The Extraordinary Publication History of Addison's *Cato*: Editions, Issues, Piracies

David Francis Taylor

Abstract

The remarkable theatrical history of Joseph Addison's 1713 tragedy *Cato* is well known, but the play is also an exceptional case in book history. This essay looks in detail at its two entirely distinct "first" editions. It resolves the relationship between these two editions and considers the quite different problems they raise for the bibliographer: the one of how we distinguish between edition and issue in the in a context of frenzied publication, standing type, and incremental resetting; the other, of how a manifestly substandard and suspicious edition came to carry self-proclaimed hallmark of the play's true publisher, Jacob Tonson. The early print history of Addison's *Cato*, this essay shows, both puts pressure on the language of bibliography and also marks an important and revealing episode in a number of larger histories: those of the Tonson house, of book piracy and copyright protection, and of the bestseller. Appendices provide bibliographical descriptions of the 1713 Qα and Qβ editions, press variants of the earliest three issues of Qα, and uncorrected errors in Qβ.

Bio

David Francis Taylor is Associate Professor of English at the University of Oxford and a Tutorial Fellow at St. Hugh's College. He is author of *Theatres of Opposition: Empire, Revolution, and Richard Brinsley Sheridan*, and *The Politics of Parody: A Literary History of Caricature 1760–1830.* He is also coeditor of *The Oxford Handbook of the Georgian Theatre.* He is currently completing an edition of Joseph Addison's dramatic works for Oxford University Press.

* * *

Joseph Addison's *Cato* is largely remembered either as a tragedy that owed its immediate and sensational success in 1713 to a party-political tug of war or as George Washington's favorite play, with Washington famously sanctioning its 1778 performance by his troops at Valley Forge, Pennsylvania, in defiance of a congressional ban on performance. But *Cato* also deserves to be

remembered as an exceptional case in book history. Jacob Tonson bought the copyright to the play on April 7, 1713, the day following the play's first rehearsal, for the record sum of £107. 10s.[1] As Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume observe, such a figure was "more than double the highest price ever paid for a play in England"—and this "before the premiere," which came at Drury Lane Theatre on April 14.[2] Tonson's investment proved to be money well spent. Published in quarto on Monday, April 27, *Cato* sold at astonishing speed and in astonishing numbers. "The town is so fond of it," wrote Alexander Pope on Thursday, April 30, "that the orange wenches and fruit women in the Park offer the books at the side of the coaches, and the Prologue and Epilogue are cried about the streets by the common hawkers."[3] By July 1713, "Ten thousand" copies of *Cato* had been sold.[4] Indeed, on Wednesday, April 29, a mere two days after its publication, Tonson put out a "Third Edition" of the play, and this was rapidly followed by "Fourth" (before May 12), "Fifth" (May 22), and "Sixth" "editions" (June 1).[5] Tonson then published a "Seventh Edition" in duodecimo on June 26, and an "Eighth Edition" (a reissue of

[1]I am very grateful to Paul Davis, Robert Hume, and Ad Stijnman for advising me on various aspects of the research detailed here, and to the suggestions of the anonymous readers of this essay. In particular, I am indebted to Hazel Wilkinson (who revealed herself as one of those readers), for helping me identify Qβ's likely printer and, above all, to Jim McLaverty, without whose wisdom and encouragement I could not possibly have navigated my way through the bibliographical complexities discussed in this article.

The original dated receipt, with Addison's signature, is in the Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas at Austin, Little Alphabet Collection: Addison. The first rehearsal of the play took place on the morning of April 6, 1713. See Jonathan Swift, *Journal to Stella: Letters to Esther Johnson and Rebecca Dingley, 1710–1713*, ed. Abigail Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 524.

[2] Judith Milhous and Robert D. Hume, *The Publication of Plays in London 1660–1800: Playwrights, Publishers, and the Market* (London: The British Library, 2015), 167.

[3] Alexander Pope to John Caryll, April 30, 1713, *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, ed. George Sherburn, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 1:175.

[4] John Dennis, *Remarks Upon Cato* (1713), in *The Critical Works of John Dennis*, ed. Edward Niles Hooker, 2 vols. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1939), 2:41.

[5] Publication notices in *Guardian* 40, April 27, 1713; *Daily Courant*, April 29, 1713; *Guardian* 53, May 12, 1713; *Guardian* 62, May 22, 1713; and *Guardian* 70, June 1, 1713.

the "Seventh") at the end of August.[6] In all, that's six "editions" in quarto in just five weeks, and eight "editions" in the space of four months.

Such, at least, is the story told by title pages and newspapers advertisements. In fact, as I wish to show in this article, *Cato*'s publication history in 1713 is remarkably complex; Luis R. Gámez, the first scholar to undertake a detailed bibliographical study of the play, rightly comments that *Cato* was "a publisher's delight" but "a bibliographer's nightmare."[7] Gámez's findings are recorded in his doctoral thesis, which took the form of a critical edition of *Cato*, along with two essays that derive from that research.[8] Building on Gámez's work, this article sheds significant new light on exactly how the play was published. My investigation raises as many questions as it answers, not only about Tonson's commercial practice and the publication of playbooks in the period, but also about the language and procedures of bibliography itself.

In what follows, I consider only the publication of *Cato* in quarto, the duodecimos meriting a study of their own; that is, I consider *Cato*'s publication history over the course of just five or so weeks in the spring of 1713. The most immediate problem confronting a bibliographer when embarking on such a task is that there exist two entirely distinct "first" editions of the play: ESTC numbers T26889 and T181473. The status of T181473—which the ESTC (English Short Title Catalogue) currently flags as a likely piracy—and the relationship of the two "first" editions to one another presents the bibliographer with a significant conundrum, one that I hope to resolve here so far as is possible. For now, I shall refer to T26889—the imprint of which, as we'll see in a moment, is certainly genuine—as Qα, and to T181473, the imprint of which has been questioned, as Qβ. This article takes each of these editions in turn, in part because it is necessary to understand the story of Qα before we can properly grapple with mysteries of Qβ, and in part because they raise quite different problems: Qα, of how we distinguish between editions and issues in a context of frenzied publication and incremental resetting; Qβ, of how so substandard and suspicious an edition came to bear Tonson's self-proclaimed hallmark.

---

[6] *Guardian* 92, June 26, 1713, and 147, August 29, 1713.

[7] Luis R. Gámez, "Histrionics and Authority: Colley Cibber and Performance-Influenced Variants in the 1713 *Cato* Duodecimo," *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 91, no. 1 (1997): 14.

[8] Luis R. Gámez, "A Critical Edition of Addison's *Cato*," PhD diss. (University of Virginia, 1986); also "'And Art reflected Images to Art': Addison's Use of Numismatics in *Cato*," *Modern Philology* 85, no. 3 (1988): 256–64, and "Histrionics and Authority."

Qα: STANDING TYPE, INCREMENTAL CHANGE, AND COPYRIGHT PROTECTION

For the moment, we must put aside the matter of how Qα and Qβ relate to one another. What we can say with confidence is that it was Qα that Tonson published on April 27, 1713. Excluding Qβ, I have collated of thirty-seven copies of the various 1713 quarto "editions" of *Cato*; I did so using the Traherne Digital Collator, with findings corroborated both by physical inspection of copies for variants, type damage, and type movement, and, where possible, by optical collation of copies side-by-side and in some cases by means of a Lindstrand collator.[9] This work establishes that Qα remained in standing type for an astonishing five weeks, through to June 1, the date at which Tonson put out the "Sixth Edition." For each of the "editions" Tonson published during this period, he advertised "*a small number*" as "*printed on a Fine Paper*."[10] I have only been able to locate a single fine paper issue, the paper of which is watermarked with a London coat of arms, but it is quite possible that fine paper copies of later quarto "editions" of *Cato* may exist.[11] Qα comprises nine sheets; the willingness to store so many type-pages (seventy in all) and to remove so much type from use for such a prolonged period can only be explained by the insatiable public demand for copies of *Cato* and thus the constant (and anticipated) need for Tonson and his printer partner John Watts to make further impressions. Yet this five-week period is also one of gradual change as formes and sheets are reset. Figure 1 offers a visualization of how this phased resetting took place. As this chart shows, only the early state of the "Second Edition" is identical in setting to the "First," being of the same impression with a variant title page (the "Second" is also the only "edition" that Tonson did not advertise). In fact,

[9] The copies I have collated are listed, by issue, in appendix 1. Collation using the Traherne Digital Collator was undertaken using my own photographs of the copies—or, on rare occasions, high-resolution photographs of copies taken for me by those libraries I could not access—rather than scans downloaded from Eighteenth-Century Collections Online. Of the thirty-seven copies collated, I physically inspected twenty-five. Details about and access to the Traherne Digital Collator can be found online; Abhishek Dutta, Joon Son Chung, and Andrew Zisserman, Traherne Digital Collator (2018), http://www.robots.ox.ac.uk/~vgg/software/traherne/.

[10] Advertisement in *Guardian* 38, April 27, 1713, italics original.

[11] The watermark is no. 243 in W. A. Churchill, *Watermarks in Paper in Holland, England, France, Etc., in the XVII and XVIII Centuries and Their Interconnection* (Amsterdam: Menno Hertzberger and Co., 1935).

the existence of these copies—not only of the first issue of Qα but also of the "Second Edition" and fine paper issue with uncorrected or partially corrected states of the inner forme of A, the outer forme of E, and (in the case of the earlier state of the "Second") the inner and outer formes of B—indicates that together these issues comprise largely though *not entirely* the same impression (see appendix 2). I say not entirely because incremental resetting was already underway, with the B and C sheets reset for the fine paper issue, and B reset again for the printing of further copies of the "Second," thereby creating a later state of this particular reissue.

The problem for the bibliographer is how to categorize Tonson's various "editions." After all, no gathering of the "Sixth Edition" has the same setting as the "First." We might think of Qα of *Cato* as the bibliographical equivalent of Theseus's ship. At what point in the process of phased resetting do we have a true new edition rather than another issue? Here, we must first attempt to define our terms. The widely accepted criterion for a new edition, as stipulated by Philip Gaskell, is where we find at least fifty percent of the type reset.[12] (As we know well, many books of this period announce themselves as a new "edition" on their title page but are nothing of the sort.) The matter of what is meant by the term "issue" has received extensive treatment. For Fredson Bowers, we are dealing with an issue when a book's form is different from that initially sold and it is "put on the market as a unit," either after the initial copies (reissue) or, less commonly, in cases where the book has "an altered makeup," at the same time as the initial copies (separate issue). Crucially, for Bowers, an issue "must still be largely composed of the original sheets, or, in special cases, impressed from substantially the original type."[13] In G. Thomas Tanselle's useful revision of this definition, which seeks to distinguish issue more clearly from state, the key factor is that not of timing, as it is for Bowers, but rather of intent and the relationship between part and whole: he differentiates a variant or variants that alter the status of a copy as a whole and which are aligned with the intent of a creating "a particular publishing unit" from those that are intended to make corrections.[14] In the case of Qα of *Cato*, the later "editions" do constitute planned "publishing units"; the problem is the degrees of resetting that

[12] Philip Gaskell, *A New Introduction to Bibliography*, 2nd impression (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 1995), 313.

[13] Fredson Bowers, *Principles of Bibliographical Description*, reissue (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949; New York: Russell and Russell, 1962), 77.

[14] G. Thomas Tanselle, "The Bibliographical Concepts of 'Issue' and 'State,'" *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America* 69, no. 1 (1975): 65–66.

we see in all of them except for the "Fourth" and the early state of the "Second Edition." It is the distinction between edition and issue, not that between issue and state, that is in question here.

James Shirley's *The Triumph of Peace* (1633/4) offers an illuminating point of comparison in this regard. As Stephen Tabor has shown, the masque was kept in standing type and printed by John Norton in four impressions (over a period of up to two months), with some portions of type distributed and reset before the second, third, and fourth impressions.[15] Further, he demonstrates that the states of *Triumph*'s title page don't align neatly with these impressions. Such a case, as Tabor observes, exposes the limits of the taxonomy of edition, impression, issue, and state by which we describe and classify books of the hand-press period. None of the later impressions of *Triumph* come close to a fifty-percent reset, and Tabor's concern is primarily the distinction between state and issue. By contrast, *Cato* Qα requires us principally to wrestle with the difference between edition and issue, for in its "Fifth Edition" fifty-six percent of its type has been reset: the entirety of the C, E, G, and I sheets, and much of F, too. Should we, then, treat the "Fifth" as either Q2 or Q3, depending on what we make of Qβ? To do so would be significantly to distort what was happening on the ground, in the printing house, where varying degrees of resetting were involved in all "editions": from the minimal, as with the partial resetting of sig. A4^{v} (the Dramatis Personae) in the "Fourth," which was likely the result of type pied accidentally during handling or possibly of what Tabor terms a "raid" undertaken to address of a shortage of specific type in the workshop;[16] to the moderate, such as the fine-paper issue and the "Sixth," in which between twenty-two and thirty-three percent of type has been reset, most probably because the standing type in some of the formes had, of necessity, been distributed. The "Fifth Edition" needs to be understood within this context; to regard it as a new edition would be to suggest a sudden break—a difference of kind rather than of degree—where in fact, as figure 1 allows us to see, the story is one of continual, gradual, and uneven change over an intense handful of weeks. Put simply, *Cato* Qα reminds us that the accepted bibliographical rule of thumb for a new edition is an arbitrary guide.

To be sure, Bowers—who is judiciously broad in his own definition of an edition, speaking in terms of "substantially the same setting of type-pages"—offers precisely this caution

[15] Stephen Tabor, "James Shirley's *Triumph of Peace*: Analyzing Greg's Nightmare," *Studies in Bibliography* 60 (2018): 191.

[16] Tabor, "Shirley's *Triumph*," 123.

when he considers the matter of new impressions made from standing type: "If one endeavors to set up criteria between issue and edition based on the respective quantity of standing type versus resetting, no useful principle can be evolved which will operate with uniformity or justice."[17] In considering the edition versus issue question, Bowers does helpfully distinguish four "classes" of books according to the method of their printing: (1) "Re-imposition" in a "different format" or "different length of type-page" (separate issue, not reissue); (2) "minor" resetting of portions of a book (neither new edition nor new issue); (3) resetting that "seems largely calculated to restore type-pages pied in the handling or accidental distribution" and does not take place on a large scale (reissue); and (4) resetting of about "one-half" with an evident pattern showing that "staggered sections of standing type" have been "designed for concealment amidst the reset portions" (new edition).[18] Bowers's "extreme" case for the third class—that of re-issue—is Thomas Wentworth's *Depositions and Articles against Thomas Earle of Stafford*, a quarto of six gatherings anonymously published in 1640, which was twice reissued: first with a forme plus a further single page reset, then again with four formes reset.[19] The level of resetting in the second reissue of this example roughly equates with that in the "Sixth Edition" of *Cato* but falls well below that in the "Fifth."

Ultimately, Bowers is clear that exceptional cases can only be settled by the judgment of a bibliographer who has undertaken extensive investigation. The complexities of *Cato* Qα make it just such an exceptional case. On the basis that the language of the bibliographer must allow for the clearest and most accurate means possible of describing what actually occurred in the printing of a book, I believe that the only sensible option is to regard the "Second" through "Sixth" "editions" of *Cato* as reissues of Qα. Doing so best captures the fluid circumstances, at once of continuity (standing type) and of constant tinkering, in which quartos of *Cato* were being printed in Watts's printshop in April and May of 1713. Henceforth, then, I refer to these issues by the designations Qα^{1st}, Qα^{2nd}, Qα^{3rd}, and so on. Such designations clearly indicate that they are keyed to Tonson's "editions" and are thus preferred to something simpler (e.g. Qα^{1}). The remaining ambiguity concerns the status of fine paper copies of Qα, which do not announce themselves as such on their title page. Are we to regard these as constituting a variant state of

[17] Bowers, *Principles*, 39, 87–88.

[18] Bowers, *Principles*, 77–108, *passim*.

[19] Bowers, *Principles*, 89.

Qα[1st] or a separate issue? Bowers and Gaskell both argue that fine or large paper copies most usually fall under the category of state.[20] However, Bowers adds that in instances "where type-pages have been altered beyond normal press-correction," a designation of separate issue is appropriate even where there is no alteration to a title page to indicate a change in the book's form.[21] In the specific case of the fine paper Qα, we have two reset sheets, B and C; the setting of B in fact is entirely unique, as it was reset again for the later state of Qα[2nd]. So the fine paper Qα is typographically distinct. On these grounds, the fine paper Qα, hereafter Qα[FP], should be understood as a separate issue that was sold simultaneously with Qα[1st].

Gámez does not regard Qα[5th] as a new edition, but he does designate Qα[3rd] as such. In truth, Qα[3rd] is the most important of the reissues of Qα in textual terms, with eight lines added to the play's final act (beyond this, there are very few substantive variants across the seven issues of Qα). At this point in *Cato*, the protagonist, Cato the Younger (95–46 BCE) is mentally preparing to take his own life rather than submit to capture by Caesar, but his solitary musings on the immortality of the soul are interrupted by the unwelcome entrance of his son, Portius. Here (in bold) are the lines that first appear in Qα[3rd], along with those that surround them:

Cato. Retire, and learn obedience to a father,
Or know, young man!—
***Por*.** **Look not thus sternly on me;**
You know I'd rather die than disobey you.
***Cato*. 'Tis well! again I'm master of my self.**
Now, *Cæsar*, let thy troops beset our gates,
And barr each avenue, thy gathering fleets
O'er-spread the sea, and stop up ev'ry port;
***Cato* shall open to himself a passage,**
And mock thy hopes—
Por. O Sir, forgive your son,
Whose grief hangs heavy on him! O my father![22]

[20] Bowers, *Principles*, 105–6; Gaskell, *New Introduction*, 315–16.

[21] Bowers, *Principles*, 105; see also Tanselle, "Bibliographical Concepts," 49–51.

Gámez proposes that this change represents a correction rather than an authorial revision, with the lines mistakenly omitted from the first printing (he regards Qβ as the true Q1) due to an error in the way the manuscript was cast off. This is very possible: the new lines come at the top of $I1^{v}$ (inner forme) and follow those at the bottom of $I1^{r}$ (outer forme). Yet two circumstances suggest instead that the new passage was not in manuscript copy. First, without the additional lines, Portius's speech—"O Sir, forgive your son" (5.2.18)—both metrically completes Cato's half line —"Or know, young man!—" (5.2.11)—and also makes sense as a response to that unfinished threat. If the eight lines were accidently omitted then, with uncommon fortune, they left no breach in blank verse or meaning. Second, there is a further, substantive change in $Q\alpha^{3rd}$ just thirty or so lines later, where the word "Good" is replaced with "Just" (5.3.9). This can't be the result of a compositorial error because, as we'll see in a moment, the type for the I sheet was *not* in fact reset in order to incorporate the new lines. It is likely, therefore, that this local, almost certainly deliberate change represents an authorial revision, which in turn suggests that Addison revisited act 5 of *Cato* before $Q\alpha^{3rd}$ went to press.

Whether added by Addison for this issue or erroneously omitted from $Q\alpha^{1st}$, the new lines significantly alter the characterization of Cato in this scene. In Plutarch's *Lives*, the only detailed account of Cato's death to which Addison could turn, Cato's final hours are frenzied, violent, and far from stoical: he strikes an understandably suspicious servant for refusing to return his weapon, which friends have hidden; then, his sword hand injured in that act, he fails to wound himself mortally and so finally resorts in desperation to tearing out his entrails with his bare hands. Such a Cato as Plutarch's fitted neither Addison's conception of the character nor his model of tragedy, with its visual austerity (in *Spectator* 44 Addison denounced the English stage's predilection for "dreadful butchering" as "absurd and barbarous"[23]). In act 5 of *Cato*, Addison works hard to temper both his Plutarchan source and the violence of the scene of classical suicide, but in $Q\alpha^{1st}$ Portius's intrusion marks the one moment in the tragedy when Cato's famous stoic posture slips and he betrays anger.[24] Without the new passage, Cato's warning ("Or know, young man!—") is immediately followed by Portius's lengthy apology: it is

[22] Joseph Addison, *Cato* (1713), 5.2.10–19, in *The Miscellaneous Works of Joseph Addison*, ed. A. C. Guthkelch, 2 vols. (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914). I have amended Guthkelch's formatting to indicate half lines more clearly.

[23] Joseph Addison, *Spectator* no. 44, April 20, 1711, in *The Spectator*, ed. Donald F. Bond, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 1:187.

this apology that quells Cato and leads to an embrace of father and son. The additional lines in Qα^{3rd} give a very different shape to this interaction and instead place dramatic emphasis on Cato's self-control. The trace of Plutarch's furious Cato is quickly shut down, with Addison ironically doing so in a near verbatim quotation of Stephen Waller's 1693 translation of Plutarch's "Life of Cato": "'Tis well! again I'm master of my self" (5.2.13).[25]

The addition of these lines is noteworthy as much in bibliographical as in textual terms, for they are inserted into the Qα^{3rd} in such a way as to avoid the need to reset either the I gathering as a whole or the affected pages (I1^{v} to I3^{v} inclusive). Figure 2, generated by the Traherne Digital Collator, shows I1^{v} of Qα^{3rd} (in blue) overlaid with Qα^{2nd} (red). This juxtaposition reveals that the already set block of type was shifted down fully intact to accommodate the new lines.[26] Randall McLeod finds a similar practice on a page of Holinshead's *Chronicles* (1587), where a compositor lowered a block of several lines of type within a column of text in order to insert an additional line.[27] In that example, space for the new line was created by abbreviating the final words in the column. But the compositor of *Cato* Qα^{3rd} could not solve a "spatial problem" of this kind, as McLeod calls it, so easily; eight new lines on a page set to accommodate thirty-seven lines caused an inevitable cascade effect. An eight-line block of type was thus carried over to the following page (I2^{r}), again fully intact, in a process repeated up to and including I3^{v} (the end of act 5). The correction of a lineation error on I3^{r}, where a single line of blank verse was mistakenly set as two lines in Qα^{1st}, recouped some space, but the extra space was ultimately found only at the end of the play: I3^{v} includes a six-line block of type that appears at the bottom of I3^{r} in the three earlier issues of Qα. Once more, Qα illuminates the novel methods that a printer might employ when amending and taking further impressions of a text kept in standing type. And once more, we find ourselves pushing against standard

[24] On Addison's departures from Plutarch in act 5 of *Cato* see David Francis Taylor, "What Cato Did: Suicide, Sentimentalism, and the Drama of Emulation," *Eighteenth-Century Life* 46, no. 1 (2022): 56–78.

[25] Plutarch, "The Life of Cato the Younger," trans. Stephen Waller, in *The Fourth Volume of Plutarch's Lives. Translated from the Greek, by Several Hands* (London: Jacob Tonson, 1693), 654. Waller's translation reads: "*Now* (said he) *I am Master of my self.*"

[26] Gámez recognizes the movement of the text blocks in this way; see "Critical Edition," 290.

[27] Randall McLeod, "Chronicling Holinshead's *Chronicles*: Textual Commentary," in *The Peaceable and Prosperous Regiment of Blessed Queen Elisabeth: A Facsimile of Holinshead's Chronicles*, ed. Cyndia Susan Clegg (San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 2005), 29.

bibliographical terminology, for what we see in the I sheet of Qα[3rd] cannot accurately be described as resetting given that the manner in which the new lines have been inserted is a workaround undertaken precisely to avoid the need to reset type that has been kept standing. McLeod, who elsewhere in the same essay considers at length how compositors dealt with spatial adjustment and consistency, does not name this practice, simply considering it under the topic of proofreading and correction.[28] But the complexities of Qα require that we distinguish it from resetting. As you will see from Figure 1, I have defined it as "reimposition." Here, I adapt Bowers, who, as we saw above, uses "re-imposition" to refer to cases in which the "length of type-page" is altered or "identical type-pages are re-arranged from one format to another."[29] Extending this definition to include the movement of identical type blocks down the page or to a subsequent page as a means of incorporating new material, as happens in Qα[3rd], usefully allows us to discriminate such practice from the resetting (i.e., replacement) of type.

Qα[3rd] is bibliographically unusual for a second reason, too, for some copies have a variant half title with woodcuts of two roman coins (figs. 3a–b), a quinarius and denarius issued under Cato the Younger's authority.[30] These woodcuts thereafter appear on the half titles of all subsequent reissues of Qα (Qα[4th], Qα[5th], and Qα[6th]). As Gámez correctly identifies, the coins are copies of an engravings in Jean Foi Vaillant's *Nummi antiqui familiarum romanarum* (1703).[31] Given Addison's marked interest in numismatics—his *Dialogues upon the Usefulness of Ancient Medals* was published posthumously in 1721—it is very likely that the specific choice of the

[28] McLeod, "Chronicling Holinshead's *Chronicles*," 44–45.

[29] Bowers, *Principles*, 87, 103.

[30] In the lower of the two woodcuts impressions of what appear to be three nail heads are clearly visible. This raised the possibility that the coins might be metalcuts (of the kind seen in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries), that is, thin metal plates attached to woodblocks. On this point, I have consulted the printmaker and print historian Ad Stijnman, who has confirmed that we are dealing with woodcuts, one tell-tale sign being the interrupted black lines caused by missing wood particles. Stijnman notes that in a metalcut the nails would be positioned in the middle of the opposing short sides, while in the lower image of the coins on the half title of Qα[3rd] they are placed randomly. He suggests that the block in question may have shown evidence of internal cracking, with the nails hammered in to prevent it splitting during printing (correspondence with Ad Stijnman, November 10, 2022).

[31] Jean Foi Vaillant, *Nummi antiqui familiarum romanarum* (G. Gallet: Amsterdam, 1703), plate CXVII. See Gámez, "Critical Edition," 283, and "Addison's Use of Numismatics," 260.

coins was the playwright's own. Both Tonson and Addison were in the Dutch Republic in the early summer of 1703: the first to acquire type, engravings, and paper for his edition of Caesar's *Commentaries* (finally published in 1712); the second on the final stage of the European excursion he had begun in 1699.[32] They met in Amsterdam and corresponded at some length, and Tonson was later to attest that it was here that Addison had shown him a draft of *Cato*, which Addison had been working on for a number of years and which then wanted its final act.[33] It is possible, given their location and respective concerns, that they discussed or even looked at Vaillant's new book. Addison was certainly familiar with it, for in his *Remarks on Italy* (1705) he cites "Monsieur *Vaillant*" as an authority on Roman coins, or "medals" as Addison calls them.[34]

Why include woodcuts on the half title? Though it is not unusual to find printer's ornaments on half titles in the period, to the best of my knowledge the specific visual effect created in the case—with a single, thematically apposite image placed below the title—is without parallel. And why, we must also ask, do the woodcuts only appear from the later state of Qα^{3rd} onwards? Answers to these questions are provided by a note Tonson appended to his announcement of the publication of Qα^{4th}:

> *N.B.* There is sold a pyrated Edition of this Play, wherein are numberless gross Faults, and several lines left out. The Edition publish'd and corrected by the Author, and printed for J. Tonson, has a Head of Cato taken from an old Medal, printed in the Title Page to distinguish it from that which is Spurious and Imperfect.[35]

---

[32] *Letters of Joseph Addison*, ed. Walter Graham (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), 39–40. Addison wrote to Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz on July 10, 1703, to ask whether he might help Tonson acquire a drawing of an aurochs that could be engraved for the latter's edition of Caesar's *Commentaries* (*Letters of Addison*, 43–44).

[33] Joseph Spence, *Observations, Anecdotes, and Characters of Books and Men: Collected from Conversation*, ed. James M. Osborn, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), 1:332 (§817).

[34] Addison, *Remarks on Several Parts of Italy, &c. In the Years 1701, 1702, 1703* (1705), in *Miscellaneous Works*, 2:158.

[35] *Post Boy*, May 12–14, 1713.

This advertisement ran in the *Post Boy*. Interestingly, the *Guardian* for the same day also featured this notice, except that it accused the piracy of leaving out "several Scenes" rather than "several Lines."[36] Subsequent advertisements for Qα^{4th}, Qα^{5th}, and Qα^{6th}—that is, advertisements Tonson placed in the newspapers between May 14 and June 1—carried the same warning (referring in all cases to missing lines, not scenes).[37] The *Cato* woodcuts—the "Medals"—constitute an anti-counterfeit device, a bibliographical hallmark, if you will. Woodcuts could, of course, be copied, but the intricacy of these woodcuts, in particular the meticulous half-moon brickwork that fringes the right sides of the coin faces and gives an impression depth, seems designed specifically to make these images difficult to copy. And, as a hallmark, these woodcuts had of necessity to appear on the half title; that way, potential readers could be certain they were purchasing an authentic Tonson edition of the play at a glance and without needing to open the quarto (most copies likely being sold only stitched).

What was the "pyrated Edition" that so vexed Tonson? We know of four 1713 editions of *Cato* that were certainly not published by Tonson, all of them in octavo. Two unauthorized editions were put out in Dublin, by George Grierson (ESTC T186220) and Matthew and Richard Gunne (T26898), respectively; another was published by Thomas Johnson at the Hague (T14865); and a pirated edition was published anonymously in Edinburgh (T163852). Each of these would have found its way into the London book market, and each lack the eight lines added to Qα^{3rd}. But none of them bears a false imprint, as is implied both by Tonson's description of the "pyrated Edition" as "spurious," and also by the lengths to which he went to protect his copyright (the warnings in the newspaper advertisements, the woodcuts added to later reissues of Qα as something like a seal of authenticity). It is at this point, then, that we need to unravel the mystery of Qβ. Might this other "first" edition in fact be the piracy in question?

Qβ: A PIRACY OR THE TRUE Q1?

There are good reasons for suspecting the imprint of Qβ. It is set in a different—slightly smaller—type to Qα, and it is characterized throughout by very poor presswork, with innumerable errors, mispagination, worn, damaged, or turned type, and instances of foul case, including,

[36] *Guardian* 55, May 14, 1713.

[37] See *Guardian* 62, May 22, 1713, and *Guardian* 70, June 1, 1713.

comically, in the very final word, which in most copies reads "EINIS" rather than "FINIS."[38] The compositor, or compositors, of Qβ also had to find occasional workarounds for a lack of type ("VV" substitutes for "W" on B1^{v} and G1^{r}). However, Gámez claims that, for all its conspicuous faults, Qβ is the true first quarto of *Cato*. This Q1, Gámez argues, was scrapped, presumably because its markedly substandard quality displeased either or both of Addison and Tonson, and a new edition was set: Qα, which Gámez regards as Q2.[39] It was this edition that was published on April 27, though, Gámez suggests, "a few copies" of Qβ (for him Q1) must have been "thrown in to help meet demand," which would explain how they entered circulation. The evidence for Gámez's theory is simple but compelling: the half title of Qβ bears the woodcuts of the Roman coins (fig. 4). Close comparison of the woodcuts on this half title confirm that they are identical in detail and dimension (each block measuring twenty-five by sixty-six millimeters) to those we find on the later reissues of Qα.

There are, though, problems with this version of events. Not least, Gámez supports his contention that two distinct editions of *Cato* were printed for Tonson between his purchase of the copyright on April 7 and the play's publication on April 27 by pointing to the apparent time lag (thirteen days) between *Cato*'s premiere on April 14 and that publication date. Tonson, Gámez assumes, would have hoped to publish the tragedy as close to the premiere as possible, but this plan was frustrated by the decision to abort Q1. Yet a delay of ten days to three weeks between a play's first performance and its publication was entirely standard at this time, as Milhous and Hume note.[40] For instance, Tonson published Susanna Centlivre's comedy sequel *Marplot* (Drury Lane, December 30, 1710) and Ambrose Phillips's tragedy *The Distrest Mother* (Drury Lane, March 17, 1712) eleven days after their premieres.[41] Moreover, the presence of the woodcuts on the half title raises a question of timing. Why would they be used for Q1 but then disappear until the second state of the "Third Edition"?

In fact, of the nine copies of Qβ that I have examined or seen photographs of, two—British Library RB.23.b.1584 and a copy I purchased from a London bookseller in 2018—have a variant half title *without* these woodcuts and in different type (fig. 5). Gámez was unaware of this

[38] Bodleian Library Don e.622 is the only copy of Qβ I have found that corrects this error.

[39] Gámez, "Critical Edition," 218–21.

[40] Milhous and Hume, *Publication of Plays*, 56.

[41] See notices of publication in *Daily Courant*, January 10, 1711, and *Spectator* 338, March 28, 1712.

fact (the British Library only acquired RB.23.b.1584 in 1987).[42] This variant half title is far more in keeping with the poor presswork of Qβ as a whole; most notably, it features the same damaged display "O" that is used—also in the word "CATO"—on A2^{r} (the title page) and B1^{r} (the start of act 1) in this edition. That this distinctive display "O" must have been removed from the outer forme of A before its inner forme was set once more indicates a shortage of type in the workshop. We can safely assume that these copies of Qβ without the woodcuts constitute its original state (Qβ^{1}).

Putting aside, just briefly, the matter of how copies of Qβ could come to have a half title with the woodcuts (creating Qβ^{2}), I believe we can establish that Qα and Qβ are the work of different printers. In the duodecimo edition of *Cato* (the "Seventh") that Tonson published on June 26, 1713, one of the woodcuts—that of the quinarius—is used as a headpiece to the start of the first act of the play (B1^{r}). Analysis of the other ornaments in this edition, using the Compositor database[43], shows that they are very common to Tonson publications in this format and also feature in a good number of books "printed for" John Watts.[44] Watts had long been Tonson's printer; from 1706 they shared premises at Bow Street, and by 1713 they were partners.[45] That the duodecimo *Cato*'s ornaments appear with such regularity in Tonson publications and also in books with a Watts imprint suggest exactly what we would expect: that it was printed by Watts. And if the woodcut was in Watts's workshop in June 1713, then we'd be secure in stating that Qα is also his work—again, as we'd expect.

Further evidence that Watts printed Qα is offered by its fit with the house style of Tonson playbooks. Figure 6 juxtaposes the word "TRAGEDY" as it is printed on the title pages of six

[42] I am grateful to Elias Mazzucco of the British Library for providing this information and also for helping me secure permission to photograph Ashley 2292.

[43] Compositor, University of Birmingham, https://compositor.bham.ac.uk.

[44] Bernard Le Bovier de Fontanelle's *Letters of Gallantry* (1715; ESTC T118883) and Sophocles's *Electra* (1714; T32487), both "printed for" Watts, share several ornaments with the duodecimo edition of *Cato*. Other books "printed for" Watts that feature ornaments also used in the duodecimo *Cato* include Charles Irénée Castel, abbé de Saint-Pierre's *A Project for Settling an Everlasting Peace in Europe* (1714; T98034), *The Lives of the Holy Apostles* (1716; T115125), and William Reading's *The History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* (1716; T94821).

[45] See David F. Foxon, *Pope and the Early Eighteenth-Century Book Trade: The Lyell Lectures, Oxford 1975–1976*, rev. and ed. James McLaverty (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 15–16.

quarto playbooks, all with (or claiming) a Tonson imprint and published between 1702 and 1713. The uniformity in the type of numbers 2 through 5 is striking given that they span a full decade. The difference between the first example, printed by Thomas Warren in 1702, and the second, printed in 1703, is instructive, the type of the former being discernibly less clean or elegant. On the basis of a careful study of typographical evidence, David F. Foxon argues that Tonson began working with Watts in late 1702, while Watts was still legally apprenticed to Robert Everingham.[46] Figure 6 corroborates this assessment. Watts clearly brought an unprecedented level of quality and standardization to the printing of Tonson's playbooks, as Robert B. Hamm's examination of the Rowe Shakespeare of 1709 also bears out.[47] The odd-one-out in figure 6 is really the last example (no. 6) which is taken from the title page of Qβ. Here both the quality and close spacing of the type immediately distinguishes it not only from Qα (no. 5) but more generally from the house style of the Tonson quarto playbook after 1702. On these grounds, we can say with considerable confidence that Qβ was *not* printed by Watts.

The ESTC records Christopher Edwards's intriguing suggestion that Qβ was likely printed for the Gunnes in Dublin. Edwards has been kind enough to share with me his unpublished notes on this topic. His hypothesis derives from a notice on the title page of T26898 (the Gunnes' unauthorized octavo of *Cato*), which reads: "N.B. This Book in a fair large Print is Sold by M. Gunne, at the Bible and Crown at Essex-Street Gate, and R. Gunne in Capel-Street. 1713." Edwards speculated that Qβ is most likely the large print edition referred to here. I am not, however, persuaded by this theory. Odd though the phrasing of the notice is, given its position on the title page, I believe it is simply the imprint for "This Book"—there being no other—rather than an advertisement for a separate edition. After all, why would the Gunnes give their names on one edition and not on the other? And why would they publish *Cato* simultaneously in octavo and quarto? Doing so would make little business sense and looking at their output in the period, there is no indication that they adopted such a practice for other works. And if they *did* publish Qβ as well as T26898, we would expect to find similarities of type between the two, none of which are in evidence.

[46] Foxon, *Pope*, 13–14.

[47] Robert B. Hamm, Jr., "Rowe's *Shakespear* (1709) and the Tonson House Style," *College Literature* 31, no. 3 (2004): 179–205.

In attempting to ascertain the identity of Qβ's printer, my search focused on using Eighteenth Century Collections Online[48] to locate other appearances of two distinctive pieces of type on Qβ's title page. The first is the "G" in "TRAGEDY," with its flat bottom and unusually pronounced spur (in fig. 6, compare its appearance in no. 6 with the similarly flat-bottomed "G" in no. 1). A similar "G" appears on a number of quarto playbooks printed for Richard Wellington in the first decade of the eighteenth century, but none of these books lead us to a printer. The second piece of type is the damaged "O" of "CATO" mentioned above, with its crack at about 1 o'clock. There is certainly no sign of this "O" on the half title or title page of any folio, quarto, or octavo with a Tonson and/or Watts imprint between 1709 and 1716. But almost certainly this same "O"—with identical measurements (16 x 15.5 mm)—does appear on the title pages of two books "printed for John Baker" (fig. 7): Bernard Mandeville's *Wishes to a Godson* of 1712 (ESTC T107413), published on November 6, 1712, and William Taverner's *The Female Advocates: Or, The Frantick Stock-Jobber* (T35472), published on March 17, 1713, just six weeks before *Cato*. H. Tomás Gómez-Arostegui has shown that John Baker, of Paternoster Row, was involved in pirating a number of books.[49] Indeed, the legal action that Tonson brought against Baker in 1710, prompted by the latter's publication of the proceedings of the trial of Henry Sacheverell (of which Tonson had been appointed sole publisher) was the first lawsuit to be filed under the new Statute of Anne. But Baker was not a printer. As Michael Treadwell identifies, he was a trade publisher; that is, he specialized in providing a front for material owned by others.[50] That Baker worked in 1712–1713 with whoever printed Qβ is not enough to implicate him in its publication.

My attention thus turned to the two ornaments in Mandeville's *Wishes* (Taverner's *Female Advocates* has none), which I hoped might, by means of the Compositor database, enable me to track down its printer. My own efforts proved in vain, but, excitingly, Hazel Wilkinson—the chief architect of Compositor—was able to piece together a trail that led to the name of Dryden Leach. There are two tailpieces in *Wishes*: a basket of flowers on a pedestal, on the title page, and the upper body of a female figure whose raised arms are draped over two scrolls, on

[48] Eighteenth Century Collections Online, Gale Cengage, https://www.gale.com/primary-sources/eighteenth-century-collections-online.

[49] H. Tomás Gómez-Arostegui, "The Untold Story of the First Copyright Suit under the Statute of Anne in 1710," *Berkeley Technology Law Journal* 25, no. 3 (2010): 1247–350.

[50] Michael Treadwell, "London trade Publishers 1675–1750," *Library*, 6th ser., 4, no. 2 (1982): 99–134.

the final page. Wilkinson found the first tailpiece on the final page of *The Optics: A Poem* (1713; ESTC T197425), the imprint of which tells us that it was "Printed by Dryden Leach." She also found the second tailpiece in *The Life and Death of Jane Shore* (1714; T139792). Sold by John Roberts, this book does not name its printer, but it does include a headpiece depicting a pair of cherubs and peacocks either side of an urn of thistles and roses that also appears, as Wilkinson identified, in *The Prices of the Labour in Ship-Building Adjusted* (1717; T100185), which was "printed by D.L."—and Dryden Leach is only printer active in London at this time with these initials. Wilkinson's analysis of the ornaments in *Wishes* strongly suggests that it was printed by Leach; in turn, if the cracked display "O" on the title page of *Wishes* is the same damaged piece of type that we see on the title page of *Cato* Qβ—and I believe it is—then Leach must be responsible for Qβ.

Dryden Leach was part of a significant dynasty of printers: his father, Francis, ran his business at Eliot's Court in Little Old Bailey from the 1670s until the first decade of the eighteenth century and was described by the bookseller John Dunton as "the handsomest Printer in London";[51] Dryden's son and heir, also named Dryden, was to be praised by John Nichols as "the Father of *Fine Printing* in this Country."[52] Dryden Leach Senior began publishing in 1706 and inherited his father's business at the start of July 1707, which is when he—rather than Francis—is first given as the printer of the *Post-Man and the Historical Account*, which he continued to print for many years.[53] In 1713, he contributed three guineas to the relief fund established to aid fellow printer William Bowyer, whose home, workshop, and stock had been destroyed by fire that January.[54] In short, Leach seems to have been a semi-respectable printer; that he might have pirated *Cato* under a false imprint is, at first, surprising. Yet, he clearly ran into trouble at times, as we learn from Jonathan Swift's *Journal to Stella*. Leach was Swift's second cousin once removed, and when Swift helped his protégé William Harrison set up a continuation of the *Tatler* in January 1711, he recommended Leach as its printer. The arrangement lasted only a few weeks. Harrison first complained to Swift that Leach was "a

[51] John Dunton, *The Life and Errors of John Dunton, Citizen of London*, 2 vols. (London: J. Nichols, Son, and Bentley, 1818), 1:247.

[52] John Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, 6 vols. (London: Nichols, Son, and Bentley, 1812), 2:453.

[53] See *Post-Man and Historical Account*, June 28–July 1, 1707.

[54] Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, 1:62.

coxcomb" and then dismissed Leach as his printer.[55] As Swift reported to Esther Johnson ("Stella") on February 3:

> this morning my cousin, Dryden Leach the printer, came to me with a heavy complaint, that Harrison the new Tatler had turned him off, and taken the last *Tatler*'s printers again. He vowed revenge; I answered gravely, and so he left me, and I have ordered Patrick to deny me to him from henceforth.[56]

For Harrison and Swift, at least, Leach was a volatile figure and not a reputable printer.

Frustratingly, I have not found the distinctive cracked "O" on any books with a Dryden Leach or "D.L." imprint in the period that Leach Senior was active (ca. 1706–1726). Thanks to the Compositor database I have been able to identify, on the basis of their ornaments, many other books printed by Leach; again, there is no sign in any of these of our "O." However, I have uncovered circumstantial evidence that corroborates Wilkinson's findings. For one, Mandeville's *Wishes to a Godson* was advertised—and, so far as I can tell, only advertised—in Leach's *Post-Man and the Historical Account*.[57] Moreover, Leach had printed Mandeville's *Treatise of the Hypochondriack and Hysterick Passions* in 1711 and would reissue it in 1715 (as a "Second edition"). These circumstances add further weight to the evidence of the ornaments in securely establishing Leach as the printer of *Wishes*.

What, though, of Leach as the likely printer of *Cato* Qβ? Well, he was certainly capable of producing reasonably complex books, such as *A General Treatise of the Dominion of the Sea* (1709?; N2377), which is illustrated and includes many tables. But a survey of his output also reveals many examples of shoddy presswork. Take, for instance, Mandeville's aforementioned *Treatise of the Hypochondriack and Hysterick Passions* (1711; T176728): its title page shows broken rules and reads, in large display type, "AOPTHOCARIES" rather than "APOTHOCARIES"; on A2^{r}, the "A" of "PREFACE" is in a smaller type than the rest of the

[55] Jonathan Swift, *Journal to Stella: Letters to Esther Johnson and Rebecca Dingley 1710–1713*, ed. Abigail Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 118, 123.

[56] Swift, *Journal to Stella*, 133.

[57] *Post-Man and the Historical Account*, November 4–6, 1712: "Wishes to a Godson, with a Letter to Mr. Asgil, Writ in Colchester, and other Miscellany Poems, by P. M. [sic] pr. 6 d."

word; and on A8^{r}, there is a piece of dropped type in the word "CONTENTS".[58] Other publications that I have identified as being printed by Leach, using the Compositor database, manifest similar problems. To mention just two: on the title page of volume 2 of *The Annals and History of Tacitus* (1716; T96041), the word "ANNALS" is composed of two different sizes of type, while the title page of *An Alarm to Protestants: or, a Short Method with a Papist* (1714; T21163) includes a broken rule and, in the imprint, a glaring error in type alignment. Leach's standards as a printer are not inconsistent with the quality of Qβ.

Moreover, among the publications that Leach printed anonymously but which we can, by means of their ornaments, attribute to his workshop with some confidence, are two that show him to be perfectly willing to play hard and fast with copyright law. The first such book is the unauthorized *Miscellanies Written by Jonathan Swift* (1721; T39486), the so-called "Fourth" edition of the Swift *Miscellanies* that was put out by Edmund Curll and which includes, in some states, two pieces not by Swift.[59] The second is an edition of Samuel Garth's topographical poem *Claremont* [. . .] *with Remarks and Annotations Variorum* (T30821), which was sold by John Roberts. Though I have been unable to determine the publication date of this undated volume—which is printed using poor quality type and broken rules—it likely appeared in the months after Tonson published the authorized edition of Garth's poem (T30820) in May 1715.[60] The copious mock notes of T30821, many at Garth's expense, do not change the fact that the poem—printed in full—was neither Leach's nor Roberts's property. Such conduct is not as egregious as the pirating of *Cato* under a false imprint, but it does reveal Leach to be a printer engaged in dubious practices; just two years after the publication of *Cato*, we find him infringing the copyright of none other than Jacob Tonson.

Ultimately, and to repeat what I've already stated, the case against Leach rests on the damaged display "O" on the title page of Mandeville's *Wishes*. If this is the same piece of type that appears on the title page of *Cato* Qβ, then Leach must be the culprit. The two "O"s have the

[58] Leach put out another issue of the book the same year (T60408), now clearly naming himself as the printer as well as its seller. This reissue has a reset—and possibly cancel—title page that corrects the spelling error of the first issue.

[59] On this *Miscellany* see Pat Rogers, "The Uses of the Miscellany," in *Jonathan Swift and the Eighteenth-Century Book*, ed. Paddy Bullard and James McLaverty (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 87–100 (98).

[60] See *Daily Courant*, May 2, 1715, which advertises the poem's publication on the following day.

same measurements and appear within six months of one another; close visual comparison, as offered by figure 7, strongly suggests they are the same. Swift tells us that Leach had "acted Oronoko" and was "in love" with the singer and actress Letitia Cross.[61] Perhaps this devotee of the theater couldn't resist the opportunity to print the most sensationally successful play of the period and illegally seize a share in such lucrative literary property.

What, though, of Qβ^2, the variant half title of which carries the woodcuts, Tonson's self-proclaimed hallmark? Physical inspection of the woodcuts in Qβ^2 confirms that they are identical in measurement and detail to those that appear in later issues of Qα, especially Qα^{6th}, where the three nails in the lower of the two woodcuts have been pushed further into the woodblock (presumably by the pressure of the press) than there were in the printing of Qα^{3rd} (see note 31, above). Thus, for Qβ to be a piracy—very likely printed by Dryden Leach Senior—the half title of Qβ^2 would have to be a cancel inserted for the express purpose of passing off a "Spurious" edition as an authentic Tonson quarto. Analysis of the paper of five copies of Qβ^2, in particular a close study of Bodleian Library Don. e.622, confirms that A1 and A4 are conjugate but that A1.4 is a cancel bifolium. The difference in thickness of the paper of A1.4 and A2.3 is readily apparent when they are placed over the light sheet, while the chain lines of the two half sheets correlate neither in angle—those of A2.3 descend at approximately 1.4°, while those of A1.4 are close to straight—nor in their spacing, with those of A2.3 appearing at narrower intervals than those of A1.4 (21–23 mm compared to 23–25.5 mm).[62] Perhaps most interestingly, a flower watermark appears in the gutter of A1 of the Library of Congress copy and again in the gutter of A4 in British Library Ashley 2292; such a watermark is not visible elsewhere in these two copies, nor in any other copy of Qβ at which I have looked.[63]

Ashley 2292 belonged to infamous bibliographer and forger Thomas Wise, and the obvious explanation is that this bifolium cancel is Wise's handiwork: by replacing A1.4 in Qβ^1

[61] Swift, *Journal to Stella*, 123.

[62] My method in measuring chain lines was informed by David L. Vander Meulen, "The Identification of Paper Without Watermarks: The Example of Pope's *Dunciad*," *Studies in Bibliography* 37 (1984), 58–81. However, while Vander Meulen recommends taking measurements in the middle of the page, I took them 10 mm from the paper edge and 10 mm from the gutter to ensure an accurate recording of the angle of the chain lines as well their spacing.

[63] I am very grateful to Marianna Stell and Monica Varner of the Library of Congress for sending me photographs of the A gathering of the Library's copy of Qβ^2 (PR3304.C5 1713) while under a light sheet.

with the equivalent half sheet removed from copies of Qα^{3rd}, Qα^{4th}, Qα^{5th}, and/or Qα^{6th}, Wise could give a number of copies of the piracy the look not only of authentic, hallmarked Tonson editions but of the true Q1. That the type used for this cancel—that is, the type on A1^{r} (the half title), A4^{r} (the final six lines of the prologue), and A4^{v} (the dramatis personae)—is that used on the corresponding pages in Qα would seem to corroborate this theory: the type in Qα is slightly larger than that in Qβ, while, unlike Qβ, the prologue of Qα makes use of swash italic capitals such as "D," "P," and "T." However, closer inspection shows that the settings of A1^{r}, A4^{r}, and A4^{v} of Qβ^{2} do not precisely match, as they would have to, those of any of the issues of Qα that carry the woodcuts. Take, for instance, the half title. In each relevant issue of Qα the woodblocks occupy a slightly different position, both in relation to the rules and type above them and also in relation to one another. On A1^{r} of all copies of Qβ^{2} I have inspected, there is a space of 1.5 mm between the two woodblocks, the upper one of which is 12 mm below the second rule. Only Qα^{6th} shows the same measurements, but there the type position differs from Qβ^{2}. The second rule on A1^{r} of Qβ^{2} also has a break at 92 mm (the rule's full length being 115 mm); this feature is not found on the half title of any issue of Qα. Turning to A4^{r} of the cancel, the interlinear spacing distinguishes it from the same page in any issue of Qα, and here the cancel also shows an accidental variant that is unique to it, for the final line of the epilogue reads "Cato'*s*" rather than Qα's "Cato's". Equally, digital collation also shows that the vertical spacing of the type on A4^{v} of Qβ^{2} differs from all issues of Qα. A1.4 in Qβ^{2} is a unique half sheet set from the same type as Qα.

Here, then, to recap, is what we can securely establish. Qβ of *Cato* was not printed by John Watts (unlike Qα and the duodecimo); available evidence suggests that it was in fact printed by Dryden Leach. Yet, a second state of this edition (Qβ^{2}) has an A1.4 cancel that *was* printed by Watts. That the setting of this cancel is unique further tells us that Watts must have printed the half sheet specifically for its insertion into copies of Qβ, presumably so that this otherwise suspect quarto carried on its half title the woodcuts that Tonson advertised as a hallmark. There are only two possible explanations for this unusual, seemingly contradictory state of affairs; neither involves Wise. The first explanation is that Gámez is right and that Qβ is Q1. In this account, Tonson must initially have commissioned a printer other than Watts—seemingly Leach—to print *Cato*, only to abort this edition due to its poor quality and thence to return to his trusted partner to print another "first" edition of the play (Qα). At some point after the publication of Qα on

April 27 and, one can assume, before the publication of the duodecimo on June 26, Tonson chose to put copies of Qβ into circulation and had Watts print and insert the half sheet cancel to indicate its authenticity within the marketplace. In doing so, Tonson was able to recoup some of the very considerable expense that would have been involved in scrapping Qβ. The only evidence that might support this theory is that Qβ includes a number of substantive variants that do not appear in any other lifetime edition of *Cato*, as shown in table 1. The problem with regarding these variants as indicative of Qβ's precedence is that they need to be understood within the context of the edition's very high error count (see appendix 3), which suggests most of them are likely compositorial slipups (note that the Huntington Qβ—in which C and D sheets have been reset—resolves two of the above variants amid a host of corrections to those sheets). Even the variant most suggestive of possible authorial revision between Qβ and Qα—"bold" versus "brave" on F4^{v}—is likely an error, as Addison uses the adjective "bold" just two lines earlier and such repetition is at odds with the play's style.

There are still more pressing problems with the theory that Qβ is Q1. We might ask why the aborted edition was not simply pulped and how it was that two states, one with and one without the cancel, came to enter the marketplace. Above all, though, this explanation raises the question of why Tonson would trust the printing of *Cato* to anyone other than Watts, his business partner at Bow Street and the man who had been responsible for printing Tonson's quarto playbooks for a full decade, as we saw in figure 6. (By contrast, Tonson seems never to have worked with or contracted work to Dryden Leach.) Tonson had just paid a record, eye-watering, sum for the play's copyright. It just doesn't seem plausible that he would make such an unprecedented investment and then break with a well-established and successful business model by commissioning someone other than Watts to do the printing. After all, Watts was evidently available, for in April 1713 he *did* print an edition of *Cato* (Qα).

This leaves us with the second explanation: that Qβ is the "pyrated Edition" that Tonson's advertisements warned the public against, but that Tonson somehow confiscated copies of this edition and subsequently reissued them himself. On this account, someone (most likely Leach) pirated the play, setting this piracy to an early, uncorrected copy of Qα, as the variants of the inner forme of its B sheet match that those of the uncorrected inner forme of B in the first setting of this sheet in Qα (see appendix 2). Qβ is an attempted facsimile of Qα and has a false ("Spurious") imprint, but it is let down by the poor quality of its type (much of which is worn or

damaged), the lack of that type, and shoddy presswork in general. Tonson was certainly aware of this piracy by May 14, 1713, when the first of his advertisements warning the public against it appears in the daily press. But he must have known of it earlier, given that a later state of Qα^{3rd} is the first of the Tonson quartos to carry the woodcuts of the coins on its half title. Qα^{3rd} was published on April 29, but, with the play in standing type, it seems likely that more than one impression of this issue was taken, given that Qα^{4th} would not appear for another twelve to fifteen days (this being the longest gap between the various issues of Qα). The second state of Qα^{3rd}—with its anti-counterfeit device—might well be a later impression of this issue which entered circulation in the first or early second week of May. As we've seen, Tonson continued to warn against the piracy up to June 1; at some point after that date, he must have identified the printer of Qβ (Leach), taken action against him, and seized the remaining stock. Tonson then sold these confiscated copies of Qβ, having first arranged for the printing and insertion of the A1.4 cancel. As Tonson published the duodecimo "Seventh Edition" of *Cato* on June 26, Qβ^{2} was most likely put on sale at some point earlier the same month, perhaps to supplement diminishing stock of Qα^{6th}. The presence of the star watermark on two of copies of the A1.4 cancel I have examined supports this timing. I stated earlier that I have not found this watermark on any other copies of Qβ; nor, I should now add, have I found it on any copy of Qα. The cancel is printed on different paper than Qα, even though both were printed by Watts. This perhaps makes it more likely that the cancel was printed *after* all issues of Qα, while the fact that the half title of Qβ^{2} replicates exactly the spacing of the woodcuts on the half title of Qα^{6th} raises the possibility that it was printed quite soon after that issue, perhaps with A1^{r} having been kept standing (though the rules have been replaced in Qβ^{2}). In any event, Qβ^{2} is a reissue of Qβ, rather than a second state of it.

Though this explanation might sound far-fetched, we know that something along these lines occurred in the action that Robert Dodsley and Alexander Pope took against James Watson for his piracy of Pope's *Letters* in 1737–1738. According to the terms of settlement, Watson surrendered the entire impression to Dodsley and received £25 compensation for expenses incurred in its printing.[64] Such compensation can only mean that Dodsley must have sold, or at

[64] The documents detailing this case are collected and transcribed or summarized in Maynard Mack, *Collected in Himself: Essays Critical, Biographical, and Bibliographical on Pope and Some of his Contemporaries* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1982), 491–500. See especially Mack's summary of the final settlement at 500.

least planned to sell, Watson's pirated edition of the *Letters*. Of course, the hypothesis I have just outlined differs from the Watson-Dodsley case in some notable respects, in particular Tonson's adding of the specially printed cancel to the pirated edition and, more crucially, the lack of any archival evidence that Tonson acted against the printer of Qβ. The Watson-Dodsley case was transacted through private correspondence rather than the courts; we know very little about Dryden Leach beyond what Swift tells us, and with only one extant letter written by Tonson Senior in 1713 and just three extant letters written by either Tonson Senior or Junior between 1710 and 1714 inclusive, there is much about Tonson's business dealings during these years that we do not and cannot know.[65]

The most significant problem with the hypothesis that Qβ is a piracy of Qα that Tonson seized and resold is that it has Tonson, the most prestigious "literary" publisher of the day, selling a product that he knew (and had publicly insisted) to be substandard. But then the other explanation—that Qβ is the aborted Q1—also has Tonson knowingly putting out a poor-quality edition. In solving the mystery of Qβ, we must ultimately heed Sherlock Holmes's famous dictum: "when you have eliminated all which is impossible, then whatever remains, however improbable, must be the truth."[66] In this essay, I have established a number of certainties, or near certainties: that Qβ was printed by someone other than Watts, very likely Leach; that Watts did print Qα, so was evidently always available to print *Cato* within the customary post-premiere timeframe; that Tonson had consistently used Watts to print his quarto playbooks since 1702, long before they entered into a formal business partnership; that the presence of the woodcuts on the half title of some copies of Qβ is a result of a A1.4 cancel specially printed by Watts; and that, with various unauthorized editions of the play in circulation, there was nonetheless one in particular that vexed Tonson to the extent that he took unprecedented steps to protect his copyright, both by actively advertising against this piracy and by furnishing the half title of his edition with the woodcuts as a means of hallmarking it. To this final point we might add that Tonson's description of the piracy as "Spurious" strongly suggests that he was responding to a piracy with a false imprint, which would rule out the 1713 pirated and unauthorized editions of

[65] Stephen Bernard, "Appendix: Complete Calendar of Extant Letters," in *The Literary Correspondence of the Tonsons*, ed. Bernard (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 294.

[66] Arthur Conan-Doyle, "The Blanched Soldier," in *The Case-Book of Sherlock Holmes*, ed. W. W. Robson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 169.

Cato cataloged in the ESTC. The second explanation I outlined above is the only one that fits all of this information.

We can be reasonably confident, then, in regarding Qα as Q1. As we have seen, this Q1 was reissued five times in the five-week period up to and including June 1, while Tonson also sold at least one separate issue on fine paper ("at least" because it is possible that other fine paper issues may come to light). Qβ, meanwhile, is almost certainly Q2, and an unusual one at that. The work of an unknown printer, it must be a piracy with a false Tonson imprint that Tonson nevertheless seized and sold, with an A1.4 cancel printed by Watts for the precise purpose of giving this Q2 the same illustrated, self-authenticating half title as later issues of Q1. Unless fresh documentary evidence comes to light, we may never know the full story behind Qβ. What is beyond question, though, is that the extraordinary and often baffling print history of Addison's tragedy in the spring of 1713 marks an important and revealing episode in a number of larger histories: those of the Tonson house, of book piracy, of copyright protection, and indeed of the bestseller.

APPENDIX I: BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTIONS OF Qα AND Qβ

Qα[1st] (ESTC T26889)

Title page: CATO. | A | TRAGEDY. | As it is Acted at the | THEATRE-ROYAL in *Drury-Lane,* | BY | Her MAJESTY's Servants. | [rule 114 mm] | By Mr. *ADDISON.* | [rule 114 mm] | *Ecce Spectaculum dignum, ad quod reſpiciat, intentus operi ſuo,* | *Deus! Ecce par Deo dignum, vir fortis cum malâ fortunâ* | *compoſitus! Non video, inquam, quid habeat in terris Jupi-* | *ter pulchrius, ſi convertere animum velit, quàm ut ſpectet* | *Catonem, jam partibus non ſemel fractis, nihilominùs inter ru-* | *inas publicas erectum.* [to the right] Sen. de Divin. Prov. | [double rule 116 mm] | *LONDON:* | Printed for J. TONSON, at *Shakeſpear*'s *Head* over- | againſt *Catherine-Street* in the *Strand*. MDCCXIII.

Half title: [rule 115 mm] | CATO. | A | TRAGEDY. | [rule 115 mm]

4°: [A]^4 B–I^4 (-[A]1, [A]2) [$2 signed]; 36 leaves, pp. [8] 1–62 [2] (*n.b.* all issues of Qα collate thus)

Running titles: B1^{v}–I3^{v} *CATO.* (swash *T*; no swash *T*: D1^{v}, D2^{r}, D3^{v}, D4^{r}, D4^{v}, H1^{v}, H2^{r}, H3^{v}, H4^{r}, H4^{v})

Press figures: ** (C3^{r})

Contents: *A*1^{r}: half title; *A*1^{v}: blank; *A*2^{r}: title page; *A*2^{v}: blank; A3^{r}: [double rule 116 mm] PROLOGUE; *A*4^{v}: Dramatis Perſonæ.; B1^{r}: [double rule 116 mm] CATO. [single rule 116 mm] ACT I. SCENE I.; I4^{r}: EPILOGUE,

Copies collated: Bodleian Library Mal. 114 (6); Bodleian Library Don. e.621; Cambridge University Library S721.c.71.1; Cambridge UL Williams.523; Cambridge UL Brett-Smith.b.6; English Faculty Library, Oxford XL12.21[Cat]; National Library of Scotland Bute.2(2); National Library of Scotland 1.55(2); Huntington Library 151864 [John Philip Kemble's copy]; Huntington Library 110764; Houghton Library, Harvard *EC7.Ad257C.1713; Houghton Library Hyde *2003J-EC5.

Qα^{2nd}: "Second Edition" (T28904)

Title page: double rule] Qα^{1st}; [rule 116 mm] | The SECOND EDITION. | [rule 116 mm]

Running titles: as Qα^{1st}, except for later state (no period: C3^{v}; no swash *T*: E1^{v}, E2^{r}, E3^{v}, E4^{r}, H1^{v}, H2^{r}, H3^{v}, H4^{r}, H4^{v})

Press figures: ** (C3^{r}, early state only)

Copies collated: British Library 841.c.9.(1.); Bodleian Library Vet. A4 d.506; Houghton Library, Harvard University *EC7 Ad257C 1713aa; Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, University of Illinois X 822 AD2C1713A Copy 1; University of Illinois X 822 AD2C1713A Copy 2.

Notes: Qα^{2nd} is not advertised and must have been published either on the same day as Qα^{1st} or on the day following (April 28, 1713). The Bodleian's copy and Illinois's two copies represent a later state of Qα^{2nd}, which includes the same reset C sheet as Qα^{FP} and a new setting of the B sheet (which then remains in standing type and is used in all subsequent issues of Qα). The running titles of this later state of Qα^{2nd} are identical to those of Qα^{3rd}, for which the same skeleton forme must have been used. It must therefore have been printed after Qα^{FP}.

Qα^{FP}: the "fine paper" issue

Title page: as Qα^{1st}

Running titles: as in Qα^{1st}

Watermark: London Coat of Arms (no. 243 in Churchill, *Watermarks in Paper*)

Copies collated: British Library 11774.g.1; author's copy

Notes: Qα^{FP} has a new setting of the B sheet, one entirely unique to it (the sheet was reset again for the later state of Qα^{2nd}). Qα^{FP} lacks the press figure (**) to be found on C3^{r} of Qα^{1st}. The absence of this figure is the easiest means of distinguishing the fine paper issue from Qα^{1st} without the need to assess paper thickness or locate watermarks. Tonson advertises fine papers issues of the "Third Edition" through "Sixth Edition," but I have not located any examples of these subsequent fine paper issues.

Qα^{3rd}: "Third Edition" (T16481)

Title page: SECOND] Qα^{2nd}; THIRD

Half title: earlier state as Qα^{1st}; later state, after second rule: woodcuts of quinarius and denarius (each 25 x 66 mm)

Running titles: as in later state of Qα^{2nd}

Copies collated: British Library 11773.f.16 [copy-text]; British Library 643.i.18.(1.); Bodleian Library Mal. B 270 (1); Worcester College, Oxford LRB. 13. 16; St. John's College, Cambridge Ee.11.3(4); Houghton Library, Harvard *EC7 Ad257C 1713d.

Notes: In this issue, all of D, inner E, and part of outer F have been reset. Entire blocks of type have been moved intact either down the page or onto the following page to accommodate eight additional lines on I1^{v} without the need for resetting. This reimposition affects I1^{v} to I3^{v} inclusive. The St. John's and the Houghton copies feature a half title with the woodcuts, making this their earliest appearance. As the Bodleian and Worcester College copies lack half titles, only two of the six copies collated (those in the BL) definitely do not have the woodcuts.

Qα^{4th}: "Fourth Edition" (T25462)

Title page: THIRD] Qα[3rd]; FOURTH

Half title: as in later state of Qα[3rd]

Running titles: no period: C3[v]; no swash *T*: E1[v], E2[r], E3[v], E4[r], H4[v]

Copies collated: British Library 11775.e.1.(3.); Bodleian Library Vet. A4 d.183; National Library of Scotland 1.836(1); Huntington Library 475504.

Notes: A reimpression of Qα[3rd], except that A4[v] (Dramatis Personæ) is partially reset (introducing errors in two of the actors' names: "Powel" rather than "Powell," "Rian" rather than "Ryan"). In the I sheet, an error introduced in Qα[2nd] is now corrected: I2[r] 9 Frail ty] Frailty

Qα[5th]: "Fifth Edition" (T188410)

Title page: FOURTH] Qα[4th]; FIFTH

Pagination: page number (58) printed upside down on I1[v].

Running titles: no swash *T*: C1[r], C1[v], H4[v], I2[v], I3[v]

Copies collated: Bodleian Library Mal. 127 (8); Cambridge University Library 7720.c.194; Beinecke Library, Yale University 1974 986.

Notes: Extensive resetting has taken place for this issue. C, E, G, and I have been reset, as have the outer forme and half of the inner forme of F.

Qα[6th]: "Sixth Edition" (N29934)

Title page: FIFTH] Qα[5th]; SIXTH

Running titles: no swash *T*: C1[v], C2[r], C2[v], C3[r], C3[v], C4[r], C4[v], F1[v], F2[r], H1[r], H2[r], H2[v], H3[r], H3[v], H4[v], I1[r], I2[v], I3[v]

Copies collated: National Library of Scotland Sund.15(8); University of Chicago Library PR3304.C4 1713e; Beinecke Library, Yale University 1980 188; Beinecke Library Ik Ad25 713f.

Notes: This final issue of Qα[5th] includes a reset A sheet, now with the correct spellings of "Powell" and "Ryan," and a partially reset H sheet—the only sheets to have remained in

their original setting since April 27 (alterations to A4^{v} in Qα^{4th} aside). The inner formes of the C and F sheets are also reset. Qα^{6th} also corrects three errors introduced in Qα^{5th} in sheets not reset: D3^{v} 24 Woods] Words; E1^{r} 10 Value] Valour; I1^{v} inverted page number amended

Qβ^{1} (T181473, but not distinguished from Qβ^{2} by ESTC)

Title page: CATO. | A | TRAGEDY. | As it is Acted at the | THEATRE-ROYAL in *Drury Lane,* | BY | Her MAJESTY's Servants. | [rule 115 mm] | By Mr. *ADDISON.* | [rule 115 mm] | *Ecce Spectaculum dignum, ad quod reſpiciat, intentus operi ſuo,* | *Deus! Ecce par Deo dignum, vir fortis cum malâ fortunâ* | *compoſitus! Non video, inquam, quid habeat in terris Jupi-* | *ter pulchrius, ſi convertere animum velit, quàm ut ſpectet* | *Catonem, jam partibus non ſemel fractis, nihilominùs inter ru-* | *inas publicas erectum.* [to the right] Sen. De Divin. Prov. | [double rule 115 mm] | *LONDON*: | Printed for J. TONSON, at *Shakeſpear*'s *Head* over- | againſt *Catherine-Street* in the *Strand*. MDCCXIII

Half title: [rule 115 mm] | CATO. | A | TRAGEDY. | [rule 115 mm]

4°: [A]^{4} B–I^{4} (–[A]1, [A]2) [$2 signed]; 36 leaves, pp. [8] 1–62 [2] (47 misnumbered as 74)

Running titles: B1^{v}–I3^{v} *CATO.*

Contents: *A*1^{r}: half title; *A*1^{v}: blank; *A*2^{r}: title page; *A*2^{v}: blank; A3^{r}: [double rule 116 mm] PROLOGUE,; *A*4^{v}: Dramatis Perſonæ.; B1^{r}: [double rule 115 mm] CATO. [single rule 115 mm] ACT I. SCENE I.; I4^{r}: EPILOGUE,

Copies collated: British Library RB.23.b.1584 (BL1); author's copy. No other copies known to exist.

Qβ^{2} (T181473)

Half title: [rule 115 mm] | CATO. | A | TRAGEDY. | [rule 115 mm] [woodcut: quinarius and denarius, both 25 x 66 mm]

4°: [A]^{4} (±[A]1.4) B–I^{4} (–[A]1, [A]2) [$2 signed]; pagination as Qβ^{1}

Copies collated: British Library, Ashley 2292 (BL2); Bodleian Library Don e.622; Cambridge University Library Brett-Smith.2; Houghton Library, Harvard University Hyde *2003J-

EC6; Huntington Library 110745. The A gathering of Library of Congress PR3304.C5 1713 has also been examined.

APPENDIX II: PRESS VARIANTS IN Qα[1st], Qα[2nd], AND Qα[FP]

Attention to press variants indicates that these three issues are largely—though not entirely—a single impression, as confirmed by the fact that some copies of Qα[2nd] and Qα[FP] have uncorrected or partially corrected states of the inner forme of A, the outer forme of E, with some copies of the earlier state of Qα[2nd] also carrying uncorrected or partially corrected states of the inner and outer formes of B. Both formes of the B sheet, in particular, see a high number of stop-press corrections that were executed in several stages.

In the listing below, variants from Qα[2nd] are in italics, and variants from Qα[FP] are in bold. The following abbreviations for examined copies are used:

Bod. 1	Bodleian Library Mal. 114 (6)
Bod. 2	Bodleian Library Don. e.621
Cam. 1	Cambridge University Library S721.c.71.1
Cam. 2	Cambridge UL Williams.523
Cam. 3	Cambridge UL Brett-Smith.b.6
Eng.	English Faculty Library, Oxford XL12.21[Cat]
NLS 1	National Library of Scotland Bute.2(2)
NLS 2	National Library of Scotland 1.55(2)
Hunt. 1	Huntington Library 151864
Hunt. 2	Huntington Library 110764
Houg. 1	Houghton Library, Harvard *EC7.Ad257C.1713
Houg. 2	Houghton Library, Harvard Hyde *2003J-EC5
BL 1	British Library 841.c.9.(1.)
Bod. 3	Bodleian Library Vet. A4 d.506
Houg. 3	Houghton Library, Harvard University *EC7 Ad257C 1713aa

Ill. 1 University of Illinois X 822 AD2C1713A Copy 1

Ill. 2 University of Illinois X 822 AD2C1713A Copy 2

Auth. Author's copy

BL 2 British Library 11774.g.1

A sheet, inner forme

Uncorrected: Bod. 1, Bod. 2, Cam. 1, Cam. 2, Cam. 3, Hunt. 1, Hunt. 2, NLS 1, NLS 2, *Ill. 2*, **Auth., BL 2**

Corrected: Houg. 1, Hough. 2, *BL 1*, *Bod. 3*, *Houg. 3*, *Ill. 1*

A4^{r} 3 Stage,] ~;

B sheet, outer forme

Uncorrected: Eng., Cam. 1, NLS 1, Hunt. 1

Corrected in original setting: Bod. 1, Bod. 2, Cam. 2, Cam. 3, Houg. 1, Hunt. 2, Houg. 2, NLS 2, *BL 1*, *Houg. 3*, *Ill. 1*

B2^{v} 3: Whener'e] When-e're; B2^{v} 7: the Appearance] th' Appearance; B2^{v} 8 streight] strait; B3^{r} 20: straight] strait; B4^{v} 28: *Affrick*] *Africk*

New setting for Qα^{FP} adopts all the above corrections: **Auth., BL 2**,

New setting for later state of Qα^{2nd}: *Bod. 3*, *Ill. 2*

B2^{v} 7: th'Appearance] the Appearance; catchword That] This

B sheet, inner forme

Uncorrected: Houg. 1, NLS 2

Corrected, stage 1: Eng., NLS 1

B1^{v} 20: degen'rate] degenerate; B3^{v} 2: ape's] Ape's; B3^{v} 14: comes.] ~!; B3^{v} 29: bounds] bound's; B4^{r} 16: *Affrick*] *Africk*; B4^{r} 30: *Affrican*] *African*

Corrected, stage 2: Bod. 2, Cam. 1, Cam. 2, Hunt. 1

B1^{v} 21: courts] court's; B2^{r} 36: *Affrican*] *African*

Corrected, stage 3: Bod. 1, Cam. 3, Houg. 2, Hunt. 2, *BL 1*, *Houg. 3*, *Ill. 1*

B2^{r} 3: calmly] coldly

New setting for Qα^{FP}: **Auth., BL 2**,

B1^{v} 1: Th’ Insulting] Th’Insulting; B2^{r} 3: coldly] calmly; B2^{r} 34: The Sense] Then ~

New setting for later state of Qα^{2nd}: *Bod. 3, Ill. 2*

B1^{v} 1: Th’Insulting] Th’ Insulting; B1^{v} 21: court’s] courts; B2^{r} 3: calmly] coldly; B2^{r} 34: Then Sense] The ~

C sheet, outer forme

Reset in Qα^{FP} and later state of Qα^{2nd} introducing the following variants:

C1^{r} 2: Orflies] Or flies; C1^{r} 17: Th’ Embellishment] Th’Embellishment; C3^{r} press figure (**) absent

C sheet, inner forme

Reset in Qα^{FP} and later state of Qα^{2nd} introducing the following variants:

C2^{r} 23: cou’d] could; C2^{r} 32: itsSurface] its Surface

E sheet, outer forme

Uncorrected: Bod. 1, Houg. 1

Corrected, stage 1: Eng., Cam. 3, Hunt. 1, Hunt. 2, NLS 2, *Ill. 1*, **Auth.**

E1^{r} 34: hide ’em] ~ them

Corrected, stage 2: Cam. 1

E4^{v} 10: smother ’d] smother’ d

Corrected, stage 3: Bod. 2, Cam. 2, Houg. 2, NLS 1, *BL 1*, *Bod. 3*, *Houg. 3*, *Ill. 2*, **BL 2**

E4^{v} 10: smother’ d] smother’d

I sheet, inner forme

BL 2, *Bod. 3*, *Houg. 3*, *Ill. 2* (i.e., all copies of all copies of *Qα^{2nd}* except *Ill. 1*) have the following error:

I2^{r} 9: Frailty] Frail ty

APPENDIX 3: CLEAR ERRORS IN Qβ NOT CORRECTED IN PRESS

The below list of errors in Qβ excludes the many instances of damaged, turned, or missed type in this edition; it also excludes the list of possible substantive variants given in table 1 (which must also be errors if, as I propose, Qβ is a piracy). Act, scene, and line numbers reference the edition of *Cato* in *The Miscellaneous Works of Joseph Addison*, ed. A. C. Guthkelch, 2 vols. (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914).

Prologue

11 *our*] *out*; 12 *Ambition*] *Ambitin*; 25 *envies*] *invies*; 40 *subdu'd;*] ~*?*

1.1

14 Philosophy] Puilosophy; 40 Greatness] Grateness; 45 Distract] Distracts; 49 Puzzled] Puzzeled; 70 Plunge] Plung

1.4

19 Sons!] ~^

2.2

41 than] then

2.5

11 known] know; 58 you're] your

3.3

6 lie] lies

3.4

5 Friends,] ~.

3.5

39 glow] grow; 47 Leaders] Leapers

4.4

5 Crimes] Crime; 55 Misfortune on] Misfortnne ~; 61 Breathless] Breatless; 79 and] aud; 86 remember] rewember; 99 Sun's] Snn's

5.3

6 Orders] Order

5.4

46 'tis] 'Tis; 48 he] ^

Epilogue

11 *Fears?*] ~,; 14 *ask*] *aek*; 23 *Gaudy*] *Gandy*; 29 *appear,*] ~.; 33 *mourn*] *morn*

Captions for figures

Fig. 1 Chart showing the gradual resetting of Qα across all issues.

Fig. 2 A comparison of settings with sig. I1^{v} of *Cato* Qα^{3rd} (British Library 11773.f.16, shown in blue) overlaid with that of Qα^{2nd} (British Library 841.c.9.(1.), shown in red). Image generated by the author using the Traherne Digital Collator.

Figs. 3a–b (top) Half title page of Qα^{3rd}, second state; (bottom) detail showing the woodcuts of quinarius and denarius. Houghton Library, Harvard University *EC7 Ad257C 1713d. Photograph by the author.

Fig. 4 Half title of Houghton Library, Harvard University Hyde *2003J-EC6 (Qβ^{2}). Photograph by the author.

Fig. 5 Half title of author's copy of Qβ^{1}. Photograph by the author.

Fig. 6 Comparison of the word "TRAGEDY" in six quarto playbooks with a Tonson imprint published between 1702 and 1713. Images taken from scans retrieved through Eighteenth Century Collections Online; nos. 1, 3, 5, 6: © British Library Board.

Fig. 7 Comparison of the damaged display "O" on (A) title page of Bernard Mandeville, *Wishes to a Godson* (1712; T107413), British Library 164.k.48; (B) title page of William Taverner, *The Female Advocates* (1713; T35472), Bodleian Library Mal. 93 (6); (C) half title of *Cato* Qβ^{1}, author's copy; (D) title page of *Cato* Qβ^{1}, author's copy. All photographs by the author.