an incident in his persecution by EBROINUS.) He subscribed at the council held at Rouen c. A.D. 682. (*Gall. Chr.* ix. 22.) [J. G.]

REPARATUS (1), bishop of Carthage, succeeded Bonifacius, probably in A.D. 533; but if there be any truth in the story of a movement made during his episcopate and the pontificate of Boniface II., to subject the Carthaginian church to the Roman see (Binius, *Conc.* ii. pt. i. 643, 644, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxx. 32, 43; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 115), he must have been bishop earlier, since the pope died in A.D. 532: the authorities however are very doubtful. In A.D. 533 he held a council of 227 bishops at Carthage, for the purpose of restoring the discipline that had been destroyed by Vandal persecutions, and of arranging on what footing the Arian bishops when converted were to be received. The general feeling was against acknowledging their episcopal status, but an encyclical letter (Binius, *Conc.* ii. pt. i. 664) was drawn up to be presented to Joannes II. (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvi. 25, *Ep. Afr. Episc.*) for his advice. The letter, which was entrusted to Liberatus, the deacon, did not leave Carthage till word had arrived of that pope's death, and of the election of Agapetus in June, A.D. 535, when Reparatus added a letter of congratulation to the new pope. Agapetus sent at once a reply (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvi. 43, ep. 2) to the questions referred to him by the council, and a special letter (*Ib.* lxxvi. 45, Ep. 3; Binius, *ib.* 666, 667) to Reparatus, restoring to him the whole of his metropolitan rights (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 115, 119). In the Origenistic controversy that followed, Reparatus kept steadily in favour of *The Three Chapters*, and held a council at Carthage in A.D. 550 to excommunicate pope Vigilius for condemning them (Walch, *Ketz.* viii. 185; Fleury, *H. E.* xxiii. 32). In the year preceding the fifth oecumenical council, he was invited to Constantinople by the emperor and strongly urged by favour and threats to accept the imperial edict, and condemn *The Three Chapters*, but, remaining unmoved, he was condemned on a false charge, deprived of his property, and banished,

Primasius being appointed in his place (Victor Tun. *Chron.* A.D. 552 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxviii. 959; Fleury, *H. E.* xxxiii. 43, 54; Gieseler, *H. E.* ii. c. ii.; Robertson, *E. H.* b. ii. c. 12.) [J. G.]

REPARATUS (2), vir spectabilis in the time of the Gothic kingdom. (Greg. *Dial.* iv. 31.) [F. D.]

REPOSTUS (1). Cyp. *Ep.* 59, xiii. A lapsed bishop of African see uncertain, but probably Tuburnuc, Tuburnica, a small municipium, with hot wells, in the proconsular province. No trace remains of any place answering to Hartel's reading, Sutunurcensis, or the various readings, Sturnucensis, Quoturnicensis, Sutun-Urcensis, Utunarcensis. In Numidia there was a *Θοῦβοῦρρικα κολωνία* (Ptol.), an *oppidum civium Romanorum* (Plin.), ap. Mommsen, *Inscr. Lat.* viii. I, p. 121; Lagnat. *Explor. en Tunisie*, fasc. ii. p. 96, seems to have identified the Numidian Tuburnuc with Sidi-el-Kassen; Mommsen assigns to this latter the bishops Tuburnicenses of A.D. 411 and 646. Morcelli gives these to the former, and one would naturally place Cyprian's lapsed Repostus nearer to him. He carried the chief part of his flock back with himself into paganism, and he took part in the pseudo-consecration of FORTUNATUS. See PRIVATUS. [E. W. B.]

REPOSTUS (2). Cyp. *Ep.* 42 (see AUGENDUS?); perhaps not likely to be the same person as (1) excommunicated with FELICISSIMUS by CALDONIUS, *Ep.* 42, and there described as *de extorribus*, which, taken in conjunction with *Irene Rutilorum*, may seem to mean that he had been banished for Christianity, or else that he was a foreigner in refuge at Carthage. Cf. *si qui de peregrinis episcopi*, *Ep.* 32. [E. W. B.]

RESTITUTUS (1), bishop of London at the council of Arles in 314. [EBORIUS (1).] (Godwin, *De Praesulibus*, 1743, p. 170; Stubbs, *Reg. Sac.* 152.) [C. H.]

RESTITUTUS (2), bishop of Carthage, and president of the council of Ariminum, A.D. 359; his name at least appears at the head of its acts. He was one of the deputation sent to the emperor by the orthodox section of the Council. He betrayed the cause, however, under court influence and received back Ursacius, Valens, and Germinius to church communion, from which he had excluded them. (Hilar. *Frag.* viii. 1346; Hefele's *Councils*, Clark's ed. t. ii. pp. 251-258; Ceill. iv. 555; Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. Wissen. Theolog.* 1884, p. 243.) [G. T. S.]

RESTITUTUS (3), a Donatist, ordained by Primianus to the see of Membresa in the place of Salvius, one of the ordainers of Maximian [MAXIMIANUS (2), Vol. III. p. 869]. The council of Bagai, which condemned the Maximianists, A.D. 394, allowed a delay of eight months to be given to the bishops of the party, as an opportunity for them to submit to the decree and avoid expulsion; but, according to St. Augustine, Restitutus was appointed before the expiration of the time allowed (*Aug. Ep.* 108, 14; c. *Cresc.* iii. 60; 62). He endeavoured to dispossess Salvius of the see, and when he resisted this intrusion, brought the case before the pro-

consul Herodes, A.D. 395, in which suit his cause was pleaded by Nummasius (HERODES (2), Vol. III. 5 (Aug. c. *Cresc.* iv. 5. 82; *Ep.* 108. 13). Salvius, however, appears to have maintained his ground, and when a further attempt was made to intrude into buildings belonging to him as bishop, the matter was brought before a subsequent pro-consul, Seranus (A.D. 398), who, on the ground of the decree of the council of Bagai, decided against Salvius. The treatment with which Salvius met in consequence of this belongs to his own history. [SALVIUS (3).] Restitutus appears to have retained possession of the see as Donatist bishop, and to have been present at the conference, A.D. 411 (Carth. *Coll.* i. 133). His case is used by St. Augustine in his argument against the Donatists, to shew their inconsistency in complaining of persecution, of which, as in his case, they were flagrantly guilty towards the Maximianists (Aug. c. *Cresc.* iv. 58; 82; Ribbek, *Aug. und Don.* p. 227). [H. W. P.]

RESTITUTUS (4), a Donatist presbyter of Victoriana, a place in Numidia, about thirty miles from Hippo Regius (Aug. *C. D.* xxii. 8. 7), who, having become convinced of the errors of his party, and returned to the Catholic church, was attacked by some clerical persons and Circumcellions belonging to the sect, and having been treated with extreme violence and indignity for eleven days, with difficulty obtained his release. Augustine complained of this outrage to Proculianus, Donatist bishop of Hippo, but with little success (Aug. c. *Cresc.* iii. 53; *Ep.* 88, 6; 105, 2, 3). [H. W. P.]

RESTITUTUS (5), an African bishop, sent together with Florentius also a bishop, perhaps of Hippo Diarrhytus, by the council of Carthage, A.D. 408, to represent to the emperor the excesses committed in Africa by Donatists and pagans (Aug. *Ep.* 97 to Olympius; Bruns, *Conc.* i. 188, Can. 106); Tillemont, vol. xiii. 175; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 180; iii. 38). [H. W. P.]

RESTITUTUS (6), bishop of Tagona, probably the same as Thagura in Numidia (El-Matnainia), one of the four keepers of the documents on the catholic side at the Carthaginian conference, A.D. 411 (Carth. *Coll.* i. 143; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* i. 301). [H. W. P.]

RESTITUTUS (7), a presbyter of Calama, mentioned by Augustine as having the power at pleasure to remain in a state of apparent insensibility (catalepsy), yet able, as he said afterwards, to hear the voices of those who spoke loudly, as if they came from a distance. He gives the case as an instance of the variety existing in human constitutions as the work of the Creator (Aug. *Civ. D.* xiv. 24, 2). [H. W. P.]

RESTITUTUS (8), a catholic presbyter, as it seems, of Hippo Regius, murdered by the Donatists, an outrage of which Augustine complained to Marcellinus the tribune, A.D. 412, and also to Apringius the pro-consul (*Ep.* 133, i.; 134, 2). [H. W. P.]

RESTITUTUS (9), a deacon, to whom Augustine wrote, recommending him to read, but with caution, the works of Tychonius, and to exercise forbearance and patience in respect

of evil existing in the church, which we lament and condemn, but are unable to remove (Aug. *Ep.* 249). [H. W. P.]

RETHUN (RAETHUN, REATHUN, HRETHUN), bishop. The *Chronicle of Abingdon* (i. 15, ed. Stevenson) mentions him as a Mercian bishop, who, smarting under contumelious treatment, retired to the monastery of Abingdon, where he became abbat. It further relates (p. 21) a journey he took to Rome, and his dealings with Kenulf king of Mercia. Haddan and Stubbs (ii. 579) are of opinion that these statements are for the most part legendary and false; that he can be traced by the charters as abbat of Abingdon as late as 814, and as a bishop from 816 to 839. The *Registrum Sacrum* (10,162) gives him as Hrethun bishop of Leicester 816, subscribing as bishop down to 839. The *Monast. Anglic.* (i. 505) makes him succeed Conan abbat of Abingdon in 784, and assigns him the see of Dorchester 814-835. In the charters of Kenulf we trace him within our period as follows:—799, bishop (Kemble, *C. D.* 177 spurious); 811, abbat of Abingdon (*C. D.* 208 spurious); 814, presbyter and abbat (*C. D.* 201, 207); 816, bishop (*C. D.* 209). [C. H.]

RETICIUS, ST. (RETICIUS, RHOETICIUS), bishop of Autun, in the early part of the 4th century. An account is given of him, but more from a legendary than a historical point of view, by Gregory of Tours, who says that he was born of noble parents, and that he became distinguished when a boy as a scholar. He married young, but lived with his wife in a state of voluntary continence. When she died, she begged that she might be buried in the same grave with him. After this he became bishop of Autun by the choice of the people, and was greatly endeared to them by his piety and kindness. When, after his death, his body was placed on the bier, the bearers found themselves unable to move it, until an old man present rehearsed to the company the wish of his deceased wife. When they reached the grave a voice was heard from the corpse addressing his wife, and reminding her of the agreement between them. He was buried in or near the cemetery of the town, and in the neighbouring parish church of St. Peter of the Stirrup, a tomb may be seen beneath a small arch in the wall with the inscription of modern date.

S. tus Rheticius Ep. s. Aeduenis, cccxiv.

(Greg. Turon. *de Gloria Conf.* 75, and note, ed. Migne). He is called a saint by Gregory of Tours and others, and in the Breviary of the church of Autun his memory as a saint is appointed to be observed on July 19, but no mention of him is found in the *Roman Martyrology*. He died probably about A.D. 334. Besides some particulars of doubtful authority related by the Bollandists, we know that he was one of the three Gallic bishops who met at Rome, A.D. 313, to discuss the case of Caecilianus (MATERNUS (2), Vol. III. 362), and that he also attended the council of Arles in the following year (Optatus, i. 23; Routh, *Rel. Sacr.* iv. p. 94; *Mon. Vet. Don.* p. 201, ed. Oberthür). He is spoken of by St. Augustine as a man of great authority in the church, especially in Gaul, and his opinion on the subject of baptism

is quoted by him in his treatises against Julian (Aug. c. Jul. i. 7; *Opus imperf. c. Jul. i. 55*). St. Jerome, speaking of him as a man highly esteemed in Gaul in the time of Constantine, says that he wrote a commentary on the Song of Songs, and a large volume against Novatianus (Hieron. *de Vir. Ill.* 82). In a letter to Florentius, written probably A.D. 374, he hopes earnestly that Ruffinus will be able to lend him the commentaries of Rheticius, in which, says Jerome, he has discoursed on the Song of Songs in noble style. But ten years later, writing to Marcella, he declines to lend her this treatise, which he describes as written in a lofty Gallic style (Gallicano cothurno fluens), but so full of blunders from the writer's ignorance of Hebrew, as to be worthless as a commentary. It is probable that the difference in tone at the two periods is due to his own progress in the Hebrew language (id. *Ep. v. ad Florentium*, xxxvii. *ad Marcellam*; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* p. 499; Tillemont, vol. vi. 12; Ceillier, iii. c. 4; Baronius, vol. iii. 337. 47). [H. W. P.]

RHAIS (HERAIS), Sep. 5, virgin and martyr at Alexandria in the persecution of Diocletian under Culcianus, at first president of the Thebaid and then Praefectus Augustalis at Alexandria. On the career of Culcianus cf. Georgii SS. *Coluthi et Panesni Miracula*, p. 233 seq. (*A.A. SS. Boll. Sep.* ii. 525). [G. T. S.]

RHEGINUS, bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, and Metropolitan, who attended the council of Ephesus, 431, and at the seventh session successfully defended the independence of the island from the claims of the see of Antioch (Labbe, iii. 787, 801; Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, iii. 71, Clark's transl.). He also delivered a short discourse, "de fide," characterized by exaggerated condemnation of Nestorian doctrine (Labbe, iii. 577). He signed the deposition of Nestorius (*ibid.* 536) and the condemnation of his teaching (*ibid.* 690) (Le Quien, *Or. Christ.* ii. 1046). [E. V.]

RHETORIUS, RHETORIANI; according to Philaster (*Haer.* 91) an Egyptian who praised all heresies, asserting that all walked rightly and that none were in error. Augustine, who copies this account (*Haer.* 72), cannot believe that anyone could have held so absurd an opinion. Fabricius makes the plausible suggestion that Rhetorius is not a proper name, and that the person intended may be the "rhetor" Themistius, who held that variety of opinion on religious questions was not offensive, but rather pleasing to the Deity (*Orat.* 12 ad Valent., 5, ad Jovinian.). [G. S.]

RHODANIUS, fourth bishop of Toulouse, between St. Hilarius and St. Silvius, about the middle of the 4th century. Influenced by Hilary of Poitiers' strong character, he stood by him at the council of Béziers, where the Arians triumphed, shared his condemnation, and was driven into exile, where he died, probably about 358 (Sulpicius Severus, *Hist. Sacr.* ii. 39, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 151; *Gall. Christ.* xiii. 4.). [S. A. B.]

RHODO (1), a Christian writer of the end of the second century, our knowledge of whom

now exclusively depends on the account of his writings, and some extracts from them, given by Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 13). He was a native of Asia, but was converted to Christianity at Rome by Tatian, as he himself tells in a treatise against Marcion addressed to Callistion. In this work he tells of the sects into which the Marcionites split up after the death of their founder (see Vol. III. p. 819); and he gives an interesting account of an oral controversy held by him with the Marcionite Apelles, then an old man (see Vol. I. p. 127). In the same work, Rhodo mentions a book of "Problems" published by Tatian intended to exhibit the obscurity of the Holy Scriptures, and he promises to write a reply giving the solutions of these problems; but Eusebius does not seem to have met with this work. Rhodo also wrote a treatise on the Hexaemeron. It seems to be only through a lapse of memory that Jerome (*De Vir. Illust.*) speaks of Rhodo as the author of the anonymous treatise against the Montanists from which Eusebius makes extracts (*H. E.* v. 16).

[G. S.]

RHODO (2), one of the seven emissaries sent by Peter of Alexandria to watch for a favourable opportunity for carrying out the plot for the consecration of Maximus [MAXIMUS (11)]. Whether he and his companions were bishops or not is not certain. Gregory's language is wavering. That they were so is however rendered probable by his words: *κατάσκοποι οὐκ ἐπίσκοποι* (Greg. Naz. *Carm.* lib. ii. sec. i. ver. 838, in *Pat. Gr.* xxxvii. 1087; Tillem. ix. 447, 713, 714). [E. V.]

RHODO (3), an Asiatic bishop who took refuge at Mitylene, being driven from his see by the enemies of Chrysostom. (Pallad. p. 195.)

[E. V.]

RHYDDERCH HAEL (RHYDDERICH, RYDERCHEN, REDERECH, REDERCH, RODARCHUS, RODERCUS, RODERICK), king of Cumbria in Strathclyde. He was son of Tudwal Tudglud, descended from Macsen Wledig, but seems on the mother's side to have been of Irish descent. In the Welsh Triads (*Myv. Arch.* ii.) he is praised for his generosity, which has obtained for him the surname *Hael*, or the magnificent, and he was in close communication and friendship with the two chief saints of that age, St. Kentigern of Strathclyde, and St. Columba of Dalriadic Scotia: the former he recalled from exile in Wales, and from the latter in reply to his message he received the assurance of a peaceful death on his own pillow. He was baptized in Ireland, but it is not evident whether he was driven thither as an exile from his kingdom by a usurper Morken, or was in Ireland previously to being regulus in Cumbria. If both he and St. Kentigern had to flee before the same tyrant, the motive would be clear for his afterwards seeking the saint's restitution. On Morken's death Rhydderch became sole king of Cumbria, and had his residence at Alcluyd, now Dumbar-ton, on the Clyde; he consolidated the Christian agencies in his kingdom, and fought the last great battle between Christianity and paganism. This took place in the year 573 at Arderydd, now Arthuret, on the Esk, five miles north of Carlisle (Skene, *Chron.* xciii.) when Rhydderch

defeated Gwendolin ap Ceidau, who was aided by the British Maelgwn and the Dalriadic king Aidan, the latter, though a friend of St. Columba's, being probably afraid of a powerful neighbour in Strathclyde. (On this battle, see Bp. Forbes, *SS. Nin. & Kent*, 360 sq.; *Notes and Queries*, 2 ser. viii. 71-2.) He ruled for twenty-eight years, and died in peace A.D. 601. The Welsh legends place his grave at Abererch, Carnarvonshire, but Reeves (*S. Adamn.* 44) thinks it more likely to have been in the neighbourhood of Glasgow. (Skene, *Chron.* xciii. sq. 12, 15, and *Celt. Scot.* ii. 190 sq.; Grub, *E. H. Scot.* i. 37-9.) [J. G.]

RHYSTUD ap Hywel, Welsh saint of the 6th century, and patron of Llanrhystud, Cardigan-shire. His feast was on the Tuesday before Christmas. If he was bishop at Caerleon on Usk, it must have been as monastic bishop or as suffragan of Menevia or Llandaff. (*Myv. Arch.* 51; Rees, *Camb. Br. SS.* 598.) [J. G.]

RIAGHAIL (RIAGAIL, REGULUS), abbat of Muicinis on Lough Derg in the Shannon, commemorated on Oct. 16 (*M. Doneg.*). He was contemporary with St. Columba in the 6th century, and is supposed to have been the original of St. REGULUS of St. Andrews in Scotland. (Colgan, *Acta SS.* 337, c. 7.) [J. G.]

RICBODUS (RICBODUS, RIGBODUS), Archbishop of Trèves, and called MACARIUS by Alcuin. He was monk at Milan, and promoted to the see of Trèves A.D. 791. He stood in the relation of pupil and friend to Alcuin with whom he corresponded (Albinus, *Opp.* pt. i. Epp. 169-172 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. c. 440 sq.), but Alcuin reproaches him for remissness in writing, and rather much fondness for Virgil. When, however, Felix, bishop of Urgel [FELIX (176)] began to develop his heresy, Alcuin recommended Ricbodus to Charlemagne (Migne, t. c. 276) as one of the three scholars fit, along with Alcuin himself, to meet the false teaching. But if Ricbod wrote, his treatise is lost. He died A.D. 804, and his feast is Oct. 1 (*Gesta Trev.* 25; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 18, 329-30, 432; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xii. 161, 200-1). [J. G.]

RICHARIUS, ST., the founder and first abbat of the Benedictine monastery of Centule (which, with its adjoining town, afterwards took his name, Saint Riquier), lived in the first half of the 7th century. We possess a biography of him written by Alcuin, early in the 9th century, at the request of the abbat Angilbertus and Charles the Great, who visited the monastery. The preface shews that it is based on an earlier, but meagre record, which, with a narrative of his miracles also referred to, has been lost. According to Alcuin, he was born at Centule, in Picardy, and passed his early years there in rustic occupations. The turning-point of his life was the advent of two Irish priests, Caidocus and Frichorius (the apostles of the Morini, see CAIDOCUS, FRICOREUS), who on their way through the village being insulted and maltreated by the people, were received by Richarius into his house and kindly entertained. Touched by their exhortations, he became a Christian. In time he entered the priesthood and devoted himself to preaching, the relief of the poor and sick, and the redemption of captives. Afterwards desiring a wider sphere he

crossed over to Great Britain, as a missionary, and continued his labours there for a time. On his return to Centule he founded his monastery. His fame spread widely, and he was visited by king Dagobert (628-638), who granted him a small estate (according to the *Chronicon Centulense*, cap. xvii. in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* clxxiv. 1230, a spot called Campania, comprising three villae), 'ad luminaria domus.' His own ambition, however, was for the solitary and ascetic life, and so entrusting the young community to its second abbat (Ocioaldus), he soon withdrew with one companion, his disciple Sigobardus, to the forest of Crisciaccum (Crécy), about ten miles from Centule. Here he took up his abode in a little hut, and courting all privations, earned a widely extended reputation for sanctity, so that the sick flocked to him to be healed. When he died (April 26), his disciple buried him by his desire on the spot where he had lived, but before long the abbat and monks of Centule came and took away the body to their monastery, where it became renowned for its miraculous powers. This life was first published by Surius, then more correctly by Mabillon. It may also be found among other places in Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. iii. 442-7, and among the collected works of Alcuin in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* ci. 681-94 (see *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 319, for the editions). In the *Acta SS.* it is followed by a book of posthumous miracles written by a monk of Centule (pp. 447-56), a history of the relics in later times (pp. 457-9) and a versified rendering of the last extracted from the work of Angelramnus or Ingelramnus, abbat of Centule, at the beginning of the eleventh century. The *Chronicon Centulense*, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* clxxiv. 1215 sqq. amplifies to some extent Alcuin's story. The metrical version of it by Angelramnus, from which the Bollandists give an excerpt, is to be found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* cxli. 1423 sqq.

The little cell in the forest of Crécy developed into another and separate monastery known as Foresti-Monasterium (Forest-moûtier). For its history, see *Gall. Christ.* x. 1307 sqq.; and for that of Centule, or Saint-Riquier, *ibid.* 1241, sqq. Besides April 26, the supposed day of his death, October 9 and June 3 commemorate translations of his relics (Boll. *ibid.* p. 442).

The exact dates of Richarius' history are a matter of controversy, but he probably died about 645.

Baronius (*Annal.* 640, xii.) identifies him with a Sicharius, who was sent by Dagobert on an embassy to the Slavi, but erroneously, as is shewn by Pagi (640, ix.). [S. A. B.]

RICHBERTUS (RIGEBERTUS), thirty-ninth bishop of Mayence c. A.D. 712. (*Gall. Chr.* v. 437.) [J. G.]

RICIMER, patrician, the most powerful man in the western empire for the sixteen years that preceded his death in August, A.D. 472. For his history see DICTIONARY OF GREEK AND ROMAN BIOGRAPHY. Like the rest of the barbarians he was an Arian, and erected and decorated with mosaics for his Arian countrymen the church now known as S. Agata de' Goti on the south-eastern part of the Quirinal. These mosaics were extant in the time of Baronius, who gives Ricimer's inscription (*Ann.* viii. 313). [F. D.]

RICTRUDIS (1) (ROTRUDIS), abbess of Marchiennes, known to us through a Life written by Hucbald, monk of Elno, c. A.D. 907 (Hucbaldus, *Opp. t. i.* in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxxxii. 827 sq.; Mabillon, *AA. SS. Ben.* ii. 937 sq.; Boll. *AA. SS. Mai.* iii. 81 sq.). Born of noble parents, named Ernoldus and Lichia, in the south of France, c. A.D. 614, Rictrudis was early brought under the influence of St. Amand, but her marriage with the Frankish noble St. Adalbold directed her work to Flanders, where she had four children, all numbered among the saints (SS. Maurontus, Clotsendis, Adalsendis and Eusebia). When her husband was murdered, she devoted herself the more sedulously to the duties of religion under the advice of St. Amand, and at last took the veil. Her chief foundation was at Marchiennes, in the diocese of Arras, c. A.D. 647, and herself ruled over a monastery for women forty years. Her daughter Adalsendis soon died, and her son and remaining daughters gave themselves over to the conventual life. She died c. A.D. 687, and was buried in her own monastery, which became famous in the Middle Ages. But in A.D. 1024 it became a monastery for monks (Boll. *A. SS. Mai.* iii. 80). Her feast is 12 May (*Hist. Litt. de la France*, xv. 89 sq.; Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 632, c. 2). [J. G.]

RICTRUDIS (2) (RECTRUDA, RICHRUDA), daughter of Charlemagne, and, with her sister Gisla [GISLA], was pupil of Alcuin, who has dedicated to Rictrudis the first five books of his *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, and the other two to Gisla (Alcuin, *Comment. in Joan. Epist. Praeviae*; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. c. 637 sqq.). [J. G.]

RICULA, sister of Ethelbert, king of Kent, and wife of Sledda, king of the East Saxons, by whom she was mother of Sebert, the first Christian king of that nation. We have no data either of the time or circumstance that throw any light on her character or history, nor are we told whether or not she was a Christian. (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 3; and the pedigrees in *M. H. B.* 629.) [S.]

RICULFUS (RICHULFUS), third archbishop of Mainz, between St. Lullus and Atulphus or Haistulphus (A.D. 787-813), was one of the higher clergy who surrounded the throne of Charles the Great, whose chaplain he had been before his consecration at Fritzlär on March 4, 787. (*Annal. Wirziburg.*, Pertz, *Script.* ii. 240.) His chief work was the building of the church and monastery of St. Albanus, one of the fugitives from Africa in the time of Hunneric, who had suffered martyrdom at Mainz. It was consecrated in 805 (*Annal. Wirziburg.* *ibid.*). He was accused of ostentatious magnificence in his office, in particular of having caused to be carried before him a pastoral staff of gold, which brought down upon him a rebuke from Charles (cf. the curious stories in Monach. Sangall. *Gesta Kar.* i. 16, 17, Pertz, *Script.* ii. 737, 738). According to Hincmar of Rheims, it was he who introduced the False Decretals from Spain to Germany (*Opusc. et Epist.*, Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cxxvi. 379), but this statement is probably not correct. In 809 and 811 he was at Fulda, mediating between the monks and their abbat

Ratgar. In the latter year, among other prelates, he attested the will of Charles the Great (Pertz, *Script.* ii. 463), and two years later, with Hildebald of Cologne, he presided at the council of Mainz. To the same year relates the charge against him of burning the wooden bridge at Mainz, which had cost Charles ten years to build, because it was the haunt of robbers, who threw the bodies of their victims into the river (*Mar. Scot. Chron.*, Pertz, *Script.* v. 549). He died Aug. 9, 813 (Pertz, *Script.* i. 63, 121). Though we have no writing of his, several letters addressed to him survive, one from pope Leo III. (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* cii. 1030), and several from Alcuin, who corresponded with him under the name of Damoetas (*Epist.* xlv., cxxii., *Pat. Lat.* c. 211, 356). If he was the recipient of the 123rd letter (*ibid.* 357) he must have been one of the delegates who escorted Leo III. back to Rome in 799. For his life see *Gall. Christ.* v. 443, and Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 578. [S. A. B.]

RIGOBERTUS, twenty-seventh bishop of Rheims, was closely related to Reolus and succeeded him at the close of the eighth century: his father's name was Constantinus. From the account given by Flodoard (*Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. cc. 11-15), which is our primary authority, we learn that he was the great organiser in his diocese, and put the monks under better discipline. "Canonicam clericis religionem restituit ac sufficientia victualia constituit, et prædia quaedam illis contulit, necnon aerarium commune usibus eorum instituit" (*Ib.* ii. c. 11). He methodically took an account of all the temporalities and privileges of the see, and had the titles preserved in the archives of the church of Rheims. As he was probably afraid even of a deliverer, he refused to open the gates of Rheims to Charles Martel when driving out the Saracens; and when the city was taken he fled to Gascony, c. A.D. 721, while one Milo was intruded into the see. He was afterwards allowed to return to France and visit Rheims, but was not restored to his office. If he returned on the death of Charles Martel, this occurred A.D. 741, but it is believed to have been much earlier, as he probably died c. A.D. 732, and was buried in the town where he used to live, but in the middle of the ninth century Hincmar had his remains translated into the church of St. Dionysius in Rheims. His feast is 4 January. His dates are all doubtful, some putting his death as late as A.D. 773, and his other dates to correspond to this. (*Acta* are in Surius *Vit. SS.* i. 60 sq.; Mabillon, *A. SS. Ben.* iii. i. 496 sq.; Boll. *A. SS.* Jan. 174 sq. See also *Gall. Christ.* ix. 24; Fleury, *H. E.* xli. c. 29; Baronius, *Ann.* A.D. 717, cc. 6 sq.; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, v. 475.) [J. G.]

RINGAN, bishop of Whithern. [NINIAN.]

RIOCATUS (RIOCHATUS), Breton bishop, who had been sent by Faustus of Riez to Clermont, with presents to Sidonius Apollinaris, the bishop; he had left his Breton see in consequence of the incursions of the heathen. Sidonius calls him, in his letter to Faustus (*Ep.* ix., Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lviii. 625), a double stranger in the world, from his monastic vow and by

his enforced banishment. But his chief interest lies in his having, in a roundabout way described by Sidonius, given to Sidonius the means of reading Faustus' works; in his letter Sidonius reproaches Faustus for keeping his writings a secret from him (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 395).

[J. G.]

RIPARIUS, a learned presbyter of Aquitaine, in the beginning of the 5th century, and friend of Desiderius (q.v.), known to us from his connexion with the controversies caused by Vigilantius and Pelagius. Vigilantius, after a stay in Palestine, where he had been received by Jerome, returned to his old diocese, in which Riparius lived, and commenced spreading his opinions, which condemned various superstitious practices, especially the adoration of relics. Riparius, finding that his bishop to some extent countenanced Vigilantius, wrote to Jerome, who replied in a short letter which is extreme both in its contempt of Vigilantius and in its advocacy of the practices impugned. This was in 404. Jerome having asked for the work of Vigilantius, Riparius sent it him by the Deacon Sisinnius, and thus called forth the treatise of Jerome, *Adv. Vigilantium*, in 406.

At a later time (417) Riparius again solicited the help of Jerome in combating the views of Pelagius. Jerome replied in a short letter of encouragement, exhorting him to stand fast, and telling him how the partisans of Pelagius had attacked the monasteries at Bethlehem, but had since been almost driven away from Palestine. Jerome speaks of Riparius as a well-known defender of the faith, and addresses him as "domine verè sancte et suscipiende frater. (DESIDERIUS, HIERONYMUS, VIGILANTIUS, SISINIUS; Jerome, *Epp.* 109, 138; *Id. Adv. Vigil.* 3.)

[W. H. F.]

RIQUIER, ST. [RICHARIUS.]

RODANUS, count, bearer of a letter from Leo the Great to JULIANUS (27) of Cos, dated the 25th of June, A.D. 453 (Leo, *Epp.* 125, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* liv. 1069). In it reference is made to other letters sent by another person of the same name, entitled *subadywa*, a title signifying that he was one of the assistants of an *adjutor*. For these offices see the Commentary of Panciroli on the *Notitia Imperii*, chaps. 12 and 16. The former Rodanus may be the same as the "Rodanus vir honorabilis," bearer of a letter, dated May 21, A.D. 449, to Flavian (Leo, *Epp.* 27, in *Patr. Lat.* liv. 751). [F. D.]

RODERICUS, last Gothic king of Spain, is one of those persons whose prominence in legend contrasts strongly with the meagreness of our authentic information about them. He had long been governor of part of Southern Spain, and on the death of Wittiza seized the throne at the instigation of the Gothic magnates. ("Tumultuose regnum hortante Senatu invadit," Isid. Pac. "Furtim magis quam virtute invadit regnum," continuer of J. Biclarenensis.) The evidence is against the story of a previous insurrection in which Wittiza perished, which is first found in Rodericus of Toledo, and is there mixed up with the legendary outrage against Roderic's alleged father Theodifred, said to have been a son of Reccesvinth or Kindasvinth. Against this

late authority, there is the silence of all earlier writers, Sebastian of Salamanca's statement that Wittiza died a natural death, and the fact that his brothers and sons commanded in Roderic's army.

There are indications that Roderic's short reign was troubled with civil war. The Arab narrative, translated by Dozy (*Recherches*, i. 43), represents him as besieging Pampeluna, when he received the news of Tarik's landing; coins exist of the same type as those of Wittiza, struck by a certain king Achila, whose name is not found in any document, at Narbonne and Tarragona, from which places no coins of Roderic are known (Heiss, *Monnaies des Rois Wisigothes*, 141); finally Lucas of Tuy's story that Roderic, by Julian's advice, sent arms and horses to Gaul, seems a confused reminiscence of some disturbance in the North-East. All these indications suggest that, as in WAMBA's case, Septimania and North-East Spain did not acquiesce in the election at Toledo, but set up a king of their own.

We need only allude to the famous story of Roderic's seduction of Florinda or La Cava, and the vengeance of her father Julian. The first Spanish chronicle that contains it, or, in its present form, mentions Julian, is that of the monk of Silo (c. A.D. 1100), but it occurs in early Arab sources, and is considered by Dozy (*Rech.* i. 41; *Histoire*, ii. 31) to be true. To us the examination of the chronology given below seems to disprove it. In any case Julian was a real personage. He is mentioned in the earliest Arabian chronicles (Dozy, *Rech.* i. 58), and Dozy, by a brilliant emendation ("*Juliani*, Africanæ regionis sub dogmate Catholicae fidei *exarchi*" for *Urbani* and *exorti*) restores him to the text of Isidorus Paecensis, who relates that a noble Christian of that name had accompanied Mousa through all the provinces of Spain, and to the caliph's court. No other author mentions such an Urban, who must have been a prominent person, and the corruption of *Urbani* for *Juliani* is an easy one. Thus Julian would have been the governor of the scrap of territory about Ceuta still held by the Byzantines. This tallies exactly with the best Mohammedan writers of Spain (Gayangos, i. 578), who narrate that when Okba invaded Western Africa, the governor of Ceuta, whose name was Ilyán, the same who afterwards led Tarik into Spain, came out to meet him with presents and asked for and obtained peace. He is called Ilyán, which, according to Gayangos, is the equivalent not of Julian but of Aelian. At the instigation, or, at any rate, with the assistance of Julian, Mousa, the caliph's lieutenant in Africa, in July, 710, sent over a reconnoitring detachment of 400 foot and 100 horse under Tarif. He landed at the point called Tarifa after him, ravaged the country and returned laden with booty. Mousa determined to repeat the expedition, and the next summer despatched 7000 men under Tarik, occupied Gibraltar (April 30, 711) (Gayangos, i. 522), and proceeded to plunder the country. Roderic marched against him with 100,000 men, on which Mousa sent a reinforcement of 5000. The armies met on the banks of the Wádi-Becca (now the Salado), near the Lago de la Janda on July 19. The battle was decided by the treason of the brothers or sons of Wittiza, who com-

manded the two wings of Roderic's army, and who fled with their contingents at the commencement of the battle. [OPPAS.] The centre where Roderic commanded in person held its ground for some time, but at last was broken, and the whole Christian army was routed with great slaughter. Later accounts make the battle

last eight days. Roderic probably perished in the rout, but his body was never found.

The chronology of the last two Gothic kings is extremely confused and uncertain. We begin by giving the statements of the four oldest authorities, reducing the years of the Spanish era to their equivalents in the Christian:

Continuer of J. Biclarensis c. A.D. 721.	Isidorus Pacensis c. A.D. 750.	Chron. Albeldense c. 880.	Sebastian of Salamanca c. 880.
687 Egica begins to reign	688 Egica begins to reign, and reigns 15 years	Egica reigns 15 years	Egica reigns 10 years alone and 5 with his son.
694 Associates Wittiza	698 Associates Wittiza	Wittiza 10 and Roderic 3	Wittiza reigns 10 years and dies in 710.
702 Wittiza succeeds alone	701? Wittiza succeeds alone	So called Chronicle of Wulsa.	
711 Roderic succeeds	711 Roderic succeeds and reigns one year Wittiza reigns 15 years	Wittiza is anointed king, Nov. 14, 700.	

Egica having begun to reign Nov. 24, 687, completed his fourteenth year Nov. 24, 701. Having reigned ten years alone, late in 697 (Isidorus Pacensis, being a year too late, in the beginning of Egica's reign, gets the association also a year late) he associates Wittiza, who, his father becoming incapable from age or illness, is anointed king, Nov. 14, 700. Egica then dies, after Nov. 24, 701, in 701 or 702, in the fifteenth year of his reign. Wittiza then reigns ten years, counting from his coronation till early in 711, having reigned thirteen complete years plus parts of 697 and 711, making fifteen years in all. The importance of the result of the comparison is the establishment of the fact, that Roderic began to reign not earlier than the beginning of 711. Now the first expedition under Tarif took place in 710. The part therefore that Julian took in the invasion of Spain was not caused by a quarrel with Roderic; the foundation therefore of the La Cava legend fails. Again, the mysterious notice of THEODEMIR'S naval victories over the Greeks in the reigns of Egica and Wittiza may refer to some successes against Julian and his Byzantines, who had submitted and become tributary to Okba.

Authorities.—The continuation of the *Chronicle* of J. Biclarensis; Isidorus Pacensis; the *Chronicle* of Sebastian of Salamanca; *Chron. Albeldense*, in *Esp. Sag.* vi. 436, viii. 298, xiii. 478, 449; the Arabian writers in Gayangos' *History of the Mohammedan Dynasties*, vol. i., and in Dozy's *Recherches*, vol. i.; Gams, *Kirchengesch. von Sp.* ii. (2) 184; Dahn, *Die Könige der Germanen*, v. 227; Dozy, *Histoire des Musulmans en Espagne*, ii. 31. [F. D.]

RODING (ROUIN, CHRAUDINGUS), patron of Beaulieu, between Verdun and St. Menehould. He was an Irish Scot, who went from Ireland to the monastery of Taballium near Treves before A.D. 642, and set about erecting a monastery in the wood of Argonne. His work was interrupted by the proprietor of the district, but he afterwards received land and permission to build the monastery of Beaulieu, of which he was the first abbat. He died about A.D. 680, and his feast is Sept. 17. (Mabillon, *Ann.* A.D. 642, 680 and *Acta SS.* Sec. iv. pt. ii. App. pp. 513-7; Boll. *Acta SS.* Sept. 17, v. 508-17.) [J. G.]

ROGATIANUS (1), an aged presbyter and confessor, addressed by Cyprian *Ep.* vi., along with Sergius and others, who are urged to

imitate his courage. In *Ep.* 13 the same confessors are exhorted to consistency, with allusions to grievous irregularities, *Ep.* 7. He was entrusted with the distribution of Cyprian's bounty, and the general relief of distress and administration of discipline, *Ep.* 41, *Ep.* 42, along with CALDONIUS and the other delegates still associated with Numidicus during Cyprian's retirement; *Ep.* 43 commended for his activity in both functions, and his sound teaching and influence. [E. W. B.]

ROGATIANUS (2), Cyp. *Ep.* 3. A bishop who appeals against his contumacious deacon to the authority of Cyprian. [E. W. B.]

ROGATIANUS (3), possibly the same in Syn. Carth. 2 sub Cyp. *de pace maturius danda*, *Lp.* 57. [E. W. B.]

ROGATIANUS (4), possibly the same in Syn. Carth. 2 sub Cyp. *de Basilde et Martiali*, *Ep.* 67. [E. W. B.]

ROGATIANUS (5), two bishops of the name appear in Cyp. *Ep.* 70: the first being one of the Numidian bishops who unite to give their views on the baptism of heretics in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. 2, *de Bap.* One of these two is doubtless identical with Rogatianus (4), as well as with the bishop of Nova (Noba, Oppidum Novum, hod. *Duperré*, a colony in Mauretania Caesariensis), whose sentence is sixtieth in Syn. Carth. sub Cyp. *de Bap.* 3. [E. W. B.]

ROGATIANUS (6), Carthaginian deacon, sent A.D. 256 by Cyprian to FIRMIAN, with a letter on the subject of re-baptism, as well as with former letters on the same subject, to Stephanus and to Jubaianus. He returned with Firmilian's reply before winter, but after September 1st. [E. W. B.]

ROGATIANUS (7), May 24, martyr with Donatianus, his brother, in the Diocletian persecution at Nantes. His acts contain genuine fragments. They dwell on the worship of Apollo, which was specially enforced in the Diocletian persecution, and the offer of imperial favour if the martyrs would recant, which Le Blant, *Actes des Martyrs*, p. 76, notes as a special mark of genuineness. Rogatianus died without baptism. The acts intimate that his martyrdom supplied its place (Ruinart, *AA. Sinc.* p. 279). [G. T. S.]

ROGATIANUS (8), a Donatist bishop, but of what see does not appear, who was associated by his party with Cassian and Pontius in the petition to Julian, A.D. 363. (DONATISM, Vol. I. p. 884; Aug. c. *Petil.* ii. 224; *Ep.* 105, 9; *Optatus*, ii. 16.) A Donatist bishop of this name was present at the council of Cabarsussis, A.D. 394, but whether the same man as the above there is no evidence to show (Aug. *En. in Ps.* 36, 20). [H. W. P.]

ROGATUS (1), African bishop in Syn. Carth. 2 sub Cyp. A.D. 252, Cyp. *Ep.* 57. [E. W. B.]

ROGATUS (2), called by Augustine the Moor, Maurus, bishop of Cartenne (*Tenez*), a town near the sea-coast of Mauretania Caesariensis, not far from the mouth of the river Cartennus (*Habrah*), and called by Pliny Colonia Augusti (Plin. *H. N.* v. 2. 11. 20; *Ant. Itin.* 14, 2; *Ptol.* iv. 2. 4; Shaw, *Trav.* p. 15). Belonging to the Donatist party, for some reason not known, he seceded from it about A.D. 370, when Augustine was a young man. He was followed by a few congregations, in number never exceeding ten (*brevissimum frustum de frusto majore praecisum*), to whom the name of Rogatists was given. They are said by Augustine to have been less violent in their conduct than other Donatists, perhaps as Augustine hints, from the weakness of their own party, though Rogatus himself was a man of litigious temper. The secession however irritated the Donatists greatly, and they made use of the power of Firmus, of whose revolt the chief strength lay in that part of Africa, to harass the Rogatists, who retaliated by calling their persecutors partisans of Firmus (*Firmenses*). Rogatus and his party appear to have made common cause with the Maximianists, and at some time in 395 or 396, on the death of Praetextatus, he was made bishop of Assuris, and was succeeded in the see of Cartenna by Vincentius Victor. At a later time he returned to the Catholic church, but by so doing incurred the hatred of the Donatists, and was attacked and mutilated by the Circumcellions. His sect, never numerous, appears to have died out in course of time, but Augustine, in arguing against the Donatists, does not fail to make frequent use of the arguments furnished: 1. By their secession and the consequent division of the original party; 2. the persecution of them under Firmus; 3. the outrages of the Circumcellions; 4. the inconsistent behaviour of the Donatist party (a) in condemnation (b) in virtual restoration of them, together with the Maximianists by accepting their baptism. (Aug. *in Joann. Ec.* x. 2; i. 6; *Serm.* 138, 10, 10; *Ep.* 87, 10-93; 1, 11, 24; 4, 12; 7, 23, 24; 8, 24; 11, 46; c. *Parm.* 1, 10, 16; 11, 17; c. *Petil.* ii. 184; c. *Cresc.* iii. 62; iv. 73; *de Gest. cum Emer.* 9; *Morcelli, Afr. Chr.* i. 86, 122; ii. 322; *Tillemont*, vol. vi. 61; DONATISM, Vol. I. 886; FELICIANUS (4); MAXIMIANUS (2).) [H. W. P.]

ROGATUS (3), Donatist bishop of Rusiccada, who made a bargain with Firmus to deliver up the city to him (Aug. *Ep.* 87, § 10), and that the Catholic inhabitants should be destroyed.

[H. W. P.]

ROGATUS (4), father of Paula the friend of Jerome. He was probably a Christian, since no mention is made of Paula being a Christian

otherwise than by birth. Though having a Roman name, he was of a Greek family, who traced their descent from Agamemnon. He was very wealthy, and owned the whole town of Actium, or Nicopolis, which he bequeathed to Paula, his only child. [PAULA, Jerome, *Ep.* cviii. 3; *Id. Pref. to Comm. on Titus.*]

[W. H. F.]

ROGATUS (5), Aug. 17, a monk and martyr at Carthage under Hunneric. He suffered with Liberatus and his companions on July 2, they are usually commemorated on Aug. 17, the date of their translation. [LIBERATUS (3).] (Victor Vit. *de Wandalica Persecutione*, v. 10, and *Passio S. Liberati* in Migne's *Patr. Lat.* lviii., 262.) [G. T. S.]

ROMANIANUS, a wealthy citizen of Tagaste, where, as well as at Carthage, he possessed a house and other property. He shewed great kindness and true friendship towards Augustine in his early life, which was never forgotten by him, and which he did not fail in later days gratefully to acknowledge. In a passage of the second book against the heathen philosophers Augustine relates with pathetic simplicity how when he was but a boy and in poverty, arising no doubt from his father's "spirited" disregard of expense, he had found in Romanianus a friend who provided him not only with a home and pecuniary help for carrying on his studies at Carthage, but also showed him what he valued still more than these, friendship and kindly encouragement. When this plan was interrupted by the death of his father in 371, Romanianus was again his comforter and friend in need, receiving him into his house at Tagaste as his honoured guest, and though, in a patriotic spirit, he endeavoured to dissuade him from returning to Carthage, when he saw that his youthful ambition desired a wider range of action than his native town could afford, he changed his dissuasion into liberal encouragement, and supplied him with the means necessary for his purpose. Nor, as Augustine mentions with special gratitude, did he take offence when the young man left to himself neglected to write to him, but passed over his neglect with considerate kindness (Aug. *Conf.* ii. 3; vi. 14; c. *Acad.* ii. 2; *Ep.* 27, 4). Romanianus had a son named Licentius, and it is not unlikely that he may have been a pupil under Augustine while he was teaching rhetoric at Carthage, but of this there is no evidence, though this was undoubtedly the case ten or twelve years later at Milan. Besides Licentius Romanianus appears to have had another son, Olympius, frequently mentioned in the various discourses composed by Augustine at Cassiciacum near Milan, who received baptism at the same time as Augustine, and who afterwards became bishop of Tagaste, of which place he was certainly a native, and of a rank in life agreeing entirely with that of Romanianus (Aug. *Conf.* vi. 7). Of this the following particulars furnish evidence: 1. In his book against the academic philosophers, dedicated to Romanianus Augustine speaks, though not very definitely, of Alypius as his son (c. *Acad.* ii. 3. 8), and in a letter to Paulinus calls him a near relative (cognatus) (*Ep.* xxvii. 5). 2. In a letter to Alypius, then a bishop, A.D. 394, Paulinus

requests to give him an account of himself, mentioning his former sojourn at Milan, of which he had heard. (Paul, *Ep.* 3, 4). 3. In his verses included in a letter to Licentius, two years later, A.D. 396, Paulinus speaks of Alypius as his brother (pater . . . sanguinis . . . consors) (Paul, *Ep.* 8). Like Augustine himself, perhaps, in some degree, through his influence, Romanianus fell into the prevailing errors of Manicheism, which, however, he appears to have cast off, though without adopting as yet the true philosophy of the gospel, by the time when, as we gather from the description of Augustine, he visited him at Milan in 385. He had gone thither on important business, and while there entered with some warmth into the scheme, in whose success his wealth made his participation all important, of a life in common of ten members, of whom two should annually act as purveyors for the rest, an airy idea which came to nothing before any serious step was taken to carry it out. In the next year, while Augustine was occupying with his friends the house of Verecundus at Cassiciacum, near Milan, and was meditating the great change of life which he brought to pass in the year following, he composed the four discourses, of which the one against the Academic philosophers in three books he dedicated to Romanianus as an argument and earnest entreaty to him to abandon their doctrines, declaring at its conclusion his own intention to abide by the authority of Christ, "For," says he, "I find none more powerful than this" (*c. Acad.* i. 1; iii. 20; *Retract.* i. 1-4). At some time in the course of the three years following the conversion of Augustine Romanianus also became a Christian, a change which drew still closer the intimacy between Augustine and himself, and we may add his family, for in a short letter written in 390 Augustine speaks of communication with his uncle, and also thanks him warmly for informing him of some happy event in his own family, perhaps, as the language of Augustine may be understood to mean the settlement of the business which had disturbed him four years before (*Ep.* 15). In the same year, according to his promise in his book against the Academic philosophy, three years before he composed and addressed to Romanianus his book on true religion, sending it to him as he did with most of his own works (*c. Acad.* ii. 3. 8; *de Ver. Rel.* 12; *Ep.* 27, 4; 31, 7). But the love and gratitude of Augustine towards Romanianus was not confined to him alone. We find him writing, A.D. 395, to his son Licentius, entreating him in the most affectionate manner to shake off the bonds in which he was held by the world, to visit Paulinus at Nola, and learn from him how this was to be accomplished (*Aug. Ep.* 26, 3). This letter he followed up by one to Paulinus himself, introducing to him Romanianus, the bearer of the letter, and commending Licentius to his attention (*Ep.* 27, 3, 4, 6). Early in the following year, 396, Augustine wrote to Paulinus announcing his appointment as coadjutor to Valerius, bishop of Hippo (*Ep.* 31-4), and in the same year Paulinus wrote to Romanianus, whose acquaintance he had made at Nola, congratulating the church of Africa on this appointment, and the advantage which it was likely to produce, sending both to him and

to Licentius loaves of friendship, and expressing the hope that the trumpet of Augustine may sound in the ears of Licentius. At the same time he wrote both in prose and in verse to Licentius himself, exhorting him to renounce his worldly plans and devote himself to God. (LICENTIUS (1), Paulinus, *Epp.* vii. viii.) But after this we hear no more of him. [H. W. P.]

ROMANUS (1), one of the seven martyrs of Samosata in the persecution of Diocletian. [HIPPARCHUS.] [G. T. S.]

ROMANUS (2), Nov. 18, deacon and exorcist of Caesarea, and martyr of Antioch, under the prefect Aesclepiades. He suffered with a child seven years of age, named Barulas. The tongue of Romanus was cut out and he was then beheaded. His story is told in Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* cap. 2; lib. 2, *de Resurrect. et Ascens. Dom.*; Prudent. *Hymn.* 10, where the story of the child Barulas is told without mentioning his name, which is also given as Theodulus in the Breviary of Toledo; Chrysost. t. i. *Orat.* 43 and 48. Ruinart in *Acta Sinc.* collects all the authorities. [G. T. S.]

ROMANUS (3), a Roman officer, count of Africa, during the time of Valentinian, employed by him to put down the Circumcellions, A.D. 365, which he probably did without much mercy, and for which reason he was called by Petilian a persecutor (*Aug. c. Petil.* iii. 29). He was an able officer, but a bad character is given of him by Ammianus, and he was accused of having caused the revolt of Firmus, but his general history does not otherwise touch that of the Church (*Amm. Marc.* xxvii. 9; xxix. 5; Tillemont, *Hist. des Emp.* vol. v.; arts. 12, 28, pp. 25, 63; Morcelli, *Afr. Chr.* ii. 271-279). [H. W. P.]

ROMANUS (4), a military confessor under Julian. According to Theodoret he was actually led to execution and with his neck bared was awaiting the final blow when he was reprieved. Rendall regards the action of Romanus as mutinous; cf. his *Emperor Julian*, p. 173; Theodor. *H. E.* iii. 16, 17; Greg. Naz. *Or.* iv. 83. [G. T. S.]

ROMANUS (5), a presbyter of Antioch, to whom, at the request of Castus and his brother presbyters, who were maintaining the orthodox cause against Porphyrius, Chrysostom wrote from Cucus in 405, assuring him of the continuance of his friendship and begging his letters and his prayers. This letter was sent through Castus and his companions, with the request, that they would inform Romanus that he had been deferring his letter until he had received one from him, but readily acceded to his desire that he would write first (*Chrys. Epp.* 22, 23). We have two other letters of Chrysostom's to Romanus, in which he thanks him for the zeal manifested in his cause, the fame of which had spread to Armenia and Cappadocia and even further, commends his courage and firmness, and begs him to write frequently. (*Epp.* 78, 91.) [E. V.]

ROMANUS (6), a Christian, much valued by Paulinus and Augustine, and with Agilis, a bearer of letters between them on more than one occasion. (*Aug. Epp.* 30, 31, 45.) [H. W. P.]

ROMANUS (7), a solitary, born and brought up at Rhosus, who retired to a cell on the mountains near Antioch, where he passed his life to extreme old age practising the utmost austerities, denying himself fire and lamp light, and taking no more food than would barely support existence. Theodoret describes him as conspicuous for simplicity and meekness, attracting large numbers to his cell by the beauty of his character, over whom he exercised a salutary influence. He was accredited with miraculous power in curing diseases and removing barrenness (Theod. *Hist. Relig.* c. xi.) [E. V.]

ROMANUS (8), priest and abbat, founder of Monasterium Condatescense and others in the Jura mountains, c. A.D. 489. Gregory of Tours (*Vitae Patrum*, c. 1, in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxi. col. 1011 sq.) gives an account *De Lupicino atque Romano abb.*, and the Bollandists (*Acta SS.* Feb. iii. 743 sq.) add another Life of Romanus that is said to be written by a contemporary monk of Condat: their comment. *præv.* contains the notices in the Martyrologies. His acts are very closely related to those of his brother Lupicinus [**LUPICINUS (6)**]. He is said to have been of a milder disposition than his brother, and to have wrought miracles, for which after his death his burial-place became a famous place of pilgrimage. His feast is Feb. 28 (Fleury, *H. E.* xxix. c. 40; Tillemont, *H. E.* xvi. 142 sq., 743 sq.; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 60 sq., 73 sq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 610, xi. 379.) [J. G.]

ROMANUS (9), ST. A celebrated and prolific hymn writer of the Eastern Church, by which he is commemorated on Oct 1st. He is said to have written more than 1000 hymns, of the kind called *κοντάκια*. There is reason to think that he was the inventor of this form of hymn, and that it derives its somewhat disputed name from the legend as to its origin, which is to be found in the Synaxasion of St. Romanus's day (*Menaea*, Oct. 1st). This legend is to the effect that the Blessed Virgin appeared to him, and commanded him to eat a roll (*κοντάκιον*) which she gave him, and that, obeying, he found himself endowed with the power of composing hymns. If he was the first who wrote *κοντάκια*, it is an argument in favour of the opinion (in which Pitra and the Bollandists agree) which places him in the reign of Anastasius I. (491-518) rather than of Anastasius II. (713-719). W. Christ, who takes the later date, supports his opinion by pointing to certain words and phrases which appear inconsistent with the earlier date. But Pitra does not think the difficulties which these raise sufficient to induce him to assign so elegant and forcible a writer to the 8th century.

Of the life of the saint we know nothing except from the *Menaea*, and what we learn there contradicts many statements which later writers have made (see Pitra, *Anat. Sacr. Spicil. Solesm.* I. xxvi. n.). He appears to have been born at Gruesa, to have been a deacon at Berytus, and afterwards attached to the churches of Blachemae and of Cyrus at Constantinople. Pitra, in the first volume of his *Analecta*, has collected several poems which he sees reason to attribute to the saint, and expresses a confident hope that more of his works will before long be discovered or identified. [H. A. W.]

ROMANUS (10), archimandrite of a monastery at Eleutheropolis, in Palestine, in the beginning of the 6th century, in succession to MAMAS (2), like whom he is said to have there indoctrinated Severus of Sozopolis in Euty-chianism (Liberatus *Diac. Brev.* c. 19 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxviii. 1033.) [J. G.]

ROMANUS (11), monk, who alone knew of St. Benedict's retreat in the cave at Subiaco, and fed him with food swung over the cliff by a rope with a bell attached [**BENEDICTUS OF NURSIA**] (Greg. M. *Dial.* ii. 1; *Vit. S. Benedicti*, Prol. in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxvi. 127 sqq.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 156.) [J. G.]

ROMANUS (12), exarch of Ravenna, appointed some time before the middle of A.D. 590 (*Letter to King Childebert*, in Troya, *Cod. Dipl.* i. 66), carried on the war against the Lombards with vigour, aided by the Frankish army sent by CHILDEBERT II. He retook Altinum, Modena, and Mantua, the Franks penetrated to Verona, Authari, the Lombard king, was obliged to shut himself up in Pavia, and the Lombard dukes who held Parma, Reggio, and Piacenza, surrendered without fighting, as did GISULF in Istria. The ravages of disease among the Franks, however, compelled their commander to conclude a ten months' truce, of which Romanus bitterly complained (Troya, i. 63). Romanus, c. 592, marched to Rome and captured several of the towns in that part of Italy, including Perugia, which was betrayed to him. Perugia was soon, however, recovered by king Agilulf, who advanced to the walls of Rome, and took many prisoners, some of whom were sold as slaves to the Franks, and others sent into the city with their hands cut off (Gregorius, *Hom. in Ezechiel.* ii. preface, and 10 in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxxvi. 934, 1072). Gregory complained bitterly of the defenceless state in which Romanus left Rome, withdrawing most of the troops to garrison Perugia and other outlying towns, while those that remained were unpaid, and could hardly be persuaded to do their duty. The exarch would neither conclude a general peace, nor allow Gregory to make a separate one for the duchy of Rome (*Epp.* ii. 10, v. 40). In a letter to SEBASTIANUS of Sirmium, he expresses himself freely against Romanus, declaring that the oppressive conduct of himself and his subordinates was more grievous than the Lombard swords (*Epp.* v. 42). In A.D. 595, Agilulf became more inclined for a general peace (*Epp.* v. 36), or if this were impossible, to make a separate peace with Gregory, but none was made till after the death of Romanus (Paulus *Diac.* iv. 12), which probably happened c. 596 or 7, as in the summer of 597, Gregory alludes to the arrival of one Callinicus, probably the new exarch (*Epp.* vii. 29). There are several letters from Gregory to Romanus; in one (i. 33) he demands that Blandus, bishop of Ortona, who had been long imprisoned by him, should be tried by a synod without delay, in another (v. 24) he warns him to desist from protecting the priest Speciosus in his resistance to his bishop, and from supporting certain nuns, who had left their nunnery. (Ersch and Gruber, *Encycl.* xxxix. 314.) [F. D.]

ROMANUS (13), defensor, is mentioned in several letters of Gregory the Great, and no less

than twenty-four are addressed to him (lib. ix. ind. ii. 18, 24, 26, 27, 39, 40, 60, 62, 94; lib. x. ind. iii. 1, 10, 13, 53, 64; lib. xi. ind. iv. 11, 21, 37, 39, 41; lib. xii. ind. v. 15, 25, 37, 42, 49). They treat of all kinds of business, and give a vivid notion of the amount of work transacted by the pope. The first in A.D. 599 appoints him defensor over the property of the Roman church in the districts of Syracuse, Catania, Agrigentum, and Mylae. The defensor Romanus, mentioned in connection with Sicilian business in A.D. 591 (lib. ii. ind. x. 32), was therefore either a different person or was now re-appointed. The most noteworthy of these letters are the seventh, referring to bishops who were said to have women living in their houses; the tenth dealing with the case of the deposed bishop of Melita, who had appropriated some of the property of the see; and the twenty-first forbidding Romanus to allow the serfs on ecclesiastical property to leave the estate to which they belonged or to marry off it. [F. D.]

ROMANUS (14) and DOMINICUS, Roman clerics, had left Rome for Ravenna without permission. Gregory the Great (April A.D. 596) pardoned them on condition of their returning (*Epp.* vi. 29). [F. D.]

ROMANUS (15), had by his will ordered a monastery to be founded in his house at Naples. Gregory the Great in A.D. 599 gave directions about the consecration of the church of the monastery, and about the management of the slaves of the deceased, so that the monastery should receive the profits of their labour (*Epp.* x. 2, 3). [F. D.]

ROMANUS (16). In A.D. 603 Gregory the Great requested him, Catulus, and Vintarith to assist the bishop of Spoleto in preventing certain priests at Nursia having women living with them (*Epp.* xiii. 35). [F. D.]

ROMANUS (17), twentieth bishop of Rouen. He was by descent a Frank; his father was named Benedictus and mother Felicitas. He was early called up to the court of Clotaire II., and when Hidulphus, bishop of Rouen, died, c. A.D. 629, Romanus was invited by clergy, king and people to succeed him, c. A.D. 630. He died A.D. 639, and was buried in the church of St. Godard outside the city, but was translated to the church of Our Lady in the 11th century. He is special patron of Rouen, and his feast is Oct. 23 (Ordericus Vit. *Hist. Eccl.* i. c. 22, v. c. 8, Boll. AA SS. 23 Oct. x. 91; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iv. 73-4; Lelong, *Bibl. France*, i. 9831 sq., Rigaltius, *Vit. S. Romanus Ep. Rot.*, e vet. mart., Lutetiae 1609; *Gall. Christ.* xi. 12). A curious privilege in honour of St. Romanus, and called the *Privilegium Feretri*, or *Privilegium S. Romani*, belonged to the Cathedral Chapter of Rouen, by which a prisoner condemned to death could annually be claimed and set free. It is supposed to date from the 12th century, and was abolished only in the end of the last century (see Floquet, *Hist. du Priv. de S. Romain*, i. ii., which is the chief authority). [J. G.]

ROMANUS (18), the second bishop of Rochester. He was probably one of the mis-

sionaries sent by St. Gregory to Britain with Augustine. When Justus, in 624, was appointed to Canterbury, Romanus was nominated to Rochester, and was consecrated by the new archbishop as soon as he received his pall from Rome. His episcopate was short. He was sent as ambassador "legatarius" by Justus to Rome, and perished by shipwreck in the Italian sea. As Justus died probably in 627, Romanus's career as bishop of Rochester can have scarcely exceeded two years (Bede, *H. E.* ii. 8, 20). [S.]

ROMANUS (19), a priest who, with James the deacon, assisted Wilfrid in the Paschal controversy at the council of Whitby in 664. He was from Kent, and appears to have been the chaplain of queen Eanfleda, whom he advised to maintain the Catholic custom of Easter, and that so firmly that some years the court kept two Easters (Bede, *H. E.* iii. 25). [S.]

ROMULA (1). [SEVERINA.]

ROMULA (2), nun, who lived at Rome with Redempta and another. She was for many years stricken with paralysis. Gregory the Great (*Dial.* iv. 15) describes a celestial vision that appeared to her shortly before her death. [F. D.]

ROMULFUS, twentieth bishop of Rheims, succeeded on the removal of Egidius, c. A.D. 590 [EGIDIUS] (Greg. Tur. *Hist. Franc.* x. c. 19; Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. lxxi. 553), and perhaps was the "Romulfum palatii comitem," sent by Childebert into Poitiers (Greg. Tur. *ib.* ix. c. 13), along with Florentianus, the major-domo. According to the memoir given by Flodoardus (*Hist. Eccl. Rem.* ii. c. 4, Duchesne, *Hist. Franc. Scrip.* t. 450, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. cxxxv. 101), he was of noble birth, son of Lupus and brother of Joannes, who was then duke. His heritage he spent in building churches and enriching the see of Rheims by gifts, which are named in the memoir. The date of his decease is unknown, but Cointius (*Hist. Eccl. Franc.*) suggests A.D. 593. (*Gall. Chr.* ix. 17.) [J. G.]

ROMULUS (1), March 24, subdeacon of Diospolis and martyr, with seven others, at Caesarea, under the president Urban, in the Diocletian persecution (Euseb. *Mart. Palest.* c. iii., *Mart. Roman.*). [G. T. S.]

ROMULUS (2), a correspondent to whom St. Ambrose addressed *Epp.* lxvi. and lxviii. The letters are expositions of passages of the Old Testament. [J. Li. D.]

ROMULUS (3) and BYZUS, two monks, personal strangers to Chrysostom, who had been very desirous to visit him at Cucusus, but had been prevented by the length of the journey, the winter, or fear of the Isaurians. Chrysostom wrote to thank them for their intention, A.D. 404. (*Chrys. Ep.* 56.) [E. V.]

ROMULUS (4), a Christian whom Augustine had been the means of converting, and whom probably he had baptized. He employed as agents to manage his property three men, Ponticanus, Valerius, and Agnesis, but with no definite understanding as to their dealing with

the tenants who were probably natives, and certainly ignorant people. In some cases he gave written instructions, in others only such as were verbal and general, as to the work to be done, and the payment of money due. Two cases of hardship and disingenuous treatment of the tenants arose out of this uncertainty of management. Upon the shuffling and unjust behaviour of Romulus in these matters Augustine founded a letter of calm and grave, but crushing rebuke, pointing out his gross injustice, and his duty to make amends. The letter is a model of Christian reproof, weighty and exhaustive in its keenness as to particulars, but full of dignity and self-renouncing love. (Aug. *Ep.* 247.) [H. W. P.]

ROMULUS (5), bishop of Man, consecrated by St. Patrick, and successor of Conindrus or Conindrius (Colgan, *Tr. Th.* 45, 265). Ussher's date is 498 (*Wks.* vi. 181), and Stubbs's A.D. 447 (*Reg.* 154). *Ann. Tig.* notices them at A.D. 471. [J. G.]

ROMULUS (6), bishop of Chalchis in Coele Syria, a bishop of orthodox principles, who through timidity, sided with the party of Dioscorus at time of the "Latrocinium." He wrote to Theodoret, urging indulgence towards those who had been led into error. Theodoret replied that the time was one for justice, and not for mercy, the truth of God being at stake. (*Theod. Ep.* 136.) He attended the council of Chalcedon in 457. (Labbe, iv. 82, 570, 575, 787.) [E. V.]

RONAN (1), hermit and bishop at Leon and Quimper in the 6th or 7th century. *Boll.* (*Acta SS.* Jun. 1, i. 80-2) have *De S. Ronano episcopo Eremita in Britannica Armorica* with comment. *præv.* by Papebrochius, and *Vita ex Brev. Corisop.* Albert le Grand also gives a Life among his *Vitæ SS. Brit. Arm.*, but the saint's life and identity are obscure. He is said to have been a Scotie bishop, who went from Ireland to Leon, led an eremitic life in the forest of Nemea or Nevet, and worked many miracles. His relics were preserved at Quimper, and his feast was June 1. (Haddan and Stubbs, *Counc.* ii. pt. i. 87.) [J. G.]

RONAN (2), Finn, of Magheralin, co. Armagh (Reeves, *Eccl. Ant.* 313, 378; *Ult. Journ. Arch.* iv. 58-9), was son of Saran, of the family of the Oriels, and brother of St. CAIRNECH (2). In O'Clery's *Mart. Doneg.* he is said to have cursed Suibhne, son of Colman Cuar, king of Araidhe, for violence done to the saint, and in the curious old tract entitled *Buile Shuibhne* there is an account of the king's maniac wanderings as the effect of the saint's ban. Suibhne fell in the battle of Magh Rath A.D. 637 (*Ann. Tig.*), and Ronan Finn must belong to the 7th century. The staff of St. Ronan Finn is mentioned at the capture of Downpatrick by John De Courcey in the time of Henry II. (*M. Doneg.* p. xxxi.) [J. G.]

RONAN (3), Scot, prominent in the paschal controversy at Lindisfarne in the 7th century. In Gaul or Italy he had learnt what Bede (*Eccl. Hist.* iii. c. 25) calls the "regulam ecclesiasticæ veritatis," or later Roman mode of calculating the Easter feast, and very keenly maintained it

against bishop FINAN (7), and the Columban school. Dempster (*H. E. Scot.* ii. 563*) calls him ROMANUS or ROMIANUS, and attributes to him *De celebratione Paschæ pro Ecclesiæ Catholicæ ritû, and De tonsura clericorum*, but we cannot go beyond Bede's simple statement with safety. [J. G.]

RONAN (4), abbat of Kingarth in Bute, died A.D. 737 (*Ann. Tig.*). He is identified by Skene (*Celt. Scot.* ii. 282-3) with the companion of St. Modan and the patron of Kilmaronog on Loch Etive, Argyleshire, and Kilmaronock, Dumbartonshire. (Bp. Forbes, *Kals.* 441; *Orig. Par. Scot.* ii. pt. i. 296-7; Martin, *West. Isles.* 19 sq. ed. 1716.) [J. G.]

RONAN (5), bishop of Lismore on the Blackwater, co. Waterford, commemorated Feb. 9: said by Ware (*Bps. Lismore*, ed. Harris, i. 549) and Archdall (*Mon. Hib.* 692) to have died A.D. 763. [J. G.]

ROSCIA, daughter of Sidonius Apollinaris, who in a letter to his wife Papanilla (*Ep.* 16), speaks of the good health of Roscia, whom he had seen in journeying to Lyons, and of her careful education. [R. J. K.]

ROTERIUS, a native of Agde, born in the reign of Reccared, king of the Goths, and the author of a history detailing the ravages which Attila had caused to the Gauls, and particularly to Agde. He was not the author of the life of Saint Severus, bishop of Agde, as some have supposed. (*Hist. Litt. Fr.* ii. 429, 430, iii. 403, 404; Ceillier, x. 385.) [R. J. K.]

ROTRUDIS. [RICTRUDIS (1.)]

RUADHAN (RUADAN, RUAN, RUODANUS, RUFFILLUS, RUFFINUS, ROADANUS, CANDANUS), abbat of Lorrha, co. Tipperary, one of the twelve saints of Ireland, and commemorated April 15. *Boll.* (*Acta SS.* Apr. 15, ii. 378 sq.) give a life of the 12th century with preface and notes by Papebrochius. (For MS. and other material see Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. pt. i. 164-5, pt. ii. 872, noticing four lives; *Proc. Roy. Ir. Acad.* iii. 480, 485, vii. 373.)

Ruadhan, son of Fergus Bern, was educated at the school of St. Finnian, at Clonard, in the beginning of the 6th century, and had many of the chief Irish saints as his companions there (Ussher, *Wks.* vi. 472-3). His chief foundation was at Lorrha about A.D. 550, where "there were one hundred and fifty persons in his congregation" or house (*M. Doneg.* Apr. 15), and many miracles are told of him. He is best known for his curse upon Tara. Diarmaid, son of Fergus Ceirbheoil, monarch of Ireland (A.D. 539-558), had invaded and violated the sanctuary of St. Ruadhan, carrying off to his palace at Tara a person who had sought refuge with the saint. For this St. Ruadhan and a bishop went to the royal residence at Tara, cursed it with all solemnity, and rang their bell energetically, that the place might be for ever waste without court or palace (Petrie, *Ant. Tara Hill*, 125 sq.; *Trans. Roy. Ir. Acad.* xviii. 25 sq.). Under this Petrie thinks there is a basis of fact, and credits the act of St. Ruadhan with the later desolation of Tara as a natural or spiritual

result. He died A.D. 585 (*Ann. Tig.*), and his arm as a relic is said to have been kept in a silver case at Lorrha (*Ult. Journ. Arch.* ii. 207 sq. 217). St. Ruadhan's bell, of bronze, is still preserved in Ireland, having been found in the saint's well at Ormond (O'Curry, *Lect. Ir. MS.* 337). The writings, *Contra Diarmod regem; De mirabili fontium in Hibernia natura; De miraculosa arbore* are extremely doubtful. (Ware, *Jr. Writ.* by Harris, i. c. iii. 16-7; Nicolson, *Jr. Hist. Libr.* 12, ed. 1736.) [J. G.]

RUBBERTUS. [RUPERTUS.]

RUFFIANA, an unmarried relative of Gregory Nazianzen, to whom in his will he bequeathed an annual pension, as well as the choice of a house wherever she pleased, and her female slaves in order that she might live in accordance with her rank. The slaves she might emancipate, if she pleased, otherwise they, together with the house were to return to the Church. (Greg. Naz. *Testam.*) [E. V.]

RUFINA, fourth daughter of Paula, the friend of Jerome. She was of marriageable age when her mother left Rome for Palestine, and vainly begged that her mother would wait till she was married. She died when still young; but nothing more is known of her. (Jerome, *Ep.* cviii. 4, 6.) [W. H. F.]

RUFINIANUS (1), an Egyptian bishop addressed by St. Athanasius. He had written, asking about the reconciliation of repentant Arians, as we gather from St. Athanasius's *Letter to Rufinianus*, written c. A.D. 372. The reply of St. Athanasius is very valuable as showing the system on which the Arians were dealt with by the champions of catholicity: those clergy, who had voluntarily espoused Arianism and then drawn back, were to be received into communion, but not into the ranks of the clergy; while those who had joined the Arians in the persecutions were to be readmitted to their former status on renouncing their errors (Migne, *Pat. Graec.* xxvi. 1180; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. 229.) [J. G.]

RUFINIANUS (2), bishop, c. A.D. 449, whom Fulgentius of Ruspe went from Syracuse to an island near Sicily to consult about proceeding to Egypt; he had taken refuge there from the violence of persecution [FULGENTIUS (3)] (*Vit. S. Fulg. Rusp.* c. 13; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxv. 130; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* xi. 4.) [J. G.]

RUFINIANUS (3), the third abbat of St. Augustine's, Canterbury; he is made to rule the monastery from 618 to 626 (Elmham, ed. Hardwick, pp. 2, 3). He is mentioned by Bede, *H. E.* i. 29, as one of the party sent by St. Gregory with the pall to Augustine in 601: all else that is said about him is matter of legend or tradition. According to the Canterbury writers he succeeded abbat John, being elected by the monks with the licence of king Eadwald, and maintained a close friendship with archbishops Laurentius, Mellitus and Justus. He was buried in the church of St. Mary, and afterwards translated into the great church, with two lines for epitaph. (Elmham, pp. 92, 94, 148-154; Thorn, ap. Twysden, cc. 1768, 2230.) [S.]

RUFINUS (1). Roman deacon and confessor A.D. 250. See MOYSES, *Cyp. Ep.* 31, tit. 32.

[E. W. B.]

RUFINUS (2) (RUFFINUS), praefectus praetorio under Theodosius, and consul A.D. 392. He is first met with as urging Theodosius to the massacre at Thessalonica, A.D. 390, and then, as promising to Theodosius that he would persuade St. Ambrose to receive him and forgive the offence; but the promise was vain (Theodoret, *H. E.* v. c. 18; Ambros. *Epp.* no. 53, Zosimus, *H. E.* iv. cc. 51 sqq.; Fleury, *H. E.* xix. c. 21; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* v. 219 sqq.). He continued in favour with Theodosius, received special charge of his son, Arcadius, with whom he was consul, and has several of the Theodosian laws addressed to him in 392 and 393; after Theodosius' death he retained his office of prefect under the weak Arcadius (Philostorgius, *Hist. Eccles.* xi. 3; *Cod. Theod.* vi. pt. ii. 82). As perhaps partaking in the penitence of his master, he built a palace and church at a place called "Drus" and in the time of Sozomen "Rufinianus," near to Chalcedon, where he dedicated the church, A.D. 394, in honour of St. Peter and St. Paul, and established a body of monks in it for the clerical duties (Sozomen, *H. E.* viii. c. 17). He invited a number of bishops to the dedication of the church, and was himself baptized, Evagrius of Pontus being his sponsor (Heraclides, *Parad.* i. c. 2 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. lxxiv. 262). With this, but in the September following, there is connected the council held at Constantinople, A.D. 394, by the bishops who had been invited to the dedication (Mansi, *Conc.* ii. 1151; Soz. viii. c. 17; Binius, *Conc.* ii. pt. i. 566; Fleury, *H. E.* xix. c. 50; Ceillier, vii. 716). Though in favour with the emperors, and made governor of the East, he was unpopular with the people, who thought he was aiming at supreme power and felt his weight as administrator of the laws, especially those against idolatry and heresy; he was suspected also of treating with the Huns for his own elevation to the throne, and incurred the dislike of Eutropius and Stilicho, his rivals in office. When the army returned from the war with Eugenius, and Arcadius went forth to meet them, the soldiers of Gainas massacred Rufinus, A.D. 395, before the gate of Constantinople, and, according to Philostorgius (*H. E.* xi. c. 3), they treated his body with every indignity, and his goods were confiscated in the following year (Socrates, vi. c. 1; Sozomen, viii. c. 1; Marcell. Comes, *Chron.* A.D. 395 in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. li. 920; Fleury, *H. E.* xx. c. 10; Baronius, *Anal.* A.D. 395, v. sqq.). [J. G.]

RUFINUS (3), TYRANNIUS, of Aquileia, the translator of Origen and Eusebius, the friend of Jerome and afterwards his adversary. Born about 345, died 410; a Latin ecclesiastical writer of some merit, and highly esteemed in his own time; born at Concordia in North Italy; baptized at Aquileia about 371; lived in Egypt some eight years and in Palestine about eighteen years, 371-397; ordained at Jerusalem about 390; in Italy, mostly at Aquileia, 397-408; died in Sicily, 410.

Sources.—The works of Rufinus himself, especially his *Apology* (otherwise *Invectives*) two

books, against Jerome; Jerome, *Apology against Rufinus*, three books; *Id. Chronicle*, Ol. 289, An. 1, A.D. 378; *Id. Ep.* 3-5, 51, 57, 80-84, 97, 125, 133; *Id. Pref. to Comm. on Ezekiel*, on *Jeremiah*, B. i.; Paulinus, *Ep.* 28, 40, 46, 47; Augustine, *Ep.* 63, 156; Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 118; Gennadius *de Script. Eccl.* c. 17; Sidonius Apollinaris, lib. iv. *Ep.* 3; Gelasius in *Concil. Rom.* (*Patrologia*, vol. 59, col. 173.)

Literature.—There is no modern Life of Rufinus, whose career has usually been treated as an appendage to that of Jerome. In this way, however, it is fairly well known, and reference may be made by students to the various Lives of Jerome. [HIERONYMUS.] There is a full Life of Rufinus by Fontanini—originally published at Rome in 1742, and reprinted by Migne in his edition of Rufinus (*Patrologia Latina*, vol. 21)—minute and exhaustive in its details, and in fixing the dates. A shorter account is given by Schoenemann, *Bibliotheca Historico-Literaria Patrum Latinorum*, Lips. 1792, also reprinted by Migne).

Works and Editions.—The genuine original works of Rufinus still extant are: *A Dissertation on the Falsification by heretics of the works of Origen*, prefixed to his translation of Pamphilus's *Apology for Origen*; *A Commentary on the Benedictions of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Gen. xlix.); the *Apology* for himself against the attacks of Jerome, in two books; a short *Apology* for himself addressed to the pope Anastasius; two books of *Eccl. Hist.*, being a continuation of Eusebius; a *History of the Egyptian Hermits*; and an *Exposition of the Creed*. Besides these are several *Prefaces* to the translations from Greek authors.

His Translations, on which his chief labour was expended, include *The Monastic Rule of Basil*, and his eight *Homilies*; the *Apology for Origen*, written by Pamphilus and Eusebius; Origen's *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν* and many of his *Commentaries*; ten works of Gregory Nazianzen; the *Sentences of Sixtus or Xystus*; the *Sentences of Evagrius*, and his *Book* addressed to Virgins; the *Recognitions of Clement*; the ten books of Eusebius's *History*; the *Paschal Canon of Anatolius of Alexandria*.

Several works are known to have existed, which have not come down to us; namely, *A reply* to the first two books of Jerome's *Apology*, a series of letters, amongst which Gennadius especially mentions those addressed to Anicia Falconia Proba; and some works translated from Greek into Latin.

Some translations of Origen exist, which are without any sure evidence attributed to Rufinus; namely, *The Seven Homilies on Matthew*—one on John; a treatise on Mary Magdalene, and one on Christ's Epiphany.

Supposititia.—The translation of Origen on St. Luke, which is by Jerome; the translation of Josephus' works; a *Commentary on the first seventy-five Psalms*, and one on Hosea, Joel and Amos, the *Life of S. Eugenia*; and *Libellus de Fide*.

The genuine works have never been collected. The *Exposition of the Creed* was one of the first books printed in England (Oxford, 1468). In 1580, La Barre published a few of them, but no attempt at a full edition was made until 1715, when Vallarsi, the editor of Jerome,

published a volume which has been reprinted by Migne in the *Patrologia*, vol. 21. It contains the *Genuine Works*, and *Supposititia*, and also the *Vita Rufini* by Fontanini; to which Migne has added Schoenemann's account of Rufinus and his works. Vallarsi intended to have published a second volume, containing Rufinus's translations; but this was not accomplished; and the student must search in the Latin editions of the authors whom Rufinus translated for many facts which his prefaces contain. Those to the *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, to the *Ep.* to the Romans, and to the *Book of Numbers*, and the dissertation on the Falsification of the works of Origen, which can only be found in this way, are of the highest importance.

Name and place of birth.—There being many contemporaries of Rufinus who bore the same name, it is well to keep the praenomen Tyrannius (sometimes written Toranus). That Tyrannius is the right orthography may be inferred from Jerome's play upon the word in *Apol.* i. 1, "Audio mihi objici in Scholâ Tyranni." The usual appellation Rufinus of Aquileia is somewhat misleading, since Aquileia, though the place of his baptism, was not that of his birth nor of his ordination. He was born at Concordia, as is shown by the letter of Jerome to Florentius (*Ep.* ii. 2, ed. Vall.), in which he speaks of Paulus of Concordia (*Ep.* 10) as writing from the 'patria' of Rufinus, and afterwards (*Apol.* ii. 2) he says that Rufinus, his parents being dead, had left his home and gone to reside at Aquileia. Concordia was a place of some importance; it was destroyed by the Huns in 452, but afterwards rebuilt.

Early Life, Concordia and Aquileia.—It is probable that Rufinus's parents were Christians, since there is no trace of other than Christian associations in his writings. His mother did not die till Rufinus's sojourn in Rome in 398 (*Jerome, Ep.* lxxx. 1). The year of his birth is uncertain; but his close friendship with Jerome, and the fact that Jerome speaks of him in their earlier days as of one somewhat above him, indicate that he was born a short time before him, and accordingly Rufinus's birth is usually placed in 345, a year before that of Jerome. He was not baptized, however, till about the year 371. That he made the acquaintance of Jerome in early life is shown by his request to him when about to go into Gaul, about the year 368, to copy out for him the works of Hilary upon the Psalms and upon the Councils of the Church (*Jer. Ep.* v. 2). Either before, or about the time of the return of his friend from Gaul, Rufinus had gone to Aquileia, and had embraced a monastic life (in monasterio positus, *Ruf. Apol.* i. 4). The life of the company of these young ascetics has been described in the article on Jerome (HIERONYMUS, section *Aquileia*). It was there, about 30 years before the writing of his *Apology* against the attacks of his former friend, that Rufinus was baptized (*Apol.* i. 4) by Chromatius and his brother Eusebius (then respectively presbyter and deacon), and Jovinus the archdeacon, all of them belonging to the company of ascetic friends, and all subsequently bishops. This must have been at the close of his stay at Aquileia (*Ille modo lavit—Jer. Ep.* 4, A.D. 374).

Life in the East: Egypt.—We do not know

how long the company of friends lived together at Aquileia, nor what was the cause of its dissolution. But when the "subitus turbo" drove Jerome to the East, Rufinus left Italy in the company of Melania, who appears to have been known in Aquileia, since her slave or freedman Hylas accompanied Jerome in his journey. They went at once to Egypt, and visited the monasteries of Nitria (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 118; Jerome, *Ep.* iii. 2); and Rufinus appears to have intended to remain there. But the church of Alexandria was at that time in a state of trouble. Athanasius died in 372, and his successor, the Arian Lucius, acting with the successive governors of Alexandria, Tatianus and Palladius (the emperor Valens being also an Arian), came as a wolf among the sheep (Ruf. *Ecol. Hist.* ii. 3; Socrates, iv 21-3, Soz. vi. 19). Not content with persecuting those opposed to him in Alexandria, he turned his anger against the solitaries of Nitria (Eremum vastat, Ruf. *ib.*). Rufinus himself was thrown into prison, and afterwards, with many other confessors, was banished from Egypt (*Ecol. Hist.* ii. 4; *Apol. ad Anastasium*, 2 "In carceribus, in exiliis"). Melania went to Palestine, where, at Dio Caesarea, she received the exiles on their way to their various destinations. Rufinus, probably, after a time joined her; but he must have returned to Egypt as soon as the stress of the persecution was abated. Possibly also the influence of Melania may have procured him some favour. He declares that he was for six years in Egypt, and again, after an interval, for two more (*Apol.* ii. 12). There he saw and heard Didymus, who wrote for him a book on the questions suggested by the death of infants (Jerome, *Apol.* iii. 28), and whom he praises in his *Ecclesiastical History* (ii. 7). He also was a pupil of Theophilus, afterwards bishop of Alexandria (Jerome, *Apol.* iii. 18); but this must have been only in private, if, as Jerome declares, Theophilus never taught in public till he was bishop. He saw also the hermits, whose teaching he prized still more—Serapion and Menites and Paulus; Macarius, the disciple of Antony, and the other Macarius, Isidore, and Pambas. On their teachings he says that he attended earnestly and frequently; and it must have been partly from his own observation that he afterwards described them in his *Historia Monachorum*. After six years, Rufinus went to Jerusalem. Whether Melania had been with him in Egypt is not certain, though Palladius implies that he was her companion throughout. Certainly he settled with her on the Mount of Olives at the close of his stay in Egypt. But it would seem that, "after a short interval," he returned to Egypt again for two years (*Apol.* ii. 22). Melania's settlement at Jerusalem is placed by Jerome in his *Chronicle* in the year 379, that is, according to the present or Dionysian computation, 377. We may place Rufinus's final settlement there with her in 379. There is, however, some reason to believe that they made one more journey to Egypt; for Palladius states, as one of the facts that he had heard from Melania, that she had been present at the death of Pambas, which took place after the accession of Theophilus in 385. (Fontanini *Vita Rufini*, i. c. ii. § 7.)

Palestine.—For eighteen or twenty years,

reckoning either from 377 or 379 to 397, Rufinus lived on the Mount of Olives. He was ordained either by Cyril or by John, probably by the latter (made bishop 385). He built cells for monks at his own expense ("Meis cellulis," *Apol.* ii. 8 a), who occupied themselves not only in ascetic practices but in learned pursuits. He describes how, after Jerome's coming, they often copied for him MSS. of the classical writers (*Ap.* ii. 8 a); and the satirical description of his professorial lectures afterwards given by Jerome (*Ep.* cxxv. 18) relates, no doubt, to this period of his life. If we separate from it the malicious turn given to its features, we may get a vivid picture of the man. He had some tricks of the voice which earned him, from Jerome, the name of Grunnius. 'He entered with a slow and stately step; he spoke with a broken utterance, sometimes as with disjointed sobs rather than words. He had a pile of tomes upon the table; and then, with a frown and a contraction of the nostrils, and his forehead in wrinkles, he snapped his fingers to call the attention of his audience. What he said had no depth in it; but he criticized others, and pointed out their defects, as though he would exclude them from the Senate of Christian teachers. He was rich and entertained freely, and many flocked round him in his public appearances. He was as luxurious as Nero at Rome, as stern as Cato abroad; as full of contradictions as the Chimaera.' In other places, Jerome uses the same expressions about him. Palladius, on the other hand, who was at Jerusalem and Bethlehem for some time before he went to Egypt in 388, speaks thus of Rufinus:—"He was a man of noble birth and manners, but very strong in following out his own independent resolutions. No one of the male sex was ever gentler, and he had the strength and the calmness of one who seems to know everything." We learn from Palladius that, in common with Melania, Rufinus exercised an unbounded hospitality, receiving and aiding with his own funds bishops and monks, virgins and matrons: "So" he says, "they passed their life, offending none, and helping almost the whole world." Jerome also, in the early part of their stay at Jerusalem, spoke of Rufinus in the highest terms of praise; he mentions in his *Chronicle* at the year 378, as a fact of general history, that 'Bonosus of Italy, and Florentius and Rufinus at Jerusalem, are held in special estimation as monks;' and when he himself settled in Palestine in 386, he had frequent intercourse with Rufinus and his monks for literary purposes; Rufinus records that Jerome was at one time his guest at the Mount of Olives (*Apol.* ii. 8, a); and Jerome acknowledges (*Apol.* iii. 33) that, up to the year 393, he had been on terms of intimacy with him.

Amongst those who thus became friends and guests of Rufinus, two are specially mentioned by him; Bacurius, who had been king of the Iberi, and afterwards became count of the Domestics under Theodosius, and was duke or governor of Palestine during the first part of Rufinus's sojourn there (*Eccles. Hist.* i. 10, end); and Oedesius, who had been the companion of Frontinus the missionary of the tribes in the N. W. of India (*Hist.* i. 9). Rufinus also records a journey which he made to Edessa and Charroe,

where he saw settlements of monks like those which he had seen in Egypt (*Eccles. Hist.* ii. 8). It is possible that he may have gone there to visit some of the exiles from Egypt before his establishment at Olivet. It is also recorded by Palladius, that he and Melania were the means of restoring to the communion of the church four hundred schismatic monks, who had separated themselves on account of Paulinus; and this statement has very naturally been supposed to refer to some extension to Jerusalem of the disputes at Antioch between the parties of the rival bishops, Meletius and Paulinus. But Wastel, followed by Fontanini (*Vit. Ruf.* i. iv. 2), has pointed out that it was more likely to refer to the schism at Jerusalem, arising from the ordination of Paulinian, Jerome's brother, the healing of which is commonly attributed to Melania. To that dispute and its consequences we must now turn.

It will not be necessary to go over again the ground covered by the articles on John, bishop of Jerusalem, and Hieronymus (sections on John and Rufinus), except so far as to add personal details about Rufinus. Aterbius, who first stirred up the dispute, fixed upon Rufinus as an Origenist, and so "barked against him" (*Jer. Ap.* iii. 33), that Rufinus drove him away, if we may trust Jerome, with the threat of a cudgelling. He also (*ibid.*) began to "bark" against Jerome because of his intimacy with Rufinus; but he found Jerome more pliable; and the willingness of Jerome to submit to the "Kettermacher" (to use a German term) seemed to condemn Rufinus, and thus made a rift between the two friends which rapidly widened. When, the next year, Epiphanius came to Jerusalem, Rufinus was present at all the scenes so vividly described by Jerome (see *Epiph. to John* in Jerome, *Ep.* i. 2). The bishop of Salamis gave him the kiss of peace, and joined with him and bishop John in prayer (*Jer. Ap.* iii. 23). But when the dissension between the two bishops arose, Rufinus was at John's right hand,—the leader of the clergy who supported their bishop. Jerome describes their conduct on the occasion (*chorus tuus cano rictu naribusque contractis, Cont. J. Hieros.* 11) in words which he afterwards applies to Rufinus personally (*Ep.* cxxv. 18; *Ep.* lvii. 3); and the abusive expressions which he says they used about Epiphanius (*delirus senex*) he quotes as used by Rufinus (*Apol.* iii. 23). And Epiphanius in his letter of warning to John mentions Rufinus as the chief of John's supporters (*Te autem et omnes fratres qui tecum sunt et maximè Rufinum Presbyterum, Jer. Ep.* li. 6). We know that Jerome accused Rufinus of stealing his translation of this letter; and the use which he made of the translation, and his comments upon it, elicited Jerome's letter (57) to Pammachius on the best method of translation. Jerome also accuses Rufinus (*Apol.* iii. 18) of having prevented Isidore from giving him the letters of Theophilus, and thus rendering abortive the mission of Isidore; and it is possible that it was to Rufinus ("ducem exercitus sui" *Cont. Joan. Hieros.* 37) that Isidore wrote, before coming to Jerusalem, the letter which fell into the hands of Jerome's friend Vincentius, and which showed a strong prejudice against the monks of Bethlehem. We do not know what further part Rufinus took in the controversy between

John and Jerome. If, however, the words of Palladius, above quoted, are to be interpreted of this controversy, we may infer that he showed a willingness at least to bring about a reconciliation. He himself was for the time fully reconciled to Jerome, who speaks frequently of their "reconciliatas amicitias" (*Ep.* lxxxi. 1; *Apol.* iii. 33). They met (probably with many friends on both sides) at a solemn Communion Service in the Church of the Resurrection; they joined hands in token of a renewal of friendship; and, on Rufinus's setting out for Italy with Melania, Jerome accompanied him some little way on his journey, perhaps as far as Joppa. They were once more friends, as in their youth.

Italy, 397-409.—The return of Melania to Italy had for its object the promotion of ascetic practices in her own family. Rufinus, whom Paulinus speaks of as being to her "in spiritali viâ comitem," returned also, as he had originally gone, in her company. His mother was still living, and he wished to see his relations and his Christian friends again (*Jer.* lxxxi. 1; *Apol.* ii. 2). They made the voyage in twenty days, and arrived at Naples in the spring of 397. Thence they went to visit Paulinus at Nola, all the nobles of those parts and their retinues accompanying them in a kind of triumph (*Paulinus, Ep.* xxix. 12). Melania, who was connected, probably, by ties of property with Campania, since Palladius speaks of her successors Pinianus and Melania living there (*Hist. Laus.* 119), stayed with Paulinus some time, and then went on to Rome, where her son Publicola and his wife Albina and her granddaughter Melania with her husband Pinianus were living. Rufinus went to the monastery of Pinetum near Terracina, of which his friend Ursacius or Urseius was the abbat, and there he stayed probably for a year, from the early spring of 397 till after Lent, 398. His intention had been to go direct to Rome, and, having passed on to his native country, to return to the East (*Paulinus, Ep.* 46, 47, in the first of which the expression "Romam peti judicatis" shows, that, when these letters were written, Rufinus was between Nola and Rome, and on his way northwards). But he was detained, either by the urgency of his friends or the delay of Melania.

He had brought with him many works of the Eastern Church writers, which were but little known in Italy; and his friends were eager to know their contents. Rufinus, having used the Greek language more than the Latin for some twenty-five years, at first declared his incompetence; "Ad Latinum sermonem triennali jam pene incuriâ torpuisse." (*Apol.* i. 11.) But by degrees he accepted the task, which, in fact, occupied almost all the remainder of his life. He began with the Rule of Basil, which Urseius desired to have for the use of his monks. Next, probably, he translated the Recognitions of Clement [CLEMENTINE LITERATURE]. He had left the Greek MS. of this book with Paulinus, begging him to translate it and to improve his knowledge of Greek for the purpose. But Paulinus's first attempts were found to contain so many mistakes, that he despaired, occupied as he was, of making progress, and urged Rufinus to undertake the task. He at the same time begged for his assistance in the interpretation of the blessing upon Judah in Gen.

xlix., and, some months later, of the rest of the blessings on the Patriarchs. The commentary on this portion of Scripture written in reply to this request has come down to us. Meanwhile Rufinus had accomplished a more difficult task, the translation of Pamphilus's Apology for Origen, and of Origen's great work the *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*. A scholar named Macarius, who was at Pinetum, had been much exercised by speculations on the subjects of Providence and Fate, and in controversy with the Mathematici (astrologists and necromancers) who abounded in Italy at the time. About the time of the arrival of Rufinus he dreamed that he saw a ship coming from the East to Italy which would bring him aid, and this he interpreted of Rufinus. He expected that he would gain help from the speculative works of Origen, and besought Rufinus to translate some of them for him. Rufinus, though knowing from the recent controversy at Jerusalem that his orthodox reputation would be imperilled by the task, yet undertook it. (*Apol.* i. 11; Prefaces to B. i. and iii. of the *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*.) He began, however, by translating the Apology for Origen written by the martyr Pamphilus in conjunction with Eusebius [PAMPHILUS, EUSEBIUS], adding a treatise on the corruption of Origen's works by heretics, and a profession of his own faith, which he held in common with the churches of Aquileia and Jerusalem and the well-known bishops of those sees. Having thus prepared the way, he translated the *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν* itself, adding to the two first books, which he finished during Lent, 398, a very memorable Preface.

In this Preface he speaks of the odium excited by the name of Origen, but asserts his conviction, that most of the passages which have given him the reputation of heresy were either inserted or coloured by the heretics. In consequence of this, he felt himself at liberty to leave out or soften down many expressions which would offend orthodox persons, and also, where anything was obscure, to give a kind of explanatory paraphrase. He pointed out at the same time that he was not the first translator of Origen, but that Jerome, whom he did not name, but clearly indicated, and of whom he spoke in high terms of praise, had in the time of Damasus translated many of his works, and in the Prefaces (especially that to the Song of Songs) had praised Origen beyond measure. Two questions arise as to this memorable Preface which set the world in flames: First, was this reference to Jerome justifiable? Secondly, was Rufinus's dealing with the book itself legitimate? We can hardly say that the reference to Jerome was quite ingenuous. If the praises he bestows are not, as Jerome called them, 'fictae laudes,' they are certainly used for a purpose to which Jerome would not have given his sanction, and their use in view of the controversy at Jerusalem, without any allusion to Jerome's altered attitude towards Origen, was ungenerous and misleading. As to the second point, though it is obscured by the fact that the chief part of the Greek of the *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν* has been lost, we have still enough to enable us to form a judgment. A specimen of the omissions made by Rufinus is given in his *Apology*, B. i. c. 19, where a copy of his own translation is said to have been produced which bore the words "as the Son does not see the

Father, so the Holy Spirit does not see the Son"; but Rufinus declares that it was not so in the Greek from which he had translated it, and that, had it been there, he would not have let it stand in his translation. Of this passage the Greek is not extant, nor is it clear to which passage he alludes. But in a similar passage in *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, B. iv. c. 35, the Greek has survived, and contains the words "Ὅστε καὶ ἐν τῷ νοεῖν ὁ πατὴρ μείζωνος καὶ τραυτέρως καὶ τελειότερος νοεῖται ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἢ ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ." And these, though vouched for by Jerome and translated by him (*Ep.* cxxiv. 13), were, with much that leads up to them, omitted by Rufinus. The licence of paraphrasing difficult expressions is also carried to an extreme length. But it must be admitted that the texts of Origen were somewhat uncertain, that the standard of literary honesty was not in those days what it is now, and that Jerome himself had in his letter *De Opt. Interpretandi* (*Ep.* 57) sanctioned a mode of interpretation almost as loose as that adopted by Rufinus. (See also his words to Vigilantius (*Ep.* lxi. 2), *Quae bona sunt transtuli, et mala vel amputavi vel correxi vel tacui. Per me Latini bona ejus habent et mala ignorant.*) We may therefore acquit Rufinus of more than a too eager desire, unchastened by any critical power, to make the greatest exponent of Oriental Christianity acceptable to Roman ears.

Rome.—The two first books *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, with the Preface, were first published probably in the winter of 397-8; the other two, having been translated during Lent, 398, when Macarius had already gone to Rome, were carried by Rufinus to the city when he removed there himself to stay with Melania and her family. During his stay with them, Apronianus, a noble Roman, was converted, partly through Rufinus, who addresses him as "Mi fili"; and the friends of Melania were, no doubt, numerous. The pope Siricius also, who had been elected in 385, when Jerome had himself aspired to the office, was favourable to Rufinus. But the expectations formed by Rufinus in his Preface were realised at once. Many were astonished at the book of Origen, some finding even in Rufinus's version the heresies which they attached to the name of Origen; some indignant that these heresies had been softened down. Jerome's friends at first were dubious. Eusebius of Cremona, who came to Rome from Bethlehem early in 398 (*Jer. Ap.* iii. 24) lived at first on friendly terms with Rufinus, and communicated with him (*Ruf. Apol.* i. 20). But Jerome's friends Pammachius, Oceanus, and Marcella resented the use that had been made of their master's name, and suspected Rufinus's sincerity. According to his account, Eusebius, or some one employed by him, stole the translation of the last two books of the *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, which were still unrevised, from his chamber, and in this imperfect state had them copied and circulated, adding also in some cases words which he never had written (*Ap.* i. 19, ii. 44). But, being in uncertainty as to the value of the translation, Pammachius and Oceanus sent the books and the Prefaces to Jerome at Bethlehem. He sat down at once and made a literal translation of the *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, and, having done this, sent it to his friends with a letter (84) written to refute the insinuations through which, as he considered, Rufinus's

Preface had associated him with Origenism. He sent them at the same time a letter (81) to Rufinus, which expostulates with him for his "fictae laudes," but which refrains from any breach of their restored friendship.

But when these documents arrived in Rome the posture of affairs had changed. Rufinus had gone; Siricius the pope had died (date in Fagius Nov. 29th, 398); the new pope Anastasius was ready to lend his ear to the friends of Jerome; Rufinus the Syrian, Jerome's friend, had arrived in Rome (Jer. *Ap.* iii. 24), and with Eusebius of Cremona had gone through the chief cities of Italy (Ruf. *Ap.* i. 21), pointing out all the heretical passages in the writings of Origen. Rufinus, a little before the death of the pope Siricius, had obtained from him the letters of recommendation (*literae formatae*), to which he appealed afterwards as showing that he was in communion with the Roman Church (Jer. *Ap.* iii. 21). He went to Milan, where he met Eusebius in the presence of the bishop, and confronted him when he read heretical passages from a copy of the *Περί Ἀρχῶν* received from Marcella, and purporting to be Rufinus's work (Ruf. *Ap.* i. 19), especially the passage above referred to, which says that the Son cannot see the Father, nor the Holy Spirit the Son. He then went to Aquileia, where the bishop Chromatius, who had baptized him twenty-seven years before, received him.

Aquileia.—He had been but a short time at Aquileia when he heard that Jerome's translation of the *Περί Ἀρχῶν*, though intended only for Pammachius and his friends, had been published, and that the letter of Jerome written against him was also in circulation. Of this letter he received a copy from Apronianus (*Apol.* i. 1); but Pammachius kept back the more friendly letter addressed to Rufinus himself. This act of treachery, which Jerome subsequently in his anger at Rufinus's Apology brought himself to defend (Jer. *Apol.* iii. 28), was the cause of the fierce invectives with which Rufinus and Jerome now assailed each other. [HIERONYMUS, Section RUFINUS, JOHN, bishop of Jerusalem.] That controversy having been described in the article on Jerome, as also the letters of the pope Anastasius to Rufinus and John of Jerusalem, and Rufinus's letter of Apology, we may pass on to the scenes in the last decade of Rufinus's life.

His friends at Aquileia were as eager as those at Pinetum had been for a knowledge of the Christian writers of the East; and Rufinus's remaining years were almost entirely occupied with translation, though several of his original works belong also to this period. A few remarks upon these works may therefore now be introduced.

The translations have no great merit, but on the whole are accurate, there being no need in the subsequent works for omissions and paraphrases such as those adopted in dealing with the *Περί Ἀρχῶν*. They were undertaken in no distinct order, but according to the request of friends. Rufinus wished, indeed, to translate the Commentaries of Origen on the whole of the Heptateuch, and only Deuteronomy remained untranslated when he died. The Commentary on the Romans, however (see Preface), and several others, besides other works, intervened.

The Exposition of the Creed is of importance,

not only as a testimony to the variations in the creeds of the various churches (that of Aquileia having "*Patrum invisibilem et impassibilem*," "in Spiritu Sancto" and "*hujus carnis resurrectionem*" as distinctive peculiarities), but also from its intrinsic merits, and as showing the influence of Eastern theology, harmonized by a clear and sound judgment, on the formation of Western theology.

The History is on a par with those of Socrates and Sozomen, exhibiting no conception of the real functions of history nor of the relative proportion of different classes of events, yet dealing honestly with the facts which came within the writer's view. It was translated into Greek, and valued in the East, as his translation of Eusebius, of which it is a continuation, was in the West. (Gennadius, *De Script. Eccl.* xvii.)

The History of the Egyptian monks presents many difficulties. It is distinctly attributed to Rufinus by Jerome (*Ep.* cxxxiii. 3). Yet it is not reckoned among his works in the list of them given by Gennadius, who says that the work is commonly attributed to Petronius, bishop of Bologna (Gennad. *De Scr. Ec.* xli.). The preface says that it is written in response to the repeated requests of the monks on the Mount of Olives. Fontanini (*Vita Rufini*, lib. ii. c. xii. § 4) grounds upon this with much reason the theory that Petronius, having been in the East, and having received the request of the Olivetan monks, but having himself, as Gennadius testifies, but little skill in composition, on his return to the West begged Rufinus to write the history. The adventures recorded would thus be those of Petronius, not of Rufinus. The *Historia Lausiaca* of Palladius is in many of its sections identical with the *Historia Monachorum*. It is, however, more probable that Palladius, who did not leave the solitary life in Egypt till 400, and wrote his History for Lausus at Constantinople, apparently some time afterwards (he lived till 431), was indebted to Rufinus rather than Rufinus to him.

Rufinus had not, like Jerome, any large range of literary knowledge, and his critical powers were defective. He quotes stories like that of the Phoenix (*De Symbolo* 11) without any question. He had no doubt of the *Recognitions* being the work of Clement, and he translated the sayings of Xystus the stoic philosopher, stating, without further remark, that they were said to be those of Sixtus, the Roman bishop, thus laying himself open to the attack of Jerome upon his credulity.

The Apology is well composed, and more methodical than that of Jerome. Its reasoning is at least as powerful, though its resources of language and illustration are fewer. His attempt to make peace, and his refusal to reply to Jerome's last invectives, though the temptation offered by a violent attack in answer to a peaceful letter was great, shows a high power of self-restraint, and a consciousness of holding a secure position.

Last years.—The years at Aquileia were uneventful. The letter of Anastasius which told him of the rumours against him at Rome, and requested him to come there to clear himself, drew from him the "*Apologia ad Anastasium*," a short document of self-defence not lacking in dignity. He enjoyed the friendship of Chroma-

tius, at whose request he consented to cease his strife with Jerome, though Jerome, adjured by the same bishop, refused to do so (*Jer. Apol.* iii. 2). He enjoyed the friendship of the bishops living near him, Petronius of Bologna, Gaudentius of Brixia, Laurentius, perhaps of Concordia, for whom he wrote his work upon the Creed. Paulinus of Nola continued his friendship for him; and Augustine, in his severe reply to Jerome, who had sent him a copy of his work against Rufinus, treats the two men as equally esteemed, and expresses his grief that such men should attack one another. "I grieved, when I had read your book, that such discord should have arisen between persons so dear and so intimate, bound to all the churches by a bond of affection and of renown. Who will not in future mistrust his friend as one who may become his enemy when it has been possible for this lamentable result to come to pass between Jerome and Rufinus?" (*Aug. Ep.* 73 ad Hieron.)

Last Journey and Death.—Chromatius had died in 405, and Rufinus's thoughts turned again to Melania, and of both to Palestine. He joined the company of Melania in Rome, in 408 or 409, Anastasius having been succeeded in 403 by Innocent, who had no prejudice against him. Owing to the danger from Alaric's invasion, they left Rome, with Albina, Pinianus, and Melania the younger (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 119), and resided in Campania and Sicily. Rufinus records that he was in the "coetus religiosus" of Pinianus on the Sicilian coast, witnessing the burning of Rhegium across the straits by the bands of Alaric, when he wrote the preface to the translation of Origen's Commentary on the book of Numbers. Soon after writing these words he died.

The cloud which rested on the reputation of Rufinus on account of Jerome's attacks has, through the overweening influence of Jerome, unduly depressed the character of his adversary. In the list of books to be received in the church promulgated by the pope Gelasius at the Roman council, in 494 (*Migne's Patrologia*, vol. lix. col. 175), we read: "Rufinus, a religious man, wrote many books of use to the church, and many commentaries on the Scripture; but, since the most blessed Jerome infamed him in certain points, we take part with him (Jerome) in this and in all cases in which he has pronounced a condemnation." With this official judgment may be contrasted that of Gennadius in his list of Ecclesiastical writers (c. 17). "Rufinus, the presbyter of Aquileia, was not the least among the teachers of the church, and in his translations from Greek to Latin shewed an elegant genius. He gave to the Latins a very large part of the library of Greek writers." After a list of his writings, Gennadius proceeds: "He also replied in two volumes to him who decried his works, shewing convincingly that he had exercised his powers through the insight given him by God and for the good of the church, and that it was through a spirit of rivalry that his adversary had employed his pen in defaming him."

[W. H. F.]

RUFINUS (4), a Roman presbyter in the end of the 4th century. He was an admirer of Jerome, and espoused his cause in the Origenistic controversy and the personal controversy with

Rufinus of Aquileia. Eusebius of Cremona, who was sent by Jerome to Rome in 398, reported the kindness of Rufinus, who wrote to Jerome to ask an explanation of the judgment of Solomon. This Jerome gives him, making the false and true mothers to be the Synagogue and the Church. Jerome speaks of him with gratitude and respect, hoping that he may not only publicly defend him, but in private judge him favourably (*Jerome, Ep.* 74, ed. Vall.) [W. H. F.]

RUFINUS (5), a friend of Jerome, known as the Syrian, to distinguish him on the one hand from Rufinus of Aquileia, and on the other from Rufinus the presbyter of Rome, both his contemporaries. He was one of the company of Italians settled at Bethlehem with Jerome; and in the year 390 was sent by him to Rome and Milan in the cause of their friend Claudius, who was accused of a capital offence. Jerome expected him to go also to Aquileia, and, in his letter to Rufinus then at that place, commends him to him, and hopes the two may have met at the house of the bishop Chromatius (*Jerome, Ep.* lxxxi. 2, *Cont. Ruf.* iii. 24).

This Rufinus must be identified with one of that name who is mentioned by Celestius (*Aug. de Pecc. Orig.* c. 3) as having been known by him at the house of Pammachius at Rome, and having asserted there that sin was not inherited. Marius Mercator goes further, and asserts that it was this Rufinus who instilled into the mind of Pelagius the views which are known as Pelagian (*Mar. Merc. Lib. Subnotationum in Verba Juliani*, c. 2). [W. H. F.]

RUFINUS (6), a lay friend of Chrysostom's, who wrote to him from Cucusus apologizing for the infrequency of his letters. (*Chrys. Ep.* 46.) [E. V.]

RUFINUS (7), a bishop (according to Savile, of Rhosus in Cilicia; cf. Tillemont, *note 90 sur Chrysost.*), whom Chrysostom had only once met for a short time at Antioch, which however had been long enough to manifest his piety, his intelligence, and his affection. Chrysostom wrote to him from Cucusus stating that his place of exile, with its desolation and constant dread of the Isaurians, would at once become more tolerable if he were assured of his love. (*Chrys. Ep.* 109.) [E. V.]

RUFINUS (8), a presbyter, marked out by Chrysostom as fitted to take the lead in the mission to the pagans in Phoenicia; to whom, on the outbreak of the violent disturbances which almost threatened to crush the undertaking, Chrysostom wrote, earnestly exhorting him to make no further delay, but to start at once. He must write to him from every post-house on the way, and let him know as soon as he reached his destination. All anxiety will cease the moment he learns that Rufinus has arrived in Phoenicia and commenced his work, which for his part he promises to render as free from outward hindrances as possible, even if he has to send a thousand times to Constantinople to effect it. He begs him to spare no pains in getting the unfinished churches roofed in before winter. He need be in no anxiety about relics, for he has sent Terentius to Otreius bishop of Arabissus,

who has a large store of unquestionable ones. He must let him know if he wants more missionaries, and he will endeavour to send them. (Chrys. *Ep.* 126.) [E. V.]

RUFINUS (9), friend of Prosper of Aquitaine, and probably cleric, had written to Prosper regarding rumours about Prosper's falling into heresy. Prosper received the letter kindly and replied in another (*Epistola ad Rufinum*, ap. Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. li. 77 sq.), which is entitled from its subject *De Gratia et libero arbitrio*, being an argument against Pelagianism. As it refers to St. Augustine as living, but in his closing years, it was probably written c. A.D. 429, but nothing is known of Rufinus (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 279-80.) [J. G.]

RUFINUS (10), archimandrite at Constantinople, addressed by pope Felix III., A.D. 484. [FELIX (3).] (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* lviii. 937, *Ep.* xi.; Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 416.) [J. G.]

RUFINUS (11), bishop of Ephesus. Gregory the Great wrote to him in A.D. 596, commending to him the bearer, a cleric, who was unable to read (*Epp.* vii. 11.) [F. D.]

RUFINUS (12), bishop of Vibo in Bruttii, was directed in July, A.D. 596, by Gregory the Great to ordain a priest for the inhabitants of the estate Nicotera, of which he was visitor during the absence of PROCULUS (10) (*Epp.* vi. 41.) [F. D.]

RUFUS (1), first bishop of Avignon, said to have been appointed by St. Paul, and still honoured as such at Avignon, where his reputed relics are kept. His feast is Nov. 12 or 14. (*Gall. Chr.* i. 795; Tillemont, *H. E.* iv. 196, ed. 1732; Usuardus, *Mart. Auct.* Nov. 14.) [J. G.]

RUFUS (2), a bishop. [PRISCILLIANUS.]

RUFUS (3), bishop of Thessalonica, appointed, in A.D. 412, as his vicar by pope Innocent for the provinces of Achaia, Thessaly, Epirus, Crete, the two Dacias, Moesia, and Dardania Praevalitana, being in fact the Eastern part of the ancient prefecture of Illyricum, which on the division of the empire had been allotted to the empire of the east (Innocentius, *Epp.* 13, in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* xx. 515). Two other letters from Innocent to him and to other Macedonian bishops are extant (*Epp.* 17, 18). For a summary of their most important contents, see GERONTIUS (8), where the number of the first letter is wrongly given as 15. [F. D.]

RULE, ST. [REGULUS.]

RUMOLDUS (RUMONDUS, RUMBOLD, RUMALDUS), called bishop of Dublin, and martyr at Mechlin in Belgium. His legend is full of uncertainty, and nothing is really known of him. His life was written by Theodoric, abbat of St. Trudo or Tron, in the beginning of the 12th century (Surius, *Vit. Sanct.* iii. 24), and much has been added to supply its deficiencies in historical points connecting Rumbold with Ire-

land, Scotland, Saxon England, and the continent. (Other chief authorities are *Vita, Passio et Miracula S. Rumoldi Arch. Dubl.* by J. Van Wachtendonck, Mechlin, 1634 and 1638; *S. Romoldi Mart. Inedit. Arch. Dubl. Acta, &c.* by Ward, Louvain, 1662, glossed by Sirinus; and *Acta S. Rumoldi Ep. Dubl. et Mart.* by Sollerius, Antwerp, 1728. For the lives, Hardy, *Desc. Cat.* i. pt. i. 256-7, pt. ii. 874, 880; Boll. *Acta SS.* Jul. 1, i. 151-237, with Comment. *Praev.* of twenty-five sections by Sollerius and *Vita auct. Theodorico* from Ward's edition.)

In Harris's additions to Ware (*Ir. Bps.*), Rumold is included among the bishops of Dublin (also by Cotton, *Fast.* ii. 8; Gams, *Ser. Episc.* 218), but the *Irish Annals* know nothing of bishops at Dublin before the 11th century. In the *Brev. Aberd.* (Prop. 33 p. aest. f. xvi.) his see is transferred to Dunblane in Scotland, with even less probability; his birth is placed at Berwick, and his parents are named David and Cecilia (see Nicolson, *Scot. Hist. Libr.* 48, ed. 1736). Theodoric says he came from Scotia, passed through Gaul to Rome, and on his way northward reached Mechlin. There he settled and taught till he was murdered by two travelling companions, June 24, A.D. 775. His body was cast into the river to hide the crime, but it was soon discovered, and his friend count Ado gave him honourable burial. A church was afterwards erected in Mechlin to his memory, and his feast is July 1. (Ussher, *Whs.* vi. 283, *Ind. Chron.* A.D. 775; Lanigan, *E. H. Ir.* iii. 197 sq.; Usuard. *Mart. Auct.* Jul. 1.) [J. G.]

RUPERTUS (ROBERTUS, RUDBERTUS, RUDPERTUS), bishop of Worms and Salzburg, and Apostle of Bavaria, belongs to the noble band of Christian evangelists, who were bringing the Gospel to Central Europe about the 6th and 7th centuries, but who owe their fame to writers of a much later age. Except the fact of his missionary work, almost every point in his life is disputed. The oldest life seems to be that attributed to Arno, bishop of Salzburg (A.D. 785-821); it is given by Surius (*Vit. SS.* iii. 267-8). Colgan (*AA. SS.* 756 sq.) gives four Lives and extracts from Arno's. Canisius (*The. Mon. Eccl.* iii. pt. ii. 260 sq.) gives a series of Lives or Memoirs in his *Monumenta Salisburgensia*, and the Bollandists (*AA. SS.* Mart. iii. 696 sq.) have two Lives with *comment. praev.* But unfortunately the Lives have not been classified, and assured inferences cannot be drawn from them. (For a list of Lives given, but without definition, in different authors, see O'Hanlon, *Irish Saints*, iii. 972-3; Chevalier, *Repert.* 1968-9.)

St. Rupert is reputed by some (e.g. Colgan, *AA. SS.* 761, 767-8) to have been an Irishman, or at least of Irish descent, but Arno has no authority for making him baptized by St. Patrick; others call him a Frank and allied to the royal house (see the above Lives). Of his kindred we read only of a sister or niece, Erentrudis, abbess of Nonnenberg [ERENDRUDA], and a brother Trudbertus, who had a hermitage near the Rhine. St. Rupert forsook all his possessions, paid a visit to Rome, and, crossing the Alps into the Rhine valley, came at last to Worms, where he settled and was much resorted to. But from the persecution of the tyrant Bor-

charius he had afterwards to leave this field of labour. After two years and another visit to Rome, he turned eastward into the valley of the Danube, and, on the invitation of Theodore, duke of Bavaria, took up his residence at Ratisbon: there he finally established the faith, and completed the Columbanian mission of Eustasius [EUSTASIUS (6)] by baptizing duke Theodore and his courtiers. In the restless spirit of the Celt, he left Ratisbon and proceeded further down the Danube: for a time he was at Laureacum, and at last fixed upon the ancient Juvavum, now Salzburg on the river Salza, a confluent of the Danube, as his seat. After visiting his own country, and returning with twelve missionaries and his niece, St. Erentrude, for whom he built the monastery of Nonnenberg, he died and was succeeded by Vitalis as bishop. But the dates are altogether uncertain, his death being placed in years varying from A.D. 560 to A.D. 718, the latter being the more likely. He was buried in his own church of St. Peter's in Salzburg, and his feast is March 27 (Mabillon, *Anal.* iv. 63 sq. and *A. SS. O. S. B.* iii. i. 325 sq.; Canisius, *Theo.* iii. pt. ii. 264, sq.; *Hist. Litt. de la France*, iii. 448; Herzog, *Real-Enc.* xiii. 167, giving a critical sketch and the later date; *Gall. Christ.* v. 662). [J. G.]

RURICIUS (1) I., thirteenth bishop of Limoges between Petrus I., if he belonged to this see, and Ruricius II., in the latter half of the 5th century, is known as the author of two books of letters, which have survived. He belonged to an illustrious Gallic family connected with the Anicii of Rome (Venant. Fort. *Epitaph.*), and married Iberia the daughter of a patrician house of Auvergne. Sidonius Apollinaris wrote their epithalamium (*Carm.* xi., Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 705-8). After some years they separated to lead the religious life (Faustus, *Epist.* ix., *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 861), and about 484 he was elected bishop of Limoges, a see which had been vacant some years, and was in a depressed condition (cf. *Rur. Epist.* ii. 32). We know little of his episcopate, except that he built a church in honour of St. Augustine of Hippo, in which he was afterwards buried, and that chronic ill-health interfered with the discharge of his duties. The letters written by and addressed to him shew that he was on terms of friendship with the chief ecclesiastical personages in Gaul of his time, Sidonius Apollinaris, Faustus of Riez, Caesarius of Arles, and others. His death occurred about 507. Though usually counted among the saints, he has no day in the hagiologies. Together with his grandson, Ruricius II., he formed the subject of a laudatory epitaph by Venantius Fortunatus (*Patr. Lat.* lviii. 123).

The two books of letters are of little importance historically, being chiefly occupied with trivial matters of personal interest and pious reflections. They were first published by Canisius, and may be also found in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 67-124. They are discussed in the *Hist. Litt.* iii. 49 sqq., and Ceillier, x. 607-9. For letters addressed to him see Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 545, 602, 863 sqq., and Ceillier, x. 609-10. [S. A. B.]

RURICIUS (2) II., 14th bishop of Limoges, between Ruricius I. and Exotius, was, with his

grandfather Ruricius I., the subject of an epitaph by Venantius Fortunatus, from which it appears that he built the church of St. Petrus de Quadrivio (*Patr. Lat.* lviii. 124). There was probably an interval between him and his predecessor, though we are unable to fill it up. He was present in 535 at the first Council of Clermont, and in 541 at the fourth of Orleans, and was represented by deputy in 549 at the fifth of Orleans. He probably died about 553 (*Gall. Christ.* ii. 503). [S. A. B.]

RUSTICA, patrician lady of Naples, mentioned in two letters of Gregory the Great (*Epp.* iii. 63; ix. 24). From them it appears she had died about A.D. 579, having by her will directed a nunnery and oratory to be founded in honour of the Virgin in her house at Naples, and bequeathed to it one-third of her property. She bequeathed the residue of her property to her husband on condition of his founding a monastery in Sicily, and paying her legacies to her freedmen within a year of her death, with a gift over if the condition was not fulfilled to the Roman church of her estate at Cumae on the same trusts. Her intentions were not carried out for many years. [F. D.]

RUSTICIANA (1), daughter of Symmachus the patrician, and wife of Boethius, who praises her highly (*De Cons.* ii. Pr. 4). After the deaths of her husband and father, she lived on at Rome, giving largely to the poor of her great wealth. She lost all at the taking of Rome by Totila, and was herself reduced to beg her bread. The Goths wished to kill her, accusing her of having bribed the Roman generals to destroy the statues of Theoderic in revenge for the murders of her father and husband, but Totila allowed no harm to be done to her. (Procop. iii. 20.) [F. D.]

RUSTICIANA (2), a Roman lady of high rank and great wealth, probably a descendant of the SYMMACHI (Mai, *Praefatio in Symmachi Orat.* xvii.), an intimate friend and correspondent of Gregory the Great (*Epp.* ii. 27; iv. 46; viii. 22; xi. 44; xiii. 22). It appears from these letters that she made a pilgrimage to Palestine and Mount Sinai; that she afterwards lived for several years at Constantinople, where she had much influence with the emperor Maurice; that she sent at different times ten pounds of gold to redeem prisoners, curtains for St. Peter's, and alms for the monastery of St. Andrew, at Rome; that she had estates in Sicily, and that she suffered from gout. [F. D.]

RUSTICIANUS (RUSTICANUS), a young subdeacon, who, being excommunicated by the presbyter under whom he served, on account of his misconduct, and the debts which he had contracted, and having taken refuge in the Donatist party, was rebaptized by them (*Aug. Ep.* 106, 107, 108; MACROBIUS (2)). This must have been about A.D. 409. In the art. MAXIMINUS (5) will be found an account of a similar transaction, in respect of a deacon of Mutigenna, whose name is not mentioned (*Aug. Ep.* 23. 2). The date of this latter case would be about A.D. 392. A discourse, discovered by Jerome Vignier in a single MS., and attributed to St. Augustine, combines the two transactions, identifying the subdeacon Rusticianus with the

deacon of Mutigenna, and, besides other inconsistent particulars, introduces Valerius the predecessor of Augustine, who died A.D. 395, as exerting himself to reclaim the young man from his evil ways, a date plainly inconsistent with that of the affair of Rusticianus. Though the story is well told, it cannot be accepted either as correct in itself, or as the work of St. Augustine. It is to be found in vol. ix. of the works of Augustine, p. 753, ed. Migne, see Tillemont, xiii. note ³³.

[H. W. P.]

RUSTICULA, ST., abbess of the convent of St. Caesarius at Arles. She belonged to a noble family at Vaison in Provence, and at a tender age entered the convent, of which she was made abbess when only eighteen. She died in 632 at the age of seventy-six (Boll. *Acta SS.* 11 Aug. ii. 657).

[G. W. D.]

RUSTICULAS, Novatianist bishop at Rome when pope Celestine proscribed their services [COELESTINUS (1)] (Socrates, *H. E.* vii. c. 11). This must have been before July, A.D. 432.

[J. G.]

RUSTICUS (1) Q. JUNIUS, cos. suff. under Hadrian, cos. ord. for second time A.D. 162, Prefect of the City under Marcus Aurelius, 163. He is celebrated as the prefect under whom Justin Martyr suffered, *Ex Actis S. Just. ap. Ruinart, Acta Sinc.* p. 43; *Epiph. Haer.* xvi. cap. 1. *contra Tatianos*. Borghesi fixes the date of Justin's martyrdom as A.D. 163 (*Oeuvr. Comp.* v. 54-60; viii. 549; ix. 307-309). Ulpian mentions him in *Digest*, lib. xlix. tit. 1, l. 1, § 3. Lightfoot (*Ignatius*, t. i. p. 494) discusses date of his city praetorship, pp. 445 and 510, his relations with M. Aurelius, p. 512 with Epictetus.

[G. T. S.]

RUSTICUS (2), a cousin of St. Augustine, present at the discussion concerning happiness, held at Cassiciacum, A.D. 386 (*Aug. de Beat. Vita*, i. 6).

[H. W. P.]

RUSTICUS (3), a young man of Gaul, in the beginning of the 5th century, whose history is instructive as an example of the evil effects occasionally flowing from asceticism. He was related to Hebidia (q.v.), and through her, no doubt, brought under the notice of Jerome. He had, with his wife Artemia, made a vow of separation, but, under temptation, had broken it. About the same time, their home having been destroyed by the barbarians, and there being danger of their falling into the enemy's hands, Artemia determined to go to Palestine, and Rusticus promised to follow as soon as possible. She went, but he did not follow. She was constantly engaged in prayer for him in the sacred spots at Jerusalem and Bethlehem, and at length, assisted by a letter from Hebidia to Jerome, prevailed on him to use his influence, then so powerful throughout the West, to bring her husband to her (*Ep.* 122 ed. Vall. A.D. 408). The result of his appeal is not known. There seems to be no foundation for Erasmus's conjecture, that Rusticus was a name assumed so as not to expose the real person to obloquy.

[W. H. F.]

RUSTICUS (4), a monk of Hippo, to whom, as well as to Felicitas, Augustine, c. 423, addressed a letter exhorting mutual forbearance (*Aug. Ep.* 210, 211) [FELICITAS (5)]. [H. W. P.]

RUSTICUS (5), bishop of Narbonne in the first half of the 5th century. He was brought up by a pious mother, who took great pains with his education, giving him the best teaching which Gaul afforded, and sending him to Rome to study rhetoric. In early youth he was attracted to the monastic life, but appears to have looked on it mainly as a preparation for the active ministry. He wrote from Toulouse, where he was living, in the year 411, to consult Jerome, the oracle of the Western Church, then living at Bethlehem. The letter, or treatise, which he received in reply (*Ep.* 125, ed. Vall.) is singularly wise and moderate in comparison with the other ascetic works of Jerome. He recommends Rusticus to maintain intercourse with his mother, though living a solitary life; he praises the coenobitic above the hermit life; and gives some curious examples of the manner in which monks could aid one another. He recommends him to adopt some regular manual occupation, the making of nets, baskets, or beehives, or some study such as that of Hebrew, which he had himself pursued in the Syrian desert. He shews from an example then well known what hindrances the family life presents to devotion, and how, in the case cited, large sums amassed for purposes of piety had been diverted into private channels. He also speaks of false monks who lived in pleasure while pretending to asceticism; and of others who made a pretence of learning. Under this last head he draws a satirical picture of Rufinus, who had just died, under the name of Grunnius. He gives rules which are a kind of sketch of the later monastic system, but guards against the opposition which afterwards grew up between regulars and seculars by praising the clergy of the cities and their followers, and he bids Rusticus seek the advice of two well-known bishops, Proculus of Marseilles and Exuperius of Toulouse (qq. v.).

In later life Rusticus became bishop of Narbonne. With other of the Gaulish bishops he received the letters of Leo the Great relating to the council of Chalcedon, in the titles of which his name occurs. He also wrote to the pope for advice as to many questions arising in the troubled times of the Huns' invasion, and received a full reply (Leo, *Ep.* 167). From that letter it appears that he had contemplated, with the timidity of one who had been a recluse, resigning his bishoprick, but is dissuaded by the pope from doing so (Leo, *Epp.* 167, 99, 102, 103, with Quesnel's note, p. 1567 in *Pat. Lat.* liv. 1472). [W. H. F.]

His chief work was the rebuilding of the burnt church of Narbonne, which we learn from an inscription was begun in 444, and completed in 448. (For this inscription, which gives details of the rebuilding, see Boll. *Acta SS.* Oct. x. 860 sqq., and *Gall. Christ.* vi. 7.) Rusticus was one of the assembly of forty-four bishops who, at the close of 451, approved the letter of Leo to Flavianus, and about four years later was especially invited to the third Council of Arles, held to compose the quarrel between Theodorus, bishop of Fréjus and the monastery of Lérins (Mansi, vi. 161, 181, vii. 874, 907). He probably died in 461, as Hermes, his archdeacon, had succeeded him on Nov. 3, 462. His day is Oct. 26 (Boll. *ibid.*) [S. A. B.]

RUSTICUS (6), bishop, to whom, with Leontius [LEONTIUS (22)], Arnobius Junior dedicated his *Commentary on the Psalms* (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. liii. 527). Some think he is the bishop of Narbonne (no. 5), but it is wholly uncertain (Ceillier, *Aut. Sacr.* x. 330). [J. G.]

RUSTICUS (7), of Bordeaux, an intimate friend of Sidonius. In the only letter (*Ep.* 11) which remains of their intercourse, Sidonius complains of the distance which separates them from each other, and addresses his friend by the title of "dominus illustris." This Rusticus (or, possibly another of the same name) had asked of Eucherius bishop of Lyons (*Pat. Lat.* lviii. 24), his two books on the Scripture, that he might transcribe them. In thanking Eucherius for granting his request, he passes a beautiful eulogy upon the two books. (*Hist. Lit. France*, pp. 428, 429; Cave, *Hist. Lit.* i. p. 444; Ceillier, x. 385). [R. J. K.]

RUSTICUS (8), Aug. 17, a sub-deacon of Carthage, and martyr under Hunneric with Liberatus. [LIBERATUS (3).] [ROGATUS (5).] [G. T. S.]

RUSTICUS (9) (popularly RUSTICE, or RUSTIQUE), ST., 22nd archbishop of Lyons, between St. Lupicinus and St. Stephanus (circ. A.D. 493-8). His pre-episcopal life is unknown, but the authors of the *Histoire Littéraire* (ii. 676) believe he was the son of Aquilinus, the friend of Sidonius Apollinaris (see Sid. Apoll. *Epist.* v. 9, Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lviii. 540). If this is correct, he was a member of a distinguished family which had for several generations been intimately connected with the poet's ancestors. Shortly after his consecration he sent pecuniary aid to Gelasius with a letter of sympathy. The pope's reply, written Feb. 22, 494, in which he recommended to his kind offices Epiphanius, the bishop of Pavia, then on his way to Gaul to redeem Italian captives held by Gundobald, is extant (*Epist.* xv. *Patr. Lat.* lix. 138, cf. Ceillier, x. 505). From Ennodius' life of St. Epiphanius we find that the pope's injunction was not neglected (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxiii. 230). The same work characterises Rusticus as one who "sub praetexta fori gubernatorem gessit ecclesiae" (*ibid.*). He probably died before 499, and is said to have been buried in the church afterwards named from St. Nicetius (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 28). His day is April 25 (Boll. *Acta SS.* Apr. iii. 368). [S. A. B.]

RUSTICUS ELPIDIUS. [ELPIDIUS (32).]

RUSTICUS (10), nephew of pope Vigilius, was appointed by him one of the seven deacons of Rome. Almost our only source of information about him is the pope's letter excommunicating him and his fellow-deacon Sebastianus. According to it Rusticus had originally been a strong opponent of the Three Chapters, and had not only warmly approved of the Judicatum of Vigilius, published at Easter A.D. 548, at Constantinople, but had caused copies of it to be transmitted to various parts of the empire without the pope's knowledge or consent. Sebastianus, on the other hand, had been temporarily appointed a deacon of Rome by Vigilius, and

had promised to resign on the return of two absent deacons. Sent afterwards to Dalmatia, he is severely blamed by the pope for neglect of his duties and for communicating with Honorius of Salome. [HONORIUS (9).] On his arrival at Constantinople he, like Rusticus, warmly approved of the Judicatum, and condemned the Three Chapters. On Christmas-day A.D. 549 (Jaffé, *Reg.* 80) Vigilius summoned him, and, taxing him with his proceedings in Dalmatia, threatened him with a trial on his return to Rome. This, according to Vigilius, was the cause of the hostility of Sebastianus towards him, who won over Rusticus, and they both communicated with abbat FELIX [194] and other opponents of the Judicatum and defenders of the Three Chapters. Rusticus and Sebastianus had also ventured to preach without the permission of Vigilius, had sent letters to all the provinces falsely charging the pope with holding opinions contrary to the council of Chalcedon; and, to crown all, had asserted in a document presented to Justinian that Leo the Great had approved of the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia. Vigilius, therefore, early in A.D. 550, degraded them from the diaconate, and declared them incapable of restoration unless they repented in his lifetime. (Vigilius, *Epist.* in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* lxx. 43, Mansi, ix. 352.) Of Sebastianus nothing more is known; after the council of Constantinople, Rusticus, with Felix and others, were banished to the Thebaid. (Victor Tun. *Chron.* in *Patr. Lat.* lxxviii. 960.) Two works of Rusticus are extant. The first is a dialogue against the Acephali, or extreme Monophysite party. The last edition, that of Galland, is reprinted in *Patr. Lat.* lxxvii. 1167. The second consists of scholia on and collections of various readings of the acts of the council of Chalcedon composed in A.D. 549. The most complete edition of them is that of Card. Pitra. (*Spic. Sol.* iv. 192.) [F. D.]

RUSTICUS (11), deacon of Ancona, one of three candidates recommended to Gregory the Great (*Epp.* xiv. 11) during a vacancy of that see, the others being FLORENTINUS (17 and 18). Gregory was informed that, though Rusticus was vigilant, he had not learned the Psalter sufficiently, and he directs bishop Joannes, to whom he is writing, to inquire into the alleged disqualification of Rusticus, and also into the objections to the other candidates. [F. D.]

RUSTICUS (12), 11th bishop of Cahors, between Eusebius and Desiderius, was arch-deacon at Rodez, and Palatine abbat to Clotaire II., before his succession to the episcopate. For his family see the anonymous *Vita* of St. Desiderius (cap. i., *Patr. Lat.* lxxxvii. 219), who was his brother. After an episcopate of seven years he was murdered in 629, by treacherous *incolae* of his church at Cahors, apparently in revenge for cruel punishments meted out by Clotaire after a great disturbance in the church and palace (*ibid.* cap. v. col. 223). The letter in which his mother, Harchenefreda, announced the event to his brother and successor, Desiderius, is extant (*ibid.* cap. vi. col. 225). The latter afterwards built a church on the spot where the murder was committed (*ibid.* cap. ix. col. 228). [S. A. B.]

RUSTICUS (13), ST., 13th abbat of the monastery of Condat, or, as it was afterwards called,

St. Claudius, in the Jura, circ. A.D. 696-731. He was prior, or praepositus, under his predecessor St. Claudius, and after becoming abbat, governed for thirty-five years (*Gall. Christ.* iv. 245). He is said to have been the author of a work illustrating the piety of the monks of the Jura, possibly a life of his predecessor. But it has not survived (*Hist. Litt.* iii. 649). Though a saint he appears to have no day. [S. A. B.]

S

SABAOTH. Some of the Gnostic sects indulged in a rather complicated mythology, and without much knowledge of the language, had recourse to Hebrew for their nomenclature. Irenaeus (I. xxx.) and Origen (*Adv. Cels.* vi. 31) agree in telling us of Ophite sects who gave names to the seven rulers of the planetary spheres. The highest was Ialdabaoth, whose planet we are told was *phalwon* or Saturn. The next two were Iao and Sabaoth, who, it may be presumed, answered to Jupiter and Mars respectively.

Epiphanius tells several times (*Haer.* xxv. 2, xxvi. 10, xl. 5, xlv. 1) that, besides the Gnostics who gave the highest place to Ialdabaoth, there were others who gave that place to Sabaoth, and who identified him with the God of the Jews. Some of them ascribed to Sabaoth the form of an ass or a swine (Epiph. xxvi. 10), accounting thus for the Jewish prohibition of the use of swine's flesh. There were those who said that Sabaoth had hair like a woman; and who taught that after death the fully enlightened Gnostic, having climbed through the realms of the other Archons, would step on the head of Sabaoth in order to attain the upper district presided over by Barbelo.

Both Irenaeus and Epiphanius censure the ignorance of Hebrew exhibited in the Gnostic appropriation of Scripture names. Irenaeus (ii. 35) tells us that Sabaoth with the long o denotes "Voluntarius," but with the short o (Sabaöth) manifests the first heaven [HEBREW LEARNING, Vol. II. p. 854.] But Epiphanius (xxvi. 10, xl. 5), correcting with more skill, explains that Sabaoth in the Bible ought not to be translated as if it were a noun in apposition to *Kýrios*, but as a genitive case, and that *Ἄδωναι Σαβαώθ* was to be translated *Kýrios τῶν δυνάμεων*, or as Aquila had rendered, *Kýrios στρατιῶν*.

In *Pistis Sophia* we have at least three personages called Sabaoth, viz. (1) Sabaoth magnus *ἀγαθός*, whom Jesus describes as his father, as having received from him a power which in him took the place of the *ψυχή* (pp. 14, 193). (2) Sabaoth parvus *ἀγαθός*, "quem vocant in κόσμῳ Δία" (p. 232), and (3) Sabaoth Adamas, once ruler over six of the twelve Archons (p. 360), now one of the archons of punishment, whose satellite hands the cup of oblivion to souls about to migrate into new bodies (p. 380).

[G. S.]

SABARIUS, of Auxerre. [SAVARICUS.]

SABAS (1), ST., Apr. 24, a Gothic officer, martyred at Rome, with seventy others, under Aurelian. (*AA. SS. Boll.* 24 April. iii. 261.)

SABAS (2), April 12, a more celebrated Gothic martyr, who suffered under Athanasius king of the Goths towards the end of the fourth century. His acts seem genuine, and contain many interesting details of Gothic life in the lands bordering on the Danube. Thus village life, with its head men and communal responsibility, appear in cap. ii. After various tortures he was drowned in the river Musaeus, which flows into the Danube. The acts are in the form of an epistle from the Gothic church to the church of Cappadocia, whither Soranus, who was "Dux Scythiae," had sent his relics. (Ruinart. *Acta Sincera*, p. 670; *AA. SS. Boll.* April. ii. 88; Ceill. iv. 278); C. A. A. Scott, *Ulfilas, Apostle of the Goths*, 1885, p. 80. On the topography of the region where he suffered there is an exhaustive article in the *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad.* 1881-82, t. xcix. p. 437-492, by Professor Tomaschek, of the University of Graz. [G. T. S.]

SABAS (3), a monk of Mount Sinai. He suffered, with many of the brethren, at the hands of the Saracens, who invaded Palestine and Arabia under Mavia their queen, December, 373. *Soz. H. E.* vi. 38.) [G. T. S.]

SABAS (4), one of the original Messalian or Euchite leaders, condemned at a council, and exiled by Flavian of Antioch. [EUCHITES, Vol. II. p. 259; cf. Ceill. x. 47.] [G. T. S.]

SABAS (5) (Σάββας), bishop of Paltus in Syria Prima (Le Quien, *Or. Chr.* ii. 799). He was present at the council of Antioch, c. 445, in the matter of Athanasius bishop of Perrha, and took an active part (*Hard.* i. 579, 583, 587, 594, 595; *Tillem.* xiv. 650). He was also prominent at the council of Constantinople, 448, against Eutyches (*Hard.* ii. 138, 170; *Tillem.* xiv. 659, xv. 283, 285, 511-513, 534), and at Chalcedon in 451 subscribed the condemnation of Dioscorus (*Hard.* ii. 370; *Tillem.* xv. 663). In 458 he subscribed the letter of his province to the emperor Leo I. (Mansi, vii. 549). [C. H.]

SABAS (6), ST., Dec. 5, abbat in Palestine and founder of the Laura of St. Sabas. He was born in A.D. 439, near Caesarea in Cappadocia. At eight years old he entered a neighbouring monastery and at eighteen went on a pilgrimage to the holy places at Jerusalem, where he entered the monastery of St. Passarion. At the age of thirty he established himself as an anchorite in the desert, where he lived in a cavern. Several persons joining him there, he laid the foundations of his monastery on a rock on the Kidron river, where it still remains. Cf. Murray's *Handbook for Syria*, p. 229. He was ordained priest by Sallustius, patriarch of Constantinople, in the year 491. Several Armenians united themselves soon after to this community, which led to a mixture of Greek and Armenian rites in the celebration of Holy Communion. Sabas ordained that the first part should be celebrated in Armenian, but the actual words of consecration be said in Greek. In 493 the original monastery had increased so much that he built another at a short distance. He was sent as an ambassador