

“Pirate Hills” and the Quartos of
Julius Caesar

By JOHN W. VELZ

IN 1913, Henrietta C. Bartlett distinguished six discrete settings of type among the Restoration quartos of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*.¹ Two are dated (1684, 1691); Q 1684 and all four undated quartos (hereafter QU1-4) bear this imprint (with nonsubstantive differences):

LONDON, | Printed by *H. H. Jun.* for *Hen. Heringman* and
R. Bentley in | *Russel-street* in *Covent-Garden*, and sold by *Joseph*
Knight and | *Francis Saunders* at the *Blew Anchor* in the Lower Walk
of the | *New Exchange* in the *Strand*.

Q 1691 differs:

LONDON, | Printed for *Henry Herringman*, and *Richard Bentley* |
at the Post-House, in *Russel-street*, *Covent-* | *Garden*.

Since Miss Bartlett described them, these players' quartos have returned to obscurity.² They are worth exhuming, because one of them can be shown to be an eighteenth-century forgery, and speculation about the circumstances of publication of this quarto and of the three other undated ones brings to attention an interesting if sordid chapter in the history of literary piracy.

i

Miss Bartlett reasoned that QU1-4 should be placed between Q 1684 (which on the evidence of its signatures is the earliest of the

¹ "Quarto Editions of *Julius Caesar*," *The Library*, IV, 3rd ser. (1913), 122-32.

² That they were little known when she approached them is indicated in the Variorum *JC* (1913), where H. H. Furness, Jr. shows knowledge only of Q 1691, which he calls "Q." Since 1913 little has been added to Miss Bartlett's bibliographical description. See H. C. Bartlett and A. W. Pollard, *A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto 1594-1709*, Yale University Press and Oxford University Press, 1916, pp. 33-37; W. W. Greg, *A Bibliography of the English Printed Drama to the Restoration*, II, Oxford University Press (for the Bibliographical Society), 1951, No. 403 (d) and (f)-(j). (But see also note 3 infra.)

six) and Q 1691, a very faithful reprint of Q 1684.³ She numbered the undated issues Q2-5 after checking sample readings which show that QU1-3 are in simple genetic descent from Q 1684. QU4, however,

is entirely different; it is much better printed than the others, has a three-line note in regard to the scene at the bottom of *Dramatis Personae* on verso title, has fuller stage directions throughout, seems from various indications in the text to have been printed from an edited rather than an acting text, as the others were, and, finally, shows more resemblance to the Fourth Folio . . . than do the others, which seem to have been taken from a copy of the First Folio corrected for acting. (p. 129)

She concludes tentatively that QU4 was printed from F4 sometime between 1685 and 1688.⁴

A full textual collation of the six quartos bears out some of Miss Bartlett's findings.⁵ Q 1684 is the parent of QU1, QU1 of QU2, and QU2 of QU3, as she suggests; and Q 1691 is a paginal reprint of Q 1684 without contamination from the undated quartos. Q 1684 is quite faithful to its copy text, F1; QU1 is very carelessly printed, often omitting words or lines and introducing a great many typographical errors (but few deliberate emendations); QU2 also is carelessly printed, yet it "improves" the text editorially, sometimes attempting to make sense out of bad readings in QU1,⁶ sometimes altering grammar or meaning;⁷ QU3 follows QU2 closely, sometimes

³ In the revised edition of the 1916 *Census* (1939), however, Miss Bartlett states without explanation, "There were four undated editions of this play issued after the first edition, 1684, and the second, 1691" (p. 41); and she organizes her presentation so that Q 1691 becomes Q2, QU1 becomes Q3, etc. It will be argued below that this is a plausible order for the quartos. Greg (see note 2), p. 552n takes no notice of Miss Bartlett's second thoughts.

⁴ Joseph Knight and Francis Saunders (see imprints above) are known to have been associated as agents for publishers only between 1684 and 1688.

⁵ I wish to express my gratitude to the Folger Shakespeare Library, where I collated the six quartos; and particularly to James G. McManaway, who weighed and debated the evidence of the collations with me—though I assume liability for the facts and the speculations offered here.

⁶ TLN 486 (i.e., the Through Line Numbering in Hinman's Norton Facsimile of F1, 1968) vnbraced] unbraced Q 1684; umbraced QU1; embraced QU2. TLN 648 And therefore thinke] Q 1684; . . . there ore . . . [the *f* uninked] QU1; . . . there o'er . . . QU2. TLN 1854 These many then] Q 1684; . . . man . . . QU1; . . . men . . . QU2.

⁷ TLN 1156 Madam, what should I do?] Q 1684-QU1; . . . what shall . . . QU2. TLN 1159 Yes, bring me word Boy if thy Lord look well,] Q 1684-QU1; . . . my Lord . . . QU2.

altering obviously incorrect punctuation and typography, but not correcting most of the other blunders of omission and commission which disfigure QU2.

It is in QU4 that a close examination of the text supersedes Miss Bartlett's tentative conclusion. Her description of QU4, quoted at length above, is essentially a correct one, but it led her to the wrong conclusion about the provenance of the edition. QU4 was not indebted to the Fourth Folio, but to Nicholas Rowe's text (which, of course, was itself based on F4). The note locating the action appears in Rowe; the division into scenes is as in Rowe; the stage directions appear verbatim in Rowe; in Act I alone QU4 and Rowe coincide against F4 and the other quartos in twenty-six substantive readings (exclusive of stage directions), some of them as evidential as *Is fev'rous* for *Is Favours* in TLN 571. The edited text which Miss Bartlett perceived to have influenced QU4 was in fact Rowe's text.⁸

That Rowe was creditor, not debtor, is apparent. His stage directions for *JC* (identical to those in QU4 in almost all cases) are of a piece with his stage directions throughout the canon; if we were to maintain that QU4 supplied Rowe's stage directions for *JC* we would have to reason that *JC* was the first play Rowe edited and that he provided the rest of the Shakespeare canon with stage directions modeled on those in QU4. Equally compelling evidence of Rowe's priority is the *Dramatis Personae*, which in QU4 is obviously a conflation of the *Dramatis Personae* of another quarto with Rowe's list. The quartos all indicate an actor for each role (from the Theatre Royal production of the early 1680s); where QU4 has added two roles from Rowe (Murellus, Lucius), there are gaps in the list of actors.⁹

We can go further and say with assurance that the relationship of QU4 is not to Rowe i (1709) but to Rowe ii (?1710) or Rowe iii

⁸ Miss Bartlett was incorrect, however, in her belief that QU4 was *printed* from an edited text. As will be shown, the copy text for QU4 was a copy of QU3 annotated from Rowe.

⁹ I.e., Cinna Mr. *Carlisle*.
Flavius Mr. *Norris*.
Murellus Mr.
Artemidorus Mr. *Percival*.

Greg notes that in QU4 "the list of personae is slightly fuller than before, but the cast is the same." He also quotes the locus of the action without recognizing it as Rowe's. (*Bibliography*, II, No. 403 (i).)

(1714).¹⁰ (This, of course, cements the case for Rowe's priority to QU₄.) In eight substantive readings, QU₄ coincides with Rowe ii-iii against Rowe i, the Folios, and the other quartos.¹¹ The choice between Rowe ii and Rowe iii must be less confident. Seven additional readings favor Rowe iii:

TLN	Rowe ii	Rowe iii, QU ₄
44	<i>Pompey</i> . . . oft?	<i>Pompey?</i> . . . oft
167	Laughter (Rowe i Laughter)	Laughter
197	Winters cold	Winter's cold
431	Caska <i>with his Sword drawn</i> ,	Caska, <i>his Sword drawn</i> ,
904	dark (Rowe i dank)	dank
1540	rendred	rendered
2108	Lucilius <i>and Titinius, and a Poet.</i>	QU ₄ Lucius, Titinius, <i>and a Poet.</i> Rowe iii Lucius <i>and Titinius and a Poet.</i>

But of these seven, TLN 44, 197, and 1540 are common-sense emendations, and 167 and 904 could have been obtained from Rowe i rather than Rowe iii. The two stage directions are more compelling. Although Rowe iii is a manifestly eclectic edition, restoring F₁ readings and possibly drawing on Rowe i as well as on Rowe ii, it seems most unlikely that Rowe iii would turn to QU₄ for two stage directions which are emendations of stage directions in earlier Rowe editions, especially since one of the two is a variant in syntax only. The probability is that QU₄ drew its "Rowe" readings from Rowe iii.¹²

It is clear then that QU₄, though it resembles the other players'

¹⁰ Jacob Tonson reprinted the Rowe text sometime between late 1709 and 1711 under the original 1709 imprint, as R. B. McKerrow demonstrates in *TLN*, 8 March 1934, p. 168. The 1714 edition of Rowe is, therefore, Rowe iii.

¹¹ TLN	Rowe i	Rowe ii-iii, QU ₄
97	curse	Course (Rowe ii Couse)
254	Walks	Walls
269	Both meet	But meet
971	Yea get	Yet get
1044	he shall say	he will say
1179	befriend himself	defend himself
2064	his friends	a friend's
2527	<i>Kills him.</i>	<i>Kills himself.</i>

In each case the reading of Rowe ii-iii, QU₄ is a "good" one—modern editors generally read *walls* in 254.

¹² In the one substantive reading (TLN 823) where QU₄ and Rowe ii coincide against Rowe i and iii, the QU₄-Rowe ii variant also appears in QU₁₋₃.

quartos of *JC* in title page and *Dramatis Personae*, is not a Restoration quarto, but dates from sometime after 1710, probably from sometime after 1714. It is possible to specify certain other facts about this extraordinary quarto before turning to more speculative consideration of the circumstances of its publication.

First, as was indicated in note eight above, the copy text for QU₄ was not Rowe but a copy of QU₃ extensively annotated from Rowe. A conservative count shows sixty substantive readings in which QU₄ agrees with the other quartos against Rowe and the Folios.¹³ Several of these are as unequivocal as TLN 42, where QU₂₋₄ read "You Blocks, you Stones, yea worse than senseless things": (" . . . you worse . . ." F₁-Rowe). Nine of them point to QU₃ as the basis of QU₄.¹⁴

Second, though QU₄ retains some errors which were passed down through earlier quartos, it is itself a carefully (one might say pedantically) edited text. Virtually every noun is capitalized, for instance, and other parts of speech are systematically reduced to lower case.¹⁵ The punctuation is rational and very often is a means to rhetorical emphasis. The text shows considerable sensitivity to metrics: Rowe's best rearrangements of lineation generally are adopted, his less adequate ones rejected; the scansion of a line is occasionally facilitated by a spelling change (TLN 1536: F₁-Rowe "rendred" QU₄, Pope+

¹³ Since the quartos derive ultimately from F₁ without influence from the other Folios, QU₄ occasionally will give a reading more acceptable to modern editorial opinion than Rowe gives. E.g., TLN 1997 I had rather be a Dogge, and bay the Moone] Qq, Pope+; . . . and bait(e) . . . F₂-Rowe. TLN 2713 How dyed my Master *Strato?*] Qq, Capell+; How dyed my *Strato*. F₂; How died my Lord, *Strato?* F₃-Johnson.

¹⁴ TLN	F ₁ -QU ₂ , Rowe	QU ₃₋₄
104	Who is it in	Who is in
119	Gamesom:(;) (approp.)	Gamesome? (inapprop.)
675	O Rome,	O <i>Roman</i> ,
969	Spirit	Spirits
1159	look	looks
1497	fell deeds	foul Deeds
1641	art (F ₁ are)	are
1916	his owne change	his own Charge (Hanmer-Steevens)
2676	to you, and you, and you	to you, and you.

¹⁵ Even when the words in question normally are nouns (see, e.g., *mutiny*, TLN 1767-1768). QU₄ is by no means fully consistent, however: though Lucius is given Lucilius's entrance and exit at TLN 2108, 2128, line 2112 is assigned to *Lucil.*; the *Exeunt* at the end of V.ii is misplaced in QU₄ as it is in QU₁₋₃.

“rendered”); one verbal emendation at least is obviously an effort at metrical completeness (the addition of *very* to TLN 1725 “Even at the very Base of *Pompey’s* Statue”).

Finally, and most interesting, is the originality of QU4. The text shows forty-five substantive emendations, almost all of them calculated, some of them of special interest, revealing as they do the predispositions of the man who inserted them.¹⁶ This man had, for example, an eye for grammar and syntax: one fourth of these emendations alter tense, mood, word order, or grammatical logic. Another group modernizes or archaizes word forms; as already pointed out, a number of emendations regularize meter. Some are harder to rationalize and may have been inadvertent (see Appendix, TLN 631, 1915, 1932, 2501). But others show an adherence to strict logic which is consonant with the pedantic attention already noticed to niceties like systematic capitalization: Brutus is made (TLN 2122) to refer to the *war* (not *wars*) against Octavius and Antony; the conspirators’ swords are *instruments* (not an *instrument*) of death (TLN 1375); Cassius has *desire* (not *desires*) to see the activities of the Lupercal (TLN 121); the musical instrument in IV.iii belongs to Brutus, not to his servant (TLN 2246). Other emendations suggest a mind less perceptive of indirection than one might wish: whoever will not hold up his head in battle is a *dastard*, not a *bastard*, though Young Cato goes on to proclaim his parentage (TLN 2604); judgment has fled to brutish *breasts*, not *beasts*, although the context makes it clear that Antony is establishing an ironic beast/man antithesis (TLN 1641); Shakespeare’s wry allusion to the English language of his play as an accent unknown in ancient Rome is lost in the redundancy of “In States unborn, and Nations yet unknown” (TLN 1328). Some emendations are more felicitous: Caesar is now superstitious, “Quite from the mean Opinion he held once | Of Fantasie . . .” (FI-Rowe “main(e) Opinion”—TLN 833); QU4 punctuates vocatively in TLN 2004, anticipating modern received opinion, though most eighteenth-century editors are wrong about the meaning of the passage.

We must call the man who prepared QU4 for publication an editor.

¹⁶ Because of the rarity of this quarto, I have listed these original readings in an appendix below. Beyond the substantive innovations, QU4 contains scores of semisubstantive emendations of punctuation.

He was, no doubt, a bit literal minded—in this a man akin to Bishop Warburton—but he was, by any standard, a serious editor: eclectic, innovative, systematic, careful.¹⁷ Though his *Julius Caesar* is not in the main tradition,¹⁸ it deserves to be known to historians of Shakespeare’s text. The editorial work was not perfunctory; yet the editor was concerned to pass the fruit of his labor off as a Restoration players’ quarto. QU4 is obviously a deliberate forgery.

ii

The career of the printer Henry Hills Jr., interesting in itself, may throw light on the undated quartos of *Julius Caesar*. As was indicated at the outset, the title page of each *JC* quarto except Q 1691 states that it was “Printed by *H. H. Jun.* for *Hen. Heringman* and *R. Bentley* . . .” “*H. H. Jun.*” was identified by Plomer as Henry Hills Jr., eldest son of the Henry Hills who was successively Under Warden, Upper Warden, and Master of the Stationers’ Company in the 1680s and co-holder of a patent as King’s Printer from 1675.¹⁹ By 1683 the younger Hills was established in London, a printer capable of good work, as Q 1684 of *JC* shows. He is credited with printing or publishing forty-six titles in the years 1683–88, working for a variety of other men.²⁰

At the time of the Revolution, Hills took up the Protestant cause; much later, in petitioning the Crown,²¹ Hills proudly informed King William that he had printed *The Prince of Orange His Third Declaration*, a four-page antipapist manifesto and call for Protestant support

¹⁷ QU4 was carefully seen through the press, as well; it contains very few typographical errors.

¹⁸ There is nothing to suggest that QU4’s anticipations of later opinion (see Appendix) are more than coincidence. Nevertheless the edition was not entirely ephemeral; the Folger Shakespeare Library owns a copy of QU4 which was marked as a promptbook, perhaps by George Garrick, ca. 1760–69.

¹⁹ Henry R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers Who were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725*. Oxford University Press (for the Bibliographical Society), 1922. S.v. Hills (Henry) jun. (The patent actually took effect in 1677.)

²⁰ See Paul G. Morrison’s *Index to the Wing Catalogue*, University of Virginia Press (for the Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia), 1955. *H. H. Jun.* was probably busier than this; Morrison does not credit him with the *JC* quartos, e.g., and Hills himself later laid claim to at least one publication which does not carry his imprint (see *infra*).

²¹ *Calendar of State Papers (Domestic)*, William III 9 June 1698, p. 294.

(dated 28 November 1688).²² Henry Hills, Sr., however, elected the Jacobite side. The elder Hills had been a Roundhead when he was printer to the Rebel Army and to the Interregnum Parliament and Council of State;²³ later he cheerfully made his Anglican profession when Charles II demanded that the Stationers' Company declare its loyalty in exchange for a new charter (1684). Shortly after, with James on the throne, the elder Hills again "made it his business to be of the rising side," this time declaring for Catholicism.²⁴ This last religious commitment was less profitable than his earlier ones—a Protestant mob sacked his printing shop in Blackfriars 11 December 1688 at the height of antipapist feeling in London, shortly before the entry of the Prince of Orange into the city.²⁵

The elder Hills died within a few weeks, leaving a will which cut his eldest son Henry off with a token legacy of twenty pounds and conferred the bulk of his estate on his second wife Elizabeth (a papist, who had been raised abroad) and his three children by her. Gilham Hills, Henry Jr.'s full brother, was named administrator of the inheritance for his stepmother, half brothers, and half sister.²⁶ As a printer in his own right, Gilham therefore in effect succeeded to his father's share of the Royal patent of 1675, which was to run to 1707 (and actually was renewed to 1740).²⁷ The stakes in Henry Hills's will were high, despite the destruction of the Blackfriars shop and its contents. Though the heirs of Henry Hills were to divide the profits

²² William never claimed authorship of this pamphlet; it is now generally attributed to Hugh Speke.

²³ Henry R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Booksellers and Printers Who were at Work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1641 to 1667*. London: Blades, East & Blades (for the Bibliographical Society), 1907. S.v. Hills (Henry).

²⁴ Cyprian Blagden, *The Stationers' Company: A History, 1403-1959*, Harvard University Press, 1960, pp. 166-69.

²⁵ "[T]he Mobile consulted to wreak their vengeance on Papists and Popery; and last night [i.e., 11 Dec.] began with pulling down and burning the New built Mass-house near the Arch, in *Lincolns-Inn Fields!* . . . Thence they went to the Mass-house at St. Jones's, near *Smithfield*, demolisht it quite: From thence to *Black-Fryers* near the *Ditch-side*, where they destroy'd Mr. *Henry Hills* Printing-House; spoil'd his Forms, Letters, & c. and burnt 2 or 300 Reams of Paper, printed and unprinted: . . ." *The English Currant*, Numb. 2. From *Wednesday* Dec. 12 to *Friday* Dec. 14, 1688. Quoted with permission from the Huntington Library copy; William Elton kindly transcribed this account for me.

²⁶ *Cal. S.P. (Dom.)*, William III, 9 June 1698, p. 294; cf. *Cal. S.P. (Dom.)*, William and Mary, 13 Aug. 1691, p. 485.

²⁷ A. F. Johnson, "The King's Printers, 1660-1742," *The Library*, III, 5th ser. (1949), 35-38.

of the King's Printing Office with other shareholders,²⁸ the legacy was a most attractive one; the *Calendars of Treasury Books* show payments to Gilham Hills *et alia* averaging more than 4,600 pounds per annum between 1693 and 1700 "for printing Acts of Parliament, Proclamations, forms of prayer, speeches and other things delivered to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London and divers public offices . . . and for stationary wares for the service of the two Houses of Parliament."²⁹

Henry Hills did not accept this state of affairs quietly. In 1691 he petitioned the Crown to set aside the will of his father, who "on the accession of the late King, perverted himself 'to the Roman religion . . . having printed thousands of popish books and sermons.'" Because his stepmother, "a notorious papist, and [her] two sons brought up that way . . . stand convicted of recusancy," they are disallowed from inheriting, and he, Henry Hills, should be awarded his patrimony. Moreover (the petition goes on) because all patents are forfeit if abused, and Henry Hills Sr. abused his patent by printing papist books, that patent was forfeit before he made the will, and could not be bequeathed—he prays the Crown to grant him a legitimate patent in place of the illegitimate one his stepmother and half brothers are unjustly enjoying.³⁰ Under the recusancy statutes Henry Hills Jr. had a good case, but the matter remained unresolved throughout the 1690s. In 1694 he petitioned again, this time concentrating on the fact that Elizabeth Hills and her sons "are outlawed for recusancy, and praying that (in regard of his sufferings) he may have the benefit of their forfeited estates."³¹ In 1698 he tried once more, deposing that

²⁸ Because shares in patents could be willed, and often were farmed out, the relationships in the King's Printing Office were complex at times. In the 1690s the patent was shared by the descendants of Thomas Newcombe and of Henry Hills, the two men named in the original patent of 1675; the heirs of John Bill also had an interest in the patent under circumstances that remain obscure. (See Johnson, *op. cit.*, for the sequence of patentees in the period.)

²⁹ See *Cal. T.B.*, x, 815-16, 2 Nov. 1694; x, 1319, 18 Feb. 1695-96; xi, 386, 2 Feb. 1696-97; xiii, 344, 24 May 1698; xv, 188-89, 31 Oct. 1699; xvi, 143, 6 Nov. 1700. Payments are recorded to Gilham Hills through 1705. (See Johnson, *op. cit.*, p. 35.)

³⁰ *Cal. S.P. (Dom.)*, William and Mary, 13 Aug. 1691, p. 485.

³¹ *Cal. S.P. (Dom.)*, William and Mary, 9 Feb. 1694, p. 23. Cf. *Cal. T.B.*, x, 526-27, 8 March 1693-94, where the Attorney General is instructed to "call before you the petitioner and Gilham Hills and likewise Edward Brewster and John Williams, the present managers of the Printing Office, and report to my Lords on the whole matter."

Gilham Hills was sending the profits of the Printing Office overseas to Elizabeth and her sons (who had served in the French army and had fought in Ireland against the Crown).³² Even this impressive argument was apparently unavailing.

The putative injustice done to Henry Hills Jr. may have been merely the result of lethargy in a bureaucratic legal system; in his third petition, Hills pointed out that the Attorney General had ruled in 1695 that the alternatives were to pardon the recusancy of Elizabeth and her sons or to confer the estate on Henry Hills Jr.—but here, three years later, neither alternative had been taken. On the other hand, Gilham and the recusant side of the family were active in the defense of their inheritance. Caveats against settling the matter without hearing first from Gilham Hills were entered in the Treasury books in response to each of the first two petitions; Elizabeth also filed a caveat to counter the second petition.³³ It would be interesting to know what defense the family made against Henry's charges. Whatever the cause, Henry Hills Jr. remained disinherited.

Shortly after his father's death, Henry Hills Jr. had a more dangerous (but more successful) encounter with the law. A warrant was issued 25 April 1689 for his arrest "on suspicion of high treason."³⁴ What the activities were that brought him to the notice of the authorities is not known. He was, however, a government agent, commissioned to seek out seditious printing presses; perhaps his arrest had something to do with an abuse of this somewhat unsavory means of support.³⁵ By late summer he was out of difficulty. On 19 August Sir John Guise wrote to Owen Wynne (neither in *DNB*): "I am satisfied of the integrity of the bearer, Henry Hills, who is recommended to you by Mr. Hughes for the re-enjoyment of his office of messenger to the press."³⁶ And on 2 September a new warrant was issued "to Henry

³² *Cal. S.P. (Dom.)*, William III, 9 June 1698, p. 294.

³³ *Cal. T.B.*, 1x, 1400, 4 Dec. 1691; x, 494, 13 Feb. 1693-94; x, 610, 7 May 1694.

³⁴ *Cal. S.P. (Dom.)*, William and Mary, 1689-90, p. 67 [i.e., 76].

³⁵ For the breadth with which "high treason" could be defined in the seventeenth century, see Thomas Manley's continuation (1684) of John Cowell's *Interpreter of Words and Terms, Used either in the Common or Statute Lawes of this Realm . . .* (1607), ed. of 1701, s.v. *Treason*. I am grateful to my fellow reader at the Folger, Eric McDermott, S.J., for helpful suggestions about the implications of Hills's various legal difficulties.

³⁶ *Cal. S.P. (Dom.)*, William and Mary 1689-90, p. 223.

Hills 'messenger, appointed to inspect printing presses for the discovery of unlicensed books, pamphlets, and newspapers.'"³⁷ More than three years later he was still serving the Crown as an informer, for he "prays the reward promised in a proclamation for discovering a printing press."³⁸

There are paradoxes enough in Hills's service to the government in the 1690s. From his standpoint, it must have seemed ironic that the Crown which would not set aside the will of his father, a printer of papist books, was simultaneously employing him—the son—as an informer against seditious printers, some of them papists. Equally fine is the irony that Henry Hills Jr., who informed on illegal printing establishments, himself became a legend in his time as a pirate printer. But Henry Hills Jr. came from an expedient lineage, as his father's religious peregrinations suggest: perhaps the ironies were lost on him.

It was for his literary piracies that Hills was best known to London in the time of Queen Anne. In the first decade of the eighteenth century he pirated thousands of short works, specializing (a further irony) in sermons.³⁹ As late as 1730, long after Hills's death, a parson who passed a borrowed sermon off as his own was said "to Harry Hills his parish."⁴⁰ The final lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695 and the progressive decline of the Stationers' Company had left an open field for pirate printers,⁴¹ some of whom, like Hills, openly acknowledged their piracies; the title pages of innumerable poems and sermons announce that they are "printed by Henry Hills for the benefit of the poor"—i.e., pirated by Hills and sold for a penny, rather than for the sixpence

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 239. Though it is clear from Sir John Guise's letter that Hills had served as messenger to the press before, I have not discovered any previous record of a warrant issued to him.

³⁸ *Cal. S.P. (Dom.)*, William and Mary, 19 May 1693, p. 144.

³⁹ Edward Solly—"Henry Hills, the Pirate Printer," *The Antiquary*, xi (1885), 151-54—gives the best account of Hills's activities after 1700.

⁴⁰ See John Taylor, *The Music Speech at the Public Commencement in Cambridge, July 6, MDCCXXX . . .* London, 1730, C 1^v: The northern vicar "Then moulds his scanty Latin, and less Greek, | And Harry Hills his Parish once a Week" ("*In quibusdam Codd.*").

⁴¹ Giles E. Dawson, "The Copyright of Shakespeare's Dramatic Works," *Studies in Honor of A. H. R. Fairchild*, ed. Charles T. Prouty (University of Missouri Press, 1946), pp. 10-35, p. 24; Harry Ransom, *The First Copyright Statute: An Essay on "An Act for the Encouragement of Learning," 1710*. University of Texas Press, 1956, pp. 89-92.

their true proprietors were charging.⁴² Edward Solly (*op. cit.*) is inclined to defend Hills as a latter-day Robin Hood, but we need not think him so altruistic; even at a penny, a book could make money for its printer if he paid nothing to its author, worked with cheap paper, and invested nothing in press corrections. And these were Hills's methods; his name became a byword for shoddy workmanship, as these lines (1712) attributed to William King attest:

Then, while Calves-leather Binding bears the sway,
And Sheep-skin to its sleeker gloss gives way;
While neat old *Elzevir* is reckoned better
Then *Pirate Hills'* brown Sheets and scurvy Letter;
While Print-Admirers careful *Aldus* chuse
Before *John Morpheu*, or the *Weekly News*:
So long shall live thy Praise in Books of Fame,
And *Tomson* yield to *Lintot's* lofty Name.⁴³

Perhaps it was the phrase "brown Sheets" which led Nichols to claim (*ad loc.*) that Parliament was striking specifically at Hills with the stipulation in the Copyright Statute (1710) that publishers were to contribute "fine paper copies" of their books to public libraries. We can regard this as an overstatement and still recognize that Henry Hills was the most audacious pirate of his time. When he died in 1713, some, at least, saw his death as the passing of an era; the *Evening Post* of 12 November carried this advertisement:

Mr. Henry Hills, printer in Black Fryars, being dead, his stock, consisting of the most eminent Sermons, Poems, Plays, &c. is now to be disposed of, at the Blue Anchor, Pater Noster Row.—N.B. There can never be any of the same, or any in the like manner, reprinted after these are gone, there being an Act of Parliament to the contrary.⁴⁴

⁴² Cf. the statement on the title page of a book of sermons printed in 1706 by D. Brown, one of Hills's rivals: "Published for the Good and Benefit of the Poor, that have not six Pence to lay out" (quoted by Solly).

⁴³ Quoted from John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century* . . . London, 1814, VIII, 165-68. King (?) is praising Bernard Lintot for his publication of the *Miscellany* (1712).

⁴⁴ Nichols, I, 72. The Act of Parliament referred to was the so-called Copyright Statute of 1710, "An Act for the Encouragement of Learning, by Vesting the Copies of Printed Books in the Authors or Purchasers of such Copies . . ."; its purpose was to stamp out the sort of piracy which Hills had made his career.

Knowledge of the career of Henry Hills Jr. and of the workmanship in QU1-3 may lead to reexamination of the provenance of the undated quartos. The alternatives to Miss Bartlett's hypothesis are, however, offered here only tentatively; since the evidence is largely circumstantial, there can be no greater certainty now than Miss Bartlett felt in 1913.

A plausible explanation of the peculiarities of QU1-3 is that they are piracies. (QU4 will be considered separately.) Herringman, who had a reputation to protect, would have been foolish to employ Henry Hills Jr. to print QU2 and QU3 if he had engaged him to do QU1 and had received so wretched a product. The hypothesis that all three were piracies got up in haste would account for the glaring difference in quality between Q 1684 and QU1-3, which in Miss Bartlett's view followed hard upon it. In one particular QU2 and QU3 look very much like fly-by-night publications—they were set in two fonts. Parts of the inside of sheet C (C 1^v-C 2) and of the outside of sheet D (D 2^v-D 3) appear in these two quartos in larger type than other pages—forty-one as opposed to forty-five lines of text to the page. (QU3 evidently followed QU2 in this aberration to preserve the exactness of the paginal reprint.)

If the piracy hypothesis is accepted we must consider the possibility that someone other than Henry Hills Jr. was the pirate. The title-page ornament in Q 1684 (fifteen fleurs-de-lys arranged in three rows of 6, 5, and 4) is reminiscent of but different from the ornament common to QU1-3 (fifteen modified fleurs-de-lys arranged in three rows of 6, 5, and 4).⁴⁵ An examination of twenty-two books printed by Henry Hills Jr. in the 1680s and twelve more from the 1690s did not turn up a coincidence with the modified fleurs-de-lys which appear in QU1-3.⁴⁶

On the other hand, there is no reason to doubt that Henry Hills Jr. was the pirate. He indulged, by his own admission, in clandestine printing as early as 1688 (see *supra*, p. 000), and in the 1690s he was

⁴⁵ The ornament on the title page of Q 1691 is a square containing an eight-pointed star; QU4 has nine conical scrolled flowers arranged in three rows of 4, 3, and 2.

⁴⁶ The fleurs-de-lys of Q 1684 did not turn up either. Very few of the title pages examined were ornamented; most of the books were sermons or political or religious pamphlets; only one play was among them (Nathaniel Lee's *Constantine the Great*).

looking about for sources of income. If the piracies are to be attributed to Hills it would seem plausible to suppose that he produced them in the 1690s, when his fortunes were in decline. He was doing some legitimate printing at the time but seemingly a good deal less than he had done in the 'eighties; between 1689 and 1700 his name appeared as printer or publisher on the title pages of only twenty-nine books (he is credited with forty-six during the shorter period 1683-88).⁴⁷ It may be that he issued the undated quartos of *JC* when legitimate business was slack.

If QU1-3 are assignable to the 'nineties, one or more of them might have been printed to compete with Q 1691, which Herringman brought out (using an unnamed printer) to capitalize on a putative⁴⁸ United Companies' production of *JC* in the season of 1690-91. Or the piracies may have been responses to either or both of the productions of 1695 (Rich's Company) and 1697-1700 ca. (Betterton's Company).⁴⁹

Choosing between these alternative datings is difficult, as an objection can be raised to each. If one or more undated quartos preceded 1695 we are faced with the difficulty that Davenant's *Macbeth* Q4, "Printed for H. Herringman and R. Bentley" in that year, carries as title-page ornament the same modified fleurs-de-lys which appear in QU1-3.⁵⁰ If one or more of Hills's piracies of Herringman's *JC* Q 1684 appeared before 1695, it would be strange if Herringman then employed Hills to print *Macbeth* (always assuming, of course, that the modified fleurs-de-lys in question did indeed belong to Hills). On the other hand; if we place QU1-3 between 1695 and 1700, we face the difficulty that the printer of these quartos was careful to preserve the

⁴⁷ See Morrison's *Index* to Wing. It is of interest that Hills is not listed at all in the years 1696 and 1698. (Hills dropped the "Jun." from his name during 1689; this led Morrison to confuse him with his father. "Henry Hills" entries in Morrison after 1688 should be credited to "Henry Hills Jr.")

⁴⁸ *The London Stage, 1660-1800* Part I: 1660-1700, ed. William Van Lennep, Southern Illinois University Press, 1965, p. 386.

⁴⁹ John W. Velz, "A Restoration Cast List for 'Julius Caesar,'" *N&Q*, xv (1968), 132-33. There were, of course, other productions to which the quartos could be related; a performance is recorded in 1687 and no fewer than sixteen for the period 1700-13. See *The London Stage, 1660-1800* Part II, Vol. I, ed. Emmett L. Avery, Southern Illinois University Press, 1960, *passim*.

⁵⁰ One row of four beneath two inverted rows of four.

appearance of the title page of Q 1684⁵¹ at a time (after the lapse of the Licensing Act) when neither the government nor the Stationers' Company was rigorously making war on piracy. Just as the objection to a 1690-95 date applies equally to a date in the 1680s, the objection to a 1695-1700 date applies equally to a 1700+ date. The temptation is to prefer a 1695-1700 date, considering that Hills did not openly declare himself a piratical friend to the poor until after the turn of the century,⁵² and supposing that he imitated Herringman's imprint as much in the expectation of better sales as out of caution.

There can be no certainty about QU1-3. But one further circumstance supports the contention that they were pirated from Herringman's *Julius Caesar* of 1684. In May 1707, Jacob Tonson laid the groundwork for Rowe's edition of Shakespeare by purchasing from the heirs of Henry Herringman "All his Copies," including his rights in the Shakespeare canon. "Mr. Shakespeiers Playes" were transferred as a lump except that *Hamlet*, *Timon of Athens*, and *Julius Caesar* were specified by name. Giles Dawson (to whose informative essay "The Copyright of Shakespeare's Dramatic Works"⁵³ I am indebted here) points out that *Hamlet* had to be specified because Herringman had obtained it separately and owned it outright, and he questions whether the *Timon* named was Shadwell's adaptation, but he finds no explanation that will cover the reference to *JC* and therefore rests the question (p. 25). The intervention of three pirated quartos of *Julius Caesar* since Herringman's last publication of the play (1691) would cloud the ownership sufficiently to necessitate clearing the matter up in the transaction of 1707. And there QU1-3 must await more definite answers than can be given here.

The questions surrounding QU4 are as full of contingencies as the questions surrounding QU1-3, and the answers must be just as tenta-

⁵¹ To the casual eye the fifteen modified fleurs-de-lys might pass for the fifteen fleurs-de-lys on the title page of Q 1684.

⁵² Many of Hills's sermon piracies are undated and cataloguers sometimes give a tentative date of publication immediately after the date the sermon was preached. However, some of Hills's sermons with title-page dates as late as 1708 and 1709 were preached in the 'eighties and 'nineties. There is some evidence that Hills printed most of his sermons in the years 1706-09; I have not found the claim "for the benefit of the poor" on any Hills title page dated in the 'nineties.

⁵³ See note 41.

tive. It will be recalled that QU₄ was influenced by Rowe ii or Rowe iii and that the evidence, though not conclusive, favors Rowe iii. Unless we reject that evidence, we must eliminate Henry Hills from the consideration, for he died a year before Tonson published Rowe iii. There is no reason to insist that Hills produced one last pirated *JC* before his death; the pedantic consistency of QU₄ has very little resemblance to the slovenliness of QU₁₋₃. The more attractive alternative is to suppose that QU₄ is the work of an amateur (?) editor who sometime after 1714 sold his annotated copy of QU₃ to a printer daring enough to print *JC* in defiance of the Copyright Statute.⁵⁴ The daring of the printer would be plausible; he could anticipate a ready sale to those who had enjoyed one or another of the frequent performances of the play.⁵⁵ Moreover, the printer disguised his illegal edition by making its title page look like the Restoration players' quartos of *JC*.⁵⁶ If he were accused of piracy he could plead that he had bought these quartos as remainders at the sale of Henry Hills's stock in November 1713.⁵⁷

The editor, whoever he was, was very much attuned to his age; the early eighteenth century was a time of serious editing. We can assume that he was inspired by Rowe's achievements, but he might have been emulating either of two other men as well. John Hughes's learned edition of Spenser was published by Tonson in 1715, and Thomas Johnson sent edited 12mos of *Julius Caesar* and several other Shakespearean plays into England from The Hague in 1711.⁵⁸ The editor of QU₄ was hardly a Bentley or a Thirlby, but his work is nonetheless of interest; if we could identify him we could add a name to the list of early editors of Shakespeare.

⁵⁴ The Statute conferred exclusive copyright for twenty-one years; Jacob Tonson was, then, the sole legal proprietor of all of Shakespeare's plays until April 1731.

⁵⁵ There were over a score of performances in London in the period 1715-20. See *The London Stage* Part II: 1700-29, passim.

⁵⁶ He even made an effort to simulate the ornament of QU₁₋₃, though his ornament does not suggest QU₁₋₃ so closely as QU₁₋₃ suggest Q 1684.

⁵⁷ As late as 1717 booksellers were still offering Hills's piracies. See Solly for a description of T. Warner's *A Collection of the Best English Poetry*, which was a collection of Hills's remainders bound together with a common title page.

⁵⁸ See H. L. Ford, *Shakespeare 1700-1740: A Collation of the Editions and Separate Plays* . . . Oxford University Press, 1935, pp. 46-56. Thomas Johnson's *JC* was based on Rowe i and is an edition in very much the sense that QU₄ is.

APPENDIX: ORIGINAL READINGS IN QU₄

TLN	Fl-Rowe, Qq	QU ₄
33	art not	art thou not
47	sate	sat (Hanmer+)
121	desires	Desire
134	give	gave
196	both have	have both
435	Are not you	Are you not (Var. '73, '78, '85)
455	a hundred	an hundred
631	warie walking	weary Walking
820	If he love	If he loves
833	maine Opinion	mean Opinion (conj. Monck Mason, 1783)
991	Priests	Priest ⁵⁹
1170	mine own	my own
1177	if it will please	if it please
1180-1	towards	toward
1209	mine's	mine is
1211	us our selfe	us our selves
1229	purposes	Purpose
1328	Accents	Nations
1343		line om. ⁶⁰
1375	Instrument	Instruments
1536	rendred	rendered
1584-5		as one line (Warburton, Capell+)
1641	Beasts	Breasts
1692	Murderers	Murtherers
1725	at the base	at the very Base
1752	Reasons	Reason
1915	greetes me	greetes you
1932	enforced	enforcing
1975	wrong'd	wrong
2004	you are not Cassius	you are not, Cassius (Hanmer, Var. '78+)
2091	the Flint	a Flint
2122	Warres	War
2161	I have heere received	I have received (Pope ii)
2210	at our backe	at our Backs
2246	thy Instrument	my Instrument
2318	you so cry out	you cry out
2437	incertaine	uncertain (Blair, Capell+)
2498	are	be
2501	ever thicke	very thick
2604	Bastard	Dastard
2613	dyest	dy'st
2615	dyest	dy'st
2636	bring us word	bring me Word
2648	Ile (I'll)	I'd
2728	ordered	order'd

⁵⁹ Because QU₄ follows QU₂ and QU₃ in omitting TLN 992, the emendation does not violate grammar.

⁶⁰ The omission was deliberate; the comma at the end of 1342 was emended to a full stop.