

What was a Homily in Post-Reformation England?

by HANNAH YIP
University of Birmingham
E-mail: h.s.yip@bham.ac.uk

The homily is frequently considered by scholars to be a printed address which acted as a substitute sermon in post-Reformation England. This essay provides an important corrective to this view by examining five singly issued homilies in English which were not intended for use in the pulpit and which were published c. 1544–c. 1635. It argues that, as a byword for popery but with recognised longstanding roots in patristic ritual, the term ‘homily’ was contentious in this period. The works investigated within this study reveal how the marginalised homily was transformed into a distinctive genre in its own right.

In Robert Greene’s steady-selling *Qvip for an vpstart courtier*, a ‘vickar that ... did oftner go into the alehouse than the pulpit’ declares defensively that although he was no great scholar, he could still ‘read an homilie euery sundaye and holiday’.¹ Such attributes are also common to Edmund Spenser’s corrupt and incapable priest in *Prosopopoeia*, whose ‘easie life’ consists of performing the simple duty of reading ‘Homelies vpon holidayes’ and attending plays.² As these contemporary sources indicate, by the late Elizabethan period the status of the homily in England had altered significantly. Originally a respected part of the medieval Roman

I would like to thank the AHRC for funding both my doctoral research and my attendance at the 2018 Reformation Studies Colloquium, University of Essex, at which a version of this article was presented. I am grateful to members of the audience for comments offered on that occasion and to Hugh Adlington, Arnold Hunt, Alexandra Walsham, the Editors and the anonymous reviewer for this JOURNAL for their invaluable feedback and suggestions.

¹ Robert Greene, *A qvip for an vpstart courtier*, London 1592 (RSTC 12300), sig. G2r–v.

² Edmund Spenser, *Prosopopoeia*, London 1591 (RSTC 23078), sig. Nr; Ronald B. Bond, ‘Cranmer and the controversy surrounding publication of *Certayne sermons or homilies* (1547)’, *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme* xii (1976), 28–35 at p. 33.

Catholic mass, the homily had been subsumed into the Protestant ritual of the administration of the Lord's Supper.³ However, this kind of homily, encapsulated within the two volumes of *Official homilies* published during the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth I in 1547 and 1563 respectively, gained an unfortunate reputation as a text designed for preachers who were not competent enough to compose their own sermons.⁴ There also existed other homilies written by official Elizabethan figures following this mode and published in quarto format which were issued with orders for occasional days of prayer; in particular, for specific crises such as the major outbreak of plague in London in 1563.⁵ Later defined by Thomas Blount as 'a kind of Sermon, properly of an inferior kind, such as is delivered out of a Book or Manuscript, by those that are not able to preach otherwise', the homily lacked 'topicality or cutting edge'.⁶

It was also the case that the word 'homily' carried lingering associations with popery in an age of increasing antagonism towards Catholics following the break with Rome.⁷ In *The troublesome raigne of Iohn king of England*, a staunchly Protestant play which addresses the eponymous protagonist's conflicts with the Roman Church, a distressed friar's macaronic doggerel makes crude references to intercessory prayer, saints and the homily:

³ John Whitgift, *An answere to a certain libel*, London 1572 (RSTC 25427), 172; Susan Wabuda, *Preaching during the English Reformation*, Cambridge 2002, 32.

⁴ *Certayne sermons, or homilies*, London 1547 (RSTC 13641); *The seconde tome of homelyes*, London 1563 (RSTC 13664); Arnold Hunt, *The art of hearing: English preachers and their audiences, 1590–1640*, Cambridge 2010, 180. Note Susan Wabuda's brief comment upon the criticism of pre-Reformation collections of printed sermons in the early years of the English Reformation: *Preaching*, 33. Limitations of space prohibit a fuller review of similar issues and concerns surrounding the homily in Europe during this period. For France in the late sixteenth century see Peter Bayley, *French pulpit oratory, 1598–1650*, Cambridge 1980, 43, 90–1; for post-Tridentine Italy see Benjamin W. Westervelt, 'The prodigal son at Santa Justina: the homily in the Borromean reform of pastoral preaching', *Sixteenth Century Journal* xxxii (2001), 109–26; and Emily Michelson, *The pulpit and the press in Reformation Italy*, Cambridge–London 2013, 25–6, 94–6.

⁵ See, for example, *An homily, concerning the justice of God*, in *A fourme to be used in common prayer twice a weeke*, London 1563 (RSTC 16505), sigs D.i.r–[F.iii.v]; Edmund Grindal to William Cecil, 30 July 1563, BL, MS Lansdowne 6, fos 156r–157r; and Natalie Mears and others (eds), *National prayers: special worship since the Reformation, I: Special prayers, fasts and thanksgivings in the British Isles, 1533–1688*, Woodbridge 2013, 56–79. Edmund Grindal, then bishop of London, had commissioned Alexander Nowell, dean of St Paul's, to compose this particular 'homily' for use in his diocese.

⁶ Thomas Blount, *Glossographia*, 2nd edn, London 1661 (Wing B.3335), sig. U4r; Ian Green, *Print and Protestantism in early modern England*, Oxford 2000, 209.

⁷ Alexandra Walsham, "'An old popish Booke of homilies': a Carthusian incunable", *Remembering the Reformation*, digital exhibition, <<https://exhibitions.lib.cam.ac.uk/reformation/artifacts/an-old-popish-booke-of-homilies-a-carthusian-incunable/>>, accessed 18 Apr. 2019.

Benedicamus Domini, was euer such an iniurie.
 Sweete S. Withold of thy lenitie, defend vs from extremitie,
 And heare vs for S. Charitie, oppressed with austeritie.
In nomini Domini, make I my homilie,
 Gentle Gentilitie grieue not the Cleargie.⁸

On the other hand, in his sermon advocating James I's *Directions concerning preachers*, John Donne responded to those who, aghast at the term 'Homilies', 'suspect the [*Official*] Homilies of declination towards *Papistré*' by putting forward similar arguments expressed by John Whitgift half a century earlier.⁹ Whitgift had stated that 'Homilies readde in the Church haue alwayes bin commendable, and vsuall euen from the beginning, looke *Augustine*, *Chrysostome* and others.'¹⁰ According to Donne, the practice of reading homilies went back to the days of Cyril of Alexandria.¹¹ Taking into account such a convoluted history, what did the homily truly stand for in post-Reformation England?

As 'the most important and characteristic form of communication for Protestants', much scholarly attention has been lavished upon the rise to prominence of the sermon in early modern religious and political culture.¹² On the other hand, although a similar study exists for the postil in early modern Germany, meticulous enquiry into the homily's place in post-Reformation England, which traces the origins of the 'homely' *Official homilies* back to one of the most ancient traditions in the Christian Church and considers its adaptation from Catholic liturgical address to printed text for use in Protestant communal worship, is

⁸ George Peele [?], [*The*] *troublesome raigne of John king of England*, London 1591 (RSTC 14644), unpaginated. See also George Peele, *The troublesome reign of John, king of England*, ed. Charles R. Forker, Manchester–New York 2011, 185–6.

⁹ John Donne, *A sermon upon the xv. verse of the xx. chapter of the booke of Iudges*, London 1622 (RSTC 7053), 62; John N. Wall Jr and Terry Bunce Burgin, "'This sermon ... upon the Gun-powder day": the Book of Homilies of 1547 and Donne's sermon in commemoration of Guy Fawkes' Day, 1622', *South Atlantic Review* xlix (1984), 19–30 at pp. 25–6; Jeanne Shami, *John Donne and conformity in crisis in the late Jacobean pulpit*, Cambridge 2003, 114; Mary Morrissey, *Politics and the Paul's Cross sermons, 1558–1642*, Oxford 2011, 93–5; Hannah Crawforth, *Etymology and the invention of English in early modern literature*, Cambridge 2013, 107–8.

¹⁰ Whitgift, *An ansuere*, 63.

¹¹ Donne, *A sermon upon the xv. verse of the xx. chapter of the booke of Iudges*, 62.

¹² Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 194. In addition to the monographs of Susan Wabuda, Mary Morrissey and Arnold Hunt, key works include Peter E. McCullough, *Sermons at court: politics and religion in Elizabethan and Jacobean preaching*, Cambridge 1998; Lori Anne Ferrell and Peter McCullough (eds), *The English sermon revised: religion, literature and history, 1600–1750*, Manchester–New York 2000; and Peter McCullough, Hugh Adlington and Emma Rhatigan (eds), *The Oxford handbook of the early modern sermon*, Oxford 2011.

lacking in current scholarship.¹³ While Siegfried Wenzel has recognised the crucial distinction to be made between the ‘homily’ and ‘scholastic sermon’ in medieval preaching, such has not been the case within histories of early modern English preaching.¹⁴ Instead, failing to question whether its usage may have developed and taken on different meanings in post-Reformation England, scholars have frequently depicted the homily as being synonymous with the sermon.¹⁵ This is perhaps understandable given that the first volume of *Official homilies*, in addition to various other religious titles published in this period, identifies itself as ‘certain sermons or homilies’.¹⁶ Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century dictionaries define the homily as ‘ghostly teaching, preaching, or sermon’; ‘[a] talking together: a speech, or a Sermon’; and ‘a speech or Sermon, common discourse or Communication’.¹⁷

¹³ ‘Some call theym homlyes ... for they are homely handeled’: Hugh Latimer, *The seconde sermon of Master Hughe Latemer*, London 1549 (RSTC 15274), unpaginated; ‘homilies, that are too homely, to be set in the place of Gods scriptures’: John Field and Thomas Wilcox, *An admonition to the parliament*, [Hemel Hempstead [?] 1572] (RSTC 10848), sig. B.v. See also Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 209–10; Wabuda, *Preaching*, 27; Morrissey, *Politics*, 58–9. Susan Wabuda has laid the groundwork for such issues by exploring the embryonic stages of the projected first Book of Homilies by Thomas Cranmer, who wished to replace longstanding late medieval preaching manuals such as John Mirk’s *Festial*: ‘Bishops and the provision of homilies, 1520 to 1547’, *Sixteenth Century Journal* xxv (1994), 551–66. For the postil see John M. Frymire, *The primacy of the postils: Catholics, Protestants, and the dissemination of ideas in early modern Germany*, Leiden–Boston 2010. Mention must also be made of Margaret Christian, ‘“I knowe not howe to preache”: the role of the preacher in Taverner’s postils’, *Sixteenth Century Journal* xxix (1998), 377–97.

¹⁴ Siegfried Wenzel, *Latin sermon collections from later medieval England: orthodox preaching in the age of Wyclif*, Cambridge 2005, 357–62.

¹⁵ A considerable number of scholars have recognised the importance of careful contextualisation of certain early modern terms and ‘keywords’. See Mark Knights and others, ‘Commonwealth: the social, cultural, and conceptual contexts of an early modern keyword’, *HJ* liv (2011), 659–87, and John W. O’Malley, *Trent and all that: renaming Catholicism in the early modern era*, Cambridge–London 2000. Lucy E. C. Wooding refers to the plethora of homilies and sermons in the reign of Mary I, but does not explain the difference between the two: *Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England*, Oxford 2000, 138. See also John N. Wall Jr, ‘Godly and fruitful lessons: the English Bible, Erasmus’ Paraphrases, and the Book of Homilies’, in John E. Booty (ed.), *The godly kingdom of Tudor England: great books of the English Reformation*, Wilton 1981, 47–135 at p. 98 and passim, and William Wizeman, *The theology and spirituality of Mary Tudor’s Church*, Aldershot–Burlington, VT 2006, 31.

¹⁶ See *Three sermons, or homelies, to moue compassion towards the poore and needie in these times*, London 1596 (RSTC 13681), and Nicholas Bownd, *The holy exercise of fasting ... in certaine homilies or sermons*, Cambridge 1604 (RSTC 3438). Leonard Pollard, in his *Fyve homiles*, refers to his work as ‘these simple and rude sermons’: *Fyve homiles*, London 1556 (RSTC 20091), sig. A.ii.r.

¹⁷ Richard Huloet, *Hvloets dictionarie*, London 1572 (RSTC 13941), unpaginated; John Bullokar, *An English expositor*, London 1616 (RSTC 4083), unpaginated; Elisha

However, the *English short title catalogue (ESTC)* reveals only fourteen works featuring the title ‘homily’, ‘homelye’, ‘homylye’, ‘homelie’ or ‘homilie’ between the advent of printing and 1640 (see appendix), in stark contrast to Ian Green’s estimated totals of 1,000 printed sermons for the period 1558–1603, and at least 2,000 for 1603–40.¹⁸ Although scholars have cautioned against relying too heavily upon resources such as the *ESTC* and *Early English books online* for a systematic analysis of the frequency with which certain words were used on title pages, it is not the purpose of this paper to delineate exact numerical counts but rather to underscore the disparity between the printed sermon and the printed homily in post-Reformation England.¹⁹ If ‘homily’ and ‘sermon’ were truly perceived to be interchangeable terms, why did ‘homily’ as a title not lend itself to many more texts in manuscript and print, by divines, devotional writers and laypeople alike?²⁰ Or, if the word ‘homily’ carried such negative connotations, why is it the case that titles (which presumably sought a readership) outside of the *Official homilies* are in existence at all? In an age in which patristic theology was studied intensely by clergymen across the confessional divides, was the term ‘homily’ paradoxically imbued with a particular *gravitas*?²¹

The scope of this study is outlined by a sample of five homilies which were printed as stand-alone works with named authors.²² The sample

Coles, *An English dictionary*, London 1676 (Wing C.5070), unpaginated. See also John Minsheu, *Ductor in linguas*, London 1617 (RSTC 17944), 237, and Henry Cockeram, *The English dictionarie*, London 1623 (RSTC 5461.2), sig. F2r.

¹⁸ Green, *Print and Protestantism*, 194. The editors of *The Oxford handbook of the early modern sermon* have commented upon the voluminous number of early modern printed works entitled ‘A sermon’: McCullough, Adlington and Rhatigan, ‘Preface’, pp. xiv–xvi at p. xv. See also Hunt, *The art of hearing*, 120. My statistic excludes reprints and, notably, features two extracts from the *Official homilies*.

¹⁹ See, in particular, Phil Withington, *Society in early modern England: the vernacular origins of some powerful ideas*, Cambridge–Malden 2010, 7, and John N. King and Mark Rankin, ‘Print, patronage, and the reception of continental reform: 1521–1603’, *Yearbook of English Studies* xxxviii (2008), 49–67 at p. 51.

²⁰ Manuscript ‘homilies’ (for example, Congregational Library, London, MS I.h.20) and postils in this era, particularly original compositions as opposed to translations, are equally scarce in comparison with manuscript sermons and constitute another intriguing area of focus which cannot be addressed in this article. For the postils in manuscript see Alec Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII: evangelicals in the early English Reformation*, Cambridge 2003, 117.

²¹ Westervelt, ‘The prodigal son’, 119; Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian antiquity: the construction of a confessional identity in the 17th century*, Oxford 2009, 83 and *passim*.

²² Groups of homilies, such as those in Old English by Ælfric of Eynsham which underwent a resurgence of interest from the Elizabethan period, have been discussed by Aaron J. Kleist: ‘Monks, marriage, and manuscripts: Matthew Parker’s manipulation (?) of Ælfric of Eynsham’, *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* cv (2006), 312–27. For the royally authorised homilies see Ashley Null, ‘Official Tudor homilies’, in

comprises vernacular translations of homilies by two Church Fathers, John Chrysostom (1544) and Origen (1565), a homily by the Catholic controversialist John Harpsfield (1556), an English translation of a homily by the French Huguenot Philippe Duplessis-Mornay (1615) and a homily by the Laudian writer Anthony Stafford (1635). Published across a century which witnessed considerable turbulence in the religious landscape, they span the first age of print and the beginnings of the Henrician Reformation until the imminent collapse of ecclesiastical censorship of texts in the 1640s.²³ While certainly unable, in themselves, to provide a definitive account of the homily's journey in post-Reformation England, they offer multifaceted and changing perspectives on the 'homily' in printed form. Indeed, contrary to the dictionary definitions, the homilies by Duplessis-Mornay and Stafford did not originate as oral texts. The homilies will be examined, in chronological order, within the historical and religio-political contexts from which they emerged. It will be argued that their language, structure and format provide evidence of their unique characteristics as homilies, thus challenging the tendencies of scholars and cataloguers to categorise them as part of the substantial body of early modern printed sermons.²⁴ Ultimately, it will be shown that 'homily' was an unstable term in this period, and that its definition cannot merely be confined to that of a state-sanctioned 'inferior sermon'.

The homily's earliest troubles can perhaps be dated to the Henrician Reformation, when the structures which had been in place in communal worship since the early fifteenth century began to break down, albeit gradually and not without resistance.²⁵ As Susan Wabuda has observed, since 1408 the homily had been part of a 'mature three-tier program of instruction' as 'a parish address that was part of the Mass'.²⁶ After the reading of the Epistle and Gospel verses, the priest or deacon moved from behind the

McCullough, Adlington and Rhatigan, *Oxford handbook of the early modern sermon*, 348–65.

²³ S. Mutchow Towers, *Control of religious printing in early Stuart England*, Woodbridge 2003, 2; David Scott Kastan, 'Print, literary culture and the book trade', in David Loewenstein and Janel Mueller (eds), *The Cambridge history of early modern English literature*, Cambridge 2002, 81–116 at p. 107.

²⁴ The *ESTC* categorises the translation of Chrysostom's homily and Harpsfield's homily as 'Sermons, English – 16th century'. The translation of Origen's homily is categorised as 'Sermons – Early works to 1800'; the translation of Philippe Duplessis-Mornay's homily as 'Sermons, English – 17th century'; and the homily by Anthony Stafford as 'Good Friday sermons – Early works to 1800', 'Salvation – Sermons – Early works to 1800' and 'Sermons, English – 17th century'.

²⁵ Alexandra Walsham, *Church papists: Catholicism, conformity and confessional polemic in early modern England*, Woodbridge 1993; Andrew R. Muldoon, 'Recusants, church-papists, and "comfortable" missionaries: assessing the post-Reformation English Catholic community', *Catholic Historical Review* lxxxvi (2000), 242–57.

²⁶ Wabuda, *Preaching*, 26.

rood screen and stepped up to the pulpit, speaking directly to the people in the homily. This was the part of the service where the priest proceeded to explain in English the texts which had just been presented in Latin. The pericopes were expounded and their relevance to daily life was elucidated.²⁷ In the 1530s this organised programme of preaching was under threat; by Henry's death, defence of the Roman-rite mass had become a contentious topic and bookstalls were replete with attacks directed towards it.²⁸

What, therefore, was to be the fate of the homily? Translations of homilies composed by, or at least attributed to, the Church Fathers maintained a stable presence in the religious print market.²⁹ Protestant divines studied patristic homilies to support their arguments in the pulpit; these were subsequently cited in the margins of the published versions of their sermons. On the Catholic side, Germen Gardynare's *Letter of a yonge gentylman* provides an example of a patristic homily in written form being used to authorise Catholic doctrine. The heretic John Frith, who had published a number of tracts against popery and purgatory, is supposedly proved wrong on several points concerning the sacrament by a homily of Chrysostom, which had been 'commaunded ... to be wryte[n] out before for the nones'.³⁰

Thus, in the early years of Reformation England, the homilies of the Church Fathers were repeatedly cited and circulated, supplying both Protestants and Catholics with an historical pedigree.³¹ In 1543 John Cheke translated Chrysostom's homily on 1 Thessalonians iv.13 from Greek to Latin as a gift for Henry VIII. It was published as part of *D. Ioannis Chrysostomi homiliae duae* (London 1543; RSTC 14634).³² For Aysha Pollnitz, Cheke's rendering of this homily attested to 'his hearty support for the Henrician Church's reform of the doctrine of purgatory by urging against elaborate displays of grief during funerals'.³³ The homily was subsequently translated from Cheke's Latin version into English by Thomas Chaloner, and was published in 1544 as *An homilie of*

²⁷ Ibid. 32; Anne T. Thayer, 'Preaching and worship', in David M. Whitford (ed.), *T&T Clark companion to Reformation theology*, London–New York 2012, 157–77 at p. 159.

²⁸ Wabuda, *Preaching*, 26–7; King and Rankin, 'Print, patronage, and the reception of continental reform', 57.

²⁹ William P. Haugaard provides a provisional set of statistics for English translations of patristic texts issued before 1600 in 'Renaissance patristic scholarship and theology in sixteenth-century England', *Sixteenth Century Journal* x (1979), 37–60.

³⁰ Germen Gardynare, *A letter of a yonge gentylman*, London 1534 (RSTC 11594), sigs B.iii.v–B.iii.v; David Daniell, 'Frith, John (1503–1533)', *ODNB*.

³¹ See Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian antiquity*, ch. i; Katrin Ettenhuber, 'The preacher and patristics', in McCullough, Adlington and Rhatigan, *Oxford handbook of the early modern sermon*, 34–53 at p. 37.

³² Alan Bryson, 'Cheke, Sir John (1514–1557)', *ODNB*.

³³ Aysha Pollnitz, *Princely education in early modern Britain*, Cambridge 2015, 144.

Saint John Chrysostome.³⁴ In the early years of the English Reformation, it was common practice to print patristic and humanist works which had been supplied with a ‘reformist twist’, and it is possible that Chaloner translated Cheke’s version in order to conform to its emphatic authorisation of Henry’s transformation of the English Church.³⁵ Furthermore, if the principal role of a pre-Reformation homily was to function as a translated text into English expounded for the auditors’ edification, Chaloner’s act of converting Cheke’s translation into the vernacular seems to represent a similar kind of transmission of approved doctrinal teachings for the benefit of readers, as opposed to auditors, who did not understand Latin. The dissolution of the monasteries, for instance, can be clearly read in the English version, with the landlord ‘purposing to reedifie an olde and ruinous house’ by destroying the old building and ‘raysng it more stately the[n] euer it was’, which correlates with God dissolving the bodies of the deceased: ‘to thend the same beyng ones new repayed, he may with greater glory repoesse the[m] again therin’.³⁶

What are the characteristics which distinguish this printed homily from a contemporary printed sermon? In terms of bibliographic presentation, the two cannot be placed in the same category. As Rosemary Dixon has shown, printed sermons ‘shared a set of generic conventions that made them a recognizable category for contemporary readers: they were headed by a scriptural text, and consisted of its exposition and application’.³⁷ The prescribed model does not fit this homily, in which the chosen biblical verse is notably absent.³⁸ Furthermore, a ‘discourse vpon Job, and Abraham’ constitutes a major part of the work.³⁹ According to Peter McCullough’s definition of the early modern sermon, which implies a focus upon a single biblical text, the homily does not conform to this format and cannot, strictly speaking, be classified as such.⁴⁰ *An homilie of Saint John Chrysostome* can therefore be best understood as a product of the Henrician Reformation, presenting itself as a small devotional octavo volume (a ‘SMALE gifte’) which could communicate with the reading

³⁴ John Chrysostom, *An homilie of Saint John Chrysostome*, trans. Thomas Chaloner, London 1544 (RSTC 14637).

³⁵ Ryrie, *The Gospel and Henry VIII*, 116; Lucy Wooding, ‘Erasmus and the politics of translation in Tudor England’, in Simon Ditchfield, Charlotte Methuen and Andrew Spicer (eds), *Translating Christianity* (Studies in Church History liii, 2017), 132–45.

³⁶ Chrysostom, *An homilie of Saint John Chrysostome*, sig. Avr–v.

³⁷ Rosemary Dixon, ‘Sermons in print, 1660–1700’, in McCullough, Adlington and Rhatigan, *Oxford handbook of the early modern sermon*, 460–79 at p. 461. See also Morrissey, *Politics*, 58.

³⁸ Chrysostom, *An homilie of Saint John Chrysostome*, sig. Aair.

³⁹ Ibid. title page.

⁴⁰ Peter McCullough, ‘Sermons’, in Andrew Hadfield (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of English prose, 1500–1640*, Oxford 2013, 560–75 at p. 566.

public in the vernacular without the intrusion of *marginalia*, conveying Henrician doctrine that was validated by its ties with patristic tradition.⁴¹

A homily published during the reign of Mary I also displays evidence of the propagandistic deployment of simple language, enhanced by a typographical layout devoid of *marginalia*. In *A notable and learned sermon or homilie*, the Roman Catholic priest John Harpsfield articulates the ‘miserable and parilous case’ of the previous twenty years, setting forth ‘the exceedinge greate benefite of oure reconciliation to ... the catholike church’ and exhorting readers to return ‘in gret multitudes ... to the Masse’.⁴² Contrary to previous accounts which argued that Mary did not take as much advantage of the press as her siblings, recent scholarship has suggested that it was ‘with the printed word that the Marian Church sought to revivify and define its faith’.⁴³ Entirely representative of these reforming efforts, this text was promptly published after its delivery on 30 November 1556, the second anniversary of the reconciliation of England with the papacy.⁴⁴ Its title page displays the words ‘Vltimo Decembris. 1556’, indicating the priority accorded to it for the purposes of ‘educating the people in the doctrines of ecclesiastical unity and the Petrine ministry of the papacy’.⁴⁵

At first glance, one might be led to believe that the work is no different from a printed sermon as described by Dixon. The biblical verse is printed above the principal body of text, albeit with no precise reference to its place in the Vulgate Bible; there is only a vague citation of the ‘hundreth and xvii. psalme’ of David.⁴⁶ Yet the ‘*homilie*’ in the title should not be ignored completely.⁴⁷ As revealed in Chrysostom’s homily, unlike a sermon, Harpsfield’s work does not merely focus on one biblical text but

⁴¹ Chrysostom, *An homilie of Saint John Chrysostome*, unpaginated.

⁴² John Harpsfield, *A notable and learned sermon or homilie*, London 1556 (RSTC 12795), sigs A.iiiiir–v, C.i.r.

⁴³ J. W. Martin, ‘The Marian regime’s failure to understand the importance of printing’, *Huntington Library Quarterly* xliv (1981), 231–47; David Loades, ‘Books and the English Reformation prior to 1558’, in Jean-François Gilmont (ed.), *The Reformation and the book*, trans. Karin Maag, Aldershot–Brookfield 1998, 264–91 at p. 285; Wooding, *Rethinking Catholicism*, 117; Alexandra Walsham, ‘“Domme preachers”? Post-Reformation English Catholicism and the culture of print’, *Past & Present* no. 168 (Aug. 2000), 72–123 at p. 80 and passim.

⁴⁴ Wizeman, *The theology and spirituality of Mary Tudor’s Church*, 15–16.

⁴⁵ Idem, ‘The Marian Counter-Reformation in print’, in Elizabeth Evenden and Vivienne Westbrook (eds), *Catholic renewal and Protestant resistance in Marian England*, Farnham–Burlington, VT 2015, 143–64 at p. 150.

⁴⁶ Harpsfield, *A notable and learned sermon or homilie*, sig. A.ii.r.

⁴⁷ William Wizeman consistently referred to this work as a ‘sermon’ in all of his discussions about it, even omitting the ‘homilie’ of the title in his references and bibliographies: *The theology and spirituality of Mary Tudor’s Church*, 15–16, 260, and ‘The Marian Counter-Reformation in print’, 149–50.

incorporates extensive narratives from the Old Testament, using the example of Moses and Aaron in their respective hierarchies to legitimise the pope's standing. It is 'the lawe of Moyses' which Harpsfield is particularly keen to 'set furth'.⁴⁸

In further contemplating the '*Sermon or homilie*' of the title, it is necessary to consider the impact that Edward VI's *Certayne sermons, or homilies*, to which Harpsfield himself contributed, may have had upon the religious printed works of the Marian era. Marian Catholic writers 'promoted a purified version of traditional religion, more solidly based on the Bible and the sacraments and less dependent on ingrained habits and popular superstitions'.⁴⁹ This is epitomised in Edmund Bonner's *Homelies* (London 1555; RSTC 3285), a project in which Harpsfield was also involved.⁵⁰ Harpsfield's '*Sermon or homilie*', carefully backed up by the authority of Scripture and the Church Fathers, therefore represents a quintessential response to the *Sermons, or homilies* of the previous reign.⁵¹ In its very title, Harpsfield's '*sermon or homilie*' constitutes a celebration of a return to the mass, yet directly acknowledges a reformed Catholic stance which had to account for the previous two decades of religious upheaval. But there is little evidence to suggest that, like Bonner's *Homelies*, Harpsfield's work was used as a printed model sermon produced for 'priests who could not preach themselves'.⁵² Rather, this '*Sermon or homilie*' conflates three textual categories: modelled as a thematic and occasional homily after the *Official homilies*; delivered as a sermon; and distributed, in octavo format, as a proselytising pamphlet rather than as a text to be placed upon pulpits and read aloud.

Returning to patristic translation, *An homilie of Marye Magdalene*, attributed to Origen, stands out as another distinctive mirror of the contestations between Catholic and Protestant doctrine. This tiny sextodecimo professed on the title page to be 'newly translated' and was published by the Protestant printer Reyner Wolfe in 1565.⁵³ The work's publication history in England can be traced back to the octavo *Omelia orige[n]is de*

⁴⁸ Harpsfield, *A notable and learned sermon or homilie*, unpaginated.

⁴⁹ Christopher Haigh, 'Introduction', in Christopher Haigh (ed.), *The English Reformation revised*, Cambridge 1987, 1–17 at p. 9.

⁵⁰ Felicity Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland*, Oxford 2003, 184; Gerald Bray, 'Introduction', in Gerald Bray (ed.), *The books of homilies: a critical edition*, Cambridge 2015, pp. ix–xxi at pp. xiv–xvi.

⁵¹ For references to Augustine see Harpsfield, *A notable and learned sermon or homilie*, sigs B.ii.r–v, B.iii.v.

⁵² Eamon Duffy, *Saints, sacrilege and sedition: religion and conflict in the Tudor Reformations*, London 2012, 200.

⁵³ Origen (attrib.), *An homilie of Marye Magdalene, declaring her ferue[n]t loue and zeale towards Christ*, London 1565 (RSTC 18847).

beata maria magdalena.⁵⁴ In 1555 an English edition of the work had been published as *An homelie of Marye Magdalene, declaring her ferue[n]t loue and zele towards Christ*, also in octavo format.⁵⁵

The motivations for the renewed interest in this homily, and the perceived need for a new translation, may be viewed in the context of the religious climate of the early 1560s, a period which encompassed the delivery of John Jewel's controversial 'Challenge sermon'.⁵⁶ In the sermon, Jewel listed a number of Roman Catholic practices, including services conducted in Latin, challenging Catholics to prove that any of them could be validated by 'any old general council, or out of the holy scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive church'.⁵⁷ Catholics took to the press in response to Jewel's attack with great zeal, referring in particular to patristic homilies to defend the contested points against their faith. Thomas Stapleton traced the significance of the homily as an integral part of the church service back to Origen:

But that Origen spake of the Scriptures read in the Seruice, it appereth probably firste for that the Scriptures were at that time in Alexandria first read in the Seruice as lessons, and after expounded by the waie of homilies: and also that Origen him selfe was at that time the Common and ordinary maker of suche homilies: and laste of all that these veye wordes of Origen are a parte of such an Homilie ordinarily made after the Seruice.⁵⁸

An homilie of Marye Magdalene thus held a potent currency in light of the innumerable patristic arguments made against Jewel's 'Challenge sermon', with lucrative scope for the printer.⁵⁹ But it is difficult to understand why this homily could be categorised as a sermon. Although the text

⁵⁴ Idem (attrib.), *Omelia orige[n]is de beata maria magdalena*, ed. William Menyman, London [1505?] (RSTC 18846). Although this work and the later editions are supposititious, the focus is upon what the publication of the 1565 edition represented during a controversial period for religious publishing.

⁵⁵ Idem (attrib.), [*An homelie of Marye Magdalene, declaring her ferue[n]t loue and zele towards Christ*], [London 1555 (?)] (RSTC 18848). It would, of course, have been a fruitful experiment to compare this translation with the 'new' one of 1565, examining in particular any purges by the unnamed translator (see Walsham, "Domme preachers", 105). Sadly, however, the only surviving copy of the 1555 edition exists in the form of a fragment at the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Arch. A d.2 (1)).

⁵⁶ Gary W. Jenkins, *John Jewel and the English national Church: the dilemmas of an erastian reformer*, Aldershot–Burlington, VT 2006, 70; Torrance Kirby, 'Political hermeneutics: John Jewel's "Challenge sermon" at Paul's Cross, 1559', in his *Persuasion and conversion: essays on religion, politics, and the public sphere in early modern England*, Leiden–Boston 2013, 114–43.

⁵⁷ Quoted in Jenkins, *John Jewel and the English national Church*, 70.

⁵⁸ Thomas Stapleton, *A returne of vntruthes vpon M. Jewelles replie*, Antwerp 1566 (RSTC 23234), sig. HHr.

⁵⁹ See Ettenhuber, 'The preacher and patristics', 40–4; Torrance Kirby, 'John Jewel, "The Challenge sermon" preached at Paul's Cross (1560)', in Torrance Kirby and others (eds), *Sermons at Paul's Cross, 1521–1642*, Oxford 2017, 225–59 at p. 229.

(John xx. 11–17) is printed at the beginning, the structure of the work is uncharacteristic of a sermon in that it moves swiftly between narration of the unfolding events within the biblical passage, a running commentary, and a crafted inward narrative of the biblical characters. An interior monologue evokes Mary's state 'without life, without sence' ('O wofull Woman that I am, what shall I do? whether shal I go? and whether is my beloued gon?').⁶⁰ A vivid characterisation of Mary as Christ's 'louer' unfolds at the heart of the homily: 'O amiable, O delitable, geue againe to me the gladnes of thy comfortable prese[n]ce. Shew me thy countinaunce, let thy voice sounde in mine eares, for thy voice is sweete, and thy visage is beutiful.'⁶¹

Elements of Catholicism and Protestantism work in tandem in the text, reflecting the 'curious ecclesiastical hybrid' of religion brought about by the Elizabethan Settlement.⁶² Deliberating upon the recurrence of the phrase 'Where haste thou layd him?' in Mary's speech, Origen states the weight of these words of Scripture: 'This word wareth exceding swete in her heart that so abou[n]deth in her mouth ... bycause shee reme [m]breth that [Christ] saidst once of her brother [Lazarus], Where haue ye laid him? for sithens ... she heard this word of [Christ's] mouth, she hath kept it diligently in her heart, and hath delighted to vse it in her speache.'⁶³ None the less, while the importance of Scripture is emphasised, the doctrine of transubstantiation could potentially be read in Origen's reference to the 'bread' of Christ's body which filled Mary with his 'fragments of the basket of her heart' to 'feede her hungry sowle'.⁶⁴ Origen's homily strikes an uneasy synthesis of Protestant and Catholic elements; it is difficult to conclude which of the two faiths would most approve of the manner in which Origen appealed to readers to 'desire' the presence of God and 'to loue Jesus'.⁶⁵

The works explored thus far have hinted at their origins as oral texts, using imperatives such as 'herke[n] ye' and 'Let vs therefore (betherne)'; rhetorical devices which were also present in printed sermons.⁶⁶ In contrast, Philippe Duplessis-Mornay's homilies could claim no such origins whatsoever, possibly indicating a shift towards an understanding of the genre as a text purely designed for stimulating a reader's religious contemplation.

⁶⁰ Origen (attrib.), *An homilie of Marye Magdalene* (1565), sigs a.v.v, B.iii.v.

⁶¹ Ibid. sig. C.v.v. unpaginated.

⁶² Alexandra Walsham, *Charitable hatred: tolerance and intolerance in England, 1500–1700*, Manchester–New York 2006, 14.

⁶³ Origen (attrib.), *An homilie of Marye Magdalene* (1565), sig. C.iii.r.

⁶⁴ Ibid. unpaginated.

⁶⁵ Ibid. unpaginated.

⁶⁶ Chrysostom, *An homilie of Saint John Chrysostome*, sig. Aiii.v; Origen (attrib.), *An homilie of Marye Magdalene* (1565), unpaginated; Hunt, *The art of hearing*, 159–63.

The works of Philippe Duplessis-Mornay enjoyed considerable popularity in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century England. Brenda M. Hosington has noted that a number of English and continental translators ‘sought to spread his thinking on issues central to the Reformed faith’; as a result, in England, ‘over ten translators published no fewer than 14 individual works between 1576 and 1608’.⁶⁷ None the less, there is limited scholarship on the English reception of Duplessis-Mornay’s translated works.⁶⁸ The Huguenot soldier-councillor gained notoriety for his huge anti-Catholic polemical tract entitled *De l’Institution, usage et doctrine du saint sacrement de l’eucharistie* (La Rochelle 1598). The reaction to this work could be viewed as the French equivalent of the sustained spate of printed works rebutting Jewel’s sermon, with various counter-attacks from Catholic writers asserting that Duplessis-Mornay had ‘falsified or even invented his citations to support his own point of view’ against the eucharist, which had included numerous patristic sources.⁶⁹ At a public disputation held at Fontainebleau on 4 May 1600, Duplessis-Mornay was disgraced and forced to retire from court.⁷⁰

This episode was well known in England, and both Protestants and Catholics were prolific in their attempts either to defend Duplessis-Mornay or to promote his fall from grace.⁷¹ It is therefore unsurprising that his works received correlating publicity. Among the last works to appear in England as translations from the French during Duplessis-Mornay’s lifetime and shortly after his death are the little-regarded homilies, which serve as unusually pithy statements, in duodecimo format, of his advancement of Protestantism to the exclusion of Catholicism.⁷² Three translations of Duplessis-Mornay with the word ‘homily’ or ‘homilies’ in the title are recorded in the *ESTC*: *Two homilies concerning the meanes how to resolve the controversies of this time, An homily vpon these words of Saint Matthew, chap. 16. v. 18*;

⁶⁷ Brenda M. Hosington, ‘Tudor Englishwomen’s translations of continental Protestant texts: the interplay of ideology and historical context’, in Fred Schurink (ed.), *Tudor translation*, Basingstoke 2011, 121–42 at p. 135.

⁶⁸ An exception is Julie Crawford, ‘Reconsidering early modern women’s reading, or, how Margaret Hoby read her de Mornay’, *Huntington Library Quarterly* lxxiii (2010), 193–223.

⁶⁹ Mack P. Holt, ‘Divisions within French Calvinism: Philippe Duplessis-Mornay and the eucharist’, in Mack P. Holt (ed.), *Adaptations of Calvinism in Reformation Europe: essays in honour of Brian G. Armstrong*, Aldershot–Burlington, VT 2007, 165–77 at p. 166.

⁷⁰ Idem, *The French Wars of Religion, 1562–1629*, 2nd edn, Cambridge 2005, 176–7.

⁷¹ For example, Matthew Sutcliffe, *A briefe replie to a certaine odious and slanderous libel*, London 1600 (*RSTC* 23453); Robert Persons, *A relation of the triall made before the king of France*, [Saint-Omer] 1604 (*RSTC* 19413).

⁷² These works are not mentioned in the definitive work of scholarship on Duplessis-Mornay to date, Hugues Daussy’s *Les Huguenots et le roi: le combat politique de Philippe Duplessis-Mornay (1572–1600)*, Geneva 2002.

and *Three homilies*.⁷³ None of these translations uses the word ‘sermon’ to describe their content. In *Two homilies*, the term ‘homily’ is immediately deemed worthy of mention by the anonymous translator, who writes, ‘Thou hast here (gentle Reader) two homilies (for so the authour himselfe ... entitleth them)’.⁷⁴ Anthony Ratcliffe, translator of the *Three homilies*, refers to the works as ‘Treatises’ or ‘Tracts’ as opposed to ‘sermons’.⁷⁵ In the homily of 1615, the reader is invited to partake in ‘this holy catechisme’.⁷⁶ However, despite the ostensibly pious nature of this ‘little booke’, the homily digresses extensively from the specified text of Matthew xvi.18. The work contains much vitriol against papal primacy and bitterness against the French Catholic monarchy, which sought to ‘dispense against the Gospell, and against the Apostle, to make new articles of faith’, and in so doing dragged ‘men by thousands into hell’.⁷⁷

Operating behind a veneer of biblical exegesis and patristic scholarship, *An homily upon these words of Saint Matthew, chap. 16. v. 18* proffers intriguing insights into Duplessis-Mornay’s interpretation of the genre, and also allows for an engagement with the homily through the additional prism of continental translation.⁷⁸ The fluid approach to the homily, considered as something other than a book to be placed on the pulpit and read aloud as a substitute sermon, was prevalent in France in the early seventeenth century.⁷⁹ Duplessis-Mornay was never a preacher but adapted this hortatory form in his later years, after public political intervention became more difficult owing to his compromised position, to continue his stand for the victory of the word of God over papal idolatry. Accordingly, he was described to Jacobean readers as ‘a true Champion of the Militant-Reformed-French Church’, who ‘valiantly fought both with pen & sword’.⁸⁰

Finally, Anthony Stafford’s *The day of salvation: or, A homily upon the bloody sacrifice of Christ* is unlike the other homilies in that it claims to have originated as a private work for just one ‘Noble and Vertuous Lady’, Lady Theophila Coke.⁸¹ As a vicesimo-quarto, ‘small in *Bulke*’ but ‘great in *Value*’ and packaged with an engraved title page depicting Christ’s

⁷³ Philippe Duplessis-Mornay, *Two homilies concerning the meanes how to resolute the controversies of this time*, Oxford 1612 (RSTC 18164); *An homily upon these words of Saint Matthew, chap. 16. v. 18*, trans. John Verneuil, Oxford 1615 (RSTC 18143); and *Three homilies*, trans. Anthony Ratcliffe, London 1626 (RSTC 18156).

⁷⁴ Idem, *Two homilies*, sig. ¶ 2r.

⁷⁵ Idem, *Three homilies*, sigs A2v, A3r.

⁷⁶ Idem, *An homily*, 3.

⁷⁷ Ibid. sig. A3r, p. 16.

⁷⁸ See *ibid.* 9, 23 for patristic citations.

⁷⁹ Thomas Worcester, *Seventeenth-century cultural discourse: France and the preaching of Bishop Camus*, Berlin–New York 1997, 54–6.

⁸⁰ Duplessis-Mornay, *An homily*, sig. A3v.

⁸¹ Anthony Stafford, *The day of salvation: or, A homily upon the bloody sacrifice of Christ*, London 1635 (RSTC 23122), title page.

torture and Resurrection, the homily purports, above all, to be a devotional gift.⁸² By this point, it seems that the homily had the potential to bear very little resemblance to its original liturgical function.⁸³ Stafford states that the subject of his book calls more for ‘the *teares* of the *faithfull*, then the *Eloquence* of *Oratours*’, and that ‘[a] holy *Extasie* is heere more seemly, then a curious *Inquisition*’.⁸⁴ The epistle ‘To the Penitent Reader’ underlines the work’s function as a reminder for the reader not to ‘*loose the interest wee have in [Christ’s] Crucifixion*’.⁸⁵ Moreover, the work abounds with imperatives such as ‘Call to minde againe, oh my *soule*’, ‘Meditate also’, ‘weigh withall’ and ‘Contemplate’, as opposed to the dialogic characteristics of the first three homilies discussed in this article.⁸⁶ It is important to remember that Stafford, like Duplessis-Mornay, was not a preacher. In terms of defining the homily, Stafford seems to have followed the lead of Anthony Ratcliffe in depicting his work as a ‘*Treatise*’, and never as a ‘sermon’.⁸⁷ The ‘limits of a *Homily*’, as Stafford understood it, was to stimulate contemplation in private for the lay reader.⁸⁸ Unlike a sermon, the work is not an analysis of one specific passage from the Bible, but rather a *précis* of the life of Christ.

Anthony Stafford’s homily needs to be understood within the context of Laudian attitudes towards the *Official homilies*. It has been beyond the limits of this article to engage with the reception and use of the *Official homilies* as fundamental sources of doctrinal authority in ecclesiastical disputes, particularly from the Laudian era onwards.⁸⁹ However, it is important to observe that the *Official homilies* were indeed prominent within Laudian preoccupations, and that there was an attempt to justify their use and redefine their relationship with the sermon. Robert Shelford, minister of the church at Ringsfield in Suffolk, rejected the opinion that the *Official homilies* were ‘dead sermons, because they are onely read’.⁹⁰ Yet, any Laudian ‘revival’ or transformation of the homily genre was evidently short-lived; Stafford’s work remains the only Laudian printed work bearing this specific title.

Scholars have barely begun to consider the evolving nature of the homily in post-Reformation England, when words were ‘charged with potential

⁸² Ibid. sigs A3v–A4r. The engraved title page by William Marshall is described in J. T., ‘Bibliographic notes – Anthony Stafford’, *Northamptonshire Notes & Queries* v (1894), 118–22 at pp. 118–19.

⁸³ *Certain sermons or homilies (1547) and a homily against disobedience and wilful rebellion (1570): a critical edition*, ed. Ronald B. Bond, Toronto 1987, 13.

⁸⁴ Stafford, *The day of salvation*, 3. ⁸⁵ Ibid. unpaginated. ⁸⁶ Ibid. 153–5.

⁸⁷ Ibid. sig. A3v. ⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ I owe this point to Peter Lake. ⁹⁰ Robert Shelford, *The ten preachers in his Five pious and learned discourses*, Cambridge 1635 (RSTC 22400), 57–119 at p. 78. I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for drawing my attention to this text.

conflict' and religious works were prone to intense scrutiny.⁹¹ The word 'homily', unlike 'sermon', was used extremely rarely within titles published in England from the early sixteenth century until 1640 (*see* appendix). Historians and literary critics alike have overlooked crucial questions regarding the infrequent use of the label and the contentious nature of the word in post-Reformation England. While the 'homily' could invoke popery because of its central role within the Catholic liturgy, the argument was also made for its illustrious origins from antiquity by Whitgift, Donne and other defenders of official Church doctrine. The term was not, therefore, one to be applied lightly, and the phenomenon of the 'homily' subsequently occupied minimal space within post-Reformation English print culture.

The above notwithstanding, this article has argued that, while the homily was a marginalised genre in post-Reformation England, it persisted nevertheless in a variety of forms. It was not limited to the *Official homilies* and other similarly sanctioned homilies prepared to be read from the pulpit. Contrary to popular perception of the 'homely' homily, the works examined in this article reveal that it did not always serve as the substitute sermon which had been denigrated by Robert Greene and Edmund Spenser. This paper has thus illuminated some of the ways in which the 'homily' could be appropriated by clarifying a multi-layered taxonomy of early modern printed homilies. During the Henrician Reformation, patristic homilies remained acceptable while the traditional homily of the Catholic mass was under threat; Chaloner's English translation of Chrysostom's text was issued, under the guise of a devotional book, to disseminate approved Henrician doctrine. The '*sermon or homilie*' of Harpsfield was a celebration of England's return to the mass in Mary's reign, but in a distinctly reformed Catholic mode in which the homily could be transformed into a propagandistic pamphlet. The 'new' translation of Origen's homily was produced in a period in which the conflicting claims to patristic authority became a particularly protracted matter. This tiny book nevertheless reflected the problematic symbiosis of the two rival faiths in light of the Elizabethan Settlement. For Duplessis-Mornay and Stafford, the homily was not an oral text; in the case of the former, it was a means to distribute incendiary views against the French Catholic monarchy under the pretext of a small religious treatise, while the latter constituted a devotional 'life' of Christ.

⁹¹ Walsham, *Church papists*, 8. There is a vast literature on religious press censorship in England in this period. See, for example, Mutchow Towers, *Control of religious printing*; the output of Cyndia Susan Clegg, including her *Press Censorship* series with Cambridge University Press; Anthony Milton, 'Licensing, censorship, and religious orthodoxy in early Stuart England', *HJ* lxi (1998), 625–51; and Ian A. Gadd, "'A suitable remedy?'" Regulating the printing press, 1553–1558', in Elizabeth Evenden and Vivienne Westbrook (eds), *Catholic renewal and Protestant resistance in Marian England*, Farnham–Burlington, VT 2015, 127–42.

None of these homilies resembles a traditional early modern English sermon, which would imply a *per verbum* style of exegesis. Biblical texts, if specified, were used chiefly as a means to unify the works thematically, rather than as the sole anchor. Bibliographically, these homilies contrast with sermons which were most frequently printed in quarto, ranging from octavo to vicesimo-quarto.⁹² Closer examination of their formats calls into question their suitability for being read aloud, like the *Official homilies*, from the pulpit to large congregations.⁹³ Of the thirteen post-Reformation homilies within the *ESTC*, it appears that only those which were specifically stipulated for use in the pulpit and printed after the publication of the two volumes of *Official homilies* follow their quarto format.⁹⁴ Such considerations situate this article within the body of a burgeoning literature which applies book-historical approaches to key religious texts of the English Reformation, giving due attention to the significance of their formats as well as continuing to acknowledge their status as vital sources of evidence surrounding the concerns of the Church of England.⁹⁵

There is certainly scope for further investigation into the life of the homily beyond the period surveyed in this article.⁹⁶ For the present occasion, however, it has been the aim of this study to shed light on the instability and ambiguity of the term, its distinctive application within post-Reformation English print culture outside of the *Official homilies*, and the manner in which writers and translators across different confessional divides adapted and interpreted the genre. The printed homily in post-Reformation England was not always a simple sermon for unskilled preachers, but was fluid in its function as doctrinal pamphlet, polemical treatise and devotional text.

⁹² David L. Gants, 'A quantitative analysis of the London book trade, 1614–1618', *Studies in Bibliography* lv (2002), 185–213 at p. 190.

⁹³ Margaret Aston, 'Lap books and lectern books: the revelatory book in the Reformation', in R. N. Swanson (ed.), *The Church and the book* (Studies in Church History xxxviii, 2004), 163–89.

⁹⁴ John Hooper, *An homebye to be read in the tyme of pestylence*, Worcester 1553 (*RSTC* 13759); Thomas Cooper, *A briefe homily, wherein the most comfortable and right use of the Lords Supper, is very plainly opened and deliuered*, London 1580 (*RSTC* 5684.5); Anon., *A sermon, or homelie, to mooue compassion towards the poore and needie in these times*, London 1596 (*RSTC* 13680.9).

⁹⁵ For an example of such scholarship see Austen Saunders, 'Articles of assent: clergymen's subscribed copies of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England', in Katherine Acheson (ed.), *Early modern English marginalia*, New York–Abingdon 2019, 115–33.

⁹⁶ A fascinating example within the Thomason Tracts is Gabriel le Roi, *Homelie sur l'Evangile de notre Seigneur*, London 1654 (Wing L.1118), General Reference Collection, BL, E.1483.(2.).

APPENDIX

Fourteen titles featuring the word ‘homily’, ‘homelye’, ‘homylye’, ‘homelie’ or ‘homilie’ in the English short title catalogue (ESTC), listed in chronological order (up to 1640)

RSTC 17568.5	[Homily on Mary Magdalen], [London 1515 (?)]. 4°.
RSTC 14637	John Chrysostom, <i>An homilie of Saint John Chrysostome</i> , trans. Thomas Chaloner, London 1544. 8°.
RSTC 14638	<i>A sermo[n] made by John Chrysostome . . . Wherunto is added an other homilie made by John Brentius</i> , trans. Thomas Sampson, [London] 1550. 8°.
RSTC 13759	John Hooper, <i>An homelye to be read in the tyme of pestylence</i> , Worcester 1553. 4°.
RSTC 18848	Origen (attrib.), [<i>An homilie of Marye Magdalene, declaring her ferue[n]t loue and zele towards Christ</i>], [London 1555 (?)]. 8°. [Fragment]
RSTC 12795	John Harpsfield, <i>A notable and learned sermon or homilie</i> , London 1556. 8°.
†RSTC 13680.8	<i>An homylye deuided into three partes, for the dayes of Rogation Weke</i> , London 1561 [?]. 4°.
RSTC 18847	Origen (attrib.), <i>An homilie of Marye Magdalene, declaring her ferue[n]t loue and zele towards Christ</i> , London 1565. 16°.
*†RSTC 13679 / 13680	<i>An homilie agaynst disobedience and wilful rebellion</i> , London 1570. 4°.
RSTC 5684.5	Thomas Cooper, <i>A brieffe homily, wherein the most comfortable and right use of the Lords Supper, is very plainly opened and deliuered</i> , London 1580. 4°.
RSTC 20844	Urbanus Rhegius, <i>An homelye or sermon of good and euill angels</i> , trans. Richard Robinson, London 1583 [?]. 8°.
RSTC 13680.9	<i>A sermon, or homelie, to mooue compassion towards the poore and needie in these times</i> , London 1596. 4°.
RSTC 18143	Philippe Duplessis-Mornay, <i>An homily vpon these words of Saint Matthew, chap. 16. v. 18.</i> , trans. John Verneuil, Oxford 1615. 12°.
RSTC 23122	Anthony Stafford, <i>The day of salvation: or, A homily vpon the bloody sacrifice of Christ</i> , London 1635. 24°.

†extracted from the Elizabethan *Official homilies*

*multiple RSTC numbers