
Born around 380 at present-day Imola, some thirty-five kilometers west of Ravenna, Peter Chrysologus was archbishop of Ravenna from about 430 until his death in 450. Although the details of his life are sparsely documented, he is known to have preached before Galla Placidia, the daughter of Theodosius the Great who served as imperial regent for her son Valentinian III from 425 to 450, and who sponsored several of Peter’s building projects in Ravenna. Peter was given the cognomen Chrysologus (“golden-worded”) by his ninth-century biographer, Andrew Agnellus of Ravenna, who in his Liber pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatis (CPL 1182) sought to elevate Peter to the status of a western counterpart of St. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, the eloquent Greek patristic theologian whose byname means “golden-mouthed.”

Chrysologus’s surviving writings consist of an Epistula ad Eutychen (CPL 229), directed to Eutyches of Constantinople, the initiator of Monophysitism, declining to pass judgment on Eutyches without knowing what the pope’s views on this doctrinal controversy were, and a corpus of 183 sermons, now available in the three-volume edition by Alexandre Olivar (CCSL 24, 24A, 24B). The majority of these sermons provide commentary on scriptural passages that were read during Mass or Office, with a primary emphasis on their literal and historical senses, an exegetical method for which he was indebted to AMBROSE (Olivar 1991 pp 298–99). Other sermons cover matters of basic Christian doctrine such as the Lord’s Prayer and Creed, the mystery of the Incarnation, and the nature of the Trinity. Several speak out against the Nestorian, Arian, and Eutychian heresies that were brewing in the early fifth century, and one (Sermo 155) laments the profanation of New Year’s day by those who continue to celebrate the pagan Roman festival of the Saturnalia. As a group these sermons are probably more important for the light they shed on the liturgical practices and Christian culture of early fifth-century Ravenna than for their eloquence or their theological sophistication.

That any of Peter’s sermons have survived at all is remarkable since many of the originals kept in the episcopal palace at Ravenna were destroyed by two fires that took place in 524 and 700, and it was left to Archbishop Felix of Ravenna, in the third decade of the eighth century, to reassemble the corpus by retrieving copies that had been fortuitously tucked away in the episcopal archives (De Bruyne 1928 p 362; Olivar 1991 p 299). This reconstituted collection, known as the Collectio Feliciana, accounts for 176 sermons (all printed in PL 52.183–666), of which 168 are now regarded as authentic works of Peter Chrysologus. An additional fifteen extravagantes were independently discovered and reunited to the group by Olivar in a series of studies leading up to his edition for CCSL.

The earliest extant English witness to the Collectio Feliciana is Cambridge, Trinity College Library B.3.32 (111) (Canterbury, Christ Church, s. xiiim or xii1), fols 44–69, which contains seven Chrysologus sermons (Olivar 1962 pp 55–56; CCSL 24.xxiv; Gameson 1999 p 71 [no. 146]). Prior to the twelfth century, it appears that only five Chrysologus sermons were known in England, in some if not most cases transmitted through versions of the eighth-century homily collections compiled by ALAN OF FARFA and PAUL THE DEACON. In early English manuscripts, these sermons are uniformly attributed to Chrysostom (as in London, BL Harley 652, fol 135va) or to AUGUSTINE (as in Worcester, Cathedral Library F.93, fol 129r) and are never correctly assigned to Peter Chrysologus, whose name was probably unknown to the Anglo-Saxons.

Sermo 50 [PETR.CHRY.Serm.50]: BHM 3B.708; CPL 227 (sermo 50), 932; CPPM 1.4934, 5043, 5820. ed.: CCSL 24.276–82.
This sermon (beginning “Christum in humanis actibus”) on the healing of the paralytic in Matthew 9.1–8 was included as a reading for the first Sunday after the feast of Holy Angels in **Paul the Deacon’s Homiliarium** (PD II.89: Wiegand 1897 p 55; Grégoire 1966 p 106, 1980 p 469). Copies appear in five English versions of Paul’s collection from the late eleventh or early twelfth century: CUL Ii.2.19, fols 115vb–116vb; Pembroke 23, fols 270v–273r; Durham A.III.29, fols 139v–141r; Harley 652, fols 135va–136rb; and Worcester F.93, fols 195r–196r. In each case it is rubricated either “Omelia beati Iohannis episcopi” or “Sermo beati Iohannis Chrysostomi.” In CUL Ii.2.19, Durham A.III.29, Harley 652, and Worcester F.93 it is designated for the nineteenth Sunday after Pentecost. Excerpts from this sermon are employed as readings for the nineteenth Sunday after the octave of Pentecost in the post-Conquest breviary of Hyde Abbey, Winchester, where they are similarly attributed to **John Chrysostom** (Tolhurst 1932–42 fol 163v). Grégoire (1966 p 106) states that in spite of Olivar’s acceptance of this sermon as a legitimate work of Chrysologus (an attribution endorsed by CPL and CPPM 1), it should probably instead be classed as a Chrysostomus Latinus sermon, but I find no support for this claim.


**Sermonis 91 recensio abbreviata** [PETR.CHRYS.Serm.91.rec.abbrev.]: CPL 227 (sermonis 91 recensio abbreviata), 368 (sermo 199); CPPM 1.984.

*ed.:* PL 39.2117–18.

MSS – Lists none.

A-S Vers 1. ?ÆCHom I, 25 (B1.1.27).
2. LS 12 (NatJnBapt, B3.1.1.14).

Quots/Cits – Refs none.

This sermon on the nativity of John the Baptist (beginning “Aurum de terra”) is an early abbreviated recension of Chrysologus’s *Sermo* 91 (ed. CCSL 24A.562–68; *PL* 52.455–58) which in medieval manuscripts is often attributed to **Augustine**. It is consequently printed by Migne, following the Maurists, as PSEUDO-AUGUSTINE, *Sermo* 199 (*PL* 39.2117–18). It was adopted as a reading for the feast of John’s nativity in the eighth-century homiliary of Alan of Farfa (AF II.40: Hosp 1937 p 233; Grégoire 1966 p 56, 1980 p 212), but no copies of this sermon survive in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. A further-abridged copy, omitting the first two sentences and ending at a point corresponding to the top line of *PL* 39.2118, appears in Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 451 (Winchester, Nunnaminster, s. xii1/4), fols 90r–v (see Hall 2005 p 211).

Two texts in Old English translate portions of this sermon. One is *Blickling Homily* 14 (LS 12, NatJnBapt, B3.1.1.14), on the nativity of John the Baptist, which Max Förster (1909 pp 246–56)
showed to be a “meist ganz wörtliche, oft sklavische” translation of the shortened version of Chrysologus’s sermon (compare the Old English at EETS OS 58, 63, 73.161/29–163/34, 165/4–167/9, and 169/22–27, with lines 13–21, 29–59, 61–74, and 79–98 of the Chrysologus text as printed in PL 39.2117–18). Years after Förster’s study, in a reexamination of the sources of Blickling Homily 14, J. E. Cross (1975 pp 145–54) confirmed Förster’s thesis and at the same time demonstrated that the Blickling homilist also made use of a second sermon on the birth of John the Baptist that circulated in Alan of Farfa’s Homiliary, namely CAESARIUS OF ARLES, SERMO 216. Cross concluded that the Blickling homilist must have come upon these sermons by Chrysologus and Caesarius together in a version of ALAN OF FARFA’S HOMILIARIUM.

A second Old English text that translates from this sermon is the entry on the nativity of John the Baptist (June 24) in the ninth-century OLD ENGLISH MARTYROLOGY (Mart, B19.gh; ed. Kotzor 1981 2.130–31), which Cross (1975 pp 155–56, 1985b p 108, 1986 pp 281–82) found to be “based on an interweaving of phrases” from two Latin sermons, Caesarius of Arles, Sermo 216 and the abbreviated version of Chrysologus’s Sermo 91 — by coincidence, the very same two sermons mentioned just above as sources of Blickling Homily 14. Specifically, Cross identified seven short phrases and clauses from two separate passages in Chrysologus’s sermon (lines 56–63 and 86–90 of the text as printed in PL 39.2117–18) which collectively provide close parallels for the final eleven lines of the Old English entry in Kotzor’s edition. However, the same phrases and clauses show up almost verbatim in the longer, original version of Chrysologus’s Sermo 91 (CCSL 24A.566 lines 76–80 and 567–68 lines 98–101), so it is not absolutely clear from the Old English text itself which version of the sermon the Martyrologist had access to. But since the rest of the Martyrology entry on John the Baptist is based on a sermon by Caesarius that circulated in the homiliary of Alan of Farfa, often side by side with the short form of Chrysologus’s Sermo 91, and since these same two sermons evidently came to the attention of the Blickling homilist through this sermon collection, there is a strong probability that it was the abbreviated rather than the full version of Chrysologus’s sermon that the Martyrologist consulted, and that he encountered this sermon in a version of Alan of Farfa’s Homiliary alongside a copy of Caesarius’s Sermo 216.

In his commentary on ÆLFRIC’s homily on the nativity of John the Baptist in Catholic Homilies I, 25, lines 96–100 (ÆCHom, B1.1.27; ed. EETS SS 17), Godden (EETS SS 18.205) identifies this sermon as a possible source for Ælfric’s remark that John was sent before the Lord as a morning star before the sun, “swa swa se dæigsteorra geæ beforan þære sunnan” (EETS SS 17.382 line 97). Godden notes that the relatively rare image of John as a morning star, corresponding to Chrysologus’s characterization of him as the novus lucifer (PL 39.2117; CCSL 24A.566 line 76), also occurs in the entry on John’s nativity in the Old English Martyrology, which similarly compares John to a morgensteorra rising before the sun (Kotzor 1981 2.131 line 1) within the passage that Cross (1975 pp 155–56) first identified as based on the abbreviated recension of Chrysologus’s Sermo 91.

On the sermon’s transmission history, which is not well understood before the eleventh century, see De Bruyne (1928 p 367), Olivar (1962 pp 180–81), Machielsen (CPPM 1.984), and Étaix (1994 p 445).


MSS
1. Cambridge, Pembroke College 24: HG 130.
Lists – A-S Vers none.
This sermon on the decollation of John the Baptist (beginning “Hodie nobis Iohannis uirtus”) circulated in the Homiliary of PAUL THE DEACON (PD II.71: Wiegand 1897 p 52; Grégoire 1966 p 103, 1980 p 466). Copies appear in four English versions of Paul’s collection from the late eleventh or early twelfth century. Those in Pembroke 24 (fols 123r–125v), Salisbury 179 (fols 84r-v), and Worcester F.94 (fols 72r–73v) are more closely related to one another textually than to the copy in Durham A.III.29 (fols 256r–257v).

In her edition of the eleventh-century Life of St Birinus of Dorchester (BHL 1361; see ACTA SANCTORUM, BIRINUS), Rosalind Love (1996 pp liv, 4) proposes that a single sentence from Chrysologus’s Sermo 127 extolling the virtues of John the Baptist was adapted for a similar set of comments in praise of Birinus. Chrysologus’s sentence reads: “Iohannes uirtutum schola [scola uirtutum in all the English manuscripts noted above], magisterium uitae, sanctitatis forma, norma morum [norma iustitie in the manuscripts], urginitatis speculum, pudicitiae titulus, castitatis exemplum, poenitentiae uia, peccatorum uenia, fidei disciplina” (CCSL 24B.782 lines 8–11). The corresponding sentence in the Vita Birini reads: “Erat omnibus uirtutis scola, boni operis forma, magisterium uite, ordo iustitie, firmissima fidei disciplina, seueritatis exemplar, speculum honestatis, religionis liber, pagina sanctitatis” (Love 1996 p 4). The lexical parallels are thus limited to fewer than ten words, almost none in the same order in which they appear in Chrysologus’s sermon, so if this sermon did indeed serve as a model for the string of epithets in praise of Birinus, it was freely reworked.

On the exceptionally rich and well-documented transmission history of this sermon in medieval homiliaries, often under the name of JOHN CHRYSTOSOM, see Olivar (1962 pp 189–95). It is also printed in PL 52.549–52.

Sermo 143 [PETR.CHRYS.Serm.143]: CPPM 1.2115.
   ed.: CCSL 24B.870–78.

MSS – Lists none.
Refs none.

Biggs (1998 pp 207–08) proposes that a short passage from BEDE’s HOMILIA I.4 on Christ’s Advent borrows a couple of phrases from this sermon by Chrysologus on the Annunciation (beginning “Debetur quidem uobis nataliticius sermo”). In commenting on Elizabeth’s blessing of Mary at Luke 1.42, “Benedicta tu inter mulieres, et benedictus fructus uentris tui,” Bede expands on the nature of this blessing and remarks: “Benedicta est enim incomparabiliter quae et diuini germinis suscepit gloriam et coronam integritatis seruauit” (CCSL 122.23 lines 90–92), where the italicized phrases reproduce wording from Chrysologus’s sermon (at CCSL 24B.875 lines 59–61).

Sermo 152 [PETR.CHRYS.Serm.152]: CPL 227 (sermo 152); CPPM 1.1716.

MSS – Lists none.
Refs none.
This sermon on Herod’s slaughter of the Holy Innocents (beginning “Zelus quo tendat”) was included in Paul the Deacon’s Homiliarium (PD I.34: Wiegand 1897 p 26; Grégoire 1966 pp 81–82, 1980 p 436), but no copies appear in any of the pre-twelfth-century English versions of this homiliary. Cross (1985a p 237, 1985b p 109, 1986 p 281) identifies this sermon as a source for the entry on the Holy Innocents (December 28) in the Old English Martyrology (ed. Kotzor 1981 2.7–8). The Martyrologist’s claims that when the Innocents were killed milk flowed from their bodies before blood did, and that the children were effectively baptized in their own blood and their mothers in their own tears, are closely paralleled in Chrysologus’s sermon (at CCSL 24B.950 line 16 and 954 lines 74–79). As first observed by Smetana (1959 pp 184–85), Ælfric draws on this sermon in his homily on the nativity of the Holy Innocents in Catholic Homilies I, 5, lines 93–95 and 107–12 (ÆCHom, B1.1.6; ed. EETS SS 17) for comments on Christ enabling the martyred Innocents to achieve victory before their deaths and on the blessed wombs, breasts, and tears of their mothers (see the source notes by Godden in EETS SS 18.42–43).

This sermon is printed by Migne in PL 52.604–07 and as Homilia 38 within the late-medieval version of Paul the Deacon’s Homiliary in PL 95.1174–75. Its transmission history is discussed by Olivar (1962 pp 211–13). An English translation is given by Ganss (1953 pp 254–59).
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