John Hayes, Printer to the University of Cambridge 1669-1705, and The Book of Common Prayer

B.J. McMULLIN

That Don McKenzie was a great bibliographical scholar is universally acknowledged. What may not be so well known is the extent of the debts owed to him by those who sought his advice in matters of research or publication or who enlisted his support in matters of appointment or promotion. Some of these debts are known; others can only be guessed at. As one who benefited over many years from his advice and support and who valued his friendship and hospitality, I offer this extended footnote to a subject on which he produced one of the monuments of bibliographical scholarship, the Cambridge University Press. In doing so I also wish to express my gratitude to the staff of Special Libraries and Archives, University of Aberdeen for their assistance and for waiving reproduction fees as a token of their esteem for Don.

John Hayes was one of the printers to the University of Cambridge from the date of his election to that office, 14 October 1669, to his death, 28 November 1705 — 'one' because according to University practice up to three printers might hold office at any particular time, as allowed by the Charter of 1534, though of the six others elected during Hayes's term none is known to have printed anything, enjoying the honour of the position — such as it was — without any responsibility. The last years of his life, from 1696 onwards, are of particular significance in the context of the progress of the Cambridge University Press, since they overlap the first half of the period covered by Don McKenzie's history, which is devoted to the years 1696-1712. Yet Hayes rates little more than passing mention in McKenzie's narrative, and only four of his productions are included in the bibliography, 'Items printed at the Press', which constitutes Appendix I — and these four only on the basis that they were printed with types acquired for the new Press.

The reason for Hayes's virtual omission from McKenzie's history is simply that from at least mid-1696 there had been moves to 'reform' the Press and that from late-1698 the reformed Press had begun to print, so that from that time until Hayes's death the University had two functioning printing houses, working independently one of the other. The older one traced its origins back to 1583,

1. Henry VIII's letters patent granted 20 July 1534 allowed the University in perpetuity to appoint three stationers, printers or booksellers with the right to print all manner of books approved by the Chancellor and three doctors. The text has been many times reprinted, most recently, in the original Latin and in English translation, in David McKitterick, A History of Cambridge University Press, vol.1, Printing and the Book Trade in Cambridge 1534-1698, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, pp.35-37. The same English translation may also conveniently be found in M.H. Black, Cambridge University Press 1584-1984, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984, pp.24-25.

when Thomas Thomas, the first active printer to be elected to the position of Printer to the University, began operation. Though appointed by the University, Thomas and his successors were independent of the University, in that other than undertaking official work for the University they were free to print for booksellers, in Cambridge or elsewhere, without reference to the University beyond securing a licence. In other words, the University had yet to assume the role of publisher, a role which — strictly speaking — it was not to assume until possibly as late as 1916, when the publishing arrangements with the Clays came to an end. The second press — known familiarly as Bentley's after one of its principal proponents, Richard Bentley, Keeper of the Royal Library and then, from 1700, Master of Trinity College — was intended to inaugurate a new regime, whereby the University, in the manner of a modern university press, would take on the role (never in fact assumed) of publisher, producing scholarly works under the guidance of a university committee or 'syndicate'. The first Printer to the University under the new creation (initially as 'Inspector', since all three positions as Printer were occupied) was the Dutchman Cornelius Crownfield, who was to remain in office until pensioned off in 1740.

The creation of the new press and the appointment of Crownfield did not bring Hayes's appointment to an end, and he continued to operate as Printer to the University. For the remaining years of Hayes's life, then, there were two establishments which could be designated 'Cambridge University Press'. Both were housed in quarters belonging to Queens' College, Hayes in the old printing house at the corner of Silver Street and Queens' Lane, Crownfield in new, but much smaller, premises further along Queens' Lane which had once been the College's stage-house; in mid-1707, after volumes in progress at Hayes's death had been completed, Crownfield moved into the old printing house.

Hayes was born in 1634, in Ashford, Kent and was apprenticed to the London printer George Miller December 1645, being freed October 1653. By 1658 he had become a master printer, but he was among those ruined by the Fire of London in 1666, when booksellers' stocks stored beneath St. Paul's were consumed by the flames. When he was elected University Printer the Press was leased to him (at £100 p.a.), so that the University had no control over what he published. His patron was George Sawbridge, Treasurer of the English Stock of the Stationers' Company, and in effect Hayes was the servant of Sawbridge

3. From 1534, the date of the Charter, until the election of Thomas the position had been occupied by booksellers. Hence it is in 1583 that University printing is traditionally deemed to have begun.
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(d.1681) and subsequently of his widow Hannah (d.1686) and then of her brother Edward Brewster. In mid-1690 the Stationers' Company actually bought the Press from Brewster as a going concern, and thereafter, in the words of David McKitterick, the modern historian of the Cambridge University Press, 'Hayes was thus an employee of the Company, in premises leased by the Company, using the Company's equipment to print, on paper supplied by the Company, what the Company chose to have printed at prices the Company set.'

Hayes's 'bread and butter' was the printing of school books and almanacs for the Stationers' Company: from 1670 to the end of the century he never printed fewer than five almanacs in any one year and in the years 1681 to 1683 printed eight – this out of a total of about 30 almanac titles appearing in the early 1680s, making him thus probably the largest printer of almanacs in the country. Undoubtedly Hayes has had a bad press, and during his incumbency the Cambridge University Press clearly fell far short of what we expect of a modern university press – McKitterick sums up the situation at the end of the century thus:

Typographically, organizationally, personally and ideologically, the press founded in 1698 was intended to replace a disjointed and ill-conceived business with a clearly identifiable vision, a logically conceived partnership between Press and University. (I, 348)

But commentators have perhaps allowed their view of his relationship with Sawbridge and the Stationers' Company to cloud their judgment of Hayes's output. It is maybe damning with faint praise to say that he was probably no worse than his predecessor as Printer to the University, John Field. On the other hand, he did produce a solid body of work: from 1670 to 1700 – according to the Wing Index – his yearly output ranged from seven items, six of them almanacs (1697) to twenty-eight, five of them almanacs (1670); and it is clear that there were other titles which he printed but which do not bear his name in the imprint, not to mention routine work done for the University, including volumes of gratulatory verses. Among classical authors that he printed (in the original, in translation or in parallel texts, and some in multiple editions) were Euripides, Cicero, Lucretius, Plutarch, Terence, Homer, Sallust, Aristotle, Ovid, Plato and so on, as well as the Poetae Minores Graeci and the New Testament in Latin. He was responsible for the printing of some standard Cambridge works, among them four editions of Samuel Newman's A Concordance to the Holy Scriptures (1672-1698) and several editions of William Robertson's Phraseologia Generalis ... A Full, Large, and General Phrase Book ... for the more Speedy, and Prosperous Progress of Students, in their Humanity Studies (1681-1695). Then there were Jean de Launoy's Epistola

5. McKitterick, I, 345. My debt to McKitterick for this outline of Hayes's career is gratefully acknowledged.

6. The number of separate editions is not clear: perhaps after all there was only one edition. There were at least two re-issues of the 1681 edition, one of them unknown to Wing: Cambridge: printed by John Hayes, printer to the University. And are to be sold by Daniel Browne, John Lawrence, Henry Bonwick and John Taylor, London, 1695 (British Library Backlog 087RB.23.a.7393; 957 890515p).
Omnès (1689), translations of Eusebius's *History of the Church* (1683, 1692), editions of Richard Crashaw's *Pseuma* (1670, 1674) and *Steps to the temple* (1670), five editions of John Bullokar's *An English Expositor* (1671-1688) and two editions of Francis Gouldman's *Copious Dictionary* (1674, 1678), along with the workaday school books, sermons and so on. Regardless of the extent of the list of works printed by Hayes, it is obvious that he must seldom, if ever, have taken the initiative in the production of these works: he was their printer, not their publisher, relying on what printing the booksellers of London were willing to give him and on individuals who were prepared to pay for their writings to be printed (for example, Joshua Barnes for his *History of Edward III* (1688)). Even the 'Cambridge Phrases' of Robertson, who taught Hebrew at Cambridge, would seem to have come to Hayes via Sawbridge, for Robertson was a 'Sawbridge author', having had a number of works published by him in London in the 1650s. And of course no list can account for what might have been printed in Cambridge had Hayes's circumstances and the University's interests been different.

One line of business which Hayes was free to pursue independently of Sawbridge and the Stationers' Company was the printing of the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer, which were the preserve of the privileged printers: the King's Printer and the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. After the Restoration of the monarchy in 1660 the King's Printer resumed the printing of both and presumably, to judge from the frequency of editions, kept them in print without interruption in a variety of formats. Oxford did not exploit its privilege until 1675; by contrast, Cambridge had begun to exercise its privilege in 1629, when median folio editions of the Bible, the Book of Common Prayer and the metrical psalms (in the version of Sternhold and Hopkins) appeared. There had been an interruption at Cambridge during the inter-regnum, but printing of the Bible resumed there in an edition of 1657 of which a Sternhold and Hopkins was bibliographically an integral part — the Book of Common Prayer had to await the Restoration. One of Hayes's finest productions is the folio bible of 1674, which has perhaps been overshadowed by the series of Oxford folios beginning in 1680; nonetheless it continued the tradition established by the folios of 1629 and 1638, and the Cambridge folio bibles remained the 'standard' until the Oxford and Cam-


bridge editions of the 1760s, which set new standards of textual fidelity, principally to the wording of the first edition of the Authorised Version, 1611/13. Apart from the 1674 folio, up to 1683 all of Hayes’s bibles, prayer books and psalms were quartos, probably the least popular of formats; in restricting himself to this format he was following the practice instituted in 1629, whereby in order to avoid the threat of undercutting by the King’s Printers Cambridge agreed to limit production to quartos and median folios, thus depriving itself in particular of the market for personal bibles in octavo and duodecimo. But Hayes ceased to print the Bible after the edition of 1683, faced with competition not only from the other two privileged printers but also from Dutch pirates. Of Sternhold and Hopkins I know of only one subsequent edition, a quarto of 1696; but Hayes also printed an edition in twentypart{?} of the new version of the Tate and Brady psalms, in 1698. Curiously the title leaf to the 1698 is a cancel in all three copies seen, though there is no extant edition of which this could be a re-issue.

However, of greatest bibliographical interest among the post-1683 output are editions of the Book of Common Prayer, of which there are three, published in 1694 (octavo), 1696 (quarto) and 1701 (octavo). None of the editions of the Book of Common Prayer produced by Hayes could be considered commonplace, but the 1694 is known to me only in the copy in the University of Aberdeen (SB 2643 6) – see Plate 1; there may be identifiable reasons for its rarity, although its existence in an apparently unique copy may also suggest that other editions have disappeared entirely or that copies of them await discovery.

The two octavos are of especial interest. The major problem for printers of the Book of Common Prayer – and presumably the reason that it was not subject to piracy – is that the text is volatile: it has to be updated whenever, for example, a prince is born, the heir to the throne marries or, as here, the monarch dies. For it was Hayes’s misfortune to have published editions of the Book of Common Prayer less than a year before the death of Queen Mary II (28 December 1694) and of her husband, William III (8 March 1702).

Though no such copy has been seen, the 1694 presumably was issued initially in a ‘pure’ form, in which all references to the monarchy are to both William and Mary, collating A-Y8 Z4. The Aberdeen copy, however, must have been issued after the death of Queen Mary, who has been removed entirely, so

9. McKenzie (no.2) ascribes the 1699 edition to Crownfield, who claimed only for setting and working off the last of the five gatherings; apparently ‘No record survives of the printing of the earlier part of this book’ There was a further edition in 1702, not included in McKenzie, and it is at least possible that, apart from the one gathering claimed by Crownfield, all three are the work of Hayes.

10. Wing records the 1673 and the 1683 in twelve locations, but the intervening editions in only five to seven. The number of copies may well be larger, since Cambridge University Library often holds more than one copy of a particular edition.


12. It is possible, of course, that the volume, though printed in a ‘pure’ form, had not been actually published before the need for cancellation arose.
that the text now recognizes only William.\footnote{13} As is commonly the case with updated prayer books, there are different 'levels' of emendation. On the one hand, in the services for occasional use or for use on anniversaries the necessary changes are often made by pen – thus here in the 'Forms of prayer to be used at sea' the words 'and Lady' and 'and Queen Mary' are crossed out and 'their' replaced by 'his'. On the other, in the services for daily use ('The Order for morning prayer', 'The Order for evening prayer' and 'The Litany') the leaves bearing reference to the monarchy were often enough cancelled. Printing cancellantia (which might take the form of slips as well as of leaves) was characteristic of all three privileged printers, and in itself occasions no particular surprise. Probably the majority of cancellantia were not signed if the cancellanda had not been signed; where the cancellanda had been signed the cancellantia might vary, as in any publication – unsigned (usually with no siglum to indicate cancellation), signed in the same manner as the cancellanda, or with the same signature but modified in some way. In Aberdeen 1694 the relevant leaves in the daily services have indeed been cancelled, so that the text now refers to William alone and the volume collates A$^8$ B$^8$(±B$^8$) C$^8$(±C$^3$, C$^5$, C$^7$) D$^4$ Y$^8$ Z$^4$. Cancellans C(C$^3$) is signed 'C3', as presumably the cancellandum had been (the volume is signed §1-4 in the gatherings in eights), but the other three cancellantia are signed anomalously. The three all fall in the second half of a gathering – i.e. they are leaves which in the original would not have been signed. B(B$^8$) is signed 'b15', C(C$^5$) is signed 'c5', and C(C$^7$) is signed 'c13'. The first and last are examples of 'signing by the page', whereby the recto of the cancellans is signed according to the page which it occupies within the gathering rather than the leaf;\footnote{14} the second appears to be doubly anomalous in having the lower-case 'c' but then being numbered according to the leaf, as if there had been a confusion in execution.

There is the additional novelty in the 1694 of press figures, which had not appeared in any of the volumes up to 1683: in all gatherings except A there is '•' or '†' once per gathering, always in the outer forme ($2^v$, 4$^v$ or 8$^v$), perhaps implying that the outer was the white-paper forme. (In Z the figure is on Z2$^v$.) In this context it might be noted that '†' appears also in the 1670 bible, on $1^v$ in gatherings BDFHIKLOMO. At first sight these incidences, in the lower margin, are press figures, and since they do not extend beyond the first fourteen gatherings they may imply that those gatherings are somehow to be distinguished from the remainder in the circumstances of their production. But their appearance on $1^v$ and the fact that there is only one siglum also could be taken to imply that

\footnote{13}{Despite my earlier guesses, I now conclude that the updated prayer books were produced in this revised form by the printing houses rather than the replacement leaves and slips being supplied to individual owners of bound copies for them to insert, since whenever cancellantia are found in prayer books they invariably appear to have been inserted before the volume was subjected to the binder's plough.}

\footnote{14}{See B.J. McMullin, 'Signing by the Page', \textit{Studies in Bibliography} 48, 1995, 259-68. For evidence of the page being the working unit of composition see, for example, McKenzie, I, 113; it is not difficult to see that in setting cancellantia for a work that was never paginated \textit{signing} by the page could well have been resorted to.}
they are paper-quality marks; however, both the superfine- and the ordinary-paper issues have the same siglum in the same gatherings, so that it does not serve to distinguish the one from the other. The bible of 1670, a quarto which collates A\textsuperscript{2} B-3O\textsuperscript{8} 3P\textsuperscript{4}; (Apocrypha) a-o\textsuperscript{8} p\textsuperscript{4}; (NT) A-S\textsuperscript{8} T\textsuperscript{4}, also has the '†' siglum, on $1^{f}$ of 92 of its 184½ sheets. Here the sigla are scattered throughout the volume, but once again they do not serve to distinguish the superfine- from the ordinary-paper issue. What these sigla represent remains to be established, but if the 1670 instances can be shown to be paper-quality marks then Cambridge anticipated Oxford by over a decade. While discussing bibliographical curiosa it might also be noted that Hayes at times used vertical titles (or labels), as, for example, in the two-volume Livy of 1679, printed for John Creed and Henry Dickinson (Wing L2612); another, for the second edition of Newman's \textit{Concordance}, is illustrated in McKitterick, I, 350, though this title is a woodblock which had earlier been used by John Field. This digression, I hope, has been warranted insofar as it serves to suggest that Hayes was not isolated from developments within the trade which were designed to improve production and storage practices.

To return to the Book of Common Prayer: the 1701 is of even greater interest bibliographically than the 1694. In its 'pure' form it collates A-Y\textsuperscript{8}, with all references to the monarch being to William. However, the University of Aberdeen copy (WN.14.20) parallels Aberdeen 1694 in containing a number of cancellantia, but this time with further instances, including the state service celebrating the Restoration, 29 May. Aberdeen 1701 is in a very poor state of preservation, being defective at the foot of some leaves (particularly in B) and lacking C3, C5 and K1, where stubs point to cancellantia having fallen out; it probably collates A\textsuperscript{8} B\textsuperscript{8}(±B8) C\textsuperscript{8}(±C3, C5, C7) D-1\textsuperscript{8} K\textsuperscript{8}(±K1) L-U\textsuperscript{8} X\textsuperscript{8}(±X3) Y\textsuperscript{8}(±Y2, Y3). In some instances 'William' is simply crossed out, but in eight instances cancellantia have been inserted, bringing the volume into the reign of Queen Anne.

So far so good: a printer might sign cancellantia by the leaf or by the page, though not, one would have thought, by both. But such is in fact the practice employed in Aberdeen 1701. Here B(B8) is signed 'B p. 15, 16.' and C(C7) is signed 'C p. 13, 14.'; the novelty here is that the cancellantia are signed not by the page of the recto alone but by the page of the recto and the verso. The other three cancellantia replace leaves which in the original are signed, but here there is the added novelty that the cancellantia are signed, redundantly for the purposes of the binder, according to two systems: that just illustrated and the orthodox system of signing by the leaf. Thus X(X3), in the Ordinal, is signed 'X p. 5, 6.' at

16. The sheets are quired, two sheets forming one gathering, as is normal in quarto bibles produced in Britain in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Apart from the half-sheet A, where the siglum is on A\textsuperscript{2}, there are only four exceptions, when the siglum appears on another page of the outer forme.
17. The cancellantia have been further modified by hand to take the volume into the reign of George I (succeeded 1 August 1714).
well as 'X3'; Y(Y2) is signed 'Y p. 3, 4.' as well as 'Y2' (see Illustration 2); and Y(Y3) is signed 'Y p. 5, 6.' as well as 'Y3'. This is the only volume known to me with cancellantia signed in this manner; why they should be so signed must remain an unanswered question. The double system would certainly meet the needs of a person familiar with either of the systems, but if that is the intent it seems odd that the practice was not employed elsewhere, being on the evidence of the Bible presses at Oxford and Cambridge prior to 1801, as well as of casual observation in the handling of other publications of the hand-press period, confined to John Hayes at the Cambridge University Press at the turn of the seventeenth century.

McKitterick's chapter title, 'John Hayes and the limits of independence' (I, 342-62, ch.18), reflects a fair judgment of John Hayes as an entrepreneurial publisher, being in the pocket of the Sawbridges and the Stationers' Company; nevertheless, that judgment should not obscure the fact that as a printer his work is not without interest to the modern bibliographer, as his treatment of cancellation in the Book of Common Prayer testifies.
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And he shall bless thee: even he shall bless the house of Israel, he shall bless the house of Aaron.

Ps. 115:12.

He shall bless them that fear the Lord: both small and great. Ver. 13.

The second, the Epistle of S. Jude.

Jubilato Deo.

The Sufferings were after the flesh shall stand thus.

Priest. O Lord, shew thy mercy upon us.

Answ. And grant us thy salvation.

Priest. O Lord, save the Church.

Answ. Who puttest her trust in thee.

Priest. Send her help from thy holy place.

Answ. And evermore mightily defend her.

Priest. Let her enemies have no advantage against her.

Answ. Let not the wicked approach to hurt her.

Ps. 84:1. Endue thy Ministers with righteousness.

Answ. And make thy chosen people joyful.

Priest. Give Peace in our time, O Lord.

Answ. Because there is none other that fighteth for us, but only thou, O God.

Ps. 84:5. Be unto us, O Lord, a strong Tower.

Answ. From the face of our enemies.

Priest. O Lord, hear our prayer.

Answ. And let our cry come unto thee.

O Almighty God, who art a strong tower of defence.

Yr. 2. Amen.

Photograph contributed by the University of Aberdeen.