

The Two Authorized *Books of Homilies* ¹⁾

Kenji Go (郷 健治)

THE importance of the two *Books of Homilies*, authorized and used by the Church of England in the days of Shakespeare, can scarcely be overstated. As prescribed in the ‘Preface’ of the Elizabethan editions of the first *Book of Homilies*, ‘euery Sondag and holy day in the yere’, ‘all persons, vicars, curates and all other hauyng spirituall cure’ were commanded by the Queen ‘to reade and declare to theyr paryshyoners playnely and distynctlye one of the sayde Homelies in suche order as they stande in the booke’.²⁾ In her recent monograph on the preaching during the Reformation, Susan Wabuda explains the epoch-making importance of the first *Book of Homilies* as follows:

-
- 1) 本稿は16・17世紀のイングランド国教会の欽定『説教集』の書誌学的な研究で、その一部は、第44回シェイクスピア学会（於・日本女子大学、2005年10月9日）における研究発表「英国国教会Homiliesと『テンベスト』」の内容に加筆したものです。16・17世紀当時のイングランド国教会の宗教的言説と英文学テキストの関連性に関する筆者の他の論考については、「シェイクスピア研究と英国国教会Homilies」『英語青年』（研究社、2002年7月）、pp. 206-11；‘The Bawdy “Talent” to “Occupy” in *Cymbeline*, *The Complaint of Rosamond*, and the Elizabethan Homily for Rogation Week’, *The Review of English Studies*, new series, vol. 54, no. 213 (Oxford University Press, February 2003), pp. 27-51；‘Samuel Daniel’s *The Complaint of Rosamond* and an Emblematic Reconsideration of *A Lover’s Complaint*’, *Studies in Philology*, vol. 104, no. 1 (University of North Carolina Press, Winter 2007), pp. 82-122 (esp. pp. 88-91, 114-22)；「欽定『説教集』とボトムスの夢—夏の夜の夢』再考」日本シェイクスピア協会編『シェイクスピアとその時代を読む』（研究社、2007）、pp. 108-27；“Religious loue” and Mocking Echoes of the Book of Common Prayer in *A Lover’s Complaint*’, *Notes & Queries*, vol. 252 (Oxford University Press, September 2007), pp. 298-303；「猥褻語Occupyの起源について—欽定『説教集』と『ヘンリー四世・第二部』—」『英文学研究』第84巻（日本英文学会、2007年11月、pp.1-16）も参照されたい。
 - 2) Quoted from *Certayne Sermons appoynted by the Quenes Maiestie ...* (London, 1559; STC 13648), sig. Aiiiv.

The placement of the *Book of Homilies* in every parish for the clergy to read to the laity was as great a landmark for the English Reformation, in its own way, as Erasmus's *Ecclesiastes* had been.³⁾

Subsequently, as Luc Borot observes in his latest study of the *Books of Homilies*, they 'were to become one of the pillars of the established Church of England'.⁴⁾ Despite their immense historic significance in the English Reformation, however, the two authorized *Books of Homilies* are either inaccurately recorded or almost entirely ignored in our primary bibliographical reference works for the English books printed before 1640.

For instance, *The New Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature vol. 1 (600-1660)* edited by George Watson (Cambridge, 1974) supplies a detailed record of numerous early editions, studies, etc. for 'The English Bible' (columns 1825-88), 'The Prayer Book' (col. 1887-96), and 'Versions of the Psalms' (col. 1895-1914) in 'Chapter 4: Religion' in the section of 'The Renaissance to the Restoration (1500-1660)'. However, in striking contrast to these Christian materials, not a single early edition of the authorized *Books of Homilies* is recorded in the subsequent section of 'Sermons and Devotional Writings' (col. 1915-48). It actually seems quite absurd that the entire entry of the *Books of Homilies* in the volume consists of a mere single modern edition (G. E. Corrie's Cambridge edition published in 1850), which is, what's more, lumped together with eight other miscellaneous books under the very peripheral heading of 'Anonymous' (col. 1935).

-
- 3) Susan Wabuda, *Preaching during the English Reformation* (Cambridge, 2002), p. 144.
 - 4) Luc Borot, 'The Bible and Protestant Inculturation in the *Homilies* of the Church of England' in *The Bible in the Renaissance: Essays on Biblical Commentary and Translation in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries*, ed. Richard Griffiths (Aldershot, 2001), pp. 150-75 (p. 150).
 - 5) This title of the first issue of the first edition of 1547 (printed by 'Rychard Grafton'; STC 13638.5) is provided in 'A Descriptive Catalogue of Editions of the Homilies to the End of the Seventeenth Century' in John Griffiths' critical edition: *The Two Books of Homilies Appointed to Be Read in Churches*, (Oxford, 1859), p. 1.

This essay, which is a preliminary report of a much more detailed study of the two *Books of Homilies* I am currently undertaking, discusses a number of their singular bibliographical and textual complexities as well as misconceptions now commonly held by critics.

I

To begin with, the exact title of the first *Book of Homilies* is problematic. It was originally published in 1547 under King Edward VI with the following title:

Certain Sermons, or Homilies, appoynted by the Kynges Maiestie, to be declared and redde, by all Persones, Uicars, or Curates, euery Sunday in their Churches, where thei haue Cure. Anno. 1547.⁵⁾

The *Short-Title Catalogue* records the full title of this first 1547 edition under the heading of ‘Book I’ of the ‘Homilies’ and lists sixteen other pre-Elizabethan and another sixteen Elizabethan and six more post-Elizabethan editions and issues all under this one title, with each item preceded by ‘[Anr. ed.]’ (i.e. another edition).⁶⁾ However, as John Griffiths correctly notes in his meticulous ‘A Descriptive Catalogue of Editions of the Homilies to the End of the Seventeenth Century’ contained in his 1859 Oxford edition,⁷⁾ the two 1549 editions printed by ‘Edwarde Whitchurche’ (STC 13644) and ‘Ihon Oswen’ (STC 13645) bore the following title, with the phrase ‘or Homilies’ unaccountably dropped after ‘CERTAYNE sermons’:

CERTAYNE sermons appoynted by y^e kinges Maiestie, to be declared and reade, by al persons, vicars or Curates, euery Sunday and holy daye in theyr Churches, where they haue Cure: Newly Imprinted in partes, according as is mencioned in the boke of

6) See the entry of *Homilies* in A. W. Pollard & G. R. Redgrave, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640*, 2nd ed., vol. I (London, 1986), pp. 594-95.

7) *Two Books of Homilies*, pp. lvi-vii.

common prayer. An. D. 1549.⁸⁾

When the first *Book of Homilies* was reissued with a new preface in 1559 under Queen Elizabeth,⁹⁾ it followed the title as well as (according to Griffiths' examination) the text of this Whitchurch edition of 1549,¹⁰⁾ and its text had undergone some verbal revisions 'for the better vnderstanding of the simple people' by the Queen's authorization as this was expressly so proclaimed on the title-page.¹¹⁾

-
- 8) This is the full title of Whitchurch's 1549 edition, which is accurately recorded in Griffiths' 'Catalogue' (*Two Books of Homilies*, p. lvi) ; it is identical in all substantives with the title of Oswen's 1549 edition saving the final publishing year, which is printed as 'ANNO DO. M.D.XLIX.' in the latter.
- 9) The heading of the Preface of Book I in the Elizabethan editions was printed simply as 'THE PREFACE' (1559, 1560) or 'The Preface' (1562, 1595) , which stated '... The Quenes moste excellent Maiestie ... caused a boke of Homelies, which hearetofore was sette fourth by her moste louynge Brother, a Prince of moste worthy memory Edwarde the syxte, to be prynted a newe ...' [*Certayne Sermons appoynted ...* (London, 1559) , sigs. Ai^v-Aii^r.] As Ronald B. Bond notes in his *Certain Sermons or Homilies (1547) and A Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion (1570) : A Critical Edition* (Toronto, 1987) , p. 58, the original Edwardian preface was 'superseded in 1559 and in all subsequent editions by the Elizabethan preface'. According to this thorough study of the early history of the *Books of Homilies* by Bond, "The most committed and enthusiastic patron of homilies in Elizabethan England ... was the queen herself, and the Tudor church owed its continued use of the two books to the impetus she provided' (ibid., p. 11) .
- 10) Griffiths comments on this 1549 edition of Whitchurch as follows: 'In this edition Whitchurch did not follow either of his own texts of 1547, but Grafton's of 1548 or 1549, introducing into it however many variations, which have remained to modern times. For it was this edition, or some later one by Whitchurch, not any one of Grafton's, which was followed in 1559' (*Two Books of Homilies*, p. lvii) . Since there is no record of Whitchurch's edition printed after 1549, it then must have been this 1549 edition of Whitchurch that was followed in 1559.
- 11) For the revisions made in the 1559 text of the first *Book of Homilies*, see Bond's article: 'The 1559 Revisions in *Certayne Sermons or Homilies*: "For the Better Understanding of the Simple People"', *English Literary Renaissance*, 8 (1978) , 239-55. Bond provides an alphabetical list of over two hundred 'words from the 1547 text of the *Homilies* for which there are substantive changes, additions, and deletions in the 1559 text' in pages 250-55 of this article.

Certayne Sermons appoynted by the Quenes Maiestie, to be declared and read, by all Persones, Uycars, and Curates, euery Sunday and holy daye, in theyr Churches: And by her Graces aduysse perused & ouersene, for the better vnderstanding of the simple people. Newly Imprynted in partes, accordyng as is mencioned in the booke of Commune prayers. Anno. M.D.Lix.

Though the *STC* fails to register the slight changes made in the title of Book I, the first authorized *Book of Homilies*, named originally *Certain Sermons, or Homilies appointed* ... during Edward VI's reign,¹²⁾ was thus called more simply *Certain Sermons appointed* ... throughout Queen Elizabeth's reign, which was, confusingly enough, later changed back to the original Edwardian title in the Jacobean edition of 1623. Subsequently, the second authorized *Book of Homilies* was published in 1563 under the following title:

The seconde Tome of Homelyes, of such matters as were promysed, and Intituled in the former part of Homelys, set out by the auctoritie of the Quenes Maiestie: And to be read in euery paryshe Church agreeablye. 1563.¹³⁾

As Peter Milward observes, the influence of these two authorized *Books of Homilies* on Shakespeare may be said to have been 'hardly less considerable than that of the Prayer Book, as well in their general themes as in their particular phrases and sentences'.¹⁴⁾ Noting also that 'The *Book of Homilies*, like the Prayer Book, was one of the most influential books throughout Shakespeare's lifetime', Naseeb Shaheen has recently come up with a list of more than 180 Shakespeare references to the authorized Homilies.¹⁵⁾ It is true that Shaheen may well have failed to 'distinguish between probably direct echoes and mere

12) That is, excepting the afore-mentioned two 1549 editions. The 1551 edition (STC 13647; printed by Grafton) was titled 'Certain Sermones, or Homelies ...'.

13) Quoted from the first issue of the first edition of Book II (London, 1563; STC 13663) .

14) Peter Milward, *Shakespeare's Religious Background* (London, 1973) , p. 115.

15) Naseeb Shaheen, *Biblical References in Shakespeare's Plays* (London and Newark, 1999) , p. 55. The list of 'References to the Homilies' is given in pages 831-32.

set phrases and terms popularized by the homilies' in many of those cases;¹⁶⁾ and yet, no one can deny the importance of these Homilies' status as (to borrow Gillespie's words again) 'knowledge common to all members of the playhouse audience' in Shakespeare's day.¹⁷⁾ Since every one of the authorized Homilies is full of biblical quotations, paraphrases, and allusions, and 'Strict quotation from the Bible mixes with paraphrase and allusion in the text, so that often we encounter a collage of exact and inexact references to Scripture',¹⁸⁾ and especially since biblical quotations in the Homilies (which Shakespeare and his contemporaries all grew up hearing read repeatedly, year in and year out) were made neither from the Bishops' Bible nor from the Geneva Bible,¹⁹⁾ the *Books of Homilies* must be taken into account in discussing biblical references in Shakespeare's works.

So, scholars and students of Shakespeare and his contemporary writers must occasionally read, study, and quote from the two authorized *Books of Homilies*. However, there's the rub. There are very few extant copies of any of their Elizabethan editions; and the two nineteenth-century critical editions of the Elizabethan *Books of Homilies* scrupulously edited by G. E. Corrie and John Griffiths²⁰⁾ are both very hard to find except in major research libraries; and the only facsimile reproduction of the *Books of Homilies* so far made available is that of the Jacobean 1623 edition. Griffiths, who brought out the monumental

16) Stuart Gillespie, *Shakespeare's Books: A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Sources* (London, 2001), p. 257. Gillespie's account of *Homilies* (pp. 254-59) is useful, but it does not address any of their complex bibliographical or textual issues.

17) *ibid.*, p. 257.

18) Bond, *Certain Sermons or Homilies*, p. 47.

19) According to Griffiths, the Latin Vulgate version was 'the form in which all the writers of the Homilies best knew the Bible, and from which most of them appear to have made their quotations, translating it on each occasion for themselves' (*Two Books of Homilies*, p. xlvi). Bond observes that 'In some sermons ... it is clear that the Vulgate rendering is the version invoked, yet in other instances, as one might expect, the Coverdale or "Great" Bible seems to be recollected' (*Certain Sermons or Homilies*, p. 47). See also Borot's article cited in the preceding footnote 3: 'The Bible and Protestant Inculturation in the *Homilies* of the Church of England', 150, 156.

edition of *The Two Books of Homilies Appointed to Be Read in Churches* in 1859, succinctly remarked on the paucity of the Edwardian and Elizabethan editions as follows:

There is no edition earlier than 1623 of which I know so many as ten copies, and there are very few of which I know so many as five.²¹⁾

A quick glance through the relevant two pages of the *STC* immediately proves the veracity of this statement by Griffiths. Although the *STC* records sixteen Elizabethan editions and variant issues for ‘Book I’ (published between 1559 and 1595) and seventeen such for ‘Book II’ (published between 1563 and 1595) , for each of most of these editions and issues only a few known copies are recorded. This is why, for instance, Alfred Hart had to rely on the 1640 edition when he worked on his pioneering study of ‘Shakespeare and the Homilies’.²²⁾ The dire scarcity of the surviving copies of the pre-1623 *Books of Homilies* is perhaps best attested by the fact that even Naseeb Shaheen, -- a most impressive long-time collector of innumerable early editions of the Bible and other religious materials from the age of Shakespeare --, has to quote from the 1623 edition in his own reference work, in the Introduction of which he notes: ‘The text for the *Book of Homilies* is that of 1623 (STC 13659) , a Jacobean reprint of the Elizabethan Homilies’.²³⁾

20) Griffiths’ edition is based on the text of 1559 for Book I and on that of 1563 for Book II (excepting the last homily ‘An Homily against Disobedience and Wilful Rebellion’, which is based on its second edition published separately in ca. 1570; see pp. xxxix-xl) . At the bottom of each page, Griffiths provides full collations with the 1547, 1549, and 1623 editions for Book I, and with the 1623 edition for Book II (see pp. lxxvii-viii) .

21) *Two Books of Homilies*, p. xlix.

22) Alfred Hart, ‘Shakespeare and the Homilies – A New Shakespearean Source-Book’, in his *Shakespeare and the Homilies and Other Pieces of Research into the Elizabethan Drama* (Melbourne, 1934) , pp. 9-76.

23) Shaheen, *Biblical References*, p. 11.

II

This putative Jacobean ‘reprint of the Elizabethan Homilies’ is indeed advertised as such in its original title of Book I as emphasized below in bold print:

CERTAIN SERMONS OR HOMILIES appointed to be read in CHVRCHES, In the time of the late Queene *Elizabeth of famous memory*. And now thought fit to be **reprinted** by Authority from the KINGS *most Excellent Maiestie*.²⁴⁾

In good contrast to the 1559 edition of Book I, whose text had been revised by the Queens’ authorization and advertised as such in the title, this Jacobean title plays up instead the unchanging continuity with the Homilies published under the late Queen Elizabeth’s reign. As for the 1623 title of Book II, it does not even mention the king, but it emphatically proclaims that it was ‘*Set out by the authority of the late Queenes Maiestie*’ in italicized letters as below:

THE SECOND TOME OF HOMILIES, OF SVCH MATTERS AS WERE PROMISED, AND entituled in the former part of Homilies. *Set out by the authority of the late Queenes Maiestie*: and to be read in euery Parish Church agreeable.

This Jacobean title is completely identical with the Elizabethan one except

24) Quoted from the 1623 edition (London, 1623) . As noted by Griffiths in his *Two Books of Homilies* (p. xxv) , this title ‘appears very plainly to imply that they had not been reprinted since the accession of James to the throne in March 1603, twenty years before’. This title was later adopted *verbatim* in all the subsequent seventeenth-century editions of the *Books of Homilies* down to the 1683 edition (i.e. 1633, 35, 40, 73, 76, 83 editions) . The last seventeenth-century edition of 1687 was a small duodecimo volume; and, as Griffiths accurately records in his ‘Descriptive Catalogue’ (ibid., p. lxxvi) , its title replaced the concluding phrasing of the Jacobean title above ‘And now thought fit to be reprinted by Authority from the KINGS *most Excellent Maiestie*’ by ‘And now Reprinted for the Use of Private Families’. To my knowledge, all the eighteenth-century editions of the *Books of Homilies* (i.e. 1713, 26, 54, 57, 58, 66, 67, 99 editions) retained the same title: *Certain Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in churches, in the time of the late Queene Elizabeth of famous memory*.

for just one word, 'late,' attached to the 'Queenes'.²⁵⁾ With these two title-pages of Book I and Book II, the 1623 *Books of Homilies* have every semblance of a perfectly respectable 'reprint' of the Elizabethan *Books of Homilies*. So, naturally, as the original Elizabethan editions are exceedingly scarce and there is no facsimile reprint for any of them, Shakespearean scholars inevitably and routinely quote from this 1623 edition, assuming no doubt that this is a *verbatim* 'reprint' of the Elizabethan *Books of Homilies*.²⁶⁾ Andrew Gurr, for instance, reprints the 1623 text of the first part of 'An Homilie against Disobedience and Wilfull rebellion' as 'Appendix 3' in his New Cambridge Shakespeare edition of *Richard II* with the following prefatory comment:

25) This Book II title of 1623 was adopted *verbatim* in all the subsequent seventeenth-century editions of *The Second Tome of Homilies* down to the 1676 edition (i.e. 1633, 35, 40, 73, 76 editions) . Though the title of Book II in the 1687 edition and some eighteenth and early nineteenth century editions was changed to 'The Second Part of the Homilies', it appears that this 1623 title of Book II was retained *verbatim* by most of the eighteenth and nineteenth century editions of the *Books of Homilies*.

26) In fact, the *Books of Homilies* are only rarely cited in Shakespeare editions or criticisms. In *The Taming of the Shrew*, edited by E. Dolan for the Bedford 'Texts and Contexts' Shakespeare series (Boston & New York, 1996) , pp. 172-84, however, 'A Homily of the State of Matrimony' is reprinted in its entirety from the 1623 edition. For other examples of Shakespeare criticisms that rely on the 1623 edition in quoting the authorized Homilies, see e.g. Lawrence Rosinger, 'Hamlet and the Homilies', *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 26 (1975) , 299-301; Daniel E. Van Tassel, 'Clarence, Claudio, and Hamlet: "The Dread of Something After Death"', *Renaissance and Reformation*, n.s. 7 (1983) , 48-62; Robert G. Hunter, *Shakespeare and the Mystery of God's Judgments* (Athens, Georgia, 1976) ; R. Chris Hassel, Jr., *Faith and Folly in Shakespeare's Romantic Comedies* (Athens, Georgia, 1980) ; Huston Diehl, *Staging Reform, Reforming the Stage: Protestantism and Popular Theater in Early Modern England* (Ithaca, 1997) ; David Beauregard, 'Shakespeare on Monastic Life: Nuns and Friars in Measure for Measure', in *Shakespeare and the Culture of Christianity in Early Modern England*, eds. Dennis Taylor and David N. Beauregard (New York, 2003) , pp. 311-35. Arthur F. Kinney relies on the 1633 edition (a later reprint of the 1623 edition) in his monograph, *Lies Like Truth: Shakespeare, Macbeth, and the Cultural Moment* (Detroit, 2001) . Borot, a historian, throughout his recent article cited at the beginning of this essay, likewise quotes the 1623 *Homilies* in discussing the religious milieu of the sixteenth-century England.

The extract which follows is taken from the one-volume folio edition of all the Homilies published with James's authority in 1623, the year of the Shakespeare First Folio. Both folios were carefully and respectfully edited, with in [sic] the Homilies scrupulous marginal notes showing the Scriptural authorities used by the authors.²⁷⁾

The following title given to the modern facsimile reproduction of this 1623 folio edition (published by Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints) appears to have further helped to reinforce the notion that the 1623 edition is no different from those published under Queen Elizabeth's reign:

CERTAIN SERMONS OR HOMILIES Appointed to be Read in Churches
In the Time of Queen Elizabeth I (1547-1571) .²⁸⁾

III

In their Introduction to this facsimile edition, Rickey and Stroup provide the rationale for their decision to choose to reproduce the 1623 edition, and not any of the earlier Elizabethan editions, as below:

This particular edition is the only proper one to choose for reprinting. In it the two books are brought together for the first time in one volume. Although each retains its separate pagination and register, and although the Second Book has its own title-page, the title-page of the First Book is modified so as to unite the two into a single work. The first united edition, this is also the last to be published by public authority.²⁹⁾

27) *King Richard II*, ed. Andrew Gurr (Cambridge, 1984) , p. 215; the homily is quoted in pages 215-20. Charles R. Forker also relies on the 1623 *Books of Homilies* in his Arden 3 edition of *King Richard II* (2002) .

28) *Certain Sermons or Homilies ... : A Facsimile Reproduction of the Edition of 1623 with an Introduction by Mary Ellen Rickey and Thomas B. Stroup* (Gainesville, Florida, 1968; Delmar, N.Y., 1993) .

29) *ibid.*, pp. v-vi.

Here Rickey and Stroup are simply repeating what Griffiths remarked earlier on the 1623 edition.³⁰⁾ But so long as their facsimile edition claims to be ‘Certain Sermons or Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches in the Time of Queen Elizabeth I, 1547-1571’, their view that the 1623 edition is ‘the only proper one to choose for reprinting’ was unfortunate and plainly wrong for the following three reasons.

Firstly, when Rickey and Stroup observe that ‘In it [i.e. the 1623 edition] the two books are brought together for the first time in one volume’, they are following Griffiths’ classification of the 1623 edition as the one that heads the category ‘The two books in one volume’ in his ‘Descriptive Catalogue’.³¹⁾ However, this classification by Griffiths should be viewed with some caution. For it is only correct in so far as the title of the 1623 Book I reverts from the simple Elizabethan title of *Certain Sermons* to the original compound Edwardian title of *Certain Sermons, or Homilies*,³²⁾ and in that the separate title page of the 1623 Book II lacks an ornamental title frame, whereas in the Elizabethan editions of Book II the title page was adorned with a quasi-architectural frame just as that of Book I always was. Griffiths classified the 1582, 1587, and 1595 editions of Book I and II under the category: ‘The two books uniformly, but with separate titles and registers’.³³⁾ However, Book I and Book II of 1623, too, had separate titles, title pages, table of contents, pagination, and registers

30) In ‘The Editor’s Preface’ Griffiths observes: ‘In this [i.e. the 1623 edition] for the first time the two Books are united in one volume. Each indeed has still its separate register and pagination, and the Second has its own Title prefixed to it; but the Title of the First is made to serve for both by alterations which bring it to the following form: “Certain Sermons or Homilies, . . .”’ (*Two Books of Homilies*, p. xxv) .

31) *ibid.*, pp. lxxiii-iv.

32) As we have already seen, however, the Elizabethan title of Book I was in fact adopted from a late Edwardian edition (i.e. the Whitchurch edition of 1549, the text and the title of which the first Elizabethan edition of 1559 followed) . Hence, this modification in the Elizabethan title of Book I was apparently not so much introduced for some authoritative reason as caused by a mere bibliographical accident.

33) *ibid.*, pp. lxxi-iii.

(i.e. the series of signatures) ; for this reason, the *STC* records the two *Books of Homilies* of 1623 separately as two independent books (STC 13659; 13675) just as it does the same with those of 1582, 1587, and 1595.³⁴⁾ Each of the black-letter quarto editions of Book I published in 1582, 1587, and 1595 was, --- just as the black-letter folio edition of Book I published in 1623 was, --- printed and ‘Issued w[ith]’ Book II (as so recorded in the *STC*) by the same printer.³⁵⁾ It seems most likely that these three late Elizabethan quarto editions of the Homilies were often ‘brought’ and bound ‘together’ as one volumes (as the old copies of these editions in the Bodleian Library all are) . Issued and bound together, then, Book I and Book II of 1582 could arguably be regarded as the first edition of the *Books of Homilies* ever published to make up a single volume just as the unabridged single-columned folio editions of the *The Book of Common Prayer* published between 1564 and 1625 are now all bibliographically regarded as making up single volumes together with the books of *The Psalter or Psalms of David*, which (just like the Elizabethan editions of *The Second Tome of Homilies*) had its own separate register and title-page adorned with a quasi-architectural frame.³⁶⁾ Therefore, in my view, it is misleading and, arguably,

34) The earliest edition of the *Books of Homilies* to have continuous register throughout Book I and II is that of 1640; and the earliest to have continuous register and pagination through Book I and II is that of 1673. In point of fact, the 1683 folio edition printed ‘at the Theatre’ in Oxford (*CERTAIN SERMONS OR HOMILIES Appointed to be Read in CHURCHES in the Time of Queen Elizabeth of Famous Memory: And now thought fit to be reprinted by Authority from the KINGS most Excellent Majesty*) was the first edition to dispense with a separate Book II title-page and to have a single ‘Table of the Sermons’ for all the Book I and II homilies at the outset of the volume (sig. A2’) , thereby genuinely presenting the appearance of ‘the two books ... brought together for the first time in one volume’.

35) The two *Books of Homilies* of 1582 were both uniformly ‘Imprinted’ by Christopher Barker; those of 1587 by J. Charlewood ; those of 1595 by Edward Allde; and those of 1623 by John Bill. See STC 13656 (1582 ed.) , 13657 (1587 ed.) , 13658 (1595 ed.) , and 13659 (1623 ed.) .

36) See the ‘Chart of Editions’ for the Book of Common Prayer in A. W. Pollard & G. R. Redgrave, *A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640*, 2nd ed., vol. II (London, 1976) , p. 88.

even erroneous to assert that in the 1623 edition ‘the two books of homilies are brought together for the first time in one volume’, or that (as Bond does) ‘it is the first collected edition of the homilies from both books’,³⁷⁾ or that (as Gillespie more recently does) ‘All [the homilies] were eventually collected into a single volume in 1623’.³⁸⁾

Secondly, according to the anonymous ‘eminent scholar’ (Griffiths’s words) who edited the critical (and modernized) edition of the 1623 *Books of Homilies* for the Oxford University Press in 1822, the text of the 1623 edition is ‘defiled’ by ‘numerous errors of every sort’ as he explains below in the ‘Advertisement’ to this edition:

To adhere strictly to the edition of 1623, without frequent reference to former editions, would have been impracticable, on account of the numerous errors of every sort, by which that edition is defiled. Many of those errors are undoubtedly derived from the copy which the printer used; but it is also certain, that many of them are to be attributed to his own negligence.³⁹⁾

That the 1623 edition was textually very corrupt is also attested by Griffiths, who comments on it as follows: ‘that edition is so full of errors, many of them errors of omission, that it really is not possible to determine with certainty which of the changes in it were intended by the editor and which are due to the carelessness of the printer’.⁴⁰⁾

Thirdly, and most importantly, though (according to Griffiths’ examination) the text of the 1623 edition was based on that of the 1582 edition,⁴¹⁾ contrary

37) Bond, *Certain Sermons or Homilies*, p. 47.

38) Gillespie, *Shakespeare’s Books*, p. 255.

39) *Certain Sermons or Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches in the Time of the Late Queen Elizabeth of Famous Memory; and Now Thought Fit to Be Reprinted by Authority from the King’s Most Excellent Majesty*, (Oxford, 1822) , pp. vi-vii.

40) *Two Books of Homilies*, p. xli (note ‘k’) .

41) In concluding his comment on the 1587 edition, Griffiths remarks as follows: ‘It is of no value in regard to the succession of the text, nor is ed. 1595, which follows it; for ed. 1623 is based upon ed. 1582, not upon either of these’ (ibid., p. lxxii) .

to its own claim on both of its title-pages and to the (apparently) commonly held belief among Shakespeare scholars, this Jacobean edition was not at all a straightforward 'reprint' of Elizabethan *Books of Homilies* but, in fact, a silently revised edition of those Homilies which Shakespeare knew intimately. This fact too was already noted nearly two centuries ago by the editor of the 1822 OUP edition:

The text of the present edition was formed for the most part on the principle of adhering to the last recension published by public authority, that is to say, to the edition of 1623, which probably was not only reprinted, as stated in the title-page, but also revised by authority of the crown, the alterations of the text being by far too numerous and important to have been made by the printer, or by an editor employed by him.⁴²⁾

A quick look through the textual apparatus on each page of this Oxford critical edition of the 1623 text (or Corrie's critical edition or Griffiths') will suffice to confirm that this was indeed the case.⁴³⁾ For Book II alone, it lists over 1500 textual variations between the 1563 and the 1623 texts. Though, admittedly, many of them are mere orthographical variants or omissions or substitutions of words that do not much affect the meaning of the text, we can still count over 200 instances in which noteworthy substantive changes, additions, or deletions are made in the text. The most conspicuous textual divergence occurs at the beginning of the second part of the Homily against peril of idolatry, where a whole passage of ten lines in the original 1563 text beginning with 'Clemens Alexandrinus' and ending with 'thankfull to God or vnthankfull' is missing in the 1623 text.⁴⁴⁾ Griffiths likewise comments on the numerous verbal changes

42) *Certain Sermons or Homilies* (Oxford, 1822) , p. vi.

43) The Oxford edition provides full textual collations with the 1547 and 1549 editions for Book I, and with the 1563 edition for Book II (see p. iv, note 'c') .

44) *The Second Tome of Homelyes* (London, 1563; STC 13663) , sig. Gg^v; *THE SECOND TOME OF HOMILIES* (London, 1623) , pp. 21-22; Griffiths' edition, p. 181; the 1844 OUP edition, p. 170.

introduced into the 1623 text as follows:

Throughout both Books in this edition many changes are found in the text, a large number of them in all probability owing to the carelessness of the printer, which was very great, but most nevertheless having been purposely introduced by the King's authority.⁴⁵⁾

Though no study has yet been undertaken to examine the revisions introduced into the texts of the Homilies of 1623, Griffiths, immediately after the above-quoted observation, judiciously explained their nature as follows:

In making these [changes] the same principle was followed on which the revision of the First Book was conducted in 1559 by command of Queen Elizabeth: none of them affect doctrine in any way, but all were intended solely for the amendment of the language by substituting easier words for such as still were difficult or had become obsolete, and replacing a few coarse or unseemly expressions by terms or phrases more suitable to the age.⁴⁶⁾

To take just one example from among the numerous verbal revisions made in the 1623 text, the following boldfaced word *occupying* found in 'An Homely of the state of Matrimonie' in *The Seconde Tome of Homelyes* (1563) is evidently an example of 'a few coarse or unseemly expressions' referred to above by Griffiths as having been replaced in the 1623 edition 'by terms or phrases more suitable to the age':

This necessitie of prayer, must be oft in the **occupyinge** and vsyng of maryed persons, that oft tyme the one should pray for the other, lest hate and debate do aryse betwixt them.⁴⁷⁾

Apparently, on account of the then prevalent vulgar meaning of the word *occupy*,⁴⁸⁾ this

45) *Two Books of Homilies*, p. xxv.

46) *ibid.*, p. xxv.

47) *The Seconde Tome of Homelyes* (1563), sig. Tttt2^v; Griffiths, p. 501; 1844 OUP, p. 447.

‘occupyinge’ was substituted by ‘practise’ in the 1623 text.⁴⁹⁾ In Book II, we come across several instances of this word occupy that had originally been used in the Elizabethan editions but was replaced by some other benign word in the 1623 edition. The following passage is found in the second part of the Homily for the days of Rogation Week:

it is wisdomē to knowe and beleue, that all goodes and graces be of GOD, as the auethour. Whiche thing well considered, must nedes make vs thinke that we shall make accountp for that whiche God geueth vs to **occupy**.⁵⁰⁾

This last word ‘occupy’ was changed to ‘possesse’ in the 1623 Jacobean edition.⁵¹⁾ As I discussed elsewhere,⁵²⁾ Samuel Daniel covertly made an ingenious parody of the argument propounded in this part of the Homily in his poem *The Complaint of Rosamond* (1592) ; and Daniel’s literary wit as well as his early readers’ understanding of his poem largely depended on this infelicitous phrasing ‘that whiche God geueth vs to occupy’ above found in the Elizabethan *Books of Homilies* as the underlying sub-text of the cryptic command given to Rosamond in line 281 of Daniel’s poem: ‘Then vse thy tallent’.⁵³⁾ In this case, reading the 1623 Jacobean *Books of Homilies* would not help at all to appreciate the ingenious wit of this fine Elizabethan literary artefact.

48) As defined in the *OED Online* (*occupy* 8) , the word then could have signified the indecent sense ‘to have sexual intercourse or relations (with) ’.

49) *THE SECOND TOME OF HOMILIES* (1623) , p. 140.

50) *The Seconde Tome of Homelyes* (1563) , sig. Pppp4^r; Griffiths, pp. 481-82; 1844 OUP, p. 430.

51) *THE SECOND TOME OF HOMILIES* (1623) , p. 225.

52) See my article ‘The Bawdy “Talent” to “Occupy” in *Cymbeline*, *The Complaint of Rosamond*, and the Elizabethan Homily for Rogation Week’, *The Review of English Studies*, n.s. 54 (2003) , 27-51 (esp. 41-8) .

53) The homilist is paraphrasing the parable of the talents in Matthew 25: 14-30 in this part of the homily; and he is referring here to the God-given ‘talents’ in the parable with the expression ‘that whiche God geueth vs to occupy’.

Hence, it is quite obvious that the 1623 edition is unsuitable for scholarly citations of the two authorized *Books of Homilies* in discussing the works of Shakespeare or his contemporary writers. For the 1623 edition was not at all a good verbatim reprint but only a very corrupt and silently revised version of the Elizabethan *Books of Homilies* that Shakespeare knew.