THE HISTORICAL AND ANTIQUARIAN INTERESTS OF THOMAS TANNER

ABSTRACT

BODLEIAN LIBRARY OXFORD
DEPOSITED
THESIS
13 viij 62

THE HISTORICAL AND ANTIQUARIAN INTERESTS OF THOMAS TANNER.

Abstract

The Tanner collection of printed books and manuscripts today forms one of the most important bequests ever to have been received by the Bodleian Library, Oxford, and the present study is an attempt to throw some light on the formation and history of this collection, and to enable students to come to a better understanding of its contents through an account of the historical and antiquarian interests of Thomas Tanner.

From comparatively humble beginnings Tanner won his way to the episcopal bench, but he was an undistinguished cleric and he owed his ultimate success in the Church to a lifelong devotion to his duties and to his wide reputation as a scholar. Born at Market Lavington in 1674, he matriculated at Queen's College, Oxford, at a time when that foundation was the hub of antiquarian activity within the University and his natural abilities in this direction were soon developed to the full. His worth was quickly recognised and he was welcomed into a wide circle of scholars who were amongst the foremost antiquarians of the day. Arthur Charlett, the Master of University College, took an especial interest in the young student and under his guidance Tanner undertook a number of literary projects which enjoyed varying degrees of success; it was partly through Charlett's influence that he

later became first Chaplain and then Fellow of All Souls College. By now his lifetime's work as an antiquary had taken shape. As an undergraduate he had started work on a county history of Wiltshire but had laid this aside in order to bring to completion a small handbook on religious houses entitled Notitia Monastica. This was an immediate success, but instead of returning to his study of Wiltshire Tanner now found himself at work on a project which was to develop into his Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica. He was to labour at this and at a revision of the Notitia for the remainder of his life.

Before the turn of the century Tanner had established himself as a young scholar of promise and his name was widely known. His reputation was built on firm foundations for he had passed many hours in the libraries of Oxford. He had prepared catalogues of collections in the Bodleian Library and the Ashmolean Museum for the mighty Catalogi Librorum Manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae and his work on the Bibliotheca had led him to examine several of the college libraries in some detail. During the summer months he enlarged the field of his researches by travelling to London to work in the libraries of the metropolis and it was on one of these visits that he met John Moore, Bishop of Norwich. Moore had collected one of the finest private libraries in the land and he was immediately impressed by Tanner's love

of books and wide knowledge of them, so much so that he very soon made Tanner his private chaplain. The appointment was purely a nominal one and Tanner's duties were confined to the management of Moore's library during those months when the preparation of the Bibliotheca took him to London.

It was not until 1701 that his association with Moore brought about the first major change in Tanner's adult life. In that year he was made Chancellor of Norwich and he also married Moore's eldest daughter. His new appointment obliged him to leave Oxford and set up house in Norwich and his academic undertakings were temporarily laid on one side as he devoted himself to the study of canon law. Even when he had mastered his new duties he was still unable to devote as much time as he would have liked to his studies, for his Chancellorship involved him in a law suit, and his only daughter died at an early age and was soon followed by his wife. In 1712 he married once again and in the following year Moore, now Bishop of Ely, collated him to a prebendal stall in that cathedral; but when Moore died in 1714 Tanner was left without any influential patron, and for several years he received no further preferment. He does not seem to have worried unduly over this and he settled down to a quiet life revolving around his ecclesiastical duties and his beloved studies. After almost perpetual childbearing Tanner's second wife died in 1718 having not

long before given birth to the only one of his children to survive. It was probably the need to provide for his son that made him at last make an effort to improve his position and, after once more gaining a welcome footing in Oxford as a Canon of Christ Church, he eventually obtained the Bishopric of St. Asaph in 1732. As a bishop Tanner made little impact on ecclesiastical or political affairs and his episcopate was scarcely more than the conscientious discharge of his duties as far as his ill-health would allow; however, his frequent indispositions did not prevent him from marrying for a third time. His tenure of the see was very short and he died at Oxford in 1735.

The bare recital of the facts of Tanner's life is unimpressive. A slow progression through minor preferments to a bishopric is indicative of a devoted rather than an outstanding clergyman and the publication at the age of twenty-one of an octavo volume is in itself hardly sufficient to entitle Tanner to be remembered as a scholar. Much of his reputation today can obviously be attributed to the fact that both the Notitia and the Bibliotheca were published posthumously, but in fact he enjoyed a very similar reputation whilst he was still alive. His antiquarian knowledge was very wide and his researches were thorough; moreover, as a result of several discriminating purchases he had formed a fine collection of books and manuscripts and it is not sur-

prising that his many academic friends turned to him with their problems. He was always ready with advice and assistance and the help that he dispensed so widely is often acknowledged in the learned works of the day. His unseen hand must surely remain untraced in many other publications and his academic ability is fully reflected by the calibre of the people with whom he became genuinely friendly.

Tanner's antiquarian interests fall into two distinct groups: his projected works and his collections. During the course of his life he embarked upon several scholarly undertakings but he only made any appreciable degree of progress with four of these. Although his History of Wiltshire was the least successful it played an important part in bringing him to the notice of the academic world. In Tanner's youth the county history was very much in vogue and as no full account of Wiltshire had as yet appeared it is not surprising to find his early researches directed towards the preparation of such an account. It was in this connection that he came into contact with John Aubrey who had formed large collections relating to Wiltshire which Tanner eventually managed to borrow, but they did not prove to be as informative as he had hoped and when Edmund Gibson asked him to contribute Wiltshire material to a new edition of William Camden's Britannia he was forced to rely for the

most part on collections that he himself had made. The Britannia of 1695 was a complete success and linked Tanner's name with those of several established scholars. Early in 1694 Tanner issued printed proposals for his Wiltshire but he seems to have made very little progress after this. For the rest of his life he was to be regarded as an authority on the county but his move to Norwich, an event that finally made him abandon the project altogether, led him to take an equal interest in East Anglia and he supplied the additions for Norfolk and Suffolk in a later revision of the Britannia. Tanner also encouraged and assisted Francis Blomefield with his History of Norfolk.

The Notitia Monastica was published in 1695 and, although this work was one which had developed from his natural interests and was to serve as the basis for much further study, Tanner's main object in putting it to the press was to attract attention and patronage to himself. Once he became established in the world he felt that he could afford to spend more time on the thorough preparation of his undertakings and he rapidly lost the drive necessary to bring them to a satisfactory completion. It was this desire to make his works as comprehensive as possible that led him to enlarge the original design of the Bibliotheca out of all recognition, and in this case his delays eventually resulted in another scholar partially forestalling his work. He repeatedly

told his friends, and occasionally advertised in the press, that the Notitia and the Bibliotheca would soon be forthcoming and then postponed his final preparation in order to visit yet another library or to consult yet another book. Both were unfinished at his death and had to undergo editorial adaptation before they could be printed.

The Notitia and the Bibliotheca are still regularly consulted by research workers and a study of their preparation is not without interest. The problems that faced Tanner were those that faced other antiquaries, and his dealings with his publisher and the learned, if somewhat erratic, correspondence that he maintained in connection with his researches are typical of the period. No one could deny the truth of Tanner's plea that his ecclesiastical duties seriously interfered with his studies, but many of his contemporaries produced numerous learned works under similar conditions and Tanner's failure in this respect must be regarded as unusual for a man of his reputation.

The fourth of Tanner's undertakings to be considered did in fact see the light of day but only after he had delegated the preparation of the work to another. As an undergraduate Tanner had become friendly with Anthony Wood and on his deathbed the Oxford antiquary had charged him with the continuation of his Athenae Oxonienses. The first edition of the Athenae had resulted in the prosecution of its author for libel, and

Tanner was not unnaturally reluctant to publish the continuation. After many years he was prevailed upon to part with Wood's papers in order that they might be incorporated into a new edition but he only did so after much hesitation and he reserved the right to strike out some of the material that Wood had written. The Athenae has become a standard work of reference and it is important to establish whether Tanner's assertion that he only made minor alterations to Wood's text is correct. Little of the original material now remains, but the present account attempts to make a definite contribution to an appreciation of the Athenae from an aspect that has hitherto received little attention.

Tanner's collection of books and manuscripts was a particularly fine one and a study of its formation and history and an analysis of its content is extremely interesting. Tanner started his collection during his early years at Oxford and he consistently added to it for the remainder of his life. From time to time his journeys around the diocese of Norwich enabled him to obtain some of the valuable material that lay in the country houses of East Anglia, and on two occasions he made very important bulk purchases. When he became Bishop of St. Asaph he transferred his library to Oxford, which seemed to be the most convenient resting-place for it and meant that it was already near to the Bodleian where he intended it should be deposited after his death, but

on the journey it was sunk in the river Thames and could not be recovered for twenty-four hours. Tanner effected what repairs he could and since its deposit in the Bodleian the collection has been extensively restored. It is hard to assess the extent of the damage suffered in this disaster for there are many other reasons why the collection as we know it today can only be regarded as forming part of Tanner's original library. The terms of Tanner's will permitted the Bodleian to reject unwanted items and there are indications that many of the volumes were not even offered to the library; moreover, problems of administration have meant that several of the books accepted have either been dispersed from the collection or disposed of as duplicates. A detailed analysis of the printed books has revealed several interesting facts about Tanner's habits as a collector and it has been possible to formulate general principles which often give an indication of the provenance of certain individual items. This is particularly important because the restoration of the collection involved the removal of many of the original end-papers, with the consequent elimination of valuable information relating to the previous owners of the books.

The present arrangement of the Tanner manuscripts has been said to be the least satisfactory of any in the Bodleian Library and, although most of the papers were bound after their deposit, it is possible to trace many aspects of the

present order back to the time when they were in Tanner's possession. A similar analysis to that carried out on the printed books has revealed several additional facts about Tanner's interests as a collector, and also shows that considerably more of the collection than has hitherto been thought was obtained in his purchase of the manuscripts of Archbishop Sancroft.

Where possible the results of the analyses have been appended in tabular form in order that they may be more readily available to the many people who consult the Tanner collections.

THE HISTORICAL AND ANTIQUARIAN INTERESTS

OF

THOMAS TANNER

1674-1735

Bishop of St. Asaph

by
M.J.Sommerlad

St (a)

A thesis submitted for the degree of
D.Phil., Oxon.

[TT 1962]

CONTENTS

	Preface	i
	References and Abbreviations	iii
Chapter I	The Biographical Background	
	a: Introduction	1
	b: Oxford	6
	c: Norwich	49
	d: St. Asaph	86
Chapter II	The Projected History of Wiltshire	102
Chapter III	The Notitia Monastica	142
Chapter IV	The Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica	199
Chapter V	The Continuation of Wood's Athenae Oxonienses	256
Chapter VI	The Tanner Collections	
	a: Formation and History	309
	b: General Observations	339
	c: Printed Books	353
	d: Manuscripts	388
	Appendices	
	Select Bibliography	

PREFACE

Over the years the Bodleian Library at Oxford has received many important bequests, and although the collection of books and manuscripts formed by Thomas Tanner, Bishop of St. Asaph, was neither the largest nor the most important of these, it has still made a significant contribution to the resources of the library. The present account of Tanner's antiquarian interests is designed to throw some light on the history and formation of this collection and to answer some of the question about Tanner and his books that might be asked by the many research workers who have benefited from the results of his labours. It is in many senses a study that is entirely domestic to the Bodleian but every effort has been made, both by public advertisement and by private enquiry, to locate related material in other repositories. I have met with much kindness from all whom I approached for their assistance. The Curators and members of the staff of the Bodleian Library have been extremely helpful and I should in particular like to record my thanks to Bodley's Librarian, and to Dr. R. W. Hunt, Mr. L. W. Hanson, Mr. I. G. Philip, Mr. D. G. Neill, and Dr. D. M. Rogers. My thanks are also due to many other people too numerous to name but I have tried to make acknowledgement

for assistance with any particular points as they arise in the text. To my supervisor, Dr. E. A. O. Whiteman of Lady Margaret Hall, I owe a debt of gratitude that I can never hope to repay; it is doubtful whether this work would ever have been submitted as a thesis had it not been for her unfailing encouragement and inexhaustible patience.

TRANSCRIPTION, REFERENCES, AND ABBREVIATIONS

As far as possible transcription throughout has been made literatim and, except in a very few instances, it has not been thought necessary to call attention to any peculiarities of spelling. Punctuation has occasionally been supplied to assist the reader, but every care has been taken not to alter the sense of the original. Doubtful readings are enclosed in pointed brackets, ⟨...⟩, and any words that have been added to the text are enclosed within square brackets, [...].

Unless otherwise indicated all references relate to material in the Bodleian and are given according to the practice of the library, but in order to avoid the unnecessary repetition of the word "Tanner" the collections bearing that name have been designated by the letter "T": thus a reference to "T. 630" (a printed book) or "MS. T. 25" should properly be written "Tanner 630" or "MS. Tanner 25". When referring to items, as distinct from leaves, amongst the Tanner manuscripts it has sometimes seemed more convenient not to refer to the first and last folios but to the item number in A. Hackman, Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae pars quarta, codices ... Thomae Tanneri ... complectens (Oxf., 1860); a single item thus being expressed as either MS. T. 342, ff.80-96 or MS. T. 342(31).

The year has been taken as beginning on January the 1st and a letter that is actually dated "2 January 1723" is dated

in references as "2 Jan. 1724".

In general a full reference has been given for the first citation of a book and a shortened reference thereafter; all books referred to in a short form have been entered in the bibliography and the use of such forms as ibid. and op. cit. has been kept to a minimum. It is hoped that little difficulty will be encountered by the reader. Certain abbreviated forms have been repeatedly used; these are:

B.M.	British Museum.
Bernard's Catalogus	Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae. [Ed. by E.Bernard]. (Oxf., 1697).
Blomefield, Norfolk	F.Blomefield, An essay towards a topographical history of ... Norfolk. 11 vols. (Lond., 1805-10).
D.N.B.	Dictionary of National Biography.
Foster, Alumni Oxonienses	J.Foster, Alumni Oxonienses, the members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714 (1715-1886). 8 vols. (Oxf., 1887-92).
Hist. MSS. Comm.	Historical Manuscripts Commission.
Hearne	Remarks and collections of Thomas Hearne. Ed. by C.E.Doble [and others]. 11 vols. (Oxford historical society). (Oxf., 1885-1918).
Le Neve, Fasti	J.Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae. Corrected and continued by T.D.Hardy. 3 vols. (Oxf., 1854).
Macray, Annals	W.D.Macray, Annals of the Bodleian library, Oxford. 2nd ed. (Oxf., 1890).

n.d.	no date
Nichols, Literary anecdotes	J.Nichols, Literary anecdotes of the eighteenth century. 9 vols. (Lond., 1812-15).
Nichols, Literary history	J.Nichols, Illustrations of the literary history of the eighteenth century. 8 vols. (Lond., 1817-58).
Summary catalogue	A summary catalogue of western manuscripts in the Bodleian library at Oxford. 7 vols. (Oxf., 1922-53).
Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses	J. and J.A.Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, a list of all known students of Cambridge. 10 vols. (Cambr., 1927-54).
Wood, Life and times	The life and times of Anthony Wood ... described by himself. Ed. by A.Clark. 5 vols. (Oxford historical society). (Oxf., 1891-1900).

CHAPTER I

THE BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

a: Introduction

From comparatively humble beginnings Thomas Tanner won his way to a seat on the episcopal bench, but he might nevertheless be described as an undistinguished cleric and he is now chiefly remembered as a scholar and a collector of books. In an age that was remarkable for the number and quality of its scholarly publications Tanner's only contribution to the literature of his day was a small volume which appeared whilst he was little more than a youth; and although he was to labour for the next forty years at the two projects on which his reputation now rests, it was left to others to edit his incompleted manuscripts and to see them through the press. In spite of his failure as an author, Tanner's erudition was widely acknowledged by his contemporaries and the correspondence that he left behind shows that they were not mistaken in him but, unlike many eighteenth-century clerics, Tanner never used his reputation to further his own advancement; his was a devotion to pure scholarship and he pursued his interests with a quiet and steady determination that drew little attention to himself. It is partly for this reason that he has been almost ignored by the biographer; however, entries relating to him are to be found in many

biographical dictionaries - even universal ones[1] - and he has been accorded something more than an "honourable mention" in Professor D.C.Douglas's English Scholars.[2]

Little is known of Tanner's paternal forebears.[3] His grandfather was Bryan Tanner, a poor weaver or spinner of Urchfont in Wiltshire, and it was his father who founded the fortunes of the family. Thomas Tanner, senior, seems to have possessed considerable natural talents and a tradition has been reported that his education was sponsored by a neighbouring Lady;[4] some such good fortune must have occurred

---

1. e.g. such works as Nouvelle biographie générale (Par., 1852-66) or Chambers's Biographical dictionary, ed. by J.O. Thorne (Edinb., 1961). The most valuable of these accounts appear in the Biographica Britannica (Lond., 1747-66) and the Dictionary of national biography. The only other significant general account of Tanner known to me is E.Wilton, "Bishop Tanner, his family and writings", Wiltshire archaeological and natural history magazine, vol.xiii, pp.59-77. Two specialist articles relating to one aspect of Tanner's work have been published; cf. p. 199 , note 2 .

2. Cf. D.C.Douglas, English scholars, 2nd ed. (Lond., 1951) pp.158-164.

3. The matter is discussed in Wilton, op. cit., pp.60-64. I have examined all the printed Wiltshire parish registers available in an attempt to trace Tanner's family back still further but "Tanner" had established itself as a Wiltshire surname and the search has been unrewarding. The only entry that seems to be of any real interest appears in The Genealogist, new ser., vol.xxv, p.49: "Tanner, Christopher, of Little Cheverell, Wilts, yeoman, 50, and Joane Samsburie, d. of John Samsburie, of Eastcot, in Urchfont, sp. 24 ... 3 Aug. [1618]". Little Cheverell is within ten miles of Urchfont and Market Lavington (the future home of the Tanner family) and Eastcot lie in between. From the information given in Wilton, op. cit., p.61 it would seem that Christopher Tanner may have been Bryan Tanner's uncle.

4. Cf. Wilton, op. cit., p.62.

for it seems unlikely that Bryan Tanner could ever have afforded the expense of sending his son to Oxford. After taking his B.A. degree from St. Alban Hall on 21 January 1669[1] Tanner's father was inducted as Vicar of the nearby parish of Market Lavington. He held the living from 1671 until his death in 1718. On 20 April 1673 he married a Sarah Willoughby[2] and their first child, the subject of this work, was born early in the following year. Sarah Willoughby came of a good local family and when her eldest son began to prepare a History of Wiltshire he drew up a rough draft of his maternal family tree with the help of which we can trace his mother's descent through several generations;[3] unfortunately no similar record has survived concerning his father's branch of the family. Tanner's parents cannot have found it very easy to educate their children for Thomas was soon followed by Joseph, Grace (who died at an early age), Sarah, John, Benjamin, William,

---

1. Cf. J.Foster, Alumni Oxonienses, 1500-1714 (Oxf., 1891,92) s.n. Tanner.

2. Cf. Wiltshire parish registers, ed. by W.P.W.Phillimore and J.Sadler (Lond., 1909) vol.viii, p.63.

3. MS. Top. Wilts. e. 4, f.156v. Sarah was the daughter of Joseph Willoughby and Grace Gough and grand-daughter of the "Rog: Willoughbie de Littleton in P[ar]ochia de Lovington (Episcopi)" who appears in the Willoughby pedigree given in "Wiltshire visitation pedigrees, 1623", ed. by G.D.Squibb, Publications of the Harleian society, vol.cv/cvi, p.217.

and another Grace,[1] but their offspring certainly did them every credit. Although John and William owed their eventual positions in the Church to the achievements of their eldest brother they seem to have been competent clergymen[2] and Joseph became an extremely successful surgeon entirely on his own merits.[3] Sarah and Grace both made satisfactory marriages[4] and enough is known of Benjamin to indicate that he too was no failure.[5] The Reverend Thomas Tanner must

---

1. I am grateful to the Reverend Daunford Davies, the present Vicar of Market Lavington, for permission to consult the parish registers. Joseph was baptized 23 June 1676; Grace, 3 April 1679; Sarah, 4 September 1681 (born 25 August); John, 22 June 1684 (born 17 June); Benjamin, 6 January 1687 (born 3 January); William, 25 August 1689 (born 8 August); Grace, 10 September 1693 (born 4 September). I have been unable to find any record of the burial of the first Grace; the baptismal register has the words "mortua est" beside her name as an addition.

2. An account of John Tanner is given in J.L.Smith-Dampier, East Anglian worthies (Oxf., 1949) p.183, and there is some mention of William in C.Candler, Notes on the parish of Redenhall with Harleston (Lond., 1896) pp.44,45.

3. Cf. p.376, note 1.

4. Sarah Tanner married William Barnes, a local man, on 19 August 1716; cf. Wiltshire parish registers, vol.viii, p.70. A child of this marriage, Frances, was baptized 11 February 1719. Grace married a Mr. Symonds, a London surgeon, but the marriage is not recorded in the Market Lavington register.

5. A letter now in the Cambridge University Library (MS. Dd. 3. 64, f.97) seems to indicate that he served, unhappily, in Europe under the Duke of Marlborough. When his son matriculated at Christ Church in 1728 Benjamin was described as "of St. Thomas's Bristol, Somerset, gent." (cf. Foster, Alumni Oxonienses, 1715-1886, s.n. Thomas Tanner) but this does not necessarily mean that he was still alive; he was certainly dead in 1733 when Bishop Tanner made provision in his will for "Elizabeth, relict of my brother Benjamin of Bristol". Even as early as 1695 there seems to have been some connection between Bristol and the Tanner family of Market Lavington; cf. MS. T. 24, f.56.

have been proud of his family, for the abilities that he himself had displayed in his youth had been transmitted to his children; the little material relating to him that is now to be found in the Tanner manuscripts seems to suggest that he was an intelligent, happy, home-loving man who was on good terms with his neighbours, the local gentry, and his diocesan superiors. He was the very man to recognise the incipient qualities of his eldest son and to do all in his power to encourage him on his way to the University.

b: Oxford

Thomas Tanner was baptized on 1 February 1674, having been born on either the twenty-fourth or the twenty-fifth of January.[1] We know very little about his youth. He probably received the rudiments of his education from his father, who certainly took care to see that his son was instructed in the basic elements of the Christian faith,[2] but the growing family and the duties of the parish soon necessitated that young Thomas should be sent to the Free School of the City of Salisbury, where he "loved to see the Cathedral and all the Chapels & Tombs".[3] Tanner spent nearly two years[4] at this school where, incidentally, one of his contemporaries was Thomas Bennett (1673-1728) who was also to become a

---

1. The date of Tanner's birth is generally accepted as the 25th of January; Tanner himself certainly regarded the 25th as his birthday (cf. p.187) and in his will he arranged for a celebration, which has recently been revived, to be held on that day at Market Lavington. The entry in the baptismal register under 1 February bears the addition in a contemporary hand "born Jan. 24. after midnight being Saturday morning"; this too would seem to indicate that the generally accepted date of Tanner's birth is correct were it not for the fact that in 1674 the 25th fell on a Sunday; moreover, when Tanner's father supplied his son with a fully attested statement of the date of his birth (now MS. T. 24, f.217) he seems to have interpreted this very entry as meaning that Tanner was born on the 24th.

2. Cf. MS. Rawl. D 742, f.56; a transcript by Rawlinson of a letter from Tanner to John Worthington, son of the Master of Jesus College, Cambridge.

3. MS. Willis 38, f.497, Tanner to Willis, 31 Jan. 1718.

4. ibid.

divine and a bibliographer.[1] Boys have changed very little over the years and there were "almost perpetual bickerings"[2] between Tanner's schoolfriends and the boys of the nearby Cathedral school: "they used us ill, when they catch'd us in the Close", he wrote later in life, but added cheerfully that he and his friends "were not behind hand, when we met wth them in the City".[3] The pursuit of knowledge was never a burden to him and he always spoke of his academic years with a tinge of regret.[4] It must have been with great eagerness that he quitted Salisbury for Oxford. Thomas Lamplugh, Archbishop of York, who was known to his father, recommended the young lad to the Provost of Queen's College, Timothy Halton,[5] and at the age of fifteen Tanner was entered as a "batteler" of the college on 6 November 1689, matriculating on 17 December.[6] The position of batteler was a fairly low

---

1. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.35v; see p.346, note 4.

2. MS. Willis 38, f.497.

3. ibid. Tanner later made notes on these two schools for his intended History of Wiltshire; cf. MS. Top. Wilts. e. 4, f.142.

4. e.g. cf. MS. Willis 38, ff.496v,497.

5. Cf. T.Tanner, Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica (Lond., 1748) Praefatio, p.xii. Lamplugh was a graduate of Queen's College and had been Principal of St. Alban Hall whilst Tanner's father was in residence.

6. The dates relating to Tanner's career at Oxford have been taken from the article in the D.N.B. by W.P.Courtney; much information for this article was supplied by J.R.Magrath, the Provost of Queen's College. Where possible I have checked them against those given in Foster's Alumni Oxonienses and in contemporary sources such as A catalogue of graduats in divinity, law, and physick ... in the University of Oxford (Oxf., 1705). Most may also be verified from Tanner's correspondence.

one in the undergraduate hierarchy and probably means that Tanner must have found it hard to make ends meet during his early years at Oxford. However, the situation could have been much worse; indeed most of the poorer clergy could only afford to enter their sons at Oxford as Servitors and they then had to work their way through college by waiting upon the more fortunate students, but the better beneficed clergy generally sent their sons to Oxford as battelers. William Nicolson was entered at Queen's College as a batteler but this, together with the education of his two brothers and the marriages of his three sisters, so overtaxed his father's slender resources that he died almost £400 in debt.[1] On the other hand Edmund Gibson, also a Queen's-man, and White Kennett, of St. Edmund Hall, were both entered as battelers although their respective families were comparatively wealthy.[2] It was customary to help some of the battelers by providing them with certain duties less menial than those of the servitors and Gibson, for example, progressed through the ranks of batteler, larder man, and poor boy.[3] Tanner must have been very pleased when in 1690 the Provost of Queen's asked him to assist in chapel, a position known in other colleges as Bible-Clerk; nevertheless he seems to have

---

1. Cf. F.G.James, North country bishop (New Haven, 1956) p.5.
2. Cf. N.Sykes, Edmund Gibson (Lond., 1926) p.6; G.V.Bennett, White Kennett (Lond., 1957) pp.3,4.
3. Cf. N.Sykes, Church and State in England in the xviiith century (Cambr., 1934) pp.192-194.

been acutely conscious of his somewhat inferior position and when John Aubrey addressed a letter to "Mr Thomas Tanner, Bible-clark"[1] he was rather sharply desired "to omit it for the future, for we have no such place in our Colledge".[2]

Perhaps no other foundation was quite so suited to Tanner's abilities as Queen's for, at this period, it was the hub of antiquarian interest in Oxford and such of its members as Edward Thwaites, William Nicolson, and Edmund Gibson had played or were playing a leading part in the revival of interest in Anglo-Saxon studies.[3] In the midst of this intellectually stimulating atmosphere Tanner soon developed those interests which he was to follow for the rest of his life and in so doing he entered into a little circle of men who, each in his individual sphere, were later to become prominent but between whom the study and love of antiquities formed a lasting bond. He entered into correspondence with John Aubrey (who was considerably older than Tanner)[4] and became friends with Nicolson, Gibson, Kennett,

---

1. MS. T. 25, f.126v.

2. MS. Aubrey 13, f.196, Tanner to Aubrey, 6 Mar. 1694. There are today two Bible-Clerkships, known by that name, tenable at Queen's College; part of the holders' duties is to say Grace in Hall at dinner. Cf. Oxford university calendar (1961) pt.ii, p.62; cf. also J.R.Magrath, The Queen's college (Oxf., 1921) vol.ii, p.154.

3. An account of the revival of Anglo-Saxon studies and the part played by Queen's College is given in D.C.Douglas, English scholars, Chapter III, "The Saxon past". Some of Tanner's notes on Gibson's Chronicon Saxonicum (Oxf., 1692) are to be found MS. T. 25, f.14.

4. Cf. pp. 110-112.

Humfrey Wanley,[1] and Anthony Wood.[2] It was Gibson who later, as Bishop of London, recommended Tanner for a bishopric.[3]

Of more immediate importance was the interest which Tanner aroused in Arthur Charlett, the Master of University College.[4] Charlett was a great encourager of students who displayed merit and, since his circle of acquaintances was very large, he was often able to be of particular service to his protégés over and above his own immediate academic patronage. Nor did he confine his attention to the students of his own foundation but where he saw promise of scholarly ability there he gave his not inconsiderable assistance. He probably first took an interest in Tanner because he himself had been educated at the Free School of Salisbury, but the young student certainly merited his attention for Tanner had established his reputation as an antiquarian by the time he was twenty-two years of age, a reputation which he was unfortunately only to consolidate rather than to enlarge in later life. Charlett, probably motivated by the fact that University College chapel is dedicated to St. Cuthbert, first

---

1. On Wanley see C.E.Wright, "Humfrey Wanley: Saxonist and library-keeper", Proceedings of the British academy, vol.xlvi, pp.99-129 and Douglas, English scholars, Chapter V.

2. Cf. pp. 256-260.

3. Cf. Sykes, Gibson, p.140.

4. There is no printed biography of Charlett but he has received an entry in the D.N.B. He was the subject of a thesis (B.Litt., Oxon.) by S.G.Gillam and copies of this are to be found in the Bodleian Library; MS. B. Litt. d. 45; MS. Eng. misc. d. 309.

encouraged Tanner to prepare for the press an edition of Robert Hegge's biography of the saint which had previously been published in 1663.[1] Charlett obtained a "very fair Copy" which was "much more correct and full than the printed"[2] and Tanner was set to work. In the spring of 1693, in spite of being "extraordinary busy in performing some exercise required by the Colledge for my Batchelors degree",[3] he was eagerly corresponding with Aubrey about the project but by the summer he was rather sadly forced to admit that his Legend of St. Cuthbert had "suffered the fate of a great many better books".[4] It appears that Tanner's manuscript was submitted to Dr. Hugh Todd of University College, who "did not approve of it" and who, in spite of the fact that the undertaking had been sponsored by the Master of his own foundation, did not bother to return the papers to their youthful editor.[5] As was to be expected Tanner was discouraged by this event and he turned his hand to other employment with the result that in 1717 out of the many collections which he had made towards the work he had then "but one sheet,

---

1. R.Hegge, The legend of st. Cuthbert, with the antiquities of the church of Durham (Lond., 1663).
2. MS. Willis 44, f.162, Tanner to Willis, 4 Jan. 1716.
3. MS. Aubrey 13, f.199, Tanner to Aubrey, 16 May 1693.
4. MS. Top. gen. c. 24, f.18, Tanner to Aubrey, 13 Jul. 1693.
5. Cf. MS. Willis 44, f.162; cf. also Hearne, vol.ix, p.188.

wch is a transcript of a List of the Priors of Durham from ye end of an Old MS. in the Bodleian Library".[1] In view of this it is not surprising that he later told Thomas Hearne that he had laid aside all idea of publishing the work.[2] Others were to lament the want of a new edition but in later life Tanner came to think that his effort was "of no great value, for it was my first dabling"[3] and that, on recollection it was "rude & wanted licking".[4]

Tanner proceeded to the degree of B.A. in 1693 and was promptly beset by the problems which dogged all those who, having passed this examination, intended to take Holy Orders.[5] In 1711 Joseph Addison bewailed the extreme overcrowding of

---

1. MS. Willis 44, f.211, Tanner to Willis, 26 Mar. 1717. The transcript is to be found MS. T. 342, f.186. From Tanner's comments on the handwriting of the original we may tentatively identify it as ff. v r, vi prefixed to MS. Fairfax 6. A transcript by Tanner of "An Antheme for S^t. Cuthbert excribed out of a Manuscript of a Monk of Dunelm" is to be found MS. T. 457, ff.298,299.

2. Cf. Hearne, vol.ix, p.188.

3. MS. Willis 44, f.162.

4. MS. Willis 45, f.239v, Tanner to Willis, 3 Jun. 1723. In the late eighteenth century it was commonly thought that the manuscript of Tanner's Legend of St. Cuthbert was amongst the papers that he bequeathed to the Bodleian and Richard Gough made an unsuccessful search for it in 1779; cf. Nichols, Literary anecdotes, vol.viii, pp.702,704. Cf. also Archaelogia, vol.i, p.xxiv.

5. An account of the difficulties of candidates for Orders and their subsequent prospects of promotion,with particular reference to those of Queen's College, is given in Sykes, Church and State, Chapter V, "The clerical subalterns".

the Church[1] and in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was the undeniable truth that the majority of ordinands were destined to remain in the most humble of circumstances for the rest of their lives, and to count themselves lucky with the poorest of preferments. Advancement was hardly to be expected by those without influence and, without influence, patronage could only be attracted by those possessed of outstanding natural talents; far more fortunate were those who could claim family ties, however remote, with someone who had a living in his gift. The outlook for the poor student was bleak and even the first hurdle which he had to surmount was by no means inconsiderable as a result of the canonical rule that deacon's orders should not be conferred until the candidate had attained the age of twenty-three. The average student matriculated at a university in his mid-teens and proceeded to his bachelor's degree at twenty or twenty-one with the result that there remained an uncomfortable and costly period before he could embark upon his chosen profession. The ideal way to offset this difficulty was to obtain a Fellowship or some other appointment within the University, any post in fact which would gain for its holder a firm footing in a college, all of which had several livings within their gift; but such

---

1. Cf. Sykes, Church and State, p.190.

positions were few and the majority of graduates were forced to look elsewhere for their livelihood. Many turned their hands to literary projects and this goes in some way to explain why so many seventeenth and eighteenth century ecclesiastical figures published learned works in their early years. Many a flattering dedication reaped its reward in the form of timely patronage.

Tanner was well aware of the difficulties that awaited him and he had laid what plans he could to secure both money and patronage. It has been said that in 1693 he issued proposals for an edition of the works of the learned antiquary John Leland, but there seems to be no evidence in support of this.[1] It was, however, during this year that he first made a serious attempt to begin a history of his native county - Wiltshire - which he hoped would receive the support of its wealthier residents.[2] The work was not encouraged to the extent that Tanner had hoped but the episode served to bring him more into public notice, and when Gibson enlisted his help for a revision of that county in the new edition of William Camden's Britannia[3] Tanner was drawn into a select circle of scholars which included, in addition to some with whom he was already well acquainted, John Evelyn and Samuel

---

1. Cf. Tanner, Bibliotheca, p.xii. Tanner did in fact later become closely associated with some of Leland's works.

2. An account of Tanner's History of Wiltshire is given in Chapter II.

3. Cf. pp. 117-126.

Pepys, the diarists, Ralph Thoresby,[1] Edward Lhuyd,[2] and John Ray.[3] Tanner's work was brought to the notice of James Bertie, Earl of Abingdon, whose country seat was at Lavington, by John Aubrey and probably also by John Byrom,[4] and it was similarly mentioned to Gilbert Burnet, the Bishop of Salisbury.[5] Burnet later told Tanner's father that "those dry studies (as he termed y^m) ... were proper & seasonable for a young man" and, what was perhaps rather more welcome news to Tanner, he promised more than once to give him every encouragement.[6] This piece of information must have been particu-

---

1. Ralph Thoresby, 1658-1725, antiquary and topographer. It should be remembered that Tanner may not have actually met these people at this juncture, but to have his name linked with theirs served as an introduction to them and a recommendation to others. Tanner did not become acquainted with Thoresby until after 23 July 1696 when Gibson wrote to Thoresby: "Mr. Tanner is upon all occasions so ready to serve the public designs of learning, that you might freely send your queries to him without any intercession of friends. But since you think my interest with him may be of some use to you, I have (by this post) sent him word of a fresh correspondent; a piece of news which I know he will thank me for"; cf. Letters of eminent men addressed to Ralph Thoresby (Lond., 1832) vol.i, p.241.

2. Edward Lhuyd, 1660-1709, Celtic scholar and antiquary; Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

3. John Ray, 1627-1705, naturalist.

4. Cf. MS. Aubrey 13, f.201; MS. T. 25, f.131. Byrom was Rector of Stanton St. Quintin, Wiltshire, and a Prebendary of Salisbury Cathedral.

5. Cf. MS. Ballard 30, f.42; MS. T. 25, f.133.

6. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.170, Tanner's father to Tanner, 17 Jun. 1694. Burnet would probably have been disposed to help Tanner as the son of a clergyman of his diocese, particularly as his studies related to Wiltshire, but he also had a particular interest in Tanner's old school; cf. T.E.S.Clarke and H.C.Foxcroft, A life of Gilbert Burnet (Cambr., 1907) p.291. Burnet became bishop in March 1689, so that it is just possible that he may have known Tanner as a schoolboy.

larly gratifying because Tanner would have liked, after ordination, to have obtained some preferment in the diocese of Salisbury in order that he might the more easily continue with his work on Wiltshire.[1] He seems to have made great efforts in this direction and by the time he took Orders he was known to the Dean[2] and Chancellor[3] of the see as well as the Bishop and Prebendary Byrom.

The year 1694 was a most important one in Tanner's life. He passed the whole period in academic work of one sort or another, but it was probably only due to Charlett's encouragement and assistance that he was able to remain at Oxford and thereby attain the academic eminence that was eventually to lead him to the episcopal bench. Every year Charlett was accustomed to sponsor editions of Latin classics which he then presented as New-year's gifts to his friends.[4] The particular work with which he was then concerned was Cicero's De Officiis which was to be edited by Thomas Cockman, a member of Charlett's own college.[5] The appointment of so

---

1. Cf. MS. Willis 38, f.497, Tanner to Willis, 31 Jan. 1718.
2. Cf. pp. 19-21.
3. Cf. p. 128.
4. For an expression by Tanner of his high opinion of Charlett which mentions these editions see MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.39v.
5. M.Tullius Cicero de officiis ad Marcum f. (Oxf., 1695). Cockman subsequently became Master of University College; cf. p. 80, note 5.

young and inexperienced a person as Tanner in the capacity of an "overseer"[1] rather than that of a collaborator can hardly have pleased Cockman, who was the same age, and even Gibson seems to have felt polite surprise for he wrote to Charlett that it was "a great honour you ha' done Mr Tanner in leaving him your Deputy; tho'", he admitted, "his integrity does sufficiently recommend him to the Offices".[2] However, Cockman and Tanner worked amicably together and the edition established Cockman's reputation: his subsequent translation of the work is in fact still being reprinted today.[3]

Tanner had by now been admitted to the vast resources of the Bodleian Library[4] where he pursued his own literary researches, but under Charlett's guidance he became more intimately connected with that great institution. At the

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.195, Charlett to Tanner, 9 Aug. 1694.

2. MS. Ballard 5, f.27v, Gibson to Charlett, 9 Apr. 1694.

3. The extent of Tanner's contribution to the work is not clear. MS. Ballard 4, f.24 is a letter from him to Charlett outlining the proposed arrangement with a great deal of common sense: he suggests that it would be best to have "the most minute Variations (excepting where the words are merely transposed) inserted at the bottom: for what seems trivial to some even learned men, it very often happens that others may make good use of, and to whom it will appear very material". The book itself makes no acknowledgement of Tanner's assistance. Cockman's translation of the De officiis appears in no, 345 of Everyman's library.

4. There does not seem to be any record of his admission as a reader amongst the library records.

time the preparation of the mighty Catalogi Librorum Manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae was in full swing under the editorship of Edward Bernard.[1] The production of this work was largely based upon the Oxford libraries, but the resources of the Bodleian alone needed the collaboration of several scholars to prepare the catalogues of the individual collections and Tanner was able to sharpen his fast-developing antiquarian skill by making the catalogues of the collections of Francis Junius and Richard James. The scope of the whole undertaking meant that only a short title could be given for each item but a close acquaintance with the manuscripts was necessary and, since the Junius collection consists mainly of philological and Anglo-Saxon manuscripts and that of James mainly of original works and extracts from medieval chronicles unfavourable to the Roman Church, the whole episode served in no small measure to widen the field of Tanner's scholarship. Perhaps more important was the fact that he also dealt with the collections of Gerard Langbaine. These consist for the most part of library catalogues that had been compiled with a hitherto unheard-of thoroughness and there is no doubt that Langbaine's technique as a cata-

---

1. This was published at Oxford in 1697. The production of this catalogue has been reviewed by Dr. R.W.Hunt in the Summary catalogue of Western manuscripts in the Bodleian library, vol.i, pp.xxv-xxxv. In further references these two works will be cited as Bernard's Catalogus and the Summary catalogue.

loguer was far in advance of that of his contemporaries.[1] Viewed in the light of Tanner's later researches the importance of his enforced introduction to so excellent an example becomes obvious.[2] Tanner was also closely associated with the library of the Ashmolean Museum and there is every reason to think that the catalogue of the Wood collection that appears in Bernard's Catalogus is his work.[3] Both the public libraries of Oxford were now freely available to Tanner and he, moreover, was for one so young unusually well acquainted with their contents.

Tanner was always ready to acknowledge what he owed to Charlett's assistance over this period, and his father was "so much obliged to ye Master for all his great favours ... y^{t} I cannot express my thankfullness enough".[4] Gibson also knew of the extent of Tanner's debt when he wrote to Charlett "We Antiquaries are all oblig'd to you for settling Mr Tanner amongst us: the loss of him would have broke us".[5]

It was in the summer of 1694 that Tanner received an offer of employment at Salisbury Cathedral. Dean Robert

---

1. Cf. Summary catalogue, vol.i, pp.xvii-xxv.

2. In particular Tanner's researches for the Bibliotheca, reviewed in Chapter IV, required good cataloguing technique and, moreover, the production of this work would hardly have been possible without Bernard's Catalogus.

3. Cf. pp. 265,266.

4. MS. T. 25, f.238, Tanner's father to Tanner, 13 Oct. 1694.

5. MS. Ballard 5, f.70, Gibson to Charlett, 13 Nov. 1694.

Woodward, with whom Charlett had engaged in antiquarian correspondence relating to Wiltshire,[1] was reorganising the Salisbury muniments and he wrote to Oxford asking for help in finding an amanuensis. The person concerned would have to wait upon Woodward both in his room and at table but the prime requirement was that he should be a "Schollar, one of a Sober, Quiet, & Industrious temper, y^{t} writes a fair hand".[2] Woodward was really offering the post to Tanner and he intimated to Charlett that "a ꝑson something of Mr Tan̄ers temp. & Way w^{d} doubtlesse find his Returne in imploying a ⟨y͡ear⟩ or 2 this way, & I shd be glad to doe all I could for him".[3] As an additional encouragement he added that he would allow his amanuensis to keep his terms at Oxford and pointed out that the person concerned would not only "get a footing"[4] in the Cathedral but the work would probably make him a "usefull Scholl^{r}".[5] Furthermore, in Tanner's case Woodward would be in a particularly favourable position to assist him with the proposed History of Wiltshire.[6] In spite of later saying that at this juncture "very small offers" would have tempted him to take a post in his home county[7] Tanner politely

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.136, Woodward to Charlett, 14 Apr. 1694.
2. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.204, Woodward to Tanner, 29 Aug. 1694.
3. MS. T. 25, f.207, Woodward to Charlett, 28 Aug. 1694.
4. ibid.
5. MS. T. 25, f.205, Woodward to Charlett, 12 Aug. 1694.
6. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.204.
7. MS. Willis 38, f.497, Tanner to Willis, 31 Jan. 1718.

refused the offer on account of his commitments at Oxford.[1] John Warham, an undergraduate of University College, was suggested and Woodward, after further enquiries,[2] appointed him with every appearance of satisfaction.[3]

In spite of his apparent desire to attach himself to his native diocese it is not surprising that Tanner rejected this offer. Byrom, whose opinion as a Prebendary of Salisbury must have carried no little weight had already advised against such a move in words that show an acute perception both of Tanner's difficulties and of the road that he must travel to obtain preferment of any real distinction:

> You will wrong yourself in ye highest degree, & perhaps give a stab to your design, if you leave ye University. Y^e^ country, as to learning, is little better than a wilderness. Can you find there such books in print & in M.S., wch you must make use of in this work? Can you improve yourself by such conversation, as is to be found in your learned body? I therefore advise you to fix your foot where you are, & I hope there will be a way found out to settle you as a Fellow in some college.[4]

At the time Tanner was not only engaged on Bernard's Catalogus and the edition of Cicero but he had also undertaken the two works that were to occupy his leisure time for the remainder

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.211, Woodward to Tanner, 5 Sept. 1694.

2. ibid.

3. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.226, Woodward to Tanner, 3 Oct. 1694. Warham graduated from New Inn Hall in 1696; he later (1699) became Rector of Eaton Constantine, Salop.

4. MS. T. 25, f.125v, Byrom to Tanner, 19 Feb. 1694. In the same letter (f.124) Byrom wrote that he found in Tanner's letter "what I thought since I knew you, ye man grown up in ye boy; 'tis pleasing to one of my temper to see so much judgement in such a narrow compass of years".

of his life; he had in fact already nearly completed the first of these which was a short survey of the religious houses of England and Wales, entitled Notitia Monastica.[1] Tanner issued a prospectus for this in the spring of 1694 and began searching for a possible publisher. To this end he enlisted the help of Gibson, who was then in London, and Gibson approached his own publisher, Awnsham Churchill. Tanner was already known to Churchill for Gibson had suggested his friend as a possible editor for the projected edition of John Leland's De Scriptoribus Britannicis,[2] a suggestion of which Churchill approved and he not only employed Tanner in this capacity but he also accepted the Notitia. During his life Tanner so enlarged the design of the edition of Leland's work that, in spite of repeated efforts to prepare the work for the press, he never succeeded in getting it into print and it was not published until more than a decade after his death. The first edition of the Notitia appeared in 1695, an event which was possibly the single most important happening of his life, and it was not long before Tanner began to prepare another edition, but with no more success than greeted his efforts over Leland. The revised and

---

1. An account of the Notitia Monastica is given in Chapter III.
2. An account of this and a description of the way it developed into Tanner's Bibliotheca is given in Chapter IV. Leland is also noticed in connection with Tanner's other undertakings on pp. 104, 144.

enlarged Notitia was published by his brother John in 1744.

At the end of 1694 Tanner journeyed to London and presented himself as a candidate for ordination.[1] He described the event in a letter to Charlett:

> On Tuesday night I got safe to Town and the next morning waited on Dr Lancaster, whom I very fortunately met just going to the Chapterhouse of S. Pauls; he was pleased to take me in his Coach along with him: where I was examined above two hours by the Bishop himself, [Compton] and Dr Beveridge, Dr Stanley, Dr Isham, Dr Alston, and Dr Lancaster; I had a note writ by the Bishop himself on the back of my Testimonials signifying that I had passed their examinations; and accordingly I delivered them in this evening to the Register at London house, and subscribed to the Articles and did the other business this afternoon, so that nothing remains but the ordination it self, wch will be to morrow morning at St Peter's Cornhill.
> Dr Lancaster has shewed himself very kind to me in this business, he very readily satisfied the B^p^ about my titles and when it came to his turn to examine me, he only ask'd what Divinity Books I had read; and then was so kind as to tell me that he would trouble me wth no more questions.[2]

Dr. Lancaster was a member of Queen's College - he later became its Provost - and was undoubtedly well acquainted with Tanner. On the day following Tanner's ordeal Gibson told Charlett that he had "pass'd Examinations very honourably; and met with a great deal of kindness & good humour from D^r^

---

1. Tanner was not quite twenty-one years old and therefore well under the canonical age required for ordination. Youthful ordination was by no means uncommon but the candidate was required to have an Archbishop's Faculty. Tanner was presumably granted one of these, but there is no record of it in Index to the Act books of the archbishops of Canterbury, 1663-1859, ed. by E.H.H.Dunkin and C.Jenkins, Part ii (Index library, vol.lxiii), (Lond., 1938) s.n. Tanner.

2. MS. Ballard 4, f.26, Tanner to Charlett, 22 Dec. 1694. In this letter Tanner also said (f.26v) that the booksellers were "very kind to me, esp. Mr Churchill".

Lancaster",[1] but in spite of his success Tanner quickly wearied of the metropolis and very soon Gibson was regretting the fact that "Eight or nine days had given Mr Tanner such a surfeit of London, that all the importunity of Friends could not keep him a moment longer".[2] Numbered amongst these friends in London were Samuel Pepys, with whom Tanner and Gibson occasionally dined,[3] and William Wake, then Rector of St. James', Westminster, but who was destined to become Archbishop of Canterbury.[4] Charlett was probably the author of both these introductions and he apparently gave Wake an extremely favourable account of Tanner's abilities.[5]

It was at this period that Tanner had need of influential friends. His acquaintance with James Bertie, Earl of Abingdon, was particularly to his advantage and when a chaplaincy of All Souls College fell vacant Bertie approached the Warden, Leopold Finch, on Tanner's behalf. Charlett and other friends probably also canvassed Finch,[6] with the result

---

1. MS. Ballard 5, f.7v, Gibson to Charlett, 20 Dec. 1694.
2. MS. Ballard 5, f.82, Gibson to Charlett, 28 Dec. 1694.
3. Cf. MS. Ballard 1, f.110v; 4, f.49v; 5, f.7v.
4. On Wake see N.Sykes, William Wake (Cambr., 1957).
5. Cf. MS. Ballard 5, f.39, Gibson to Charlett, 24 May 1694. Charlett certainly seems to have introduced Tanner to Pepys; cf. MS. Ballard 5, f.7v.
6. This would probably account for Tanner's haste to leave London.

that on 27 January 1695, just after his twenty-first birthday, Tanner was nominated to the post. When Finch confirmed the appointment to Charlett he added the encouraging information that he expected "to find out something else to annexe to it, to make him easy".[1] This action of Finch's has been singled out as one of the most creditable features of his career as Warden of All Souls.[2]

Two months later the first edition of the Notitia Monastica appeared and Tanner dedicated it to Finch: "'Tis this grateful remembrance of Your late generous kindness to a Person altogether unknown to You, and without which he must have left this beloved Place and his Studies, that obliges him to offer these his First-Fruits of Duty and Gratitude, and will also give You a right to command all his future Labours".[3] The reaction to the Notitia was one of uniform approbation and Tanner was henceforth to be regarded as an established antiquarian. Finch was delighted at being connected with such a successful effort and paid Tanner "a great many complements on account of the honour (as he was please[d] to term it) I did him by my Book. I am willing to believe", Tanner hopefully told his father, "he will stand my true friend upon any occasion".[4]

---

1. MS. T. 25, f.252, Gibson to Tanner, 23 Oct. 1694.
2. Cf. C.G.Robertson, All Souls college (Lond., 1899) p.160.
3. Notitia, sig. a4.
4. MS. T. 24, f.56v, Tanner to his father, 30 Aug. 1695.

The publication of the Notitia was swiftly followed by the appearance of the Britannia and Tanner's reputation began to grow. It was further enlarged at the end of the year when Anthony Wood died for on his death-bed the Oxford antiquary entrusted Tanner with the disposal of his papers and with the continuation of his Athenae Oxonienses.[1] This work had caused a furore on its publication and a successful action for libel had been brought against Wood. The fate of his collections was a matter of wide interest and to a young man such a charge must have seemed onerous, but the real significance of the incident lies in the indication that it gives of the high opinion that Wood must have held of Tanner's abilities.

Tanner could hardly have regarded a chaplaincy of All Souls as anything more than a stepping-stone towards further promotion. As a means of enabling him to remain in Oxford it served its purpose and he was able to continue with his work on the edition of Leland, but of itself it offered little advancement. He proceeded to the degree of M.A. on 28 April 1696 and not long after this a Fellowship of All Souls became vacant. Such a position would be admirably suited to his needs since it would supply him with a fairly comfortable living, higher standing in the University, and,

---

1. An account of Tanner's connection with Wood and of the continuation of the Athenae Oxonienses is given in Chapter V.

more important, it would serve as an introduction to all the scholars and patrons of scholarship in the country and thereby greatly facilitate his own academic labours.[1] So obvious were the advantages that Tanner and his friends became very active in canvassing for support in the forthcoming election. Charlett was particularly energetic and he assured Tanner of Finch's continued assistance for he had "often heard from his own Mouth, that He has a good Esteem of your Manners and Learning".[2] Charlett's confidence in the Warden was not misplaced, but his dealings with him are a little obscure because Finch later expressed his resentment to Gibson "on account of a Letter which the Master had writ to him, to excuse your standing. He seem'd exceeding angry, that any man should imagine him an enemy to your promotion in any kind; and more especially in this".[3] There are many letters in the Tanner collection relating to the election and it is apparent that the canvass on Tanner's behalf was very thorough and was not confined to Oxford. Fellows who were then absent were approached[4] and Tanner's friends in London and elsewhere were kept closely informed of progress; Pepys, in particular,

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 24, f.215, Gibson to Tanner, 27 Oct. 1696.
2. MS. T. 24, f.160, Charlett to Tanner, 4 Oct. 1696. Tanner's letter to Finch asking permission to stand for the Fellowship is to be found MS. T. 114, f.16.
3. MS. T. 24, f.205, Gibson to Tanner, 30 Oct. 1696.
4. Cf. MS. T. 24, ff.208,225.

seems to have been anxious on his behalf.[1] Tanner's claims were even pressed home upon Archbishop Tenison, the Visitor of All Souls,[2] but with little effect for he had already refused to intervene on behalf of someone to whose relations he had "very particular Obligations".[3] However, he did promise to do nothing that would detract from Tanner's chances, and it was Wake's opinion that Tenison would be particularly pleased to hear of Tanner's election.[4] The efforts of Tanner's friends were rewarded, and on 2 November 1696 he was appointed to a Fellowship.[5] More than twenty years later Tanner was still to remember what this election meant to him and to express his gratitude for its successful outcome.[6]

The years that followed immediately upon this election

---

1. Cf. MS. Ballard 5, f.101v; MS. T. 24, f.210.

2. Cf. MS. Ballard 5, f.101v; MS. T. 24, ff.203,205. The Archbishop of Canterbury is ex officio Visitor of All Souls.

3. MS. T. 24, f.203, Wake to Charlett, 29 Oct. 1696.

4. Cf. ibid. Another person who regretfully refused to use his influence on Tanner's behalf was George Hickes, the eminent scholar. Hickes was a non-juror and he felt that because of the oaths involved in the Fellowship it would be better if he did not support any candidate so that he "might not give men occasion to say that I was for having others do that, wch I pretended was ag^t my own Conscience ... I think nothing too good, or too great for Mr Tanner, and I think it will be a shame for the College to passe him by, but were my interest ten times greater, than it is, I could not sollicit for him for the reason above hinted"; MS. Ballard 12, f.123, Hickes to Charlett, 13 Oct. 1696.

5. The "birth certificate" now in the Tanner collection (cf. p.6,note 1) probably had to be produced in connection with his standing for this Fellowship.

6. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.135, Tanner to Charlett, 28 Oct. 1719.

must have been particularly happy ones for Tanner and he was able to devote himself almost entirely to the studies that he loved so much.[1] His edition of Leland had become somewhat enlarged and by now it had firmly established itself as a work of his own to be entitled Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica, an undertaking which required exhaustive research in various libraries for its preparation. He had already consulted several of the college libraries whilst he was still a chaplain of All Souls[2] and he now put his new position to good use by completing his researches in Oxford[3] and enlarging

---

1. In October 1697 Tanner took the oath as a notary public. He had made enquiries about this from Charlett a year earlier (cf. MS. T. 24, f.184) and it was Charlett himself who finally administered the oath. Tanner's testimonials, together with a copy of his admission to the office and of the oath taken by him on that occasion (11 October 1697) are to be found MS. T. 114, f.49; the testimonial was originally dated 8 July 1697 but Tanner has subsequently altered this to 3 October. Documents endorsed by Tanner in his capacity as a notary public are to be found at Christ Church in MS. Arch. W. Epist. 3. An interesting letter relating to this event has survived; MS. T. 23, f.139, Gibson to Tanner, 16 Oct. 1697:

"The Facultie is deliver'd to Dr. Floyd, who will be in Oxford on Tuesday-night. The Expences are as follows:

Commission	1.	2.	6.
Facultie	4.	4.	6.
Stamp	2.	0.	0.
Chancerie	0.	13.	4.
Carrying the Facultie to Chancerie	0.	1.	0.
M. Tailor's Clerk	0.	2.	6.
	8.	4.	10 "

It is to be hoped that Tanner checked the arithmetic involved in this account because he appears to have been overcharged by one shilling.

2. Cf. p.228, note 2 .

3. Cf. p.228, note 3 .

his field by visiting the libraries of London. In the early summer of 1698 he pursued his researches in the King's library at St. James' Palace. Lambeth Library, under the care of Gibson, was also visited and a careful approach was made to Thomas Smith, Sir John Cotton's librarian, for permission to use the vast resources in his charge.[1] Smith had already quarrelled most bitterly with Humfrey Wanley over the use of the library[2] and although Wanley had overcome Smith's objections it was wisely decided that Tanner should in the first instance approach Smith with a letter of introduction from Pepys or from Captain Charles Hatton.[3]

Pepys had been particularly impressed by Tanner's academic abilities[4] and after the appearance of the Notitia he tried to persuade him to prepare a continuation of Peter Heylyn's Help to English History which had already gone through several editions.[5] Tanner refused on the ground that his other commit-

---

1. Cf. MS. Ashm. 1817b, f.8, Tanner to Lhuyd, 11 Oct. 1700. Pr. in Bodleian library record, vol.ii, p.254.

2. Cf. MS. Ballard 5, f.122, Gibson to Charlett, 10 May 1698.

3. Cf. ibid.; cf. also MS. Ballard 4, f.32, Tanner to Charlett, 11 May 1698. Tanner had met Hatton in connection with the Bibliotheca; cf. p. 212.

4. Cf. MS. Ballard 1, f.104, Pepys to Charlett, 5 May 1695.

5. Cf. MS. T. 24, f.22v, Pepys to Tanner, 5 May 1695 and MS. Ballard 5, f.39, Gibson to Charlett, 24 May 1694. Wanley also conveyed Pepys' suggestion to Tanner and added that "in truth, it would be a work that would be very beneficial to all that are desirous to know any thing of our English History, & I could heartily wish that you would set upon it for to speak sincerely, I know none more fit than Mr Tanner, to do his country this piece of service"; MS. T. 24, f.24, Wanley to Tanner, 23 Apr. 1695.

ments would not allow of it[1] and indeed the Bibliotheca soon proved to be an undertaking that would fully occupy one man for a considerable time. Nevertheless it seems to have been not long after this that Tanner, with Wake's encouragement, began to contemplate printing a series of medieval chronicles.[2] He even commenced taking the necessary transcripts[3] but there is no evidence to suggest that he ever came near to getting any of these works into print and it eventually fell to his acquaintance Thomas Hearne to see, quite independently, such a series through the press. But if Tanner felt that he himself could not undertake any further projects he was by no means averse to giving his friends the benefit of his

---

1. Cf. Private correspondence and miscellaneous papers of Samuel Pepys, ed. by J.R.Tanner (Lond., 1926) vol.i, p.128 or Letters and the second diary of Samuel Pepys, ed. by R.G. Howarth (Lond., 1932) p.262. Both these editions print several references to Tanner in addition to some of the correspondence that passed between the two men.

2. Cf. MS. Ballard 3, f.76, Wake to Charlett, 10 Jan. 1706; cf. also Hearne, vol.x, pp.61,64. On 26 December 1693 Tanner told Aubrey that he was "now going thro' a Course of all our English Historians (for a publick design of wch you shall hear farther, when it is come to greater maturity)"; MS. Aubrey 13, f.204.

3. Cf. MS. T. 472; "Cronicon Adami Murimouthensis", a transcript by Tanner of a manuscript in Magdalen College; and MS. T. 473, "Continuatio Chronicorum Ranulphi [Higden] per Johannem Malvern", a similar transcript, which has later been compared with a manuscript at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. These two items were bought by the Bodleian as Lots 497,498 of the Phillipps sale of 6 June 1898 (cf. p.225, note 3) and Lot 499 in the same sale was Tanner's transcript of "Cronicon Thomae de Elmham de vita Henrici V".

scholarly assistance and Nicolson's English Historical Library,[1] Gibson's Reliquiae Spelmannianae,[2] and in particular Wake's State of the Church[3] all received improvements from his ready pen. His devotion to literary research and the reputation that he quickly acquired for his willingness to help others brought him the approval of many people of influence. It was perhaps this popularity that involved him in a rather unfortunate episode.

The attention and assistance which Charlett lavished on his protégés soon bred jealousy among their less fortunate colleagues. This finally culminated in an attack on him by

---

1. W.Nicolson, The English historical library (Lond., 1696-99). Notes that Tanner sent to Nicolson on Parts I and II are now to be found MS. Eng. misc. e. 373, ff.1-37, and MS. Eng. misc. f. 17, ff.81-86. Cf. also MS. T. 23, ff.22,124 and Bodleian library record, vol.v, p.224.

2. Reliquiae Spelmannianae, the posthumous works of sir Henry Spelman, [ed. by E.Gibson], (Oxf., 1698). A letter from Gibson, now MS. T. 23, f.124, shows that Tanner corrected the proofs of all after p.104, i.e. approximately half the book. Gibson's original collections are now MS. T. 455a,b and these show that Tanner supplied several of the transcripts. Amongst these his hand is particularly prominent in the History of Sacriledge which Gibson finally omitted and which was published (not from this transcript, but from MS. Cherry 18) by an anonymous editor later in the same year.

3. W.Wake, The state of the Church and clergy of England (Lond., 1703). Gibson understood in 1699 that Wake and Tanner were to "proceed jointly" in the undertaking; cf. MS. T. 21, f.157. It seems however that Tanner merely criticised Wake's text (cf. ~~the~~ two communications from Tanner to be found at Christ Church in MS. Arch. W. Epist. 18) and supplied some transcripts for the appendices. These are now at Christ Church in MS. Wake 312.

Charles Usher, a student of University College, and Tanner's name was dragged into the fray.[1] Charlett had been elected Master in 1692 but by 1697 his relationship with the Fellows had become very strained and in this year Usher was elected to a vacant Fellowship in direct defiance of Charlett's wishes. During his younger days at the college Usher had taken a dislike to the Master and, jealous of the students who enjoyed Charlett's patronage, had given vent to his feelings by passing slanderous remarks about him in Hall. When the Vice-Chancellor, Doctors, and Proctors met the day after Usher's election in order to confirm or reject it, Charlett brought up these injudicious remarks and the election was quashed. Usher had insinuated that Charlett was guilty of immoral behaviour with Tanner and other young students, but few people gave much credence to these allegations and Tanner was advised to "have more prudence than to lett a false aspersion discompose you; so there can be no greater evidence of the Masters innocency, than that you and he are equally concern'd".[2] Charlett, however, decided that such accusations could not be allowed to remain seemingly un-noticed and on 15 January 1699 Usher was summoned at the suit of both Charlett and Tanner to appear in the Vice-Chancellor's court

---

1. A short account of the whole dispute is given in W.Carr, University college (Lond., 1902) pp.163-165.

2. MS. T. 22, f.175, George Fleming to Tanner, 4 Mar. 1699.

where depositions were made against him in which his words were specified.[1] On hearing of the impending action Gibson wrote that he was "heartily glad that it is like to come to Expulsion; wch ye impudent Villain deserves and a great deal more".[2] Usher's cause failed and public opinion was generally against him. George Fleming reported that whenever Thomas Smith, the Bishop of Carlisle, had "occasion to mention that unlucky business, he did it in such a manner as sufficiently shew'd his resentments of Ushers behaviour".[3] Nicolson, who was Archdeacon of the same diocese, was surprised to hear that Tanner had been "most villanously abus'd" and his annoyance with Usher was in no way abated by the fact that, before he had heard of that gentleman's "rascally misbehaviour" towards his friend, he had been prevailed upon to use his influence on Usher's behalf.[4] "Let me assure you", he wrote to Tanner, "that your Credit here is not to be shaken by any Calumny he can asperse you with; and that he'l find as little quietness or encouragement with us as at Oxford".[5] With bishop and archdeacon so fixed against him[6] Usher must

---

1. A number of documents relating to the case are to be found amongst the University Archives.
2. MS. T. 22, f.158, Gibson to Tanner, 9 Jan. 1699.
3. MS. T. 21, f.13, Fleming to Tanner, 27 Mar. 1699.
4. Cf. MS. T. 22, f.136, Nicolson to Tanner, 23 Feb. 1699.
5. ibid.
6. It might also be mentioned that Fleming (afterwards Sir George Fleming) later became successively Canon, Archdeacon, Dean, and Bishop of Carlisle.

have found things somewhat uncomfortable in his home county of Cumberland.

Encouraged by four Fellows who also disliked Charlett, Usher appealed to Convocation but the Vice-Chancellor refused to allow the appeal. On hearing of this Charlett propheciedthat "Possibly theyre next step, will be to Westminster Hall, wherever it is", he added belligerently, "they shall not fail of an Answer".[1] Usher first tried to evade the Vice-Chancellor's decision by making a direct appeal to Convocation in a pamphlet entitled A Letter to a Member of the Convocation of the University of Oxford: containing the Case of a Late Fellow Elect of University-College in that University[2] which was entirely directed at Charlett. It was Kennett's opinion that Charlett's character "does not at all suffer wth any judicious Reader of the little Libel against Him and all Discipline",[3] but Fleming thought that it was "severe enough"[4] upon him. The names of both Tanner and Wanley were involved in this pamphlet, but many people seem to have agreed with Nicolson when he asserted that their "extraordinary Qualifications will alwaies be respected and esteem'd by Men of like

---

1. MS. T. 21, f.68, Charlett to Tanner, 21 May 1699.

2. Published at London in 1699. This pamphlet, although biased, gives a very clear account of the various stages of the dispute and also contains Usher's explanation of what he intended by his slanderous remarks.

3. MS. T. 21, f.179, Kennett to Tanner, 30 Oct. 1699.

4. MS. T. 21, f.8, Fleming to Tanner, 12 Nov. 1699.

worth and Knowledge; where this little Gentleman and his Apologies will be as justly scorn'd & despised".[1] Gibson, however, did not dismiss Usher's Letter out of hand and, displaying the good sense and caution which were to make him the most important churchman in the land, he agreed with Charlett that there was no need to answer "such a little fellow" in print[2] but then pointed out to Tanner that "it might not ... be unseasonable to draw up the misrepresentations in short, and to lodge them in writing with some particular Friends; that they may be able, as occasion serves, to confute the Libel and expose its Author".[3] The pamphlet did not have the desired effect and Usher next obtained a mandamus in the King's Bench against Charlett. His claim for reinstatement to his Fellowship was rejected and the whole unfortunate episode was brought to a close. Tanner later described his connections with the case to Rawlinson:

> In the unhappy Case of Ch. Usher I was no farther concern'd than in suffering my name to be join'd wth Dr Charlets in the prosecution, wch was carried on without my intermedling or being at any expence, and wth my consent hardly obtained - being inclined rather to pass by and forgive words tho' very diffamatory than to take the rigor of the Law. Tho' I was very sensible that the Liberties Mr U. and his companions had taken wth our Characters had hurt us among the unthinking youth of the Univ. yet knowing that there was not [the] least foundation for any aspersion of that nature, I was

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.7v, Nicolson to Charlett, 20 Nov. 1699.
2. Cf. MS. T. 21, f.164, Gibson to Tanner, 2 Nov. 1699.
3. ibid.

> desirous to let it rest upon our innocency and let it wear of - but there was a faction in the College upon an Klection account they would rest[1] till the Master carried that matter first before the Visitors of the College (where of 22 M[r] Usher had but 2. for him) then in the Vice Chancellor's Court and afterward when M[r] U. brought the affair into Westm. Hall - he was forced to follow him. I cant now recollect nor perhaps will it become me to recite particulars, but 'twas very hard if M[r] U. could not have justice in any one of the three solemn hearings, if there had been room to have favor'd him.[2]

When Tanner first arrived in London in the May of 1698 he stayed with Wake,[3] and it was Wake who deliberately engineered a meeting between Tanner and John Moore, the learned Bishop of Norwich, in order that Tanner might obtain permission to consult Moore's immense private library.[4] The meeting had more far-reaching consequences than Wake could possibly have forseen and Moore soon replaced Charlett as the major influence in Tanner's life. He immediately offered Tanner the full use of his study and even suggested that he should lodge in his house.[5] This invitation was politely refused but Moore was so insistent in his offer of hospitality that Tanner eventually had to ask Wake to intercede on his behalf

---

1. i.e. "would not rest"?
2. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.39, Tanner to Rawlinson, 7 Nov. 1735. An interesting retrospective account, almost certainly biased, is to be found Hearne, vol.ix, p.10.
3. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.32, Tanner to Charlett, 11 May 1698.
4. Cf. ibid.; cf. also f.131v, Tanner to Charlett, 22 Apr. 1719.
5. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.32v.

with a more definite refusal.[1] He did, however, take a room exactly opposite Moore's house in Charles Street, Westminster.[2] Moore was one of the greatest bibliophiles of his age and Tanner's interests in this direction were a great recommendation to the bishop. He had long been looking for some young clergyman who "would be useful to him in ye ordering of his Library, and teaching his daughters to write"[3] and Tanner was particularly suited to be his amanuensis. Moore was pleased with Tanner's work and very soon made him his private chaplain, a chaplain whose duties were considerably more literary and bibliographical than spiritual, and eventually Tanner became what can only be described as Moore's librarian. This post was never intended to interfere with Tanner's researches. It was rather to be regarded as a nominal appointment in earnest of things to come, and he returned to Oxford at the end of August[4] after four months of research in the London libraries.[5]

In the summer of 1699 Tanner resumed his searches at London,[6] and this time he appears to have lodged at Moore's

---

1. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.49, Tanner to Charlett, 14 May 1698.
2. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.32v.
3. MS. Ballard 5, f.112, Gibson to Charlett, 18 Feb. 1697.
4. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.34, Tanner to Charlett, 18 Aug. 1698.
5. Cf. MS. Ashm. 1817b, f.8.
6. He presumably took with him the letter of introduction dated 31 May 1699 to Thomas Gale, Dean of York, from John Williams, Bishop of Chichester, now MS. T. 21 ff.83,84. Williams speaks of Tanner as being "a very worthy person ... one known & lov'd by all his acquaintance, & must be so by you, who are in a

[cont. on next page]

house.[1] Moore himself was not at that time in London, but he bombarded Tanner with instructions for the purchase of books for his library[2] to such an extent that he later apologised for the interference he had caused in the work on the Bibliotheca by "tempting" him to attend book auctions.[3] Tanner was kept very busy and Gibson saw his friend only when he could be spared by the bishop.[4] Tanner's duties as Moore's chaplain-librarian not only meant that one of the finest collections in England was readily available for his researches but the immense value of this library was widely known and, with Moore's permission, it was freely used by many eminent scholars. Tanner may well have formed several valuable connections during this period.[5]

Tanner had hardly settled in London on this particular

---

6 cont. peculiar manner an encourager of those studies which this our Friend is conversant eminently in. I know him to be very curious, & that you are able to gratify that so inquisitive & industrious a temper by your directions & the MSS. you have in possession". A catalogue of Gale's manuscripts appears in Bernard's Catalogus, tom.ii, pp.185-195.

1. Tanner's correspondence was directed to Moore's house; cf. MS. T. 21, ff.38,40v,64v &c.

2. Cf. p. 317.

3. Cf. MS. T. 21, f.81, Moore to Tanner, 2 Jun. 1699.

4. Cf. MS. Ballard 5, f.159, Gibson to Charlett, 6 May 1699.

5. For example, John Strype mentioned his extensive use of Moore's library in the Preface (sig. a2) to his Historical collections of the life and acts of ... John Aylmer (Lond., 1701). There does not seem to be any record of Tanner having been acquainted with this eminent antiquary; he did, however, subscribe to his works. Cf. also Hearne, vol.xi, p.301.

visit when he received the news that Benjamin Cooper, the Registrar of Oxford University, had fallen ill. Charlett had earlier suggested that this might be an ideal post and Tanner agreed that it was a situation "that suits very well wth my circumstances, and every way agreeable to my Studies and Inclinations".[1] As soon as Charlett heard of Cooper's illness he immediately told Tanner that his name would be put forward if a vacancy occurred and suggested the names of some people in London who should be forthwith canvassed for support.[2] Charlett was so active on Tanner's behalf that he wrote another letter on the same day and endorsed it "if delivered before 10 morning May 3^{d}, pay one shilling".[3] Since this letter was written "past 12" on May the second he obviously regarded the matter with some urgency. Tanner took Charlett's advice and made every effort to obtain what support he could from those members of the University who were then in London, but he could not refrain from observing that it was most unfortunate that, at that particular moment, he and some of his best friends happened to be absent from Oxford.[4] Failing his own presence Charlett's enthusiastic support was the next best thing and, even before he could

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.52, Tanner to Charlett, 4 May 1699.
2. Cf. MS. T. 21, f.18, Charlett to Tanner, 2 May 1699; "12 a clock".
3. MS. T. 21, f.49v, Charlett to Tanner, 2 May 1699; "past 12".
4. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.52.

reply to Charlett's original letter, Charlett was able to report that Tanner's friends had "moved in several Places for you with good Successe, as they think".[1] It was all to no avail. Within a fortnight of his indisposition Cooper had recovered sufficiently well "as to appeare abroad again publicly so that the present fears of his Death are over".[2]

The excitement over Cooper's illness had hardly died down when Tanner received a further interruption to his work on the Bibliotheca. He had intended to continue his researches in Cambridge when he had finished in London and he been invited by Thomas Green, the Master of Bene't, now Corpus Christi College, to lodge with him when he did so[3] but unfortunately, in the second week of June, Tanner fell ill with smallpox. After his appointment as chaplain of All Souls there had been an outbreak of the disease in that college

---

1. MS. T. 21, f.20v, Charlett to Tanner, 3 May 1699. In MS. T. 21 there are letters written by Charlett dealing with this matter dated 2 May (ff.18,49); 3 May (f.20v); 4 May (f.41); and 5 and 7 May (f.16v).

2. MS. T. 21, f.16v, Charlett to Tanner, 7 May 1699; cf. also MS. T. 21, ff.31,53. Cooper eventually died in 1701 and was succeeded by his son, George. On 18 February 1701 Charlett wrote to Pepys that before Tanner left Oxford "he had the satisfaction to see the respects of the University by an offer made to him from the best and most considerable part of the University, of the office of Public Registrar, a place of great trust and credit"; cf. Private correspondence of Pepys, vol.ii, p.196; Letters and second diary, p.325.

3. Cf. MS. Ballard 5, f.162, Gibson to Charlett, 8 Jun. 1699. Green became Bishop of Norwich in 1721 and of Ely in 1723, so his connection with Tanner was maintained.

but he had escaped;[1] now, however, he was not so fortunate and he later described himself as "very like to have died in that distemper".[2] On hearing of Tanner's illness Kennett expressed extreme concern because he was "expos'd to the greater danger by lying in a place remote from his Relations and more intimate Acquaintance"[3] and Charlett, who had been worried by the same thought, sent John Prickett, the Butler of University College, to London to help in whatsoever way he could. Kennett and other friends were swift to express their regard for Charlett's action.[4] Tanner was not so without assistance as Charlett may have believed and he appears to have passed his confinement in Moore's house. The apothecary who was consulted at the first symptoms of the disease called in on his own initiative a "Dr. Hanns".[5] In the light of what we know of Tanner's other visitors during his illness this is particularly interesting for this physician may be safely identified as Edward Hannes, one of the foremost and most fashionable doctors of the day. The eminent Hans Sloane also called upon Tanner, but in his

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 24, f.56v, Tanner to his father, 30 Aug. 1695.
2. MS. Ashm. 1817b, f.8, Tanner to Lhuyd, 11 Oct. 1700.
3. MS. Ballard 7, f.77, Kennett to Charlett, 20 Jun. 1699.
4. Cf. ibid; cf. also MS. Ballard 5, f.165, Gibson to Charlett, 20 Jun. 1699.
5. Cf. MS. T. 21, f.101, T.Goodwin to Moore, 10 Jun. 1699.

capacity of a friend rather than of a medical adviser,[1] so that Tanner was receiving what was virtually the best attention available. It is quite remarkable that Tanner should have been treated by these two men, both of whom later attended upon royalty and received knighthoods; but both were of an academic frame of mind and Sloane, like Tanner, was an eager collector of books and manuscripts.[2] At the time Tanner's younger brother Joseph was making a name for himself as a London surgeon[3] and it is possible that Tanner may have been well known to many medical men, particularly the antiquarians amongst them.

Timothy Goodwin,[4] who visited Tanner almost as soon as he fell ill, noted that the smallpox was "very distinct" but he found him in as good a condition as could be expected.[5] Three days later, on 13 June 1699, the danger was still not yet past but the encouraging news was that Tanner "Spitts well, and is cheerfull"[6] and on 20 June Gibson delightedly

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 21, f.101. Tanner had probably met Sloane in the summer of 1698; cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.32.

2. Hannes had been appointed Reader in chemistry at Oxford in 1690. On Sloane see Sir G.R.De Beer, Sir Hans Sloane and the British museum (Lond., 1953) and E.St.J.Brooks, Sir Hans Sloane, the great collector and his circle (Lond., 1954). Several further references are to be found in C.R.Hone, The life of dr. John Radcliffe (Lond., 1950).

3. Cf. p. 376, note 1 .

4. Goodwin subsequently became Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh, and Archbishop of Cashel.

5. Cf. MS. T. 21, f.101.

6. Cf. MS. Ballard 6, f.31v.

told Charlett of Tanner's recovery "not knowing any thing for wch you will be more heartily thankful".[1] Gibson was particularly grateful that Charlett had sent Prickett to London because he had "been a benefactor to us all by his daily intelligence during our Friend's illness".[2] On 21 June Gibson was once again able to see Tanner and found him very hearty and well.[3] Rest was prescribed to complete the cure and, as soon as he was able to travel twenty miles a day with safety, Tanner journeyed to his father's house at Market Lavington,[4] where he was forced to restrain himself from his studies in order that his eyes might not be permanently affected.[5] Gibson, bearing this in mind, playfully refused to furnish Tanner with any books from London.[6] Tanner commissioned him to convey five guineas to Hannes for his attendance but these were refused with "many expressions of love and affection for you; w^{ch}", added Gibson, "I think, you ought to acknowledge in a particular Letter to him by the first opportunity".[7] Tanner had evidently already developed the fault which was to become so prominent in his

---

1. MS. Ballard 5, f.165, Gibson to Charlett, 20 Jun. 1699.
2. ibid.
3. MS. Ballard 5, f.167, Gibson to Charlett, 22 Jun. 1699.
4. Cf. ibid.
5. Cf. MS. Ashm. 1817b, f.8.
6. Cf. MS. T. 21, f.134, Gibson to Tanner, n.d.
7. MS. T. 21, f.114, Gibson to Tanner, 10 Jul. 1699.

later correspondence, that of extreme procrastination over his replies. Many of his letters begin with a lengthy apology for his delay, and he variously pleads as an excuse pressure of business, ill-health, and family affairs,[1] but this trait appears to have been an integral part of his character and it was in much the same way that he failed to publish anything after 1695. In both cases his delay seems to have stemmed from a desire to make everything that he did as complete as possible, and indeed some of the queries with which his antiquary friends showered him must have needed considerable research before they could be answered.[2] This procrastination was the weakest point in a man who was "so communicate that every body admires him"[3] and had he been better able to discipline himself there can be little doubt that his academic reputation would today be greater that it is.

By 1700 Tanner's recovery was complete and during the summer months he again renewed his annual pilgrimage to the larger libraries of the country.[4] After a short stay in London, where he lodged with his uncle,[5] he made the journey

---

1. e.g. cf. MS. Willis 38, f.505; 41, ff.143,157; 44, f.174.
2. A fine example of the depth of Tanner's correspondence is to be found in Original letters of eminent literary men, ed. by Sir H.Ellis (Camden society), (Lond., 1843) pp.328-334.
3. MS. Rawl. lett. 27a, f.143v, Willis to Hearne, 2 Jun. 1715.
4. Cf. MS. Ashm. 1817b, f.8,
5. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.44, Tanner to Charlett, 4 Jun. 1700.

to Cambridge that he had been forced to postpone the year before[1] and took the opportunity of incorporating as an M.A. in the University.[2] In mid-July he moved to Norwich and from here he accompanied Moore on a journey to Lincoln where he worked in the cathedral library.[3] He returned to Oxford in the September and began to prepare the Bibliotheca for the press.[4]

If at this juncture Tanner had paused to take stock of his personal situation he could hardly have felt anything other than satisfaction at what he had so far achieved and eager expectation for the future. From comparatively humble beginnings he had become what for a young man of twenty-five was an undoubted success. He had every prospect of a worth-

---

1. Cf. MS. Ashm. 1817b, f.8.

2. Cf. Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, s.n. Tanner.

3. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.39; MS. Willis 64, f.49v.

4. Cf. MS. Ashm. 1817b, f.8. I do not think that it has been formerly noticed that during this period Tanner was for a while curate of Stanton Harcourt, Oxfordshire. He subscribed on being licensed as curate on 18 January 1700 (cf. MS. Oxf. dioc. papers, e. 22, p.90) and was summoned to the Bishop's visitation of June 1701 (cf. MS. Oxf. dioc. papers e. 6, f.11v). He was apparently expected to answer at the Archdeacon's visitation of September 1701 but his name has been erased and that of his friend Thomas Rivers substituted; cf. ibid., f.28. It is interesting to note that a similar substitution occurs in the Archdeacon's visitation records of April and (?) September 1702; cf. ibid., f.45v,63v. Rivers' subscription, dated 1701, is recorded in MS. Oxf. dioc. papers e. 22, p.93, but the day and the month are not entered. The curacy seems to have had some connection with All Souls and although that college did not hold the right of presentation the curate usually seems to have been a Fellow. The college maintained a pest-house at Stanton Harcourt.

while career within the Church for not every young cleric was known to the Archbishop as well as several bishops: Moore of Norwich, Burnet of Salisbury, Smith of Carlisle, and Williams of Chichester had all offered him encouragement in varying degrees and so had many other cathedral dignitaries. It is now possible to see that his position was very much stronger than he himself realised, for amongst his close acquaintances he numbered such men as Wake, Nicolson, Goodwin, Gibson, Kennett, and Fleming - all of whom attained the episcopal bench and the first three of whom became archbishops.[1] He had similar prospects as a scholar. At Oxford he stood high in favour with the heads of two colleges and had attained some academic standing within the University. In the world at large he was known as the author of the Notitia, and as a collaborator in the production of Bernard's Catalogus and the new edition of Camden's Britannia. His Wiltshire and the Bibliotheca were known to be in preparation and he was also talked of as the propective continuator of Wood's Athenae Oxonienses. His work had been uniformly praised by scholars of note. If Tanner wondered what the next step in his career should be his mind must have gone back to a letter he received from his father in 1695:

---

1. Nicolson was translated to the archbishopric of Cashel on 28 January 1727 but he did not live to take up the appointment.

> While we were at dinner ye Bp. [Burnet] began to talke of you before ye Company to your praise but now & then a little of his Old discourse,[1] viz. yt yose studies (as well as ye Mathematicks) were very commendable to shew to ye world yt a young man was studious & a lover of Books yet he thought it not convenient for a man not to spend too much of his time upon yt dry sort of learning adding withall yt Antiquaries was generally poor, instancing in Tony Wood & some Others & y^t^ ye highest preferm^t^ they could expect was to be King at Armes wch but a few of many attained to. To wch it was replyed yt you was yet very young & designed to take ye Orders of priesthood & so did not aime at such promotion but in due time to betake your selfe to ye study of Divinity.[2]

There had never really been any question of Tanner failing to enter the Church and he took Orders at the earliest possible opportunity,[3] however the question that faced him at the end of the century was not very dissimilar to the one that Burnet had been discussing five years earlier. Many a churchman had won his promotion on the strength of his scholarship but the Church could not live on scholarship alone and there was also room for the competent administrator or diplomatist. It was difficult for those just starting out on a career within the Church to know where to place the emphasis in their studies and actions. Tanner never did fully resolve this problem and his failure to do so is reflected in his subsequent career.

---

1. Cf. p. 128.
2. MS. T. 24, f.59v, Tanner's father to Tanner, 17 Sept. 1695.
3. Little is known of Tanner as a churchman during this period of his life. References to occasions on which he preached at Oxford and at London are to be found MS. T. 21, f.79; 22, f.106; 24, f.130; 305, f.8v.

c: Norwich

The turning point in Tanner's life coincided with the turn of the century. As early as 1697 he seems to have been contemplating marriage[1] and in 1699 it was suggested that he might make a match with one of the daughters of Dr. Richard Lydall, the Warden of Merton College, but he had not pursued the matter.[2] Perhaps Moore's greater possibilities as a patron carried rather more weight with Tanner when in 1701 he married Rose, the eldest daughter of the bishop, for Moore's daughters were far from renowned as beauties. One popular ballad of the day began:

> All in the City West-minster
> There does a Prelate dwell;
> In Daughters foul and Authors fair,
> Long known for to excell.[3]

Thomas Hearne, an unreliable authority, asserted that Tanner had been "drawn in" to the match[4] and gave colour to the

---

1. On 16 February 1697 Kennett replied to a letter that he had received from Tanner "wherein You mention a business of great concern, but I can only say at present, that I doe not apprehend wch Sister is meant. The eldest, Madam Frances, is Housekeeper to her Brother and not much inclined to marry, the second, Madam Betty, who has been latest at London is at her own choice and her Brother's approbation, so is the youngest, Madam Anne, their respective fortunes is not much above one thousand ready pounds, but if their Brother like a Match it is possible he may give some little augmentation. For discretion, good nature and frugality I know no young ladies better, and no family more kind and generous to One Another. When you are able to be more particular with me, I shall be so wth you"; MS. T. 24, f.130.

2. Cf. MS. T. 21, f.90v, W.Adams to Tanner, 1 Jun. 1699. Wood says that Lydall had "6 or 7" daughters; cf. Wood, Life and times, vol.iii, p.436.

3. This ballad is printed in Hearne, vol.ii, p.110.

4. Cf. Hearne, vol.i, p.200.

general opinion of Moore's daughters by describing Rose as a "short squabb dame" whilst noting her most outstanding feature as being a person "remarkable for drinking of Brandy".[1] The first result of Tanner's marriage was that he was "soe taken up with a new wife and a new house" that his correspondence with his friends virtually ceased[2] and this caused Gibson to recollect that Tanner had formerly been nick-named "The Monk" which, he observed, was "a name, that he never deserv'd soe much in his State of Celibacy, as since he came into ye Noose".[3] The epithet undoubtedly sprang from Tanner's interest in monastic establishments which had culminated in the Notitia Monastica, but it may also carry the inference that in his student days he had been unusually oblivious to the charms of the weaker sex. In fairness both to Tanner and to Rose Moore it must be said that nowhere does he ever indicate anything other than a genuine affection for his wife and, at her death, he wrote a peculiarly moving letter to Charlett praising her virtues.[4]

It was plainly incumbent upon Moore to provide for the young couple and on 6 March 1701, with the regardless nepotism that was a feature of eighteenth century diocesan appointments,

---

1. Hearne, vol.ii, p.9.
2. Cf. MS. Ballard 6, f.63v, Gibson to Charlett, 11 Oct. 1701.
3. MS. Ballard 6, f.65, Gibson to Charlett, 23 Oct. 1701.
4. Now MS. Ballard 4, f.83.

he made Tanner Chancellor of the Diocese of Norwich.[1] There is nothing to indicate that Tanner had any legal training whatsoever, but he displayed his considerable abilities by rapidly becoming conversant with canon law, with such success that in 1702 Humphrey Prideaux, who had been a member of the cathedral chapter of Norwich since 1681 and who had recently been made Dean,[2] said that Tanner was "the greatest Blessing that has come to that Diocese in many years; and has already got a better knowledge of the business of his place, than his Predecessor wth soe long Experience was ever master of".[3] Tanner became an excellent Chancellor and for thirty years he faithfully discharged the duties of that office.[4] He lost little time in putting his new appointment into order and it was not long before he wrote to Charlett:

> I most humbly thank you for Your many kind advices & assistance, especially your Last in relation to my present

---

1. Where possible the dates relating to Tanner's career at Norwich have been verified from the diocesan records; where such verification was not possible the date that Tanner gives in his conspectus of Norwich diocesan appointments (cf. p.140) has been accepted without any comment. On only one occasion (cf. p. 57, note 2) was there any variation from the generally accepted dates given in the D.N.B.

2. For an account of Prideaux that makes some mention of his relationship with Tanner see R.W.Ketton-Cremer, Norfolk assembly (Lond., 1957) pp.63-91.

3. Cf. MS. Ballard 6, f.76v, Gibson to Charlett, [Jul. 1702]. Tanner's predecessor as Chancellor was Robert Pepper.

4. Tanner was later consulted by both Wake and Gibson for his opinion on points of canon law; cf. [Christ Church] Arch. W. Epist. 17, item 197; [Lambeth Palace] unreferenced, but formerly St. Pauls 17 D 2 and Dalton 9 (cf. p. 117, note 3) letter from Tanner to Gibson dated 25 Jan. 1723.

> employm.t in wch I hope I shall always have the Courage & Conscience to do right to the best of my knowlege. The Consistory Court has of late been held only once in 3. weeks, sometimes once a month & sometimes not in six weeks, by wch means and the dilatory terms our Law allows no plenary Cause used to be dispatch'd under a twelve-month, a year & half and I hope the next Court day to dispatch one that has been call'd over these three years [sic]: this I am resolv'd to remedy if possible by holding a Court every fortnight: for next to the strict I fancy nothing can bring us into credit more than the speedy administration of Justice.[1]

The position of Chancellor not only brought Tanner a great deal of work but it also involved him in a legal squabble. Gibson, speaking of Tanner's appointment, prophetically told Charlett that his predecessor "left the Office, and the Rights of it, in some confusion; and I fear, nothing under a Law-suit will rectify it".[2] The dispute arose over the Chancellor's jurisdiction and fees in the Archdeaconry of Sudbury and the town of Bury St. Edmunds.[3] The case was

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.55v, Tanner to Charlett, 2 Apr. 1701. By a slip of the pen Tanner has dated this letter 1700; the internal evidence makes it quite clear that it was written in 1701. The records of the Consistory Court are now kept in the chapel adjoining the Bishop's Palace, Norwich, and the Act Books show that both Tanner and his predecessor held between thirteen and sixteen courts a year so Tanner's good intentions were not fulfilled. He does, however, seem to have discharged a few more cases at any one sitting. The records of the court are particularly full for the period whilst Tanner was Chancellor and there is ample evidence of his care in the discharge of his office.

2. MS. Ballard 6, f.68v, Gibson to Charlett, 20 Mar. 1702.

3. A notice of this dispute appears in M.D.Slatter, "The records of the Court of Arches", Journal of ecclesiastical history, vol.iv, p.151. The late Professor C.Jenkins in Ecclesiastical records (Helps for students of history, 18), (Lond., 1920) p.78 cites this case as one of the more interesting among the records of the Court.

tried in the Court of Arches and opened 7 October 1703. John Butler and John Pern, the Commissary and Official of the archdeaconry, went to considerable trouble to prepare the case against Tanner, and the diocesan records were searched back as far as the fifteenth century in an effort to find out which official had proved wills and granted marriage licenses. But, as Gibson observed, Tanner was quite capable of managing his side of the affair, "especially under ye direction of soe cautious a Person as my Lord of Norwich".[1] The case dragged on for some years and only came to an end when Tanner himself was appointed Commissary in the Archdeaconry of Sudbury.[2]

This law suit, his duties as Chancellor, and the necessity of applying himself to the study of canon law put considerable difficulties in the way of Tanner's private researches. Hearne attributed the delays to Tanner's wife and declared that he was "forc'd to lay aside Books, She not caring he should follow them"[3] and that this treatment, together with the worries attendant upon the law suit "made the poor man wish for a Return to Oxon again".[4] This was hardly true.

---

1. MS. Ballard 6, f.68v.
2. There are several documents in Tanner's hand relating to the extent of the Chancellor's jurisdiction in Box 800 of the records in the Bishop's Chapel, Norwich.
3. Hearne, vol.ii, p.9.
4. ibid.

Norwich was after all one of the largest cities of England and, although he was to complain that the lack of good libraries impeded his studies,[1] Tanner settled down to a happy existence and seems to have derived a great deal of pleasure from the conscientious discharge of his duties. He was perhaps denied lengthy periods of time in which he could wholeheartedly devote himself to the preparation of academic works but he began to correspond more and more frequently with the antiquarians Browne Willis and Peter Le Neve, Norroy King-at-Arms.[2] There has also been preserved a series of letters which he wrote to Bishop Moore's brother, Thomas, who was the officer in charge of the Customs House at Great Yarmouth; these letters reveal Tanner in an otherwise unsuspected light as something of a tippler. Although many references are made to antiquarian, political, and family affairs undoubtedly one of the main topics of conversation is wine.[3] Thomas Moore was in

---

1. Cf. p. 236.

2. Tanner's letters to Willis are to be found in the Bodleian, chiefly in MS. Willis 36, 38, 41, 44, 45, 64. Some of Tanner's letters to Le Neve are printed in Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, pp.408-435. I have been unable to discover the fate of these but they have presumably been completely dispersed because two of them (those of 18 Mar. 1702 and 10 Feb. 1716) are now in the Bodleian as MS. Eng. lett. c. 12, f.159 and MS. Don. d. 90, f.144 and another two (18 Jan. 1698 and 12 May 1725) are in the National Library of Wales, MS. 6751. There is a printed biography of Willis: J.G.Jenkins, The dragon of Whaddon (High Wycombe, 1953) but there would seem to be room for a further study of this interesting antiquary.

3. Cf. MS. Bodl. 1013, ff.8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 27, 36, 48 &c. This volume contains all Tanner's letters to Thomas Moore that

[cont. on next page]

a particularly favourable position to assess the quality of any imported wine and he always took care to let Tanner know when a fresh cargo was due. Through his agency Tanner placed many orders and over the years his tastes ran to Sherry, Red Port, White Lisbon, Rhenish, Brandy, Hock, and Canary and these, moreover, were generally purchased in quantities of twenty gallons and more.[1] In February 1709 Tanner refused to buy some Rhenish because he already had enough laid in to last him all that summer.[2] Sometimes these consignments were shared with John Moore, the bishop's son and Registrar of the diocese, but more generally they seem to have been for Tanner himself and, although he occasionally made gifts of wine,[3] he admitted that for the most part he placed the orders because of the great number of friends to whom he had no other opportunity of paying his respects "but by a glass of good Wine".[4] Moreover he appears to have been

---

3 cont. are in the Bodleian. Another letter to Moore, dated 30 May 1712, which is equally concerned with wine, is to be found in the National Library of Wales, MS. 3255.

1. Tanner ordered by the aam or the half-hogshead (cf. MS. Bodl. 1013, ff.10, 13, 14); an aam is an obsolete measure of about 40 gallons, a hogshead is 52½ gallons. His tastes were not however exclusively alcoholic and a permit enabling him to import 2 lbs. tea, 1 lb. coffee, and 6 lbs. chocolate is to be found MS. Rawl. D 1480, f.529.

2. Cf. MS. Bodl. 1013, f.10.

3. Cf. MS. Bodl. 1013, f.13.

4. Cf. MS. Bodl. 1013, f.10.

regarded as something of a connoisseur[1] and on one occasion when he visited his brother at Lowestoft, John Tanner felt obliged to send hastily into Yarmouth for a better wine than he could obtain locally.[2]

Tanner's marriage was not to last long. Early in 1707 he wrote to Charlett telling him that "it has pleased God to visit my wife with a sickness, wch has brought her very low, and under wch She still labours",[3] and on 15 March his wife died, at the age of twenty-five. Tanner, in telling Charlett the sad news, spoke of her as "a kind wife, who was very dear to me upon many accounts" and, as if in refutation of Hearne, added the tribute that among other virtues she "very little hindered my Studies".[4] It was the opinion of that tattling diarist that Rose Moore's death was the direct result of her addiction to brandy,[5] but Hearne's personal remarks must always be regarded with caution for his assessment of people was generally influenced by their political persuasions. By Rose Moore Tanner had one daughter, Dorothy, who died at the early age of fourteen months. Mother and daughter were

---

1. Tanner was careful to have his orders dispatched wither in a cask or in bottles "as shall be best for the nature of the Wine"; cf. MS. Bodl. 1013, f.13.

2. Cf. MS. Bodl. 1013, f.32, John Tanner to T.Moore, 28 Jun. 1711; cf. also ibid., f.33.

3. MS. Ballard 4, f.82, Tanner to Charlett, 24 Feb. 1707.

4. MS. Ballard 4, f.83, Tanner to Charlett, 11 Apr. 1707.

5. Cf. Hearne, vol.viii, p.171.

buried on the south side of the chapel adjoining the Bishop's Palace at Norwich cathedral.[1]

When his wife died Tanner, after six years of married life, was left without any immediate family of his own; he had, however, already received further promotion at the hands of his father-in-law. Not long after he became Chancellor he was made Commissary of the Archdeaconry of Norfolk[2] and on 26 June 1706 he was presented to the rectory of Thorpe-next-Norwich[3] which was "much to his Satisfaction"[4] partly

---

1. This chapel was restored twice during the nineteenth century and the gravestone has been removed. I am grateful to the Precentor and Sacrist for assistance in my search and, more particularly, to Mr. A.B.Wittingham, consultant architect to the cathedral. The inscription on the tomb is given in F.Blomefield, An essay towards a topographical history of ... Norfolk (Lond., 1805-10) vol.iii, pp.590,591; the date of Rose Moore's death is given in old style dating and it is probably this fact that has led to the wrong year being given in the D.N.B. Dorothy Tanner was baptized 13 December 1702 (cf. The first parish register of St. George of Tombland, Norwich (Norwich, 1891) p.150) and the inscription on the tomb shows that she died 17 February 1704. MS. T. 306, f.472 is an elegy written by John Gardner on the death of Rose Moore and the date is given correctly as 15 March 1706/07. If Gardner hoped to ingratiate himself with Tanner by means of this composition he was probably unsuccessful for he speaks of Rose Moore as being the wife of Dr. John Tanner, Chancellor of Norwich. Thomas Tanner did not proceed to a doctorate until 1710; cf. p. 60.

2. The date 24 November 1703 is given in the D.N.B., presumably on the authority of the Biographia Britannica, but I have been unable to verify this from contemporary sources. Blomefield's Norfolk, vol.iii, p.657, gives the year as 1702 and Tanner's Index, vol.i, f.402, is indistinct but appears to confirm November 1702 as the correct date.

3. Cf. W.R.Supple, A history of Thorpe-next-Norwich (Lond., 1918) p.49.

4. MS. Ballard 6, f.104, Gibson to Charlett, [May 1706].

because it was very near to Norwich.[1] This living had been obtained for him not by Moore but by the Archbishop of Canterbury[2] and Gibson, who had been intimately connected with Tenison since 1698, related that the arrangements on Tanner's behalf had been both tedious and troublesome.[3] On 1 January 1707 Moore made Tanner Commissary in the Archdeaconry of Sudbury and the town of Bury St. Edmunds and on hearing of this Gibson observed to Charlett that he would be "very glad to see our Friend ye Chancell^r^ nearer Oxford and London; but by his Chancellorship, Living, and ye late accession of a Commissaryship, he seems to be fixt in y^t^ Diocese, beyond all probability of a Remove".[4] His surmise almost proved to be correct for it was nearly another quarter of a century before Tanner moved from Norwich.

The changes which were taking place in the diocese of Norwich at this period must have made Tanner himself wonder if he was to remain there for the rest of his life. In the neighbouring see of Ely Bishop Simon Patrick was failing fast. Moore was widely regarded as a possible successor and Tanner observed from Norwich that "upon a translation (wch is not improbable, if the B^p^ of Ely should drop) every body here

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.82, Tanner to Charlett, 24 Feb. 1707.
2. Cf. ibid.; cf. also MS. Ballard 6, f.104. Tenison exchanged the patronage of a living in Kent with Duncan Dee who held that of Thorpe.
3. Cf. MS. Ballard 6, f.104.
4. MS. Ballard 6, f.105, Gibson to Charlett, 8 Feb. 1707.

would wish another Member of the Church in this See".[1] Patrick died on 31 May 1707 and two months later Moore was translated to Ely.[2] After the death of his daughter Moore was under less obligation to provide for Tanner and his removal from Norwich might well have meant the end of his patronage. "This alteration is not like at present to be much to my advantage", Tanner told Charlett, but he was considerably encouraged by the fact that "In all outward appearance My L^{ds} affection and kindness to me is not at all lessen'd since the death of his daughter, wth my behavior to whom the family always expres'd g^{t} satisfaction" and he concluded that he had reason to think himself "pretty safe" in expecting a continuance of Moore's former favours.[3] By the end of the year, however, his expectation had received scant encouragement, and when Kennett mentioned the matter to Charlett Tanner's dispirited reaction was that if Kennett "was no nearer the Deanery of Peterb. than I am Ely Chanc^{p} he must never expect to come there".[4]

It was probably this dismal assessment of his future prospects that made him entertain thoughts of supplicating for his Doctor's degree at Oxford, and in the summer of 1708

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.83v, Tanner to Charlett, 11 Apr. 1707.
2. Cf. Handbook of British chronology, ed. by Sir F.M.Powicke and E.B.Fryde, 2nd ed. (Royal historical society; Guides and handbooks, 2), (Lond., 1961) p.224.
3. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.84v, Tanner to Charlett, 25 Jun. 1707.
4. MS. Ballard 4, f.85, Tanner to Charlett, 7 Nov. 1707.

he told Charlett of his intentions.[1] His position as Chancellor placed him in a quandary as to which faculty he should proceed in: "Law", he felt, "is most suitable to my Office and might be more pleasing to the Profession Of D^rs. Commons, but Divinity has the precedence, and is fitter for a person in Holy Orders".[2] Two years later he formed a more definite resolve and he asked Charlett, "is any more expected from such as accumulate and live above 30. miles from the Univ. than the exercise for the Doctors degree viz. 3. Cursory Lectures on one of the Epistles - for if I proceed at all, it will be in Divinity; as I remember the Lat. Sermon & Disputations are usually dispensed w^th, if not I should be glad to know".[3] Three weeks before the degree giving he had still not definitely made up his mind[4] but he finally took his B.D. and D.D. degrees on 30 June 1710.

In October 1712[5] Tanner wrote to Charlett and, as was his habit, began by apologising for a gap in their correspondence. This time he had a better excuse than usual for "about 2. months since in London" he had once again become a married man.[6]

---

1. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.91, Tanner to Charlett, 18 Jun. 1708.
2. MS. Ballard 4, f.91.
3. MS. Ballard 4, f.101, Tanner to Charlett, 15 May 1710.
4. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.103, Tanner to Charlett, 5 Jun. 1710.
5. On 31 August 1711 Tanner became Official to the Archdeacon of Norfolk.
6. MS. Ballard 4, f.107, Tanner to Charlett, 20 Oct. 1712. I have been unable to discover the precise date of this marriage or where the ceremony was performed but the present reference, together with the fact that in his will Tanner mentions

[cont. on next page]

His second wife was Frances Preston and although she and her parents lived in London the family had strong Norfolk connections.[1] She was aged 34[2] but there is no reason to believe that she had been married before. Tanner entertained high hopes that this marriage to "a chearfull good Housekeeper, that will make her Husbands Friends welcom"[3] would be a happy one; hopes that were increased because the union had received the approbation of Bishop Moore and many friends that knew both parties.[4] A year later Moore showed his approval in a most practical manner, for when Tanner and his wife visited him at Ely he was "so kind as unask'd for"[5] to collate Tanner to the second prebendal stall of that cathedral on 10 September 1713.[6] Tanner's faith in Moore's patronage proved

---

6 cont. an indenture made 26 August 1712 in consideration of the marriage "about to be solemnised", means that it must have taken place about 1 September 1712.

1. Frances Preston's pedigree appears in The visitation of Norfolk, ed. by A.W.H.Clarke and A.Campling (Publications of the Harleian society, vol.lxxxvi) p.173. Her grandmother was the daughter of Sir Isaac Appleton and this probably explains the appearance of Appleton papers in the Tanner collection; cf. p.390. The inscription on her tomb (cf. Blomefield, Norfolk, vol.iii, p.636) says that her father, Jacob, was a "Citisen of London". In the printed pedigree her mother's maiden name is said to be "Welldow" but Tanner tells us (cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.107) that she was the sister of the Peter Waldo who succeeded him in his Fellowship of All Souls.

2. She died 11 June 1718 at the age of 40; cf. Blomefield, Norfolk, vol.iii, p.636.

3. MS. Ballard 4, f.107.

4. ibid.

5. MS. Ballard 4, f.110, Tanner to Charlett, 21 Sept. 1713.

6. Cf. J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, ed. by T.D.Hardy (Lond., 1854) vol.i, p.356. Tanner himself gives us this date in a list that he compiled of the prebendaries of Ely, now MS. Willis 45, f.112v.

justified and he hastened to explain the delay to his friends, pointing out that Moore had "never been wanting in any instance of affectionate regard to my self and all that belonged to me, even since the time that others might have thought their Relation & obligations ceased; and the delay of shewing me kindness in the like manner upon the two former vacancies proceeded from reasons unexceptional to those that know the state of his Family; not from want of any inclination to do well by me, wch sufficiently shewed it self upon this late occasion to the disappointm^{t} of other projects & sollicitations".[1]

This position was doubly welcome to Tanner because it carried with it the obligation of fifty days residence during the year and at Ely, unlike some other cathedral chapters, this residence was "very strict".[2] For seven weeks of the year therefore Tanner retired to an oasis of peace and quiet which enabled him to indulge once more in those antiquarian pursuits which were so dear to his heart: "I have nothing to do", he told Charlett, "but to mind my prayers & Studies, a state of living very acceptable to one that is hurried all the rest of the year in a great town and a busy imploym^{t}."[3] During these weeks Tanner tried to make some progress with the Notitia and the Bibliotheca and also to catch up on his

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.111, Tanner to Charlett, 5 Dec. 1713.
2. Cf. MS. Ballard 6, f.130v, Gibson to Charlett, 23 Aug. 1718.
3. MS. Ballard 4, f.111.

permanent arrears of correspondence, but things did not always work out as he had intended and in 1721 he told Browne Willis that he had gone to Ely "fully designing from thence early to have pester'd you wth letters, but within 2. or 3. day after I got thither came to my hands 3, or 4, old books, upon wch I could not keep my eyes of, and they so took up my whole time that I did not do one sheet of the Not. Monast. when I hoped to have done so, and yet scarce ever work'd harder than I did those seven weeks".[1]

There now follows a lull in Tanner's ecclesiastical advancement which came at a time in his life when he might reasonably have expected some recognition to be made of his meticulous discharge of the duties of Chancellor.[2] The cause of this is not hard to find. The peaceful accession of George I to the throne in 1714 bore with it the obligation to recompense the more enthusiastic supporters of the House of Hanover and consequently the elevations to the episcopal bench were for some years partly coloured by political rather than pastoral considerations, a tendency which was also reflected in the appointments made amongst the lower ranks of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Although a Whig sympathiser Tanner had throughout his life studiously avoided controversy and it was this very fact that enabled him to remain on intimate terms

---

1. MS. Willis 41, f.143, Tanner to Willis, 10 Jul. 1721.

2. It perhaps should not go unmentioned that this lull coincides with Moore's death. Moore died on 31 July 1714.

with the adherents of the High Church party like Browne Willis and, even more remarkable, with Hearne. Willis admitted to Hearne that Tanner was "under the direction of others whom neither you or I regard or care for"[1] but he also found him good company and an excellent collaborator with his antiquarian researches; so much so that he dedicated the second volume of his History of Mitred Abbies to him.[2] In the political field, therefore, Tanner had little to commend him to those in power but he was well-known as a scholar and although his production was small his reputation was large. Unfortunately he was a scholar pure and simple and, as has been pointed out, "though the eighteenth century appreciated learning, it preferred it spiced with politics".[3] The polemics and dissensions of late seventeenth and early eighteenth century ecclesiastical polity were a breeding ground for the study of antiquities. Most of the protagonists in these controversies appealed to precedent and the appeal to precedent brought the historian into his own; but there was no room for pedantic study and the men who made the most of the occasion were those who themselves applied their great learning to the problems of the day. Among Tanner's friends Wake, Kennett, and Gibson were all prominent in the greatest of all the disputes - the Convocation Controversy - and they were all

---

1. MS. Rawl. lett. 11/12, f.64, Willis to Hearne, 9 Feb. 1716.
2. Cf. p. 99 . Volume one was dedicated to Wake.
3. Sykes, Church and State, p.165.

to reap their reward in rapid promotion.[1] Throughout these arguments Tanner remained silent and never sided with any party, with the result that no one in power had any need to recompense him for his services. Excellent churchman and outstanding antiquary though he was these qualities were not in themselves sufficient to ensure that they would receive their merited reward and had he not had influential friends, notably Gibson, it is doubtful if Tanner would have ever obtained even the minor bishopric which eventually fell to his lot. Gibson had perhaps foreseen this state of affairs as early as 1711 when he expressed his regret to Charlett that Tanner's position as Chancellor of Norwich was so satisfactory that it was unlikely that he would soon relinquish it and also observed that Tanner "might be more serviceable to ye publick in many respects, if he were in London, than he can be there under ye frequent and unavoidable Avocations of little trifling Causes".[2] Tanner, however, was not discontented:

---

1. Wake became Dean of Exeter in 1703, Bishop of Lincoln in 1705, and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1716. Kennett became a prebendary of Salisbury in 1701, Dean of Peterborough in 1708, and Bishop of that see in 1718. By 1710 Gibson had become Rector of Lambeth, Canon and Precentor of Chichester, and Archdeacon of Surrey. He was made Bishop of Lincoln in 1716 and translated to London in 1720.

2. MS. Ballard 6, f.110v, Gibson to Charlett, 27 Jan. 1711. These "trifling Causes" did not always fall within Tanner's sphere of office; in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 587, f.260, Tanner writes to Matthew Postlethwayte on 26 Aug. 1730: "This Bearer Mrs Paten is a perfect stranger to me, and thô in compassion to the distress or lowness of spirit she seems to labor under I have given her in a very busy morning a pretty long hearing, I am not much the wiser nor dos it in any way lay in my way to assist or ease her ... Besides 'tis a matter she ought to consult wth the Common Lawyers about".

he wanted above all to be "an honest Man, an Antiquary, a Clergyman endeavoring so to pass thro' things temporal as finally not to loose the things Eternal",[1] and when in 1717 his friends began to talk of his promotion he was disinclined "now the best part of my Life is over to unsettle all my affairs, enter upon the Cure of a g^t parish where I am a perfect stranger - begin new Friendships - put myself into a state of dependance & sollicitation - for additional preferm^ts when I am now contented".[2]

This lull in Tanner's ecclesiastical advancement coincided with a deterioration in his personal affairs and the year 1715 saw the beginning of a period of intense emotional strain. It is probable that the first of Tanner's misfortunes was the death of a daughter early in February[3] but the rest of his family troubles seem clear. Tanner himself was not in the

---

1. MS. Willis 44, f.165, Tanner to Willis, 6 Jun. 1716.

2. MS. Willis 36, f.201, Tanner to Willis, 4 Dec. 1717.

3. The evidence for the existence of this child rests almost entirely on the statement by F.H.Relton, a direct descendant of Tanner's brother John, in Notes and queries, 11th ser., vol.v, p.393 that Tanner had a daughter who was buried 11 February 1714/15 aged sixteen months. Tanner rarely mentions his children, although the birth of three of them is adequately documented in his letters to Thomas Moore. The only supporting evidence for such a child in Tanner's correspondence between the months of November 1713 and February 1715 would seem to be a reference to his "little Family" (cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.115, Tanner to Charlett, 9 Nov. 1714) and that soon after the suggested date of death Browne Willis voiced an expression of concern at Tanner's family troubles, which are said to have been of a "melancholy" and "afflicting" nature (cf. MS. T. 468, f.14; 28 Apr. 1715).

best of health and had just heard that his brother William was dangerously ill when at the end of August 1715 his wife gave birth to a little girl. The pleasure that this must have brought the childless Tanner did not last long for the baby, who had been christened Elizabeth, died on 12 September[1] and when his wife's health took a turn for the worse he distractedly told Thomas Moore that he had "neither time nor inclination to concern my self about any more than needs must ... my Dear wife is in a very bad way: she has now been a week under Dr Wrench's care who has done I believe to the best of his power for her - but without any great effect ... I am in g^t^ trouble about this poor dear woman".[2] His wife was still in a "pitiable State" a month later, but as she was showing slight signs of improvement Tanner was able to hope that she might in time make a complete recovery[3] and this prospect enabled him to write a letter to Willis recounting his troubles in a more composed manner: "My wife being seised wth a Feavor upon her lying in, heightned [sic] by the death of the Baby at 3. weeks old and of her own maid here in the house and one or two other ill accidents that she has for two months & better labored under great Weakness both of Body & Mind, and has occasioned me great greif [sic] and interrup-

---

1. Cf. the inscription given in Blomefield, Norfolk, vol.iii, p.636; cf. also MS. Bodl. 1013, f.56, Tanner to T.Moore, 19 Sept. 1715.
2. MS. Bodl. 1013, f.56.
3. Cf. MS. Bodl. 1013, f.58, Tanner to T.Moore, 15 Oct. 1715.

tions in my affairs".[1] To add to his troubles in the summer of 1715 Tanner was not expecting his father to live much longer;[2] but the Vicar of Market Lavington seems to have been a determined old gentleman. Even in his illness he insisted on being carried to his church in order to perform the services and Tanner expressed the belief that he would "one time or other dy there" so devoted was he to his duties.[3]

With the beginning of 1716 Tanner's affairs seemed to improve a little for his father was still alive and his wife was slowly recovering. On May the fourteenth Tanner was able to tell his uncle-in-law that "the poor woman you and other Friends have taken such pains about is not well yet, but I am willing to hope gets ground of her unhappy distemper - and thoughts";[4] and ten days later it was with great relief that Tanner could at last record his thanks to God for "removing the sad thoughts that have so long afflicted her poor Soul; wch within this week are quite gone, and she can say her prayers & go to Church wth comfort".[5] Poor Frances! She can hardly have regained her health when she once again found that she was to be a mother. On 25 February 1717 Tanner told Moore that his wife had been "brought to bed on Sunday fortnight, and is (God be thank'd) in a likely way to

---

1. MS. Willis 44, f.160, Tanner to Willis, 26 Oct. 1715.
2. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.118v , Tanner to Charlett, 28 May 1715.
3. ibid.
4. MS. Bodl. 1013, f.61, Tanner to T.Moore, 14 May 1716.
5. MS. Bodl. 1013, f.62v, Tanner to T.Moore, 24 May 1716.

be well - the hopes of which makes us more easy under the loss of the Child (another Girl)".[1] A year later, on 24 February 1718, Tanner at long last wrote to Charlett to tell him the joyous news that his wife had that day at noon been safely delivered of a "stout boy".[2] In his letters to his friends Tanner's delight at having a "brave young Antiquary"[3] to follow in his footsteps shines transparently through two and a half centuries, delight which was enhanced by the fact that his wife was as well as could be expected in the circumstances.[4] Bearing in mind the fate of his former children Tanner hoped for the best but prepared himself for the worst, piously placing himself in God's hands:

> ... so many accidents attend these little Infants, that there is very little depending on their continuance, wch if it please God to grant we shall be very thankfull - if

---

1. MS. Bodl. 1013, f.60, Tanner to T.Moore, 25 Feb. 1717. In Frances Tanner's epitaph (cf. Blomefield, Norfolk, vol.iii, p.636) an~~d~~ un-named child is said to have been buried on 11 February 1715/16. In 1716/17 February the twenty-fifth was a Thursday an~~d~~ this means that the child would have been born on 7 February; an interrment date of 11 February is therefore quite probable and if this epitaph was not erected until 1718 such an error might perhaps occur. From Tanner's letter to Moore it would seem that this child was almost certainly not baptized and therefore that it is the un-named one that is buried with her mother. The coincidence of the date 11 February does however suggest that there might possibly be some confusion with the child said to have been buried 11 February 1714/15 (cf. p. 66 , note 3) but it seems likely that a name would have been given for a child aged sixteen months.

2. MS. Ballard 4, f.125, Tanner to Charlett, [suffixed] 24 Feb. 1718.

3. MS. Willis 38, p.505, Tanner to Willis, 14 Mar. 1718.

4. Cf. ibid.

> he thinks fit to make an alteration, we must submit - and I hope shall endeavor to be as easy and contented under the Loss as before we had the Blessing.[1]

The child lived and was christened Thomas after both his father and grandfather, but the delighted father was soon to become the sorrowing widower: weakened by the strain of almost perpetual child-bearing since their marriage in 1712 Frances Tanner died 11 June 1718 at the age of forty.[2] Eleven years after he had told Charlett of the death of his first wife Tanner performed the similar sad duty for his second, and both the letters contain genuine sentiments of sorrow at the termination of what, in spite of all the trials and tribulations, had been far from unhappy marriages. Once again he recorded his wife's relationship to his studies, saying that "she was so discreet and excellent [a] Woman, so carefull of my domestic Concerns, and so obliging to my self and all my Friends that in her I had all the comforts and as few of the inconveniences as ever Scholar had in the Married State".[3] His sense of loneliness was increased by the fact that he soon entered into his residence at Ely; this was to last from August until October, "the most pleasant season that ever yet fell to my share - and here is a great deal of good company,

---

1. MS. Willis 38, p.505.
2. Cf. Blomefield, Norfolk, vol.iii, p.636. She was buried near Tanner's first wife; cf. pp.56,57. The gravestone has similarly been removed.
3. MS. Ballard 4, f.127, Tanner to Charlett, 12 Aug. 1718.

the B^p & Dean & their Families and 2 more Prebendaries besides my Self - wch is lucky enough for me in my melancholy state - and who never lived here before without her whose good sense and chearfull temper made all times of the year and all places agreeable to me".[1] Soon after his wife died Tanner's son became very ill but he recovered within a few weeks;[2] never a strong boy his health was for some time a worry to his father.[3] At the close of this distressing year Tanner's father died on 18 December; he was buried in the church at Market Lavington

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.127.

2. ibid.

3. MS. T. 306, ff.482-491 is a poem by John Watson, Rector of Woodrising, dedicated to "Master Tanner". After his mother's death the young lad seems to have been in the care of a nurse (identified in Tanner's will as an Elizabeth Hewitt) at Matishall. On f.488 the following lines appear:

> Much ow'st thou, TANNER, to thy nurse's care,
> Thy head distinguish'd by uncommon hair.
> She cherish'd those weak limbs, when death was fear'd,
> And feeble thee to views of manhood rear'd.

Tanner's son was educated at Norwich Grammar school and matriculated at Christ Church, Oxford, where his father was a canon, in 1734, taking his B.A. in 1737 and M.A. in 1740. He became Rector of St. Edmund the King and St. Nicholas Acons, London; of Childerstone, Kent; and Merstham, Surrey. He was also Rector of Hadleigh and Monk's Eleigh, Suffolk. He became a Prebendary of Canterbury in 1746 and D.D. by archbishop's faculty in 1749; he died 11 March 1786. In 1742 he married Mary, daughter of Archbishop Potter and had issue of one daughter, Mary Elizabeth, who died 29 September 1818. She married on 9 October 1765 Richard Milles, M.P. for Canterbury: the subsequent pedigree appears in W.Rye, Norfolk families (Norwich, 1913) p.553. Cf. H.W.Saunders, A history of the Norwich grammar school (Norwich, 1932) p.302; Foster, Alumni Oxonienses; Le Neve, Fasti, vol.i, p.51; Blomefield, Norfolk, vol.iii, p.636; Index library, vol.lxiii, p.353; Harleian society, register section, vol.xi, p.148; E.Farrer, Church heraldry of Norfolk, vol.ii, p.107.

in the same grave as Tanner's mother, having been for forty-six years the "diligent, pious, resident minister" of the parish.[1]

Throughout these worrying times Tanner had been obliged to discharge the duties of his office and, as a result, his studies,[2] his correspondence, and above all his health began to suffer. He wrote to Browne Willis in September 1716:

> I have been and am under much concern that I met wth avocations of so many kinds this summer as not to have been able to do for you in the manner I have been very sincerely inclined. But the hurry of the B^ps^ Visitation, the many businesses arising thence and from the B^ps^ going early to London to be settled - more indisposition in body than I have had these good many years wch has obliged me to go thro' the Drs Methods of Bleading, vomiting, purging &c^ch^ - and a journey of near 200. miles round the Diocese wch I begin to morrow upon Courts of a good deal of business, and the ordering matters before hand for them, have taken up my time almost altogether this summer from serving my self or Friends in beloved Antiquities. But I hope when next month is over to be easier and apply more closely to my Monastick Studies.[3]

In the light of his subsequent misfortunes it is small wonder

---

1. The inscription on the memorial tablet erected by Tanner near his father's grave in Market Lavington church is given in Wilton, op. cit., Wiltshire archaeological and natural history magazine, vol.xiii, pp.71,72: Tanner's mother is said to have died 16 June 1711 aged 63 years. This tablet is now to be found directly opposite the south door of the church. The parish register shows that after an almost indecently short period of mourning Tanner's father married, on 2 September 1711, a Margaret Gardham of the neighbouring parish of Cheverell Magna; cf. Wiltshire parish registers, vol.viii, p.69.

2. On 11 November 1715 Tanner admitted to Rawlinson that his "Studies as well as Business" had suffered as a result of his family misfortunes; cf. MS. Rawl. B 268, f.114v.

3. MS. Willis 44, f.168, Tanner to Willis, 21 Sept. 1716.

that his friends waited in vain for the publication of the learned works on which he was engaged, and the fact that he was able to maintain his reputation as an antiquarian at all says much for his academic qualities. The amazing erudition that he placed at the disposal of his many friends may be seen amongst the letters now preserved in the Bodleian Library, particularly those in the Willis collection, but it is perhaps only fair to add that Tanner himself admitted to Willis that he had corresponded more with him than with "all my Learned Friends put together".[1]

Even his official duties did not seem to run very smoothly and he found himself involved in a quarrel with the Dean of Norwich, Humphrey Prideaux. It appears that the cause of this rupture was Tanner's discovery that some of Prideaux's tenants at a nearby estate would not repair their own parish church, nor would they contribute their proportions to the neighbouring church which they now used. Tanner, in his position as Chancellor, made some "honest attempts" to remedy this neglect which annoyed Prideaux and "brought g^t wrath & indignation upon one that little cares for it, while he is doing his Duty".[2] Prideaux's diary became full of scathing references to Tanner[3] and the two men seem to have avoided each other.[4] Tanner told Willis that he would be "amazed to

---

1. MS. Willis 44, f.211, Tanner to Willis, 26 Mar. 1717.
2. Cf. MS. Willis 38, p.501, Tanner to Willis, 24 May 1718.
3. Cf. R.W.Ketton-Cremer, Norfolk assembly, pp.83,84.
4. Cf. MS. Willis 38, p.501; MS. Ballard 4, f.127v.

think what difficulties & ill usage I have met wth in this plain thing from a Dean, Archdeacon & director of Church Wardens".[1]

If Tanner's circumstances hindered the production of the Notitia and the Bibliotheca his reputation as an antiquarian had in no way diminished and at about this time he was elected Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries.[2] Whilst he remained at Norwich he was not able to attend the meetings very often, but he was still to be remembered later as one of the more active members before 1720.[3] Afterwards, when circumstances took him more often to London he quickly became an enthusiastic and popular supporter of this Society.[4]

---

1. MS. Willis 38, p.501. There are two interesting letters from Prideaux to Wake relating to this affair at Christ Church, Oxford, in Arch W. Epist. 20, dated 31 March and 16 April 1718. Prideaux confessed that the point of law was on Tanner's side but he thought that the strict application of the law would result in an injustice - an injustice that would cost him personally about £800. Although he had earlier thought Tanner a model Chancellor (cf. p. 51) Prideaux now says of him that he "pursues ye Lucrative part of his Office with such a greedynesse as hath drawn on him ye Odium of ye whole Countrey" and that he had "laid [a] scheme ... wch will bring 3 or 4 hundred pounds into his pocket". Both Wake and Bishop Trimnell of Norwich seem to have supported Tanner in the dispute.

2. The date of Tanner's election to the Society is given in the D.N.B. as 23 December 1718 but the authority for this is not clear. The Society has no definite record of his election but Miss Josephine Farrell kindly informs me that the minutes of the Society for February 1770 could be interpreted as meaning that Tanner was a Fellow as early as 1715.

3. Cf. MS. Top. Lond. c. 2, f.144, G.Vertue to Willis, 21 Apr. 1752; cf. also ibid., f.21.

4. MS. Top. Lond. c. 2, f.141 is a copy of a letter from W.Nicholas to C.Compton, 19 Nov. 1736 (pr. in Joan Evans, A history of the Society of antiquaries (Lond., 1956) p.83).

[cont. on next page]

Just before Tanner's death Richard Rawlinson offered him membership of the Royal Society but he replied that he "must beg to be excused. Their discourses and performances being for the most part out of the way of my Studies - and my lameness and business such that when I am in London I can't attend their meetings".[1]

The third decade of the eighteenth century saw Tanner's career as a churchman take on a new impetus. He seems to have become aware that his promotion was not quite as rapid as it might have been and henceforth many more references to changes in ecclesiastical appointments appear in his correspondence. As his young son was in the care of a nurse his domestic worries were few and he was able to concern himself more with the future; besides, he now had influential

---

4 cont. It reads:
The place of our Meeting is ye Mitre Tavern in Fleet street, where we have a large Room. Upon the revival of the Society in 1717 our first Meeting was there, & so continued for many years afterwards; but upon the desire of some B^ps^ and hopes that others would become Members and be present if Gentlemen met at some private place, we removed first to Grays Inn and then to ye Temple. The former place was soon complaind of as too much out of the way, and the Bishops came as little to Grays Inn as they did to the Mitre: we also found the latter Inconveniency attended The Temple also, except in Dr Tanner late Bish^p^. of St Asaph, who was with us in all places, being a great friend to Antiquities and ventur'd to put his Mitred head into the Mitre Tavern, which others pretended some excuse to avoid. Tho' perhaps they could not have thought a tripple Mitre too heavy, if they could obtain them at one time.

1. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.47, Tanner to Rawlinson, [Dec. 1735?].

friends in high places for Wake was Archbishop of Canterbury[1] whilst Gibson was Bishop of Lincoln and Kennett Bishop of Peterborough. Tanner must have accordingly thought that his chances of obtaining preferment had considerably improved. Robert Cannon, Archdeacon of Norfolk, became Dean of Lincoln in 1721 and Tanner, who was Cannon's Official, wrote to Wake to ask for the vacant position, at the same time pointing out that he would be thought "a very insignificant Creature, if I have the Slurr of a young man or a stranger thrust in over my head"[2]; he had at length realised that he could not "expect any thing without asking".[3] His request was granted and on 26 December 1721 Tanner was installed as the new Archdeacon of Norfolk.[4] It was not long before the Deanery

---

1. Tanner's letter to Wake congratulating him on this appointment is now at Christ Church, MS. Arch. W. Epist. 6, f. 20. Tanner's letters to the Archbishop reveal that the two men remained on extremely friendly terms until Tanner's death.

2. [Christ Church] MS. Arch. W. Epist. 9, item 121, Tanner to Wake, 27 Sept. 1721.

3. ibid.

4. Cf. Le Neve, Fasti, vol.ii, p.485. Cannon had married Elizabeth, daughter of Bishop Moore and a younger sister of Tanner's first wife. Tanner's letter to Wake (cf. note 2) indicates that Cannon resigned the Archdeaconry specially for his benefit and as, on becoming Archdeacon, Tanner resigned his Officiality in favour of his brother John the whole transaction was something of a family affair. Tanner thought that his new appointment would be "about 50 £ ann advantage and some little ease to me" (ibid.) but in a letter to Charlett (MS. Ballard 4, f.144; 2 Apr. 1722) he wrote that the first fruits were "so exceeding high above the Clear value, that I scarce expect in three years (if I live so long) to repay my self what the first fruits, tenths & other Charges oblige me to expend". Cf. also Memoirs of a royal chaplain, ed. by A.Hartshorne (Lond., 1905) p.267.

of Lincoln again fell vacant for Cannon died on 28 March 1722.[1] Willis expressed the hope that Tanner would succeed Cannon at Lincoln but Tanner himself thought that this was unlikely and observed that he stood a much better chance of obtaining the less important Deanery of Peterborough where his old friend White Kennett was bishop.[2] An appointment in that "old Monastical Church" would have been most acceptable but in spite of his new-found desire for advancement he was placidly able to observe that "to one who is satisfyed and thankfull for what he already has, the disposal of Dignities to others who better deserve and perhaps more want is by no means grieveous".[3]

Whilst Gibson was Bishop of Lincoln he had emerged as chief ecclesiastical adviser to Sir Robert Walpole, a fact which was not generally realised until he was nominated to the see of London on 10 April 1723, when it became transparently clear that in regard to Church appointments he was an even more important person than Archbishop Wake.[4] Wake, however, was not entirely without influence and he too had been for some time disposed to advance Tanner to the best of

---

1. His death must have been a blow to Tanner who believed that Cannon was now in a position to assist him and "would upon a proper occasion [have] worried & made the g[t] folks hear of me"; cf. MS. Willis 64, f.52v.

2. Cf. MS. Willis 64, f.52v, Tanner to Willis, 28 Apr. 1722. Why Tanner should expect preferment at Kennett's hands but not at Gibson's is not clear.

3. ibid.

4. Cf. Sykes, Gibson, pp.84,85.

his ability.[1] Tanner began to entertain serious hopes of promotion and when it became common talk that Kennett would follow Gibson at Lincoln he at last, albeit half-heartedly, allowed his thoughts to rest upon a mitre.[2] However Kennett was trying to obtain the Deanery of Westminster in commendam with his present bishopric and indicated to Wake that he would be unwilling to accept the translation.[3] Tanner could hardly aspire to Lincoln, which fell to Richard Reynolds, the Bishop of Bangor, and he was in any case by no means in desperate need of financial advancement "having (God be thank'd) enough already to place my little boy well into the World, if he prove good - and too much if he prove a Rake";[4] moreover, he had viewed with great distaste the efforts of some of his brethren to enlarge their worldly wealth and expressed his opinion that the goods of the Church "were design'd for other and better uses".[5] He was able to lie easy under what cannot have been a particularly great disappointment, and he described his situation to Willis:

> Ely is the nearest place wch I conceive I shall ever be in to Whaddon;[6] that neighborhood was indeed one of the most comfortable prospects upon what was so generally talk'd of, the removal into Huntingdonshire - wch discourse or any other of the like nature I know no founda-

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 21, f.112, Wake to Tanner, 8 Jul. 1699.
2. Cf. MS. Willis 64, f.49v, Tanner to Willis, 18 Feb. 1723.
3. Cf. Bennett, White Kennett, p.153.
4. MS. Willis 64, f.49v.
5. ibid.
6. Willis lived at Whaddon Hall, Buckinghamshire.

tion for or real thoughts of among any of my friends, save some speeches of [the] B^p of Peterb. (who I fancy has no g^t hand in making B^ps) nor am I in the least sollicitous about it, and as glad as I should be of an easier station in the decline of my Life, I never intimated even so much to any Minister of State, ArchB^p, Bishop or other Person in a Condition to assist - some may think me as persons & things now are a little wanting to my self - but I have perhaps other notions of those g^t Promotions than many of the seekers and enjoyers of them. God has given me (blessed be his name) what is more valuable than the greatest preferm^t in Chtendom, a mind contented wth and thankfull for what I have, and not anxious for more or higher, having a view to the Onus as well as the Honor. And tho' the annual income of my places dos not exceed much above half of what the worst provided B^p now has (including his Commendam's) I don't know but that I may be so simple as to think the same as sufficient for me as our G^t Friend at Lambeth doth his for him & his Family. And I believe I may say with truth, that every week in the year that I am here,[1] I have as many Clergymen at my table as some of those Prelates I could name.[2]

For the rest of 1723, however, Tanner hardly had time to dwell upon his future prospects, nor was he able to make any progress with his studies, for that year's diocesan visitation was a particularly strenuous one and the burden of its organisation fell upon Tanner to an unusual degree. Not only was there a new bishop[3] who was not well acquainted with the clergy and the diocese but John Moore, the Principal Registrar, was "lazy and above his business".[4] Tanner felt obliged to gloss over his incompetence because he was Bishop Moore's son. The result was that "the care of settling

---

1. The letter is written from Norwich.
2. MS. Willis 45, f.238, Tanner to Willis, 3 Jun. 1723.
3. Thomas Green was consecrated to the see on 8 October 1721.
4. MS. Willis 45, f.238.

Places, Preachers, Processes, Articles, instructions for terriers &c. and in short the whole business from General to private Centinell has almost wholly laid upon me and will do 'till the 20 sessions or Courts are over, the fatigue of wch I dread".[1] Tanner looked forward longingly to the end of the visitation when he would be able to take up his annual residence in the peace and quiet of Ely Cathedral; meanwhile the Notitia Monastica made no progress and "old Monks must be laid aside, till I can get thro' this review of the modern secular Clergy".[2]

On 15 February 1724 Tanner was installed as a Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, an appointment for which he resigned his prebend of Ely.[3] To leave his situation at Ely, which had been such a source of pleasure to him and which had provided him with the opportunity to continue his antiquarian researches in the midst of his otherwise busy life, must have made him rather sad[4] but this sorrow was more than compensated by the joy that he undoubtedly felt at returning to the city that might have been his home for life. Time had changed Oxford and Tanner now found that he hardly knew anyone at the University; Charlett had died in 1722[5] and even

---

1. MS. Willis 45, f.238.
2. ibid.
3. Cf. Le Neve, Fasti, vol.i, p.356; vol.ii, p.522.
4. To mark his departure he made the gift of a fire-engine, for which he paid £40; cf. MS. Willis 45, f.110v.
5. Charlett's death had been followed by a dispute over the

[cont. on next page]

after four years as a canon he could say that at All Souls he only knew the Warden[1] and two of the Fellows,[2] and "at St Johns, Balliol & Exeter - I scarce know a man except the Heads by sight, but they don't visit me".[3] He did, however, soon consolidate his acquaintance with Thomas Hearne, an association which was academically advantageous to both men.[4] Soon after his appointment as a canon Tanner was amongst those that were thought might possibly succeed Hugh Boulter as Dean of Christ Church and Bishop of Bristol, but the position went to William Bradshaw.[5] Not long afterwards the Deanery of Norwich became vacant when Prideaux died on 1 November 1724; Tanner would have liked this position very much and it had at one time been promised to him but he already knew that it was to be bestowed elsewhere. However, in being warned of this disappointment no less a person than Sir Robert Walpole told him that he would be "early thought of for something better".[6]

---

5 cont. Mastership of University College. Tanner was appointed a member of the commission of enquiry which eventually pronounced in favour of Thomas Cockman with whom Tanner had collaborated on the edition of Cicero's De Officiis. Cf. W.Carr, University college (Lond., 1902) pp.172-176.

1. Stephen Niblett. There is some semi-official correspondence between Tanner and Niblett amongst the archives of All Souls.

2. John Irish and George Clarke.

3. MS. Willis 45, f.111, Tanner to Willis, 12 Mar. 1728.

4. Cf. Hearne, vol.viii, p.193.

5. Cf. Hist. MSS. Comm.; Portland vii, pp.378,382.

6. Cf. Records of Buckinghamshire, vol.ix, pp.62,63; Tanner to Willis, 16 Nov. 1724.

In 1727 Tanner's name was one of five submitted by Gibson to the King for consideration as candidates for episcopal honours,[1] but with no immediate result and in the following year we find his eyes cast enviously upon the Deanery of Salisbury.[2] He felt that such a position, together with his canonry, would have well contented him, but he was aware that the post was coveted by others and when it was given to John Clarke, who had made "g^{t} advances" in that direction he felt neither surprise nor resentment.[3] He probably found some small compensation in the compliment that was paid him when he was elected Prolocutor of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury.[4] With his commitments in Norwich, London, and Oxford it now became obvious to others that Tanner was unlikely ever to find sufficient spare time to enter the literary arena again.[5]

This busy life, together with his persevering if unavailing devotion to his beloved studies, was beginning to tell upon Tanner who was by now well into his fifties. In 1723 his health had obliged him "to relax a little from my Studies and undergo the discipline of a little Physick"[6] and by the

---

1. Cf. Sykes, Gibson, p.140.
2. Cf. MS. Willis 45, f.111.
3. ibid.
4. The speech that Tanner delivered on this occasion, 9 February 1728, is to be seen MS. T. 282, ff.164-168.
5. Cf. Hearne, vol.ix, p.401.
6. MS. Willis 64, f.49v, Tanner to Willis, 18 Feb. 1723.

spring of 1727 he was complaining of a general lack of health and more particularly of inflammation of the eyes.[1] The following summer was very hot and Tanner, in common with many others, suffered both from the heat and from eating over-ripe fruit, an indisposition that was so widespread in East Anglia that in some villages there were hardly enough men available to gather the harvest,[2] but he was not so ill that he was unable to perform his duties and these so fully occupied him "as to leave me very little time for my own private Studies, or the service of my learned Friends".[3] He was soon reduced to the use of spectacles[4] and, even with the help of these, constant poring over old manuscripts by the uncertain light of a candle brought about a recurrence of his eye trouble and he was temporarily forbidden to read and to write which, he felt, to an antiquary, was a "hard sentence".[5] But it was his bodily health that caused him more worry than his eyes. The sharp and uncertain weather of the early months of 1729, together with frequent colds, upset his constitution and he reluctantly summoned the physician and was forced to submit to "bleeding, vomiting, purging & a good

---

1. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 23-25, f.62, T.Baker to Hearne, 2 Apr. 1727.
2. MS. Rawl. lett. 9/10, f.281, Tanner to Hearne, 19 Aug. 1727.
3. MS. Rawl. lett. 9/10, f.283, Tanner to Hearne, 14 Oct. 1727.
4. Cf. MS. Willis 45, f.132, Tanner to Willis, 10 Jul. 1728.
5. Cf. MS. Willis 45, f.148v, Tanner to Willis, 20 Oct. 1729.

deal of nauseous Physic".[1] He was confined to his room until the weather improved, ordered to rest, and expressly told that he must moderate the amount of his reading and writing.[2] The disease from which he was suffering seems to have been some form of dropsy and he never did make a complete recovery: later he was described as being of "so gross a Body" that it was inevitable that his remaining years should be spent in discomfort.[3] Nevertheless he was consoled by the memory of his healthy younger days and he philosophically observed to Willis, who also was not in the best of health, that "what is now befallen us is no more than what we might expect and what younger people often feel".[4] The indisposition centred upon his legs which began to swell, and even when he was sufficiently recovered to resume his researches his physical infirmity proved something of an obstacle: for a while he was unable to "stir about my Study to reach down books &c. - but sitting still can [redacted] do a g^{t} deal of business, my head (God be thank'd) holding well,

---

1. Cf. MS. Willis 45, f.96, Tanner to Willis, 28 Feb. 1729. In this letter Tanner says that this was the first occasion on which he had summoned the physician for himself since he moved to Norwich. If this is true then Tanner may have treated himself in 1716 (cf. p.72); he certainly seems to have had some interest in medicine; cf. p.375.

2. ibid.

3. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 21/22, f.155v, Baker to Hearne, 16 Dec. 1733.

4. MS. Willis 64, f.54, Tanner to Willis, 29 Jan. 17[29?].

and my hands at liberty".[1]

In August 1730 Tanner experienced a recurrence of his trouble; his legs swelled to "a very high degree" and he said that his general health was worse than it ever had been in his life.[2] He had to keep to his room for two months and it was not until late October that he was able "to hop down stairs & get out for an hour in my Chariot".[3] Again his biggest complaint was of the interference with his studies, for although his head had been "all along pretty clear, yet I have been able to do very little - not being able to get sho or stocking on - and scarce able to get [out] of my seat".[4] He made a temporary recovery but with the new year came a relapse and for twelve weeks he was once more forced to undergo medical attention,[5] but by the end of March he was much improved, able to dispense with the medical advice, and to look forward to a visit to Oxford which was to take place in the May.[6] This time his recovery was to last longer and with his return to comparative health there came the long-awaited preferment that was to take him permanently away from East Anglia.

---

1. MS. Willis 64, f.54.
2. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 9/10, f.295, Tanner to Hearne, 24 Oct. 1730. Tanner seems to have forgotten that he was "very like to have died" of smallpox in 1699; cf. p. 42.
3. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 9/10, f.295.
4. MS. Willis 41, f.157, Tanner to Willis, 5 Oct. 1730.
5. MS. Rawl. lett. 15/16, f.486, Tanner to Hearne, 29 Mar. 1731.
6. ibid.

d: St. Asaph

The recommendation that Gibson had made as to Tanner's suitability for a bishopric was not unheeded and in the summer of 1731 there was a strong rumour that he was to receive the see of St. David's.[1] William Baker, Tanner's diocesan, spoke with Sir Robert Walpole on the matter and, on his return to Norwich from London, gave Tanner the pleasant news that Walpole had verbally confirmed the appointment.[2] Unfortunately Elias Sydal, the present bishop, was to be allowed to hold the see so that he could "hook in" the Michaelmas rents both of St. David's and of his new diocese of Gloucester, and with this in view he was deliberately being as slow as possible over his tour of confirmations.[3] Tanner was disappointed at the delay, which was eventually to prove to his advantage, but was more than occupied in seeing to his own affairs. He described to Willis his hurry "in preparing to leave a place where I have lived comfortably almost 31. years, directing the packing up my Cartloads of old Books & lumber - visits to receive and make both in town and Country upon parting wth old Friends, & Relations &c.".[4] On 23 January 1732 Tanner was consecrated

---

1. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 27c, ff.26,313.
2. Cf. MS. Willis 64, f.58, Tanner to Willis, 6 Aug. 1731.
3. Cf. MS. Willis 64, f.59, Tanner to Willis, 18 Sept. 1731.
4. MS. Willis 64, f.63a, Tanner to Willis, 1 Nov. 1731; cf. also MS. Rawl. lett. 27c, f.221.

not to St. David's but to the slightly richer see of St. Asaph[1] and at the same ceremony Nicholas Claggett, Dean of Rochester, was consecrated as Bishop of St. David's. The service was conducted by Archbishop Wake and this occasion was the last on which the ageing Wake was to perform a consecration;[2] it was perhaps only the memory of his friendship with Tanner, which had lasted since 1698, that made him make the painful effort to officiate. Tanner recorded that "The old Arch B^p^ exerted himself to admiration, going thro the whole Office both at Consecration and Communion himself".[3] Two days later, on 25 January 1732, Tanner and Claggett were formally introduced into the House of Lords.[4] The son of a poor vicar had, by his devotion both to study and duty, risen virtually to the top of his profession. He was granted an archbishop's faculty to hold his canonry of Christ Church _in commendam_ with his bishopric,[5] and for the rest of his life he divided his time between Oxford, St. Asaph, and London.

Tanner was pleased where providence had placed him and

---

1. Cf. Le Neve, _Fasti_, vol.i, p.78. The _congé d'élire_ was issued 25 November 1731 and Tanner kissed the King's hand on 3 December; _ibid_.
2. Cf. Sykes, _William Wake_, vol.ii, p.255.
3. Cf. MS. Willis 64, f.64, Tanner to Willis, 3 Feb. 1732.
4. Cf. _Gentleman's magazine_, vol.ii, p.585.
5. Cf. _Index to the Act books of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 1663-1859_ (Index library, vol.lxiii) p.353. The faculty also included the Archdeaconry of St. Asaph, the Rectory of Llandrinio and two other livings _sine cure_ in his gift as bishop.

expressed the pious hope that he might be able to do "some little good among the good people of N. Wales".[1] Although London was rather distant from his diocese, Oxford was a most convenient point to break the journey and it was in his rooms at Christ Church that he kept his books and established what might be regarded as his permanent home. This position became even more suitable when his son matriculated at Christ Church in 1734. Tanner's ill health and his attendance at the House of Lords coupled with the short time that he occupied his see render it hard to assess his qualities as a bishop. All that can be said, however, is in his favour for he regularly travelled to St. Asaph during the summer months to perform his pastoral duties and his efforts were highly thought of by his contemporaries.[2] Soon after his consecration Tanner journeyed to St. Asaph and when in July 1732 John Loveday[3] visited him he was met with a hearty

---

1. Cf. MS. Willis 64, f.64.

2. After Tanner's death it was said of him that "Contrary to modern Practice he visited his distant Diocese, and perform'd all the Parts of his most sacred Character in Places that had been as long Stranger to the Presence of any Diocesan, as the West-Indies, or the nearer Islands of Jersey and Guernsey, &c. in the Diocese of Winchester, very much to their Satisfaction, tho to the impairing his own Health"; cf. MS. Rawl. J 4° 4, f.144v, a newspaper cutting that I have failed to identify among the papers of the period in the Bodleian Library. In the National Library of Wales (referenced "Church in Wales", SA/Let/826) are directions signed by Tanner and written at his instigation to one of his clergy setting forth the method for a proposed visitation in some detail.

3. John Loveday, 1711-1789, philologist and antiquary.

reception and invited to dine. Loveday noted that there were many people at table but added that it would be "utterly inexcusable if ye Bp. did not live in an hospitable manner, for ye Countrey is continually sending Him in Provisions of all kinds";[1] The Welsh bishoprics were notably deficient in revenues but to offset this there was an established precedent that the bishop should hold the valuable Archdeaconry of St. Asaph in commendam together with other minor livings, so that Tanner was comparatively well provided for.[2] Another advantage was that all the cathedral offices were in the gift of the bishop and when the most valuable of these fell vacant - that of Precentor - Tanner lost little time in bestowing it upon his brother John.[3] There can be little doubt that William Tanner would have found his way to the Welsh diocese as well had his distinguished brother lived longer for Tanner had always done his best to advance the family interests.[4]

On his visit John Loveday also observed that Tanner's

---

1. J.Loveday, Diary of a tour in 1732 (Edinb., 1890) p.65.

2. Cf. p. 87 , note 5 . Loveday (op. cit., p.67) says that the bishopric was worth £1300 p.a. and that the archdeaconry was worth more than the bishopric.

3. Cf. Le Neve, Fasti, vol.i, p.86.

4. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.144, Tanner to Charlett, 2 Apr. 1722. Most of John and William Tanner's preferments were in the diocese of Norwich and were obtained for them by the efforts of their eldest brother.

house was being kept by his widowed sister.[1] Tanner's rise in the world had been accompanied throughout by the obligation to keep more and more of an open house and he was to complain that his house was often filled with "Strangers, Relations, and friends";[2] but among his relations the female sex seems to have predominated and he rather sadly observed that his was a "Her-House".[3] Not that Tanner, in spite of his youthful nick-name,[4] in any way disliked women, a fact which he sufficiently demonstrated in May 1733 by marrying, at the age of fifty-nine, his third wife. Elizabeth Scottowe[5] was a resident of Thorpe, near Norwich, the living of which Tanner had held from June 1706 until leaving the diocese in 1731, and there is therefore every probability that he had been contemplating the match for some time.

Browne Willis, who of all Tanner's friends probably enjoyed

---

1. Cf. Loveday, Diary of a tour in 1732, p.65. This must have been Grace Symonds who is described in Tanner's will dated 1733 as being "of New Palace Yard" - Tanner's London address. There does not seem to be any record of her husband's death in Tanner's correspondence but he was still alive in December 1728; cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 9/10, f.285. Sarah's husband, William Barnes, is mentioned as a beneficiary in Tanner's will. Tanner was paying Grace Symonds the dividend on stocks still standing in Joseph Tanner's name in 1731 and 1732; cf. National Library of Wales, MS. 6751 and 11027.

2. e.g. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 9/10, f.283, Tanner to Hearne, 14 Oct. 1727.

3. MS. Willis 41, f.143v, Tanner to Willis, 10 Jul. 1721

4. Cf. p.50.

5. Tanner's marriage took place in the church at Thorpe on 14 May 1733 and the ceremony was performed by John Tanner; cf. W.R.Supple, A history of Thorpe, pp.148,149.

his confidence the most, asserted that Tanner had been courting the lady for about fifteen years.[1] When Hearne, who could be depended upon to retail any scandal, first heard of the event he understood that Tanner "was married to a beautiful young Lady of about 15 years of age, and a Fortune of 20,000 l," which must have caused him a great deal of surprise, but he soon learned the truth and added in the margin of his diary "she is about 35".[2] Had the third Mrs. Tanner known of this she would doubtless have been very pleased for she was forty years of age at the time. Willis estimated her fortune at £18,000[3] whilst the Gentleman's Magazine made a still more conservative estimate of £15,000.[4] Whatever the precise amount it is certain that Tanner's new wife was possessed of a considerable sum of money,[5] but in

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.xi, p.279.
2. ibid., vol.xi, p.212.
3. ibid., vol.xi, p.336.
4. Gentleman's magazine, vol.iii, p.325.
5. Elizabeth Scottowe was great-grand-daughter of John Mann who was mayor of Norwich in 1653; in 1682 Mann was described as "the richest man in town", and Norwich was an extremely prosperous city. She outlived Tanner and subsequently married Robert Britiffe, formerly an M.P. for Norwich and later Recorder of that city. An interesting letter regarding this match is printed in R.W.Ketton-Cremer, Country neighbourhood (Lond., 1951) pp.131,132. She died on 1 May 1771, aged 77. Cf. Farrer, Church heraldry of Norfolk, vol.iii, p.29; A.Campling, East Anglian pedigrees (Publications of the Harleian society, vol.xci) p.243; B.Cozens-Hardy and E.A.Kent, The mayors of Norwich, 1403-1835 (Norwich, 1938) p.87; Nichols, Literary anecdotes, vol.ii, p.163.

spite of this he was accused by Willis of becoming "miserably covetous".[1] Hearne had also heard of this but charitably noted that Tanner "bore a quite contrary character before" and although he was not in the least averse to putting down in his diary exactly what he thought of people, he described Tanner's wife as bearing a "very good character".[2]

As a bishop Tanner made no more impact on political and ecclesiastical affairs than he had during the rest of his life, and his episcopate was little more than the conscientious discharge of his duties as far as his ill-health would allow. His correspondence contains frequent, but not plaintive, allusions to his indisposition. He was ill in the autumn of 1733[3] but rallied before the winter to such an extent that in late November Hearne was able to describe him as "pretty well recovered of his Feaver".[4] Christmas was spent in his rooms at Christ Church with his wife and son but an invitation to Hearne to join with him in quiet celebration reveals that Tanner was so infirm as not to be able to venture into the Hall of the college,[5] and he later admitted that during his stay in Oxford he had "so

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.xi, p.336.
2. ibid.
3. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 27c, f.345, J.West to Hearne, 17 Oct. 1733.
4. Hearne, vol.xi, p.279.
5. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 15/16, f.487, Tanner to Hearne, 25 Dec. 1733.

many Cautions given me age^{t} venturing to much and often abroad, that I went no whither, not so much as to the Vice Chancellor".[1]

On 12 May 1734, after he had made a return journey to London,[2] Tanner preached a sermon at Christ Church although he was far from well[3] and he was still receiving treatment on 29 May when he lamented his inability to pay visits on his friends. He told Hearne that he had "endeavored more than once to have made you a visit at your own Chamber, but your Neighbors of Queens have so stopp'd up the way wth Stones that my Coach could not get into the Lane, and I was not well able to walk so far on foot", but even thus inconvenienced he intended to leave Oxford for his distant diocese seven days later.[4] Tanner's health generally improved during the summer months but he must have by now realised that he could not expect to live much longer for in the midst of all his other commitments he seems to have made a final effort to bring the Bibliotheca and, more especially, the Notitia to completion.

---

1. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 27c, f.223, Tanner to Hearne, 16 Feb. 1734.
2. Cf. ibid.
3. Cf. Hearne, vol.xi, p.342.
4. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 15/16, f.489, Tanner to Hearne, 29 May 1734.

The following year, 1735, he was again able to go to Wales in the summer and he returned to Christ Church in September.[1] The months of October and November were spent, as far as time would allow, in putting what he hoped were to be the final touches to the Notitia and he expected to be able to prepare a fair copy of the work ready for the press by the following spring.[2] Unfortunately at the end of November his indisposition took a turn for the worse and after an illness which lasted seven days he died at Christ Church on Sunday, 14 December 1735 at the age of sixty-one.[3] It was left to others to see the works on which his reputation now largely rests into print. He was buried in Christ Church cathedral on 26 December 1735[4] and an epitaph was erected on

---

1. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.29, Tanner to Rawlinson, 20 Sept. 1735.

2. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.32, Tanner to Rawlinson, 2 Oct. 1735.

3. The circumstances of Tanner's death are recorded in a pamphlet compiled by Joseph Clutton entitled A true and candid relation of the good and bad effects of Joshua Ward's pill and drop (Lond., 1736) where it is stated on pp.79,80 in an anonymous letter from the country that he took one of Ward's pills "... about a Fortnight before his Illness, which agreed with him very well; about a Week before his Death he took another, which, within a few Hours, threw him into so violent a Looseness, and afterwards bloody Flux, that, notwithstanding the immediate Help of two Physicians, it could not be stopp'd. This is what I had from his Nurse, whom I take to be a good Judge. He liv'd but five Days after taking the Pill."
I received also an Account from another Hand, intimating the same, adding, that his Bowels mortify'd, and that the Smell was intollerably bad when any one went near him".

4. Cf. Miscellanea genealogica et heraldica, 2nd ser., vol.i, p.145.

the third pillar on the south side of the cathedral.[1] His grave is near the foot of this pillar but it is now half-covered by the pews. By his will dated 22 November 1733[2] he made numerous charitable bequests but the most important clauses were those which provided that the Notitia and the Bibliotheca should be completed after his death and that his renowned collection of books and manuscripts should be deposited in the Bodleian Library, Oxford. Were it not for these two provisions then Tanner's name might today be virtually unknown.

Throughout his life Tanner did his best to continue with his studies. The move to Norwich forced him to abandon the projected account of Wiltshire and ~~other~~ of a different nature considerations led him to delegate the continuation of Wood's Athenae to another, but he faithfully drudged on with the preparation of the Bibliotheca and the revision of the Notitia.[3] It is easy to sympathise with Tanner over the obvious difficulties

---

1. The text of this inscription is given in Blomefield, Norfolk, vol.iii, pp.636,637. Cf. also Nichols, Literary anecdotes, vol.ii, pp.161-163.

2. Tanner's will was proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury on 7 February 1736 and is now to be found in the Principal Probate Office at Somerset House, P.C.C. 21 Derby. An abbreviated transcript is to be found in The East Anglian, new ser. xiii, pp.17-21.

3. It seems that after his appointment as Canon of Christ Church Tanner began to prepare a history of that foundation; cf. MS. Ballard 19, f.81; and MS. Rawl. A 498, f.28v.

that faced him for he could hardly be expected to emulate the steady literary output of Hearne who had the peace and quiet (if not all the resources)[1] of Oxford in which to work: to feel, in fact, that Tanner's failure to publish either of these undertakings is no more than might have been expected in the circumstances. However, it is not with Hearne but rather with the ecclesiastical scholars of the day that Tanner is to be compared and, even within the narrow compass of his personal friends, such a comparison reveals Tanner in a less favourable light. Kennett and Gibson each engaged in the Convocation Controversy and subsequently proceeded through a succession of Church appointments the duties of which were conscientiously discharged by them and yet they still found time to publish learned works; as to family commitments, Kennett was married thrice and had two children within the space of ten years, a period incidentally in which his prominence in worldly affairs in no way abated, and Gibson had twelve children of whom seven survived him. Similar accounts may be given of Wake and Nicolson and it will be seen therefore that it was not impossible or even unusual for a scholar to appear publicly in print whilst holding and fulfilling the obligations of a high office in the Church. But there are certain factors that make such a comparison inexact.

---

1. Cf. Macray, Annals, p.193.

The problems that faced Tanner as a Chancellor were possibly more complex and certainly of a more continuous nature than those that would be encountered by deans and archdeacons and other members of a cathedral chapter, and unlike many of these gentlemen Tanner was not inclined to delegate his authority; moreover, whilst the works of other scholars were largely narrative Tanner's were compiled on the dictionary system and could contain very much more information within the same number of pages. Men who were controversialists were used to public debate and equally used to public criticism and censure and they were therefore willing to publish the fruits of their scholarship whilst still aware of the defects of their work. Tanner, on the other hand, was a good-natured perfectionist who spent his life striving after an unattainable goal in order to avoid such criticism. However these considerations are not excuses and it is not to be thought that Tanner can be entirely exonerated from the responsibility of his literary failure.

The reputation that Tanner enjoys today as an antiquarian is largely based upon the undeniable value both of his collections and of his posthumously published works. It is possible to review these in some detail but it is almost impossible to make any worthwhile assessment of his contemporary impact. In his own day Tanner's erudition was freely admired: he was well known to be "not more able than willing

to communicate his very sure & extensive knowledge to all who ask it"[1] and his unseen hand must surely have some small part in the production of several of the learned works of the period. He was always willing to help[2], even when it interfered with his own researches[3], and he expressed his surprise that others should be less co-operative.[4] Many of the letters that he wrote in answer to antiquarian queries must have been destroyed and much of the help that he gave was probably verbal; nevertheless a list of the works with which he is known to have been connected, in addition to those already mentioned, is still impressive. He assisted John Le Neve with the Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae,[5] Samuel Knight with his lives of Colet and Erasmus,[6] and Francis Blomefield with his account of Norfolk.[7] He contributed to Francis Peck's Annals of Stanford,[8] to Robert

---

1. MS. Willis 42, f.71, W.Fleetwood to Willis, 2 Aug. 1718.

2. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 23-25, f.211v, T.Baker to Hearne, 9 Jan. 1723.

3. Cf. [B.M.] Stowe MSS. 749, f.138, Tanner to Anstis, 15 Feb. 1721.

4. Cf. MS. Willis 44, f.170, Tanner to Willis, 26 Oct. 1716.

5. Cf. J. Le Neve, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae (Lond., 1716) pp.75,214. Tanner subsequently annotated his copy (now Vet. A 4 e. 211) and this was used by T.D.Hardy in preparation for the revised edition of 1854.

6. Cf. S.Knight, The life of dr. John Colet (Lond., 1724) p.xiii and The life of Erasmus (Cambr., 1726(p.xvii. Hearne said that Tanner gave Knight considerable assistance with his works; cf. Hearne, vol.xi, p.113.

7. Cf. pp. 138-141.

8. Cf. F.Peck, Academia tertia Anglicana; or, The antiquarian

[cont. on next page]

Hawes' History of Framlingham,[1] to Gibson's edition of Spelman's Works[2] and to his 1722 revision of Camden's Britannia,[3] and also to the edition of Francis Bacon's works that appeared in 1730.[4] Willis dedicated the second volume of his History of Abbies to him in gratitude for the help that he had received over the years.[5] One of the greatest works of the period, Wilkins' Concilia, received improvements and additions from his pen and in this instance

---

8 cont. annals of Stanford (Lond., 1727) sheets 17B, 17C. Cf. also Hearne, vol.ix, p.214. Tanner's copy of this work was delivered to the Bodleian but is not now to be identified and was presumably disposed of as a duplicate; cf. Appendix B, p.419.

1. Cf. R.Hawes, The history of Framlingham (Woodbridge, 1798) p.vi.

2. The English works of sir Henry Spelman (Lond., 1723). Tanner contributed the two formerly unpublished treatises; cf. ibid., sig. b4. These treatises (now MS. T. 92, ff. 62-64, 69-74; 130, ff.81-113; 288, ff.1-15, 252, 253) were discovered by Tanner in a sad condition on the floor of the Corn Chamber at Congham in Norfolk, Spelman's birthplace; cf. p.322, note 2. Tanner's copy (he subscribed for one on large paper) appears to have met the same fate as his copy of Peck's Stanford; cf. Appendix B, p.420. See also Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, pp.427,428.

3. Cf. p~~f~~. 138.

4. Cf. Francisci Baconi ... opera omnia [ed. by J.Blackbourne] (Lond., 1730) vol.i, p.219 (sheet 1i12).

5. B.Willis, An history of the mitred parliamentary abbies (Lond., 1718,19). Tanner seems to have revised the proofs of this work as they came from the press; cf. MS. T. 468, f.31v; MS. Willis 44, f.162. For his opinion of the dedications see MS. Ballard 4, f.129v. Another reference to Tanner's assistance is to be found in Willis, A survey of the cathedrals of Lincoln, Ely, Oxford, and Peterborough (Lond., 1730) p.iii. Tanner's annotated copy of the Survey of the cathedral-church of Landaff (Lond., 1719) is to be found T. 781.

the editor was not only to have Tanner's direct assistance but he was also to work from much of the material that Tanner had earlier contributed to Wake's State of the Church.[1] Wilkins however, more than repaid his debt for he was the man who later successfully prepared the Bibliotheca for the press.[2]

As time goes by evidence will surely come to light to show that Tanner was in fact connected with many other

---

1. Conciliae Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae, ed. by D.Wilkins (Lond., 1737). Tanner's connection with the Concilia has already been reviewed in E.F.Jacob, "Wilkins Concilia and the fifteenth century", Transactions of the Royal historical society, 4th ser., vol.xv, pp.91-131. Cf. also F.M.Powicke, "Sir Henry Spelman and the Concilia", Proceedings of the British academy, vol.xvi, pp.345-379, and Sykes, William Wake, vol.ii, pp.249-252. Tanner's interesting letter to Wilkins of 17 November 1732 (now MS. Autogr. c. 8, f.13a) is reproduced in Powicke, op. cit., pp.377-379. In addition to the material mentioned in these articles Tanner's reply to Wilkins' first approach for assistance, dated 28 April 1732, is to be found at Lambeth Palace, MS. 1373, f.103, and there are many annotations in Tanner's hand on a copy of Wilkins' Proposals for printing now in the Bodleian Library, Vet. A 4 b. 60.

2. There is no evidence to suggest that Tanner himself regarded his contribution to the Concilia as in any way more important than his assistance to other scholars. Wilkins, however, felt obliged to present a copy to John Tanner (who was already a subscriber) for the use of the Library of St. Asaph cathedral; now St. Asaph 288. In 1724 Tanner had suggested to Wake that Wilkins was a possible successor to Prideaux in the Archdeaconry of Suffolk (cf. [Christ Church] MS. Arch. W. Epist. 10, item 93) and Wilkins did in fact receive the appointment, but Wake was in any case Wilkins' patron and the suggestion was hardly needed.

learned works of his day[1] and this elusive picture of an universal encourager of scholarship is, one feels, the true portrait of Tanner. Besides this his failure to publish the researches of a lifetime seems unimportant. His correspondence displays to the full his wide knowledge and a willingness to use it on behalf of all who asked for help. He is perhaps best summed up by the motto that he wrote in Cox Macro's collection of autographs:

Non nobis solum nati sumus, partim patriae, partim amicis
Thom.Tanner.[2]

---

1. The D.N.B. states that Tanner assisted John Ray but I have been unable to find any reference to Tanner in Ray's works, in the various publications of the Ray Society, or in C.E.Raven, John Ray, naturalist, 2nd. ed. (Cambr., 1950). Although Rayšs researches were not particularly closely related to Tanner's interests such assistance is not improbable and Ray is known to have corresponded freely with Aubrey and Lhuyd; he was also a contributor to the 1695 edition of Camden's Britannia. In the second edition of James Bentham's History and antiquities of the conventual and cathedral church of Ely (Norwich, 1812) Bentham's son states on p.6 that "Bishop Tanner's example, ... who had honoured the family with many marks of his kindness and friendship, is supposed to have directed our Author's attention to the study of Ecclesiastical Antiquities".

2. [B.M.] Add. MSS. 25103, f.5.

CHAPTER II

THE PROJECTED HISTORY OF WILTSHIRE

In Tanner's youth the detailed study of local topography was one of long standing. The first county history had been published a century earlier when, in 1576, William Lambard had issued his Perambulation of Kent[1] and this was followed in 1598 by John Stow's Survey of London.[2] With the new century came a work by Richard Carew on Cornwall[3] and it was not long before William Burton published his Description of Leicestershire.[4] The year 1656, however, saw a marked impulse given to topographical studies for in this year appeared Daniel King's description of Cheshire[5] and Sir William Dugdale's all-important Antiquities of Warwickshire,[6] a study on which many subsequent essays were to be based. Dugdale's work was obviously superior to anything that had preceded it and it inspired others to emulation:[7] in the three decades

---

1. W.Lambard, A perambulation of Kent (Lond., 1576).
2. J.Stow, A survay of London (Lond., 1598).
3. R.Carew, The survey of Cornwall (Lond., 1602).
4. W.Burton, The description of Leicestershire (Lond., 1622).
5. D.King, The vale-royall of England, or, The county-palatine of Chester illustrated (Lond., 1656).
6. Sir W.Dugdale, Antiquities of Warwickshire illustrated (Lond., 1656). On Dugdale see pp. 147-150.
7. In his diary Anthony Wood described how his "tender affections and insatiable desire of knowledg were ravish'd and melted downe" by reading Dugdale's book and he was directly inspired by this work to undertake studies of a similar nature. Cf. The life and times of Anthony Wood ... described by himself, ed. by A.Clark (Oxford historical society), (Oxf., 1891-1900) vol.i, p.209.

immediately before Tanner's matriculation at Oxford there appeared, in quick succession, works on the counties of Kent, Cheshire, Nottingham, Oxford, Rutland, and Stafford.[1] The study of local topography had become fashionable.[2]

It is not surprising, therefore, that one of Tanner's earliest academic projects was to write a history of his native county, Wiltshire, of which no detailed account had as yet been published, and he seems to have commenced his researches whilst he was still an undergraduate. However, before we can consider this it is necessary to survey the work of John Leland and his literary successor, William Camden.

---

1. R.Kilburne, A brief survey of the county of Kent (Lond., 1657) and A topographie, or survey of the counties of Kent (Lond., 1659); T.Philipot, Villare Cantianum: or Kent surveyed and illustrated (Lond., 1659); Sir P.Leicester, Historical antiquities in two books ... the second containing particular remarks concerning Cheshire (Lond., 1673); R.Thoroton, The antiquities of Nottinghamshire (Lond., 1677); R.Plot, The natural history of Oxfordshire (Oxf., 1677); J.Wright, The history and antiquities of the county of Rutland (Lond., 1684); R.Plot, The natural history of Staffordshire (Oxf., 1686).

2. For a short account of the beginnings of topographical research see Esther A. L. Moir, "The early English antiquaries", History today, vol.viii, pp.781-786; see also H.B.Walters, The English antiquaries of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (Lond., 1934) and S.Piggott, "Antiquarian thought in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries", English historical scholarship in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, ed. by L.Fox (Dugdale society), (Lond., 1956) pp.93-114. A general account is to be found in Sir T.D.Kendrick, British antiquity (Lond., 1950). Elias Ashmole's Antiquities of Berkshire (Lond., 1719) and John Aubrey's Natural history and antiquities of the county of Surrey (Lond., 1719,18) were both prepared during the second half of the seventeenth century. The original collections for these works are now in the Bodleian, MS. Ashmole 850; MS. Aubrey 4.

Leland is especially deserving of notice because most of Tanner's scholarly work derives in part from Leland's researches,and, more particularly, because the first scheme of the Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica was nothing more than a projected edition of one of Leland's manuscripts. It even appears that Tanner may at one time have been contemplating an edition of the whole of Leland's works.[1] The importance of William Camden in this connection will appear later.

There is little need to concern ourselves with the wider aspects of Leland's life.[2] He was born early in the sixteenth century and was educated at St. Paul's School, London, and afterwards at Cambridge University where he took his B.A. degree in 1522. He subsequently studied at Oxford and at Paris and then became one of the chaplains to Henry VIII. Rapidly acquiring a reputation for his scholarship and knowledge of antiquities[3] he was employed in one of the royal libraries, and it was in this capacity that he was commissioned

---

1. Cf. p. 14.

2. For a general account of Leland see W.Huddesford, The lives of those eminent antiquaries John Leland, Thomas Hearne, and Anthony à Wood (Lond., 1772). Modern and more valuable accounts are to be found at Chapter V of Kendrick, British antiquity and the Introduction to Lucy Toulmin Smith's edition of The itinerary of John Leland (Lond., 1907-10).

3. The present account necessarily lays stress on Leland's antiquarian researches, but it must be remembered that he is also known as a classical scholar and as a writer of Latin verse.

in 1533[1] to report on the contents of all the libraries and similar repositories of the kingdom. He seems to have spent the next ten years travelling the length and breadth of the country preparing his notes and in 1546 he presented a report[2] to the King in which he described his researches. Leland himself tells us that it was his journeys around England that fired his interest in topography, and it was not long before his new studies "totallye enflamed" him.[3] On all his travels he had made the most of his opportunity to take copious notes and when he returned to London he began to digest these and to supplement his observations with further study. In his report to the King he declared his intention of preparing a description of the whole realm[4] but

---

1. The authority for this commission rests with Leland who specifically refers to it (cf. Leland, Laboryouse journey [see note 2] sig. B8) and with it he obtained permission to enter libraries that would otherwise have remained closed to him; cf. Kendrick, British antiquity, p.51. Its existence has, however, been politely questioned; cf. Sir T.D.Hardy, Descriptive catalogue of materials relating to the history of Great Britain and Ireland (Lond., 1862) vol.i, pt.i, p.xxxviii, and L.Toulmin Smith, Itinerary of Leland, vol.i, p.ix. The tradition that Leland was appointed "King's Antiquary" has recently been shown to be unlikely; cf. A.Momigliano, "Ancient history and the antiquarian", Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld institutes, vol.xiv, Appendix I, pp.313,314.

2. This was later published by John Bale as The laboryouse journey & serche of Johan Leylande, for Englandes antiquities, geuen of hym as a newe yeares gyfte to kinge Henry the viij. (Lond., 1549). Tanner possessed a copy of this work, which is usually referred to as the Laboryouse journey or the New year's gift; it is now in the Bodleian, shelfmarked T. 945.

3. Cf. Leland, Laboryouse journey, sig. D4.

4. ibid., sig. D6v.

before he could bring this work to completion his brain failed and it remained unpublished at his death in 1552. Leland's collections eventually passed into the hands of William Burton, the historian of Leicestershire, and by gifts in 1632 and 1643 he presented all these papers to the Bodleian Library where they now remain.[1] They are divided into two parts, the Itinerary,[2] in quarto, which contains Leland's notes of his travels and the Collectanea,[3] or miscellaneous notes, which are in folio.

The importance of Leland's work was obvious. Even in the sixteenth century at least two transcripts were taken of the Itinerary, and as the originals in Burton's possession became damaged by an unkind fate coupled with hard use, a deterioration not entirely halted by their deposit in the Bodleian,[4] so these early transcripts became more valuable. Unfortunately one of them has failed to survive[5] and the most complete copy of Leland's work known today is the

---

1. Cf. Macray, Annals, p.75 and Summary catalogue (s.c.3117-3123). One volume of the Itinerary had become separated from the others at the time of Burton's original gift and did not arrive at the library until 1677 or even later. The provenance of these papers was described by Burton himself, cf. Huddesford, Life of Leland, vol.i, pp.72,73.

2. MS. Top. gen. e. 8-15.

3. MS. Top. gen. c. 1-4.

4. Cf. The itinerary of John Leland, ed. by T.Hearne (Oxf., 1710-12) vol.i, p.xiv.

5. Cf. Hearne, vol.ii, p.227.

transcript made in 1576 by John Stow, the topographer of London. Tanner must have been particularly pleased when this valuable manuscript came into his possession.[1] In the seventeenth century transcripts continued to multiply, even after the originals were available for consultation in the Bodleian, and in 1695 Gibson was aware of the existence of several copies.[2] Even so, in 1704 Browne Willis found it necessary to take yet another[3] and it was he who suggested to Hearne that he should print an edition of Leland.[4] Hearne published the Itinerary between 1710 and 1712[5] and the Collectanea in 1715.[6]

---

1. Now MS. T. 464(a-e). It bears the signatures of Tom Stafford (a; f.193v); Thomas Newton (c; ad initium); Evan Williams and Humphrey Thomas (d; ad finem). This transcript was probably used by Camden (cf. Kendrick, British antiquity, p.149) and excerpts from Leland in his hand are now to be found in the British Museum, Lansdowne MSS. 229, ff.83-98. In 1657 Stow's transcript was "in ye custody of Mr Robt. Vaughan of Hengwrt in Merioneth"; cf. Lucy Toulmin Smith's edition of The itinerary in Wales of John Leland (Lond., 1906) p.vi. By 1711 it had migrated to the library of Robert Davies of Llanerch whose son lent it to Hearne who made great use of it for the fifth and subsequent volumes of his edition of the Itinerary; cf. Itinerary, vol.ii, pp.iii,iv; vol.iv, p.iii; vol.v, et seqq., passim. It was then apparently returned to Wales where Tanner perhaps obtained it in 1732 (cf. Hearne, vol.xi, p.111) or 1735 (cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.28).

2. Cf. Camden, Britannia, ed. by E.Gibson (Lond., 1695) sig. fl.

3. Now MS. Top. gen. c. 5.

4. The itinerary of John Leland, ed. by T.Hearne (Oxf., 1710-12) vol.i, p.xiv.

5. Hearne presented a copy to the Bodleian (Mus. Bibl. II 8° 15-23) and his own working copy, with collations and annotations for a second edition, is to be found Mus. Bibl. II 8° 24-32. The first volume of this second copy has at some time belonged to Tanner, who has signed the title-leaf.

6. J.Lelandi antiquarii de rebus Britannicis collectanea (Oxf., 1715).

The value of Leland's notes to the topographer is sufficiently demonstrated by the fact that they were still in demand at a time when his general design of a complete description of the kingdom had been fulfilled in print. The eminent antiquary Humphrey Lhuyd had prepared such a work which was published posthumously in 1572.[1] It was, however, soon superseded by the work of William Harrison who issued a similar, and slightly longer, description in 1577.[2] In fact Harrison's account was largely derivative, as he himself admitted, and it was left to William Camden to publish the first satisfactory topography of Britain in 1586.[3] It was an immediate success and five subsequent editions of the Britannia and a sixth in an English translation appeared during the author's life; the octavo format becoming quarto and then folio as Camden incorporated his additions. Although

---

1. H.Lhuyd, Commentarioli Britannicae descriptionis fragmentum (Colon. Agripp., 1572). An English translation by T.Twyne, entitled The breviary of Britayne, was issued at London in 1573.

2. It was contained in R.Holinshed, The firste volume of the chronicles of England, Scotlande, and Irelande (Lond., 1577).

3. W.Camden, Britannia: sive Florentissimorum regnorum Angliae, Scotiae, Hiberniae, et insularum adjacentium ex intima antiquitate chorographica descriptio (Lond., 1586). Tanner possessed a copy of this edition, now T. 172. Subsequent editions appeared in 1587, 1590, 1594, 1600, 1607, and the edition of 1610 was in an English translation by P.Holland. Other editions were being printed in Germany. Recent accounts of Camden and the Britannia are to be found at Chapter 5, "Britannia", of Kendrick, British antiquity; and S.Piggott, "William Camden and the Britannia", Proceedings of the British Academy, vol.xxxvii, pp.199-217.

the original framework of 1586 was to be enlarged by others beyond all recognition,[1] it is possible to say that Camden's Britannia was without rival as the work of general British topographical reference until the Lysons brothers produced their Magna Britannia in the early nineteenth century.[2]

When Tanner began to prepare his survey of Wiltshire there were, therefore, several models on which to base his account; but within his terms of reference he had a clear field in which to work. In print the only substantial description of the county as a whole was that in Camden's Britannia[3] and beyond this, apart from a few works on Stonehenge,[4] little had been published that related specifically to Wiltshire, although much relevant information was to be culled from such sources as Dugdale's Monasticon[5] and

---

1. The 1586 octavo grew to three folio volumes when, in 1789, an edition was issued by R.Gough.

2. D. and S.Lysons, Magna Britannia (Lond., 1806-22).

3. There were minor accounts given in such works as the various editions of John Speed's The theatre of the empire of Great Britain.

4. Inigo Jones, the architect, wrote The most notable antiquity of Great Britain, vulgarly called Stone-Heng ... restored by I.J. (Lond., 1655) in which he asserted that the stones were of Roman origin. This conclusion was attacked by Walter Charleton in Chorea gigantum, or The most famous antiquity of Great Britain ... called Stone-Heng ... restored to the Danes (Lond., 1663). Jones' work had been published posthumously by his son-in-law, John Webb, also an architect, and Webb replied to Charleton with A vindication of Stone-Heng restored (Lond., 1665).

5. R.Dodsworth and Sir W.Dugdale, Monasticon Anglicanum (Lond., 1655-73). See also pp. 147-150.

Fuller's Worthies.[1] It was obvious that the greater part of Tanner's material could only be obtained from original sources supplemented by personal observation, and it is in this connection that he came into contact with John Aubrey.

John Aubrey[2] was born at Easton Pierse, Wiltshire, on 12 March 1626. His father was a man of some fortune, owning estates in Wiltshire, Hereford, and Wales, and Aubrey was able to devote the greater part of his time to antiquarian studies. When he inherited his father's estates his mismanagement, together with a certain natural ill-luck, soon brought about their dispersal; but his lively discourse and his inherent good-nature secured for him a fairly pleasant life in the houses of established families who found his company and conversation to their liking. In 1656, perhaps directly inspired by the appearance of Dugdale's Warwickshire, Aubrey had begun to make collections towards an account of Wiltshire and he later claimed, probably with every justification, that he was the first person ever to have done so.[3]

---

1. T.Fuller, The history of the worthies of England (Lond.,1662).

2. Aubrey has recently been the subject of much investigation. The two best authorities are A.Powell, John Aubrey and his friends (Lond., 1948) and the introduction by O.L.Dick to his edition of Aubrey's Brief lives, 3rd. ed., (Lond., 1958).

3. Cf. Preface to the Natural History of Wiltshire, MS. Aubrey 1, f.6. In March 1660 Aubrey attended a meeting at Devizes, Wiltshire, for electing the Knights of the Shire, when some of the gentlemen present decided jointly to undertake a history of the county "in Imitation of Mr Dugdale's Illustration of Warwickshire". Aubrey undertook to describe the North division with Thomas Gore, Jeffrey Daniel, and Sir John Erneley as his assistants; cf. MS. Aubrey 3, f.10. Aubrey himself later

[cont. on next page]

He proposed to publish one work relating to the natural history, and another to the antiquities of that county.[1] But Aubrey lacked the drive necessary to see his work through the press and when, in 1675, Robert Plot was at work on his Oxfordshire Aubrey offered him the use of all his collections if Plot would write a similar history of Wiltshire. Plot twice refused the offer and politely suggested that Aubrey might finish his Wiltshire himself.[2] Aubrey, however, knew his own shortcomings. In 1685, no other editor having presented himself and, fearing that his papers "might either perish; or be sold in an Auction, and somebody els (as is not uncom̄on) put his name to my Paines",[3] Aubrey stitched all his collections together in a very rough order in the hope that they might be "an Incitement to some ingeniose and publiq spirited young Wiltshire man, to polish & compleat, what I have here delivered rough-hewen".[4]

---

3 cont. described his Antiquities as being "after the method of Sr W.Dugdale's Description of Warwickshire"; cf. MS. Aubrey 5, f.123v.

1. For an account of these see Appendix A., "Aubrey's works", II, III, in Powell, John Aubrey and his friends, pp.272-278. References to these works occur passim in both Powell and Dick, opp. cit. Those Wiltshire papers still extant are amongst Aubrey's collections in the Bodleian, sc. MS. Aubrey 1-3. MS. Aubrey 11 contains his remarks on Charleton's Chorea gigantum.

2. Cf. MS. Aubrey 1, ff.6,7.

3. MS. Aubrey 1, f.7.

4. ibid.

Although the work did not appear in print[1] Aubrey's intentions were widely known and to a person of Tanner's interests it must have been a matter of common knowledge that Aubrey had made large Wiltshire collections. Once Tanner had made up his mind that he intended to be the first to publish a history of that county, it was obviously to his advantage that he should cultivate Aubrey's acquaintance. The circumstances of their introduction do not seem to have been recorded but by early 1693 Tanner was on as close academic terms with Aubrey as it is possible for a youth not yet twenty to be with a man fast approaching seventy. When reading their correspondence it is difficult to remember the great difference in their ages.

Tanner had begun his Wiltshire collections by the summer of 1692, but his researches seem to have been largely confined to making excerpts from printed sources,[2] and by the end of

---

1. Most of Aubrey's Wiltshire collections have subsequently been published by Sir T.Phillips (1821,38), by J.Britton (1847), and by J.E.Jackson (1862). Browne Willis was contemplating their publication in 1732 but nothing came of it; cf. Hearne, vol.xi, p.45.

2. Tanner's notes on Wiltshire are now contained in MS. Top. Wilts. e. 1 and MS. Top. Wilts. e. 4. The earliest are contained in the second of these volumes, in which they have been bound in the wrong order: Tanner's original order, as shown by his pagination, being now arranged as ff.71-132; 41-70. Several of the original leaves are missing. The date "July. .92." appears on f.90(originally p.37) and it therefore appears that ff.72-89 (pp.1-36), which have their own list of contents (f.71) and index (f.71v), must be contemporary with or earlier than this. Folios 90v-105 (with a list of contents on f.90r, and originally pp.37-67) may all be ascribed to July 1692. The index on f.71v has been partially enlarged to cover this

[cont. on next page]

the year other studies had established a prior claim on his time for Charlett was urging him to the completion of the edition of Hegge's Legend of St. Cuthbert. Tanner assured Aubrey that as soon as he had completed this he would employ the greatest part of his time in preparing a history of Wiltshire "to wch end", he added, "I must desire you choicely to preserve your Papers, wch relate to that matter ...".[1] It was not long before the edition of Hegge was abandoned and Tanner was able to begin serious work on his native county.

Aubrey was more than willing to let Tanner have the use of his collections for here at last was the "ingeniose and publiq spirited young Wiltshire man" whose appearance he had hoped for in 1685. He had lent the manuscript of the Natural History to Sir John Hoskins, a former President of the Royal Society, but he hoped for its return by the end of May, at which time he had "a good mind to deposit it with Dr Charlet, or Queens coll: to be printed at leisure at Oxon."[2] Meanwhile

---

2 cont. portion. Pages 1-36 consist entirely of excerpts from printed historians and were probably compiled from the resources of the Bodleian Library; the first item being from Webb's Vindication of Stone-Heng restored, Tanner giving (f.71) the old Bodleian shelfmark A 4. 6 Art. The volume is now kept as AA 105 Art. Pages 37-67 also contain excerpts from printed works but on p.41 (f.92v) et seqq. appear transcripts from MS. Barlow 49 and, on ff.104v,105, from MS. Dodsworth 10. On ff.95v-104 are transcripts from MS. Dugdale 1,2,5,13,22, and 31 which were then in the Ashmolean Museum; Tanner giving the earlier shelfmarks of MS. Dugdale A1,A2,C1,G1,O and X.

1. MS. Aubrey 13, f.198, Tanner to Aubrey, 7 Mar. 1693.

2. MS. T. 25, f.39, Aubrey to Tanner, 4 May 1693.

Tanner was welcome to borrow the Antiquities and when he had finished with the manuscript he was to deposit it in the custody of Edward Lhuyd, the Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum,[1] to which place Aubrey was gradually sending all his books.[2] Tanner was delighted at the offer and eagerly awaited the manuscript, hoping that it would be a useful guide to him in forming his own collections which he intended to begin "with all the diligence and speed imaginable".[3] The truth was that Aubrey was relieved to see his collections in such young and eager hands and to feel that there was some chance of their being preserved in print; he hoped that between them Tanner and his own brother William would finish his work and generously, if optimistically, offered them all the profit they might make from it.[4] On 1 June 1693 Aubrey despatched his

---

1. MS. T. 25, f.39, Aubrey to Tanner, 4 May 1693.

2. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.94, Aubrey to Tanner, 14 Oct. 1693.

3. MS. Aubrey 13, f.199, Tanner to Aubrey, 16 May 1693.

4. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.94, Aubrey to Tanner, 14 Oct. 1693. Aubrey entitled his Antiquities either An essay towards the description of the North division of Wiltshire or Hypomnemata Antiquaria. It was one of the conditions of its deposit in the Ashmolean that "when my Brother shall peruse them, that he gives Bond for the re-delivery of them; for he is almost as tenacious as Anthony [Wood]"; MS. T. 25, f.49; cf. also MS. Aubrey 13, f.200. Aubrey's opinion of his brother proved to be well-founded, but his precaution ineffective: the Antiquities were originally in two volumes, but on f.215 of the remaining volume (MS. Aubrey 3) is the entry "August 14 1703. Borrow'd then of Mr Edw. Lhwyd the Keeper of the Ashmolean Library, the Second Volume of my Brothers Hypomnemata Antiquaria, which I shall restore upon demand. Wm Aubrey". The volume was never returned and, although it can be traced to Thomas Thorpe the bookseller in 1836, and perhaps later, its present whereabouts is unknown. J.E.Jackson wrote an article

[cont. on next page]

Antiquities to Tanner[1] and there can be little doubt that Tanner took them with him when he journeyed home to Market Lavington in the middle of July: "My principal business", he wrote to Aubrey before setting out from Queen's College, "is to drive on our Common design viz. the Antiquities of Wilts, which I hope will find encouragemt, if it does not I will never undertake any thing more for the publick".[2]

In the summer of 1693 Tanner spent almost a quarter of a year in Wiltshire working upon his collections.[3] The hurry of the harvest impeded his work a little, but when this was past he visited as many of the neighbouring churches as he could[4] and although in August he told Gibson that "the unseasonableness of the weather has hindered any g^t^ discoveries"[5]

---

4 cont. on the missing part in the Wiltshire archaeological and natural history magazine, vol.vii, pp.76-80, and he also unsuccessfully offered £10 reward for its recovery in similar accounts in Notes & Queries for 10 December 1859 and in the Wiltshire independent for 5 January 1860. In his article Canon Jackson proves the existence of the second volume and in a manuscript addition to a Bodleian copy [G.A.Wilts. 8° 17(2)] of a reprint of his article he conjectures as to its probable whereabouts or fate. The two volumes are now generally referred to as Hypomnemata Antiquaria "A" and "B"; it has been suggested that "B" relates to South Wiltshire, but it will be remembered that Aubrey had originally undertaken to describe only the North division; cf. p. 110, note 3. The volume is also noticed by Canon Jackson at p.v of his edition of Aubrey's Wiltshire (Devizes, 1862). See also p. 116, note 1.

1. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.49, Aubrey to Tanner, 1 Jun. 1693.

2. MS. Top. gen. c. 24, f.18, Tanner to Aubrey, 13 Jul. 1693.

3. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.83, Tanner to Aubrey, Draft [Sept. 1693]

4. Cf. MS. Aubrey 13, f.194, Tanner to Aubrey, 12 Aug. 1693.

5. MS. T. 25, f.79, Tanner to Gibson, Draft reply to Gibson's letter dated 18 August 1693. Tanner took the opportunity to

[cont. on next page]

he then went on to relate a number of original observations. Perhaps the bad weather was a blessing in disguise for it appears that he was able to bring his notes into some sort of order during this period.[1] Throughout the summer Tanner so

---

5 cont. bring Aubrey's Antiquities up to date; on MS. Aubrey 3, f.147v he has noted that Durrington Church "was blown down in the stormy weather about Aug. 20th 1693". For another example see. f.159. Before Tanner returned to Oxford he told Gibson (MS. T. 25, f.79v) that he intended to visit Salisbury and observed that it might be advisable first to get Charlett to furnish him with an introduction as he was "utterly unknown to any body thereabout". This is extraordinary because Tanner had not long since been attending school at Salisbury, but he presumably means "unknown to any body of importance".

1. The results of Tanner's work prior to and during the summer of 1693 appear to be contained in MS. Top. Wilts e. 1, ff.1-116. This consists of notes arranged in alphabetical order of the names of the places to which they relate, with provision for subsequent additions. There is an admirable index of surnames (f.116v) which shows that the basic notes had been completed by 12 August 1693. The text is in two parts, the first containing those Wiltshire place names that appear in the various editions of John Speed's The theatre of the empire of Great Britain (referred to in the index with upper case letters) and the second to Speed's not inconsiderable omissions (indexed with lower case letters). The whole volume is a very scholarly production: Tanner has taken great care to supply adequate references to his sources and today these can easily be traced. References to Aubrey's Antiquities are made by the sign A , which is an adaptation of the A that Aubrey used as a monogram. These references are incorporated in the body of the text and therefore these notes must have been compiled between 1 June, when Aubrey despatched the Antiquities, and 12 August 1693, when Tanner completed the index. The supplementary references to Aubrey relate to the Natural History, which Tanner did not receive until February 1694; cf. p. 123. A appears on the original upper cover of the Natural History (MS. Aubrey 1) and elsewhere in the Aubrey collection; e.g. MS. Aubrey 5, original upper cover, &c. Aubrey himself refers to his Antiquities as being in books "A" and "B", so present-day terminology (cf. p. 114 , note 4) can in no way be questioned; but it is of interest to note that the "A" on the original upper cover of MS. Aubrey 3 may be an unfinished monogram, and not the complete title "Hypomnemata Antiquaria A".

devoted himself to his work on Wiltshire that Gibson playfully suggested that since that county was so full of antiquities and Tanner "soe horrid greedy of them" he could scarce escape a surfeit and, as an antidote, Gibson presented Tanner with a copy of his recent edition of Quintilian's De Institutione Oratoria;[1] in his experience he had found that "Rhetorick and Antiquities digest one another admirably".[2]

Of far greater importance, however, was the fact that Gibson had already engaged Tanner's help for his new edition of Camden's Britannia.[3] The English version that Philemon

---

1. M.Fabii Quinctiliani De institutione oratoria libri duodecim (Oxf., 1693). Tanner's copy of this work is not now in the Bodleian.

2. MS. T. 25, f.78, Gibson to Tanner, 18 Aug. 1693. That this letter accompanied a copy of the book is shown by Tanner's draft reply, MS. T. 25, f.79.

3. In writing of Gibson's edition of Camden's Britannia I am fortunate in having had access to Gibson's original collections; these were not, I think, consulted by Sir T.D.Kendrick and Professor Piggott for their recent accounts of the work. They are contained in two large folio volumes and consist of the many additions that Gibson received from his various collaborators, with the insertion of the relevant leaves from Holland's 1637 edition of the Britannia; the translations of Camden's text are not included. It is interesting to note that Gibson arranged these collections in an alphabetical order of counties although his published edition followed Camden's original arrangement by tribal groups. These two volumes belong to Major-General C.J.G.Dalton, C.B., C.B.E., and form part of a series of Gibson papers which was successfully reclaimed from the library of St. Paul's Cathedral by the Dalton family and subsequently divided amongst the claimants. Dr. Norman Sykes consulted most of the collection for his biography of Gibson and an account of it is to be found on pp.xxi,xxii of that work. I am grateful to the late Dr. Sykes for bringing these papers to my attention. I am also particularly grateful to General Dalton for permission to use his portion of the collection and also for finally depositing it, at my instigation, in the Bodleian Library where it is now available for consultation as

[cont. on next page]

Holland had issued in 1610 and again in 1637 was unsatisfactory, and the recent spread of antiquarian taste and of topographical studies made a new edition incorporating the supplementary material now available a desideratum. Gibson's first task was to arrange for new translations of Camden's text; that for each county being supplied by a different person - generally the one who was to supply the additions to that county. Some of these translations Gibson found unsatisfactory in style and on 25 January 1694 he told Tanner that at a private meeting of the prospective publishers[1] "they generously told me that what translations I mislik'd they would burn or tear, and leave it entirely to me to find out proper persons who should translate it over again at their charge. You cannot deny", he added, "but this has something in it that's above ye Spirit of a Bookseller".[2] Tanner, whose help had been engaged for both the translation of and the additions to Wiltshire, had already been contemplating his translation for nearly half a year[3]

---

3 cont. Dep. c. 225-246. The collections for the Britannia are now Dep. c. 225,226. I have prepared a report on the deposit for the National Register of Archives and also a conspectus, Dep. c. 246(20*), of the present whereabouts, if known, of the reclaimed manuscripts.

1. Abel Swalle, and Awnsham and John Churchill.

2. MS. T. 25, f.114, Gibson to Tanner, 25 Jan. 1694. The names of the various translators are given at sig. a1v of the 1695 Britannia; another list, in Gibson's hand, appears in Dep. c. 225, f.iii, where "Mr W.S. of the Middle Temple" is shown to be William Salkeld.

3. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.79.

and Gibson's warning that "Every man shall set his hand to his own Translation, and as it is accurat^{e}, or harsh, let him take ye honour or ye Scandal"[1] fell upon ready ears. Tanner's version was submitted to Charlett,[2] and possibly later to Kennett and Gibson,[3] for revision: in its final form it was as accurate as he could make it.[4] Late in 1693

---

1. MS. T. 25, f.114v.

2. The Bodleian Library now contains two of Tanner's draft translations. The first is MS. Top. Wilts e. 1, ff.120-141 and is written on alternate leaves, Tanner making notes of his intended additions to the text on the opposite page. The second is a fair copy of the first and is now MS. Top. Wilts e. 4, ff.3-26; it has been incorrectly endorsed, and noted in the Summary Catalogue (S.C. 27815), as being Tanner's additions to Camden. It was this copy that was submitted to Charlett for revision, and it contains a number of amended readings in his hand; these were invariably incorporated into the final version. In making his translation Tanner was faced with certain examples of Latin verse, but he was apparently aware that White Kennett's brother Basil had undertaken to translate all of these (cf. Britannia, 1695, sig. a2) and he made no attempt to supply a version of his own. Charlett's copy of the 1607 Britannia is now in the Bodleian Library, I 2.2 Med., and pasted inside the upper cover is a sheet in Gibson's hand giving an interesting account of the expenses incurred in preparing his edition, making particular reference to the relative expense and quality of the translations.

3. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.79v.

4. On 2 November 1693 Abel Swalle arranged for 50/- to be paid to Tanner (cf. MS. T. 25, f.95); this was apparently payment in advance for a map of Wiltshire and probably also for the translation. Gibson had not seen the finished map on 11 January 1694 (cf. MS. T. 25, f.112) nor did he receive the translation until after 25 January 1694 (cf. ibid., f.114v). Robert Morden, the engraver, told Gibson that Tanner's map was the "most nice & ingenious of any he had yet seen"; cf. ibid., f.115. Tanner was apparently paid £5 for the whole of his contribution to Camden; cf. ibid., f.116.

John Byrom wrote to Tanner congratulating him on the progress that he had made with his contribution to Camden and expressing the hope that by Tanner's management Wiltshire would be the best performed of all the counties;[1] the draft of Tanner's reply has been preserved:

> I [am] mightily oblig'd to you for ye good hopes you conceive of my management of Wiltshire, I shall be heartily glad if I can in any measure answer the expectation of my Friends and Country: but people will not look for any extraordinary things from a Boy, and one of such small acquaintance as I am, for truly besides w^t^ notes I shall receive from you and a Friend or two more, I have nothing to adorn this Part wth but [my] own reading and observation. I was the more willing to Undertake Wiltshire in this Edition not only because I had made some Collections towards the illustrating of that County, but also that I might have an opportunity of telling my Country, that I do fully design (if I find any tolerable encouragement, and it shall please God to tend me life and health) to make the Antiquities and History of that County my study for some years, and if things go to my mind I will do more toward illustrating it than has been done already in that nature for any shire in England. And sometimes I think that I shall be wanting to the Duty I owe my Native Country, seeing my Naturall inclination and course of my studies have led me [to] this sort of learning if I do not do my part toward the illustrating it, and this I must have the vanity to tell you, if I had a competent maintenance in the University or a livelihood in that County, or any other hopes of gratuity answerable to such a laborious undertaking, that I could do more for my Native Country than has been already done in this nature for any County in England.[2]

As we have already seen, Tanner obtained an appointment within the university and was able to refuse an offer of employment

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.100, Byrom to Tanner, 27 Nov. 1693.

2. MS. T. 25, f.101, Tanner to Byrom, Draft, [Dec. 1693?]. I have not transcribed some of Tanner's obvious errors such as the repetition of words.

at Salisbury which would have been ideal for his work on Wiltshire. Even so, his high hopes of his county history were not to be realised.

In spite of his pleasure at being associated with the forthcoming edition of Camden, Tanner apparently thought it better not to tell Aubrey of this new aspect of his Wiltshire studies and, as soon as Aubrey heard of the projected revision of the Britannia, his caution proved justified. When Aubrey despatched part of the manuscript of his Monumenta Britannica[1] to Tanner he added the injunction that it was to be carefully kept in Tanner's own hands; Edward Lhuyd, in particular, was not to "excerp out of it: for if he sends to London an Extract of it to be put into the Britannia, it will spoile the Sale of my Book".[2] Aubrey had heard that Lhuyd had undertaken the revision of Wales. Tanner had not as yet read Aubrey's Natural History and to renew his request for the manuscript at this juncture might possibly arouse Aubrey's suspicions; nevertheless it would probably save him considerable time and trouble and his contribution to Camden could not be indefinitely postponed. In a non-committal letter to Aubrey, dated 20 October 1693, Tanner said that he would regard it as a "signal favour" if he could borrow the Natural

---

1. Now MS. Top. gen. c. 24,25.
2. MS. T. 25, f.94, Aubrey to Tanner, 14 Oct. 1693.

History and the remainder of the Monumenta, adding the encouragement that he had "several notes by me which will be very pertinently inserted".[1] Aubrey, however, still failed to send the manuscripts, and by Christmas it became necessary for Tanner to try another approach; on 26 December he wrote:

> You promised to send me your other parts of your Monumenta, and your Nāal History of Wilts, as soon as you came to London, but I suppose you have altered your mind upon hearing that I am ingaged in Camden. Which I confess is true, and I should not have conceal'd it so long from you if I had thought (wch I did not a month since) it would have gone on, or at least that I should have [any] thing to do in it. But since it is so, you need not fear my playing the Plagiary wth your MSS. tho' I must excuse your jealousy of such a thing, Antony Wood having dealt so ungenteely by you.[2] Yet if you will take ye word of him that hath done all that led in his power, since he hath had the Honour to be known to you, to approve himself your true friend, there shall be no injustice done you upon the perusall of your Papers. Nay farther suppose I should prove never so false (of wch I hope you will not entertain the least thought) what great harm can I do you in one single sheet, for that will be all I shall have in that Volume.[3] And I think nothing can raise ye expectation of the World more, then to quote two or three curious Remarks out of a book wth respect to ye Author. But this is not my business wth your MSS., only I thought that I must prevent this Objection wch you might naturally raise, for indeed I

---

1. MS. Aubrey 13, f.201, Tanner to Aubrey, 20 Oct. 1693.

2. Wood had incorporated much material furnished by Aubrey into his Athenae Oxonienses without due acknowledgement and when prosecuted by Clarendon (cf. pp. 258) had destroyed some of Aubrey's manuscripts. On the subsequent quarrel between Aubrey and Wood see Chapter VII of Powell, John Aubrey and his friends.

3. In the event the additions to Wiltshire occupied 1½ sheets, i.e. 7 pages. One-third of one page was a catalogue of rare plants growing within the county, which was supplied not by Tanner but by John Ray.

> have by me at present (beside your Wiltshire Antiquities) above 100 Sheets[1] relating to the History of Wilts. (wch indeed I have collected toward the completing your Antiquities) so that I shall not want matterials to fill four Pages.[2]

This letter had the desired effect and in February 1694, nearly a year after his original request, Tanner at last received the manuscript of the Natural History.[3] He immediately set to work upon it, incorporating his excerpts within the frame of notes that he had prepared during the previous summer[4] and at the same time, as he had promised, making annotations in Aubrey's manuscript.[5] To set Aubrey's heart further at rest Tanner later told him that he had been very sparing in taking anything from his papers "besides w^t necessarily serves to confirm any opinion of my own".[6] The Natural History had only just arrived in time. On 9 March[7]

---

1. This sounds less impressive when it is realised that Tanner means octavo sheets.

2. MS. Aubrey 13, f.204, Tanner to Aubrey, 26 Dec. 1693.

3. Cf. MS. Aubrey 13, f.197, Tanner to Aubrey, 15 Feb. 1694.

4. Cf. p.116, note 1. These additions are not incorporated in Tanner's index.

5. On 15 February 1694 Tanner told Aubrey that he had "already read over the first part wth incredible sa[tis]faction, and have taken the boldness to add some remarks of my own" (MS. Aubrey 13, f.197). His annotations on the first part (MS. Aubrey 1) appear on ff.48; 67v; 75v; 110; 117; 120; 121; 122; and 147, but there are no annotations by Tanner in the second part (MS. Aubrey 2). Both volumes contain notes by John Evelyn, John Ray, and Thomas Gale. Tanner also made annotations in the Antiquities (MS. Aubrey 3), on ff.24; 69r & v; 84; 140v; 147v; 159; and 160.

6. MS. Aubrey 13, f.202, Tanner to Aubrey, 3 Apr. 1694.

7. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.129, Gibson to Tanner, 9 Mar. 1694.

Gibson wrote to Tanner urging him to make haste with his additions to Camden and, no reply being forthcoming, twelve days later he repeated his request.[1] Although he had been prominent in arranging for different people to translate Camden's text, Gibson believed that if he were to apply the same principle to the additions it would result in an obtrusive and unpleasant inequality of style[2] and he himself proposed to be responsible for their actual composition. All that Tanner had to do, therefore, was to arrange his notes in a semi-digested form in the order in which they related to the original text. The notes that he had drawn up in 1693 were admirably suited to this kind of use and a large part of Tanner's contribution to Camden is contained in the three lengthy letters that he wrote to Gibson on 5, 10, and 12 April 1694.[3] These letters are in the form of a continuous narrative and, with one exception, contain few references as to the source of the information: in accordance with his promise to Aubrey that he would not "play the Plagiary" Tanner has been careful to underline everything

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.130, Gibson to Tanner, 21 Mar. 1694.

2. On 1 February 1694 Gibson told Charlett that "Most of those men who are concern'd to return us intelligence seem to be of the same opinion, and doe not trouble themselves any farther than to send their papers without form or method"; MS. Ballard 5, f.21.

3. Dep. c. 226, ff.401-406. The three letters are supplemented (ff.407 et seqq.) by twenty quarto leaves, undated, but in direct continuation of the letter dated 12 April 1694. These four parts represent the whole of Tanner's additions.

that he took from this source in red ink.[1] However, his careful honesty was not always observed by Gibson, who sometimes incorporated the information in the text whilst omitting to make the reference to Aubrey;[2] but Gibson, even if he did not think Aubrey's far from inconsiderable Wiltshire collections worthy of inclusion in his bibliography of sources, took good care to see that Aubrey received an honourable mention.[3] Tanner has not underlined many phrases in red, and his assertion that he only took from Aubrey's papers what served to amplify or support information that he already

---

1. Cf. MS. Aubrey 13, f.202; Dep. c. 226, f.401.

2. For instance, in the original (Dep. c. 226, f.403) Tanner has underlined the information that appears in the Britannia (1695) column 101 as "It [Cricklade] has now a Free school, founded by Robert Jenner Esq. and endow'd by him with 40 l. per Annum", but Gibson gives no reference. Many similar examples are to be found; e.g. "and grass grows where the Choir was" (ibid., col.102); "Queen Mary in the beginning of her reign granted her Charter to this Corporation, which consists of a Bailiff and 12 Burgesses" (ibid., col.103); &c.

3. A number of references to Aubrey are made in the additions to Wiltshire. In the bibliography (sigs. fl-gl) Gibson makes no mention of Aubrey's Wiltshire collections although he says that Tanner "has made large Collections in order to the Antiquities of this County". In his list of general topographical works, however, he enters Aubrey's "Templa Druidum, Monumenta Britannica &c ... in four Volumes". The Templa Druidum is the first of the four parts of the Monumenta which are now bound in two volumes, MS. Top. gen. c. 24,25. It was of this work that Gibson said "the accounts of things are soe broken and short, the parts soe much disorder'd, and the whole such a mere Rhapsody, that I cannot but wonder how that poor man could entertain thoughts of a present Impression, They will be serviceable however, especially in Counties where Intelligence falls short; for the rest, we shall not make much use of them"; MS. T. 25, f.134, Gibson to Tanner, 12 Apr. 1694.

possessed seems to be fully justified.[1]

Tanner's share in the Britannia was not quite completed with the dispatch of his additions to Wiltshire. On 27 July 1694 Gibson wrote: "Now I begin to close with your promise of marking the Religious Houses. The parcel o' Maps you received must begin that trouble" and, remembering that Tanner had not been any too hasty in sending his additions, he added that "the slowness of the rowling-press forces us to desire expedition. If it were not too much interruption, you would oblige us by doing them immediately and returning them by the first opportunity".[2] Tanner's work on the Notitia Monastica was by now in its final stages and, even at the age of twenty, he was perhaps the most suitable person in the whole of the country to undertake this revision of the maps. This, however, was the final part of his contribution to Camden[3] and he was now able to turn his attentions to his own projected account of Wiltshire.

In February or March 1694 Tanner had printed a sheet entitled A Scheme of the intended History of Wiltshire[4] but

---

1. Cf. p.123. Tanner repeated this to Gibson in very similar words; cf. Dep. c. 226, f.401.

2. MS. T. 25, f.187, Gibson to Tanner, 27 Jul. 1694.

3. Tanner seems to have read some of the proof-sheets (cf. MS. Ballard 5, ff.44,46,56v) but whether this was in the capacity of a proof-reader or merely out of interest is not clear.

4. Tanner inserted a copy of this among his Wiltshire collections, MS. Top. Wilts. e. 4, f.163. His manuscript draft is to be found in the same volume, ff.161,162.

on 3 April he told Aubrey that it was "not yet made publick" and added that it would remain that way until he could find more time to devote to his project.[1] The Scheme, which incidentally is anonymous, is not a set of proposals for printing and there is no evidence to suggest that it was ever "published" in the usual sense of the word. It is more in the nature of a private circular in which Tanner outlined the manner in which he proposed to treat his subject and which he sent to his friends for their criticism, and probably also to the more influential people of the county that they might be encouraged to allow him access to the vast amount of privately owned material which would be of great assistance to him. Perhaps more important, in view of the prevailing vogue in topographical studies, was the fact that this printed sheet formed a caveat to other topographers that a history of Wiltshire was in progress.

It was not long before Gibson asked Tanner to send him a copy of the Scheme to London "because communicating the full design to some persons here in town may be of some consequence towards promoting the work".[2] Charlett also did his best to further Tanner's interests in this matter, and in the hope that the projected history would come to the ears of Gilbert

---

1. MS. Aubrey 13, f.203, Tanner to Aubrey, 3 Apr. 1694.
2. MS. T. 25, f.128, Gibson to Tanner, 3 Mar. [1694].

Burnet, the Bishop of Salisbury, he sent a copy of the Scheme to Michael Geddes, the Chancellor of the diocese. Geddes immediately offered Tanner his own personal assistance, a small annuity for three years, and some financial help with the costs of publication as well as assuring Charlett that when Tanner's work took him into North Wiltshire he would be "as welcome at my house, as at his fathers".[1] Burnet, however, thought Tanner rather too young to be "drawn ... from his other studies, and be engag'd in a work soe Laborious and tiresome"[2] but, on one of his visitations, he recollected the incident sufficiently well to discuss the matter with Tanner's father in highly encouraging terms.[3] Both Tanner's father and Chancellor Geddes believed that if, young as he was, Tanner actually produced the work then Bishop Burnet would be "as forward as any body to promote it".[4] Gibson also approached Geddes on Tanner's behalf and he reported that Geddes was "altogether of opinion, that it cannot miss of proper encouragement as well from the Nobility and Gentry, as the Church of Salisbury",[5] and when John Byrom received his copy of the Scheme he prophesied that Tanner's

---

1. Cf. MS. Ballard 30, f.42, Geddes to Charlett, [Mar. 1694].
2. MS. T. 25, f.133, Gibson to Tanner, 24 Mar. 1694.
3. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.170, Tanner's father to Tanner, 17 Jun, 1694.
4. MS. Ballard 30, f.42. Cf. also MS. T. 25, f.170.
5. MS. T. 25, f.133.

name would one day be as great as those of Camden, Spelman, and Dugdale.[1] Although today Byrom's prophecy does not fall so very far short of the truth, at the time it would have seemed excessively over-complimentary were it not for the good sense and advice contained in Byrom's letters; from the outset he warned Tanner that Wiltshire would require "a laborious industry as well as an exact judgement, ye one finding materials, ye other setting them together, filing & polishing them"[2] and in a subsequent letter he outlined the difficulties that Tanner would have to overcome.[3] But Tanner was well aware of the scope of the work that he had undertaken, and in his Scheme he warned the reader that "a Book of this

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.244, Byrom to Tanner, 15 Oct. 1694.

2. ibid.

3. On 19 October 1694 Byrom wrote to Tanner (MS. T. 25, f.248):

"Your design about Wilts has bin often in my thoughts & I hope, when 'tis finish'd, 'twill be as lasting a monum^t^ as Stone-henge wch stands in it. But in order to it there is required so much application, such knowledge of languages, understanding of Geography, Architecture, heraldry, incampments, coins, old customs, history, searching of Records, Lieger-books &c. & judgement in setting these elegantly together, y^t^ 'tis not easy to imagine, y^t^ ever they will meet in one person. W^th^out application nothing of this nature can be done, there must be a continual digging in old books & ruines. This must begin, & be continued throuout ye whole work & herein I think w^th^out complement y^t^ you are fitly qualified; & I hope it will animate you so far, as to lay a good foundation of languages. Besides lat. & Gr. you cannot be w^th^out ye Welsh (Gallish), Saxon, & modern French". Byrom then went on to review at some length the need for these languages. He had also mentioned the matter in an earlier letter, MS. T. 25, f.124, Byrom to Tanner, 19 Feb. 1694.

nature cannot be expected immediatly, considering the time and pains that must be spent in Surveying every Town and Village throughout the whole County; In searching the Records in the Tower, and in the Exchequer, MSS. in the Heralds Office, in the Cottonian, Bodleian, and other Libraries; In examining the Registers and other Muniments relating to the Bishops, Church, and Diocese of Salisbury; as also the Charters and Writings of all Corporations and private Gentlemen ...". The whole tone of the Scheme is one of comprehension; Tanner's Wiltshire was intended to be the authoritative work on the county, and as a result it hardly reflects the true state of his Wiltshire collections at the time of its issue.[1] When reviewed in the light of Tanner's personal position early in 1694 it becomes apparent that its main purpose was to attract attention to Tanner himself rather than to his projected work, for the years after graduation at the university were always hard for the young student who was not yet of an age to enter the Church and had not yet proved himself worthy of academic patronage.

In view of the fact that the Bishop, Dean,[2] Chancellor, and at least one Prebendary[3] of Salisbury had offered Tanner

---

1. These appear to have been fairly restricted; cf. p. 112, note 2; p. 116, note 1. In the last paragraph of the Scheme Tanner truthfully described the collections that he had so far made as being "out of most of the printed Historians and several MSS".

2. Cf. pp. 19-21.

3. i.e. Byrom.

earnest encouragement, it seems unlikely that the Scheme, which was "not yet made publick" at the beginning of April 1694, was ever in general circulation, for Tanner does not seem to have received any widespread support for his proposal. The reason for Tanner's delay in this matter is quite clear. On 1 May Gibson told Charlett that Awnsham Churchill, the publisher, was about to visit Oxford and that part of his business was "to divert my neighbour Tanner from the thoughts of medling in Wiltshire for one twelvemonth".[1] It was of little consequence if Tanner should forsake his topographical studies (unpaid) for the historical and literary work (paid) that was now offered him and, as Churchill also accepted the Notitia Monastica for publication, he was very soon effectually prevented from embarking on his proposed plan of research.

As far as Tanner was concerned Wiltshire was only postponed, but the careful collections that he had already made soon reaped their reward because his contribution to the Britannia, which was published in 1695, brought him some well-founded credit in academic circles. In his spare time he made further extracts from the manuscripts available at

---

1. MS. Ballard 5, f.32, Gibson to Charlett, 1 May 1694.

Oxford,[1] and there were those happy occasions when his new line of study was not entirely divorced from the old and the two could be profitably combined.[2] Nevertheless, it was necessary that the History of Wiltshire should be kept well in the public eye, and in this matter Tanner's friends fell nobly into the breach. White Kennett inserted two allusions to the forthcoming work in his own contribution to topographical studies, the Parochial Antiquities of Ambrosden,[3] and in the Britannia Gibson excelled himself

---

1. In addition to those transcripts already mentioned (cf. p. 112, note 2) MS. Top. Wilts. e. 4 contains excerpts from several manuscripts available in the libraries of Oxford, as well as from the private collections of Matthew Hutton, of Aynhoe (f.29); Sir William Glynne of Ambrosden, White Kennett's patron (f.41); Kennett (f.107); John Mill, Principal of St. Edmund Hall (f.123); and Timothy Halton, Provost of Queen's College (f.132). There are also excerpts, dated 1698, from the collections of Peter Le Neve (f.47). On 16 May 1696 Le Neve had offered to help Tanner with his description of Wiltshire; cf. MS. T. 24, f.139.

2. e.g. in work on Leland's papers. In this Tanner demonstrated that he was well aware of the value of working from original sources: it appears that in making some of his transcripts from Leland he was unable to obtain the original and was forced to work from Burton's copy. He later completed his transcript from the original and at the same time took care to collate what he had already transcribed. Cf. MS. Top. Wilts. e. 4, ff.119-122; [illegible] sc. f.122v.

3. W.Kennett, Parochial antiquities attempted in the history of Ambrosden, Burcester, and other adjacent parts, in the counties of Oxford and Bucks (Oxf., 1695) sig. b4 and p.36. The Bodleian possesses two copies containing Kennett's notes (Don. d. 56; Gough eccl. top. 67b) the first of which contains ad initium, a few allusions to Tanner. This work was not Kennett's first connection with topography: in 1693 he had contributed a biography of William Somner to an edition of Somner's Treatise of the Roman Ports and Forts in Kent. On this occasion Kennett took the opportunity (sig. c3) to take notice of Tanner's proposed edition of Hegge's Legend of St. Cuthbert. He presented a copy (now T. 917) to Tanner who has made notes, some from Leland, on the additional end-papers.

by including at least four direct references to it,[1] as well as taking every other opportunity to mention Tanner and his undertakings. Both these works were published in 1695, and in the following year William Nicolson mentioned Wiltshire in his English Historical Library[2] and the aged John Aubrey

---

1. Cf. Britannia, 1695, sigs. a1, g1 and columns 75 and 107.

2. Cf. W.Nicolson, The English historical library, Part I (Lond., 1696) p.65. On 21 June 1696 Gibson wrote to Charlett (MS. Ballard 5, f.99):

"Yesterday, glancing over the sheets [of Nicolson's work] I was a little offended at a passage which concerns Mr Tanner. Giving an account of ye Wiltshire-Historians, he begins thus:

Wiltshire. "John Aubrey Esqr (Fellow of ye Royal Society, and a person well vers'd in our British and English Antiquities) has laid ye Foundation of ye History and Antiquities of this County; but designs to leave the finishing-part, I think, to Mr Tanner; whose extraordinary proficiency in these studies will quickly be made known to the world."

By this, it is very natural for those who know neither of ye Parties, to imagine that the former has made some vast Collections towards the History, and that ye latter is to be little further concern'd, than to put them in a method & soe print 'em. Which construction gives Mr Aubrey infinitely more than his Performances deserve; and falls as far short of the honour due to Mr Tanner's design. I went over to Mr Swall, and told him, that Leaf must of necessity be reprinted: he agree'd to it, and soe (by the following alteration) I have endeavour'd to give each of the two Antiquaries the share of glory that belongs to him:

Wiltshire "John Aubrey Esqr (Fellow of the Royal Society) has made some collections towards ye Antiquities of this Shire: but Mr Tanner (whose extraordinary proficiency in these studies will quickly be made known to ye world) designs to survey the whole County, and to give us a complete work in ye method of Sr William Dugdale's Warwickshire."

I thought, the mention of Mr Aubrey's Skill in our English Antiquities might well be omitted in this place; because Mr Nicolson (in other parts of his book) has been very kind to him, if not over-liberal."

Both versions survive in print; cf. 8° V 105 Art., 8° F 53 Jur: in the first of these sig. Fl is a cancel. It is therefore, to all intents and purposes, Gibson's reference to Tanner that is today to be found in the "official" version of Nicolson's book. In fairness to Aubrey it must be said that his collections appear to be far larger than Tanner's ever were.

in the dedication to his Miscellanies, the only work that he himself ever published, publicly acknowledged that he had devolved his half-finished Wiltshire collections upon Tanner, "who hath Youth to go through with it, and a Genius proper for such an Undertaking".[1]

It was as well that Tanner had forewarned readers of his Scheme of a possible delay in the appearance of the work. In 1695 Tanner had received a chaplaincy and in 1696 a Fellowship of All Souls, so he was by now in possession of the "competent maintenance" that he had earlier been seeking to enable him to continue with his work on Wiltshire, but it was of little avail. Even before he had obtained his Fellowship he told Le Neve that his work for Churchill would delay him for a year or two, but that when this was finished he had every intention of returning once more to these studies - if he could "find any tolerable encouragement".[2] However, Tanner's appointment as Bishop Moore's chaplain and librarian, which proved so much to his advantage in his family and professional life, proved more than a hindrance to his work on the History of Wiltshire and when Tanner became Chancellor of Norwich in 1701, with the result that he became

---

1. J.Aubrey, Miscellanies (Lond., 1696) sig. A4. This work was dedicated to James Bertie, Earl of Abingdon, who had earlier assisted Tanner to obtain his chaplaincy of All Souls.

2. Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, p.408, Tanner to Le Neve, 13 Jun. 1696.

completely domiciled in the diocese, it ceased altogether. Nevertheless, he was for the rest of his life regarded as an authority on Wiltshire, although he quite openly admitted in 1714 that his collections were inadequate, "being only from the printed Historians and such MS. as the Oxford Libraries could furnish" and he added that he had been "diverted from that design before I had opportunity of searching the Tower Records or the Muniments of Gentlemen in the Country";[1] but in the same year Nicolson, in the second edition of his English Historical Library, was still assuring the world at large that Tanner's work would soon be forthcoming.[2] Three years later, however, Tanner spoke of the whole project as a past incident belonging to his "younger days at Oxford" and said that he had "defer'd taking an actual survey of the Churches, Epitaphs &c. - till it should please God, that I should get a settlement in that Country".[3] It was presumably only the fact that his preferment came at such a distance from Wiltshire that prevented him from continuing with the work, and it is reasonable to suppose that if fate had returned him once more to a permanent position in his native diocese

---

1. MS. Willis 48, f.436, Tanner to Willis, 3 Dec. 1714.

2. Nicolson, English historical library, 2nd. ed., (Lond., 1714) p.26. The words used are the same as those that appear in the first edition, but in many other instances Nicolson has brought his text up to date and it must be thought that he did not know that Tanner's work was not still in progress.

3. MS. Willis 38, p.497, Tanner to Willis, 31 Jan. 1718.

he would have eagerly resumed his researches.

By 1722 it had become obvious that any remove from Norwich was unlikely and Tanner gave up all hope of ever publishing Wiltshire; in Gibson's revised version of the Britannia he announced his willingness to communicate his collections to any person who would undertake that work.[1] His offer does not seem to have been taken up, although in 1731 Hearne noted that a "M.r Greenaway, formerly Schoolmaster of Coventry, is in good earnest about the Antiquities of Wiltshire" and made a note to remember to tell Tanner.[2] Wiltshire did not receive a comprehensive account until the nineteenth century when Aubrey's papers were at last seen through the press.[3] At Tanner's death a few of his Wiltshire papers came to the library with the rest of his collections, but part of the intended History was retained in the possession of his son and was presented by him to the library in 1751.[4]

It has recently been said in regard to Tanner's collections for the History of Wiltshire that "in the course of years he was to amass collections which were commensurate

---

1. Cf. Britannia, 1722, vol.i, sig. m2v.

2. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.473.

3. Cf. p.112, note 1. At about the same time Sir Richard Colt Hoare began his series of publications on Wiltshire.

4. MS. Top. Wilts. e. 4 is noted in the Summary catalogue (S.C. 27815) as having been given by Tanner's son on 18 June 1751. MS. Top. Wilts. e. 1 was possibly contained in the Gough collection.

with the magnitude of his design" and that "apart from all else [the Tanner manuscripts] suggest that his Wiltshire may have been one of the great unwritten county histories of England".[1] This is somewhat of an over-statement. We have seen that Tanner himself admitted that his collections were extremely limited, being based on little original research and still less personal observation. Much of the material relates directly to his contribution to the Britannia and in the remainder there is nothing to indicate that he made anything other than the most minor of additions to them after his removal into Norfolk; in fact the latest definite date at which he was at work upon them seems to be 1698 when he made a transcript from some of Le Neve's papers.[2] Moreover, when compared with Aubrey's tumultuous collections Tanner's effort seems by no means large, even taking into account the fact that his small writing encompasses a deceptive amount of information. On the other hand his Wiltshire collections display to the full his neat, methodical, and careful manner of research and he quite obviously possessed the disposition to assemble the materials for a really good county history; but it must also be admitted that, however exhaustive his research, in the light of his record with the Notitia Monastica and the Bibliotheca Brit-

---

1. D.C.Douglas, English scholars, 2nd. ed. (Lond., 1951) p.160.
2. Cf. p.132 , note 1.

annico-Hibernica it is unlikely that he would ever have reduced these collections to a point when they were ready for the press.

Tanner's interest in topography was a natural one and as he travelled around the diocese of Norwich he gradually came to know the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk very well indeed. When Gibson published the revision of his edition of the Britannia it was Tanner who supplied the additional material for these counties[1] but there is nothing to suggest that he ever contemplated a full-scale account of Norfolk on the lines of his proposed History of Wiltshire. When such a history did finally appear[2] it was dedicated to Tanner's memory as the man who had done most to encourage it and it is ironical to think that his help was given only after he had finally left the diocese. Three months before his death Tanner wrote to Rawlinson:

> '... there is a very industrious young Clergyman one Mr Blomfield who ... is about a Civil History of Norfolk - has sent me up what he has done as to one Hundred, wch I am mightily pleased with, and hope he will be encouraged to proceed thro' the whole County. I think as to the account of Mannors and Estates and their possessors he is as exact as Dugdale or Thoroton,[3] and in some things more so. I will give him a plate - and assist him what I can out of my own Collections - wch were chiefly as to the Ecclesiastical state - for having a little Fee out of every Institution while I was Chancellor there, I

---

1. Cf. Camden, Britannia, 1722, vol.i, sig. [a]2v.

2. F.Blomefield, An essay towards a topographical history of the county of Norfolk (Fersfield, 1739-75).

3. Thoroton was the author of a work on Nottinghamshire, cf. p. 103, note 1.

> thought to earn it, by going thro' the Registers and making a series of the Incumbents and Patrons in the manner of Mr Newcourts Repertorium[1] - Mr Blomfield will take in all that.[2]

Francis Blomefield had begun to collect material for his History of Norfolk in 1720 when he was only fifteen years old but it does not seem to have been until 1733 that Tanner was approached for his assistance.[3] Blomefield immediately received every encouragement but Tanner was unwilling to part with the abstract that he had made of the Institution Registers. Instead he suggested that Blomefield should send him a fair copy of his work as it was written and he would then himself make what additions he could out of his own collections. In April 1735 Blomefield despatched the manuscript relating to the Hundred of Diss and he received it back in the following November - the delays on this occasion were due to the carriers and not to Tanner's procrastination. Tanner's amendments and annotations were plentiful[4]

---

1. i.e. R.Newcourt, Repertorium ecclesiasticum parochiale Londonense: an ecclesiastical history of the diocese of London (Lond., 1708,10).

2. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.31v, Tanner to Rawlinson, 2 Oct. 1735.

3. Tanner's connection with Blomefield is reviewed in S.W.Rix, "Cursory notices of the rev. Francis Blomefield", Norfolk archaeology, vol.ii, pp.201-224. Cf. also W.Rye, "Francis Blomefield", Norfolk antiquarian miscellany, vol.iii, pp.177-184.

4. Cf. Rix, op. cit., Norfolk archaeology, vol.ii, p.216. Tanner's notes seem to have been separate (ibid., p.217): his hand is not to be found on Blomefield's collections for Diss, now MS. Gough Norfolk 6 and 12. Cf. also C.L.S.Linnell, "Some notes on the Blomefield MSS. in the Bodleian library",

[cont. on next page]

but this must have been the extent of his direct personal assistance to Blomefield for little more than a month after the return of these papers Tanner was dead.[1] In his will Tanner directed that his abstract of Institutions should be placed in the Norwich Diocesan Registry and that Blomefield should have the use of them.[2] Blomefield immediately reaped a rich harvest. Tanner's "Index", as it is known today, is contained in two large folio volumes[3] which apparently at one time consisted of more than 2100 pages, nearly all of them covered in Tanner's small neat hand; the index proper consists of 1454 pages[4] giving a chronological list of all the incumbents for each living within the diocese. It is

---

4 cont. Norfolk record society, Publications, vol.xxii, pp.65-83. MS. Gough Norfolk 2, ff.43-63 is incorrectly described in that work and also in the Summary catalogue (S.C. 18056) as being in Tanner's hand; there are, however, annotations by him. Fols.67-103 in the same volume are endorsed by Blomefield as having belonged to Tanner and also bear notes in Tanner's hand. A few very minor notes by Tanner are to be found in other Blomefield volumes in the same collection.

1. In the Introduction to his work Blomefield states that Tanner's "Kindness was so great, as not only to help me to the sight of vast Numbers of Records, and Manuscripts concerning this country, but also to fix my Method, and revise my Collections when put together, Town by Town, as I compiled them" but, as we have seen, ten weeks before his death Tanner said that he had only revised the material for one Hundred, presumably that of Diss.

2. Cf. East Anglian, new ser., vol.xiii, p.20.

3. Now Boxes 803, 804 in the records deposited in the chapel adjoining the Bishop's Palace, Norwich. Box 805 contains miscellaneous notes in continuation by various hands.

4. The latter part of the second volume contains transcripts of documents relating to the diocese.

strange that Tanner should find time to do this and yet not to complete his other works for the amount of labour involved was immense. The production of a "Repertorium" for the diocese of Norwich would probably have been a more practical proposition than either of Tanner's other undertakings but the terms of his will indicate that these two volumes were all that he ever prepared for such a work. It is no exaggeration to say that Blomefield's debt to Tanner's Index was very great indeed: on page after page he has made a mark to indicate that he had examined the lists that Tanner had prepared.[1] As these lists were later reproduced in the printed version of Blomefield's work it came about that after commencing work on one county and making incidental collections relating to two others[2] Tanner's greatest contribution to a published county history was almost unintentional and took place only after his death.

---

1. Blomefield's mark is a cross within a circle - ⊕.

2. Several Norfolk and Suffolk papers are to be found in the Tanner collections in the Bodleian. Cf. also p.378, note 1. Lots 27-36 in the Thomas Martin sale catalogue of 28 April 1773 were "Original Letters, Pedigrees and Papers, collected by Le Neve, Bp. Tanner, &c. ... in ten large Parcels" all of which probably related to Norfolk, and similar material is contained in Lots 39 and 143 of the same sale. Lot 649 in the Craven Ord sale of 25 June 1829 is said (cf. Macray, Annals, p.212) to have been a collection of Suffolk papers by Tanner but the printed catalogue ends at Lot 618. It is probable that this was bought by Sir Thomas Phillipps at the Ord sale and is to be identified with no. 3828 in his catalogue. At the same sale Phillipps bought a Tanner letter as Lot 527, subsequently Phillipps 4094. Phillipps 7430 is said to be collections relating to Ely, possibly by Tanner. These papers are probably now amongst the Phillipps manuscripts owned by Lord Iveagh but I have as yet been unable to arrange to see them. The Phillipps catalogue indicates that they are not very numerous.

CHAPTER III

THE NOTITIA MONASTICA

The only work that Tanner himself ever completed was an octavo volume entitled Notitia Monastica; or, A Short History of the Religious Houses in England and Wales which was published at Oxford in March 1695. Tanner was then only just twenty-one and the circumstances that spurred him to its production at such an early age have already been reviewed.[1] This was the work that immediately established his scholarly reputation and it is no exaggeration to say that if Tanner had failed to see the Notitia into print it is unlikely that he would ever have attained the eminence of the episcopal bench or even the less exalted, but still highly satisfactory, position of Chancellor of Norwich. It is true that his career had in fact started before its publication but it was largely this work in prospect that had prompted such patronage as he was able to obtain, and its subsequent appearance served to consolidate his position and to display his undoubted talents to a wider circle.

There does not seem to be any record of what prompted Tanner's researches into ecclesiastical topography, and it is not clear how he came to pursue this branch of study rather than the account of Wiltshire to which he might more naturally

---

1. Cf. pp. 12-14.

have been drawn. The explanation is probably that Tanner himself saw only too clearly the necessity of publishing some learned work as soon as possible and felt that the preparation of a county history, if it were to stand comparison with the excellent work already done in this field, would be altogether too arduous a task among his other academic commitments, and would in any case involve him in much time-consuming travel. It was plainly advisable to undertake a work that could be compiled largely from the resources of the Oxford libraries, and the Notitia Monastica was admirably suited to his purposes because the greater part of what would have been his primary material had been systematically destroyed at the dissolution of the monasteries. Working mainly from sources that were available within the University Tanner was able to compile a work that was comprehensive enough and that displayed sufficient original historical scholarship to attract the interest and patronage of men of learning, whilst being compact enough to be prepared in a comparatively short space of time. There are indications that a considerable part of his researches had been accomplished before he had taken his B.A. degree and, as we have already seen, during this period he was also engaged on Hegge's ~~Life~~ Legend of St. Cuthbert[1] and on his own History of Wiltshire.[2] It was only fair that such industry should reap its reward.

---

1. Cf. p. 11
2. Cf. pp. 112,113.

At the end of the seventeenth century the history and bibliography of monasticism was by no means such a fashionable study as topography and, although it had received some attention from the more serious antiquarians, little on this subject had actually been printed - with, of course, the notable exception of Dugdale's Monasticon. This reticence was largely due to a national antipathy towards Roman Catholicism which, although of a century and a half's standing, was hardly tempered by the behaviour of the later Stuart kings. Nevertheless, much contemporary research was derived from the records of the dissolved monastic establishments, particularly in the field of the county history, and Tanner set out to fill a long-felt want by supplying a small handbook which gave a brief account of each foundation and an indication of the present whereabouts of its archives.

Tanner himself reviewed the sources of his work in the Preface to the Notitia Monastica[1] and foremost among them he places Leland's notes. Leland, it will be remembered,[2] had undertaken to examine and report on all the archives of the kingdom at the very time when most of the literary repositories were being suppressed, and his work naturally contained a wealth of information for the Notitia, particularly relating to the smaller and more remote establishments that in Tanner's day were half-forgotten and probably undocumented elsewhere.

---

1. Sigs. a7-b1.
2. Cf. pp. 104, 105.

Fortunately Leland's papers were readily available in the Bodleian Library where they had been deposited by William Burton.

The earliest printed source that Tanner used was the Catalogue of the Religious Houses within the Realme of England and Wales which had appeared at the end of the chapter on Henry VIII in John Speed's History of Great Britain.[1] This had been incorporated in the text without any indication of its authorship and it had been automatically assumed that it was Speed's work.[2] Tanner only discovered his mistake just before the Notitia was published; too late, unfortunately, to make any alterations and in the body of the work he makes his references to Speed whilst drawing attention to his error in the preface.[3] On the authority of Sir Henry Spelman,[4] Tanner suggested that whilst William Burton had owned Leland's collections he had made use of them to compile this Catalogue, but it now seems that the real author may well have been Sir

---

1. J.Speed, The history of Great Britaine (Lond., 1611) ff.787-801

2. An examination of the work, however, reveals that the Catalogue is foliated whereas the remainder of the book is paginated, and that the sequence of signatures has been slightly modified. This perhaps indicates that these sheets were set up out of sequence, as if supplied by someone other than Speed; but as the Catalogue is tabulated this may merely have been done to suit the printer's convenience.

3. Notitia, sig. a7.

4. Cf. Sir H.Spelman, Concilia (Lond., 1639) tom.i, p.215.

Robert Bruce Cotton.[1] Whoever the author was, this Catalogue held the distinction of having been the first of its kind to be published and for this very reason it could hardly escape being "defective and erroneous".[2] It was, in fact, for many years the only work in print and, apart from a "rapsody of stories" by Richard Broughton,[3] Tanner was unable to find

---

1. Whilst Speed was preparing his History he wrote to Sir Robert Cotton requesting "a Note of all Monasteryes in the Realm" and a "furtherance for the Monasteryes erected in every shire". These letters are reproduced in Original letters of eminent literary men, ed. by sir H.Ellis (Camden society), (Lond., 1843) pp.110.112. Ellis believed the Catalogue to be Cotton's work; this evidence points that way, and it is certain that Cotton revised the proof sheets of Speed's work; cf. ibid., p.111. It is just possible that Cotton defaulted over the Catalogue and the deficiency was made up by Burton, and slightly more weight can be given to Spelman's version when it is remembered that he too was assisting Speed at the time of the publication of the History and was on particularly friendly terms with Sir Robert Cotton. (Cf. D.N.B., s.n. Spelman; and E.Gibson's "Life of Spelman" prefixed to Reliquiae Spelmannianae (Oxf., 1698) sigs. c4v, d1). When Spelman made the ascription he was, however, writing nearly thirty years after the event. Cf. also D.Knowles and R.N.Hadcock, Medieval religious houses, England and Wales (Lond., 1953) pp.xv-xvii for this and other points relating to the growth of monastic studies.

2. Notitia, sig. a7v. Cf. p.157

3. R.Broughton, A true memorial of the antient, most holy, and religious state of Great Britain (n. pl., 1650). This work seems to have been better known as Monastichon Britannicum, under which title it was published at London in 1655. Tanner's judgement was somewhat harsh on Broughton whose work, an octavo of more than 400 pages, was the first narrative in the field and had been published posthumously, Broughton dying in 1635. Thomas Baker wrote in his copy of the Monastichon (Gough eccl. top. 11, ad initium) "This Book is well wrote, notwithstanding the disparaging character given of it by Bp: Nicholson. The Author seems to have seen more, & judg'd truer, then[sic] any of the Antiquaries, that wrote before him". Nicolson merely described the book as consisting of "indigested Tales" and charitably attributed this to its posthumous nature; cf. Nicolson, English historical library, Part II (1697) pp.184,185.

anything else to serve his purpose until the appearance of Dugdale's Monasticon.

The first volume of "that glorious work"[1] the Monasticon Anglicanum, representing the joint efforts of Roger Dodsworth and Sir William Dugdale, appeared in 1655. At the beginning of the career that was to make him Garter King-at-Arms Dugdale[2] was a minor country squire whose interest in Warwickshire had prompted William Burton to introduce him to Sir Simon Archer, foremost among the gentry of that county.[3] Archer's encouragement gradually gave place to active collaboration[4] and he, in his turn, introduced Dugdale to Sir Henry Spelman[5] who was perhaps the greatest antiquary of the age. Spelman, like

---

1. Notitia, sig. a6.

2. The most important work on Dugdale is The life, diary, and correspondence of Sir William Dugdale, ed. by W.Hamper (Lond., 1827). The Life is Dugdale's autobiography, written in the third person. A modern, and little known, account of Dugdale's life is the broadcast script by N.Painting, Midland biography: William Dugdale - historian (1953). See also F.Madison, D.Styles, A.Wood, Sir William Dugdale, 1605-1686, a list of his printed works ... with notes on his life and the manuscript sources (Warwick, 1953).

3. Dugdale, Life &c., p.8.

4. Cf. F.Styles, Sir Simon Archer (Dugdale society occasional papers, 6), (Oxf., 1946) p.36. This monograph contains much valuable material relating to Dugdale.

5. For accounts of Dugdale's relationship with Spelman over the proposed Monasticon, in addition to Dugdale's Life &c., see H.A.Cronne, "The study and use of charters by English scholars in the seventeenth century: sir Henry Spelman and sir William Dugdale", in English historical scholarship in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, ed. by L.Fox (Dugdale society), (Lond., 1956) pp.73-91. See also Gibson's Life of Spelman in his edition of Reliquiae Spelmannianae.

Archer, was impressed with Dugdale's obvious abilities and told him that a Roger Dodsworth[1] of Yorkshire "had taken much paynes in search of Records, and other antient Memorialls, relating to the Antiquities of that County; but especially touching the Foundations of Monasteries there, and in the Northern parts of this Realme",[2] and offered the use of his own monastic collections relating to Norfolk and Suffolk if Dugdale and Dodsworth would collaborate in the production of a"Monasticon Anglicanum". Spelman appears to have realised that neither his nor Dodsworth's collections would ever be printed unless someone of "youth, and forwardnesse to prosecute those Studies"[3] were introduced to the work. Within a few days Dodsworth and Dugdale had met and "acquainting each other what they were then in hand wth as to their farther progresse in those Studies, readily engaged themselves to prosecute the gayning what Transcripts they could obtaine from any Leiger-bookes, publiq' Records, original Charters, or other Manuscripts of note".[4] Both the antiquaries set to with a will, and even the Civil War did not prevent Dugdale from making his transcripts for, as one of the King's Heralds, he was based upon Oxford and was able to examine the contents of

---

1. Dodsworth published nothing in his lifetime, but he enjoyed a high reputation as an antiquarian.
2. Dugdale, Life &c., p.10.
3. ibid.
4. ibid., pp.10,11.

its libraries, both public and private.[1] The Monasticon was ready for the press in 1654 but the mass of such apparently indigestible material with little commercial application made the booksellers apprehensive and they refused to publish the work. Dodsworth and Dugdale accordingly subsidised the book from their own slender resources[2] and, in spite of Dodsworth's almost immediate death, the first volume of the Monasticon appeared in 1655. In the following year Dugdale was fully occupied in seeing his Antiquities of Warwickshire through the press,[3] but it was purely financial considerations that compelled him to delay the publication of the second volume of the Monasticon until 1661, for the booksellers' apprehension over the first proved fully justified and it failed to show any profit. The third and final volume appeared in 1673 and this omitted Dodsworth's name from the title; it can only be regarded as an injustice to the Yorkshire antiquary that, partly for this reason, the work has become generally known as "Dugdale's Monasticon".[4]

Whatever the share to be attributed to each of these two antiquaries their collaboration had produced a monument of

---

1. Dugdale, Life &c., p.21.
2. ibid., pp.24,25.
3. Cf. p. 102.
4. Cf. Douglas, English scholars, Chapter III, "The grand plagiary". On this point see also N.Denholm-Young and H.H.E.Craster, "Roger Dodsworth ... and his circle", Bodleian quarterly record, vol.vii, pp.409-419.

scholarship. Their work consisted of transcripts of hundreds of monastic documents and, although the sources were not always authoritative and Dugdale was soon to be charged with being an uncritical editor,[1] its impact was immense. Suddenly, in an almost uncharted sea, antiquaries were confronted with a work of such comprehension that even to this day it has not been fully superseded; small wonder that Dugdale and the Monasticon enjoyed high repute and it is to regretted that its surviving compiler did not receive a corresponding financial return for his prodigious effort.

At first sight it seems extraordinary that Tanner should have elected to write a book on monasteries for the work that he intended to be his introduction to the literary world. Although the Monasticon had been acclaimed by scholars it had also provoked an outcry on the part of the Protestant landed gentry, whose accusations that the book showed pro-Roman Catholic sentiments were inevitably coloured by the fact that they themselves were comfortably settled on lands whose monastic origin was here displayed for all to see; such people could hardly be expected to approve of the Monasticon, particularly when the world around them was moving towards the restoration of Charles II and the possible reintroduction of the Church of Rome. Dugdale himself refuted the charge by pointing out,[2] among other objections,

---

1. Cf. Sir Roger Twysden's letter to Dugdale; pr. in Dugdale, Life &c., letter cxxii, pp.335-337.
2. Cf. Dugdale, Life &c., p.25.

that the work had been actively encouraged by no less a Protestant than Lord Fairfax himself, but the Monasticon remained unpopular with many people. The blatant Catholicism of James II, leading to his flight in 1688, had brought anti-Catholic feeling to a head and 1695 was hardly the most propitious time for Tanner to publish a work on monasticism, particularly as a means of seeking patronage. He himself was well aware of this disadvantage and in the dedication of his work he wrote that because of the "Popular Clamours, that have been raised and carried on against the Old Monks ever since the Reformation, it is easie to forsee, what cold reception a Book of this nature must meet with. The reflections of the witty, and the censures of the prejudiced, are the best entertainment it must expect ...".[1] But it was, after all, essentially academic patronage that Tanner sought and in the second half of the seventeenth century, so full of political and religious dissension, the English scholars held an admirable record for their non-partisan devotion to pure scholarship. There were, moreover, reasons why a Notitia Monastica might be highly acceptable. Although the Monasticon was undeniably "capable of many Additions"[2] it was as comprehensive a work as contemporary scholars had any right to expect, and it was this very aspect that limited its use.

---

1. Notitia, sig. a2.
2. ibid., sig.a8.

Tanner correctly asserted that it was "too voluminous and costly for the generality of Readers" and believed that his book would appeal to those who had "neither leasure to consult, nor money enough to purchase the Monasticon".[1] But in 1693, at the very outset of Tanner's researches, an epitome and translation of Dugdale's work was published[2] and Tanner found it necessary to lay stress on the imperfections and omissions of the larger work[3] and to present his Notitia as a handy general reference book on monasteries. Although largely derived from sources in the Monasticon[4] Tanner's Notitia Monastica represents a new approach, and a valuable contribution, to the study of English monasticism.

---

1. Notitia, sig. a8.

2. Sir W.Dugdale, Monasticon Anglicanum ... now epitomised in English [by James Wright], (Lond., 1693). A similar work was issued in 1718 by Captain John Stevens who also issued two volumes of additions in 1722 and 1723. James Wright was the author of the History and antiquities of Rutland (cf. p.103) and was also the owner of an early transcript of Leland's Itinerary (cf. Hearne, vol.ii, p.227). Tanner says of Wright's Epitome that "to the errors of the Original are added several of the Translator" (Notitia, sig. a8v) but the article in the D.N.B. (s.n. Wright, by T.Seccombe) describes it as "accurate". Two of Wright's letters are in the Tanner collection (MS. T. 26, f.41; 456, f.36) presumably being obtained by Tanner with the papers of Anthony Wood, to whom they are addressed. There is nothing to indicate that Tanner was acquainted with Wright.

3. Cf. p. 157.

4. It seems probable that, in preparing his 1695 Notitia, Tanner himself was unable to afford a copy of the Monasticon and that he worked from library copies. He must surely, however, have owned a copy when he was preparing for his second edition and it would be interesting to know the present whereabouts of this. It is not among his books in the Bodleian or at St. Asaph.

If Tanner were to make corrections to the Monasticon it was obvious that the mere examination of all the available printed sources[1] would be insufficient and it was vital that he should find some new material. The vast resources of the nearby Bodleian Library provided this, and if it had not been so readily available it is doubtful whether Tanner would ever have undertaken this line of research. His work on Wiltshire had brought him a sound knowledge of Leland's papers and, to his delight, they yielded a number of short accounts of religious houses that Dugdale, who had also worked from Leland's collections, had entirely omitted.[2] He also discovered in the same library an "old Parchment MS.[3] wrote by a Monk of Canterbury, about the later end of Henry VI. Reign" which, although not entirely reliable, provided the order and dedication of a number of monasteries; and the

---

1. Hearne later expressed the belief that Tanner had not consulted W.Prynne, Brief animadversions on ... the fourth part of the Institutes of the lawes of England ... compiled by ... Sir Edward Cooke (Lond., 1669) which had an excellent index (sig. Ll1) of "abbeyes, prioriee, abbatts, abbesses, priors, and what concerns them"; cf. Hearne, vol.ii, pp.6,7. The omission was hardly disastrous.

2. Notitia, sig. a8. ~~Cf. also p. , note~~

3. Tanner gives the old shelfmark NE. E. 2. 17 which is now MS. Bodl 648. The relevant portion is ff.22-46 which is of paper, an error which Hearne in his annotated copy of the 1695 Notitia (8° Rawl. 1079, sig. a8v) was quick to point out. This must surely be regarded as an extraordinary error for Tanner to make. The first four leaves of the volume (which is in a 15th century binding) are of parchment and belonged to William Molash, prior of Canterbury; Tanner later acquired a whole volume of similar provenance (MS. T. 165) with the Sancroft papers.

nearby Ashmolean Museum yielded a "fair paper MS.[1] ... collected not long after the Dissolution, by one who probably had a sight of Leland's Collections", which furnished some founders' names which had formerly been wanting.[2] Tanner also made an unsuccessful search for a book on monasteries known to have been written at the end of the fourteenth century by Henry Crump, a Cistercian monk and member of Oxford University.[3]

By carefully assimilating all these sources Tanner's work progressed swiftly and must have been in a fairly advanced state by January 1694. Gibson, in fact, was already approaching the London publishers on Tanner's behalf and he eagerly reported that he had located a bookseller who was inclined to accept the Notitia on his recommendation: "If you could think it safe to send it up hither", he wrote, "& give me some intimations what you think may be an agreeable gratuitie, 'tis possible I might make a saving bargain".[4] Gibson was in London preparing for his edition of the Britannia,

---

1. Now MS. Ashmole 839 in the Bodleian Library. It is not clear which portions of this manuscript are in question, but relevant information is to be found ff.44-54, 72-82 &c. These leaves appear to be in the hand of Robert Glover (1544-1588) Somerset herald.

2. Notitia, sig. a8v.

3. The work was said to be "de fundatione monasteriorum in Anglia", cf. J.Twyne, De rebus Albionicis, Britannicis, atque Anglicis commentariorum libri duo (Lond., 1590) p.156; J.Ware, De scriptoribus Hiberniae libri duo (Dubl., 1639) pp.73,74. An account of Crump is to be found in the D.N.B.

4. MS. T. 25, f.116, Gibson to Tanner, 30 Jan. 1694.

and consequently in close contact with several booksellers whose general efficiency seems to have impressed him, and he advised Tanner to have his book printed at the metropolis because of the "slowness" of the press at Oxford.[1] Tanner could hardly have had a better agent than Gibson, who appears to have had a highly developed business sense as well as a sincere devotion to his friends' interests; he even offered to turn the Britannia into a general advertisement for the Notitia by deliberately glossing over his references to monasteries "and my reason for it in the Preface, shall be this, that your labour upon that subject has superseded all enquiries of that nature".[2] Tanner's draft reply to this proposal shows that the Notitia must have been very nearly ready for the press:[3]

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.116v.

2. MS. T. 25, f.116. Gibson did, in fact, carry out his suggestion, cf. Camden, Britannia, 1695, sig. a1v.

3. Unfortunately Tanner's collections for the Notitia have become rather more scattered than those for Wiltshire. The earliest date I have come across in this connection is "1693", which appears on the title-leaf of a manuscript version of the more or less completed Notitia (MS. T. 457, f.53) and this, of course, may well be old style dating and refer to 1694. Tanner was certainly still making transcripts as late as the summer of 1694 and these are to be found MS. T. 342, ff.216-273, dates appearing on ff.256v and 257. The last portion of this section (ff.262 et seqq.) relates to a cartulary of Reading abbey in the possession of Henry Worseley, and information as to this was duly incorporated in the 1695 Notitia, p.4. Fols. 257-261 relate to a hospital and as such did not warrant inclusion as they consisted of lay-brethen. These must have been the last transcripts before the work went to the press because the double columns in this section are numerated by Tanner from 1-226 (an index, also by Tanner, of places is to be found ff.1v,2) and columns 241 et seqq., which commence at f.165 of the same volume, were not written until in and after December 1697; cf. f.165.

I have often obseryed, that there are no men in ye world (that are of ye same profession & follow the same sort of learning) so ready to communicate, and do mutual offices of kindness one to another, as Antiquaries: the truth of wch reflection having been so often confirmed on my own part by ye many instances of Kindness wch M^r^. Kennet and you daily oblige me wth. It was but the last night that Mr Kennet was pressing me very hard to throw my Notitia Monastica out this spring, to wch end I was to get a specimen set this morrow, and wch then he was to acquaint the Master[1] wth it in order to contrive some way to get it printed in a short time. But this offer of yours shall supersede that trouble, wch I would (upon reasonable terms) close w^th^. ... I give you many thanks for ye effectuall way you thought on to recommend it to ye world, but I hope if you can bargain wth ye Bookseller, I think my papers are so near completed that it may be in a condition to be published before Camden and then if [you] think I have autority[sic] for w^t^ I say I shall take it as a great honour, if you would be pleased sometimes to quote it. If you think ⟨soe⟩ I will fall to finishing it and will send it you up about the latter end of next week, as for the gratuity I shall leave it entirely to your prudence.[2]

In May 1694 Tanner issued a sheet printed at Oxford containing an account of his proposed book,[3] but as this was issued anonymously it can hardly have been with a view to obtaining financial or even academic assistance with the

---

1. i.e. Charlett.

2. MS. T. 25, f.117v, Tanner to Gibson, Draft, n.d.

3. The prospectus, An account of the book, entituled, Notitia Monastica, was published without date or place of imprint but is entered as no. 15 under 1694 in F.Madan, A chronological list of Oxford books, 1681-1713 (Oxf., 1954). Anthony Wood's copy is now in the Bodleian Library, Wood 658(782), and he has endorsed it as having been given him by Charlett on 24 May 1694, and such was the Tanner-Charlett-Wood relationship that this date must be very close to its original appearance. Charlett's own copy of the Account is pasted in the back of his 1607 edition of Camden's Britannia (I 2.2 Med.; cf. also p.119, note 2) which was later acquired by Hearne, cf. Hearne, vol.vii, p.233. Tanner's original draft is to be found MS. T. 457, ff.2,3.

Notitia; as Hearne later said, it was purely "to encourage People's Exspectation before it went to the Press".[1] Part of this prospectus is in the form of a table in which Tanner claims to have corrected fifty-two errors in, and made two hundred and forty-three additions to, the Monasticon; and to have corrected one hundred and seventy-nine errors and supplied eight hundred and twenty-one defects in "Speed". The general tone of this Account lays emphasis on the "handy reference" nature of the Notitia. Each county of England and Wales is to be surveyed in alphabetical order and the religious houses in each county are to be summarily described in order of the seniority of their foundation; the description being confined to the name and degree of the founder, the time of foundation, and the order, dedication, and valuation of each house. After the description are to come references to any relevant printed material and also to any muniments known to be extant in either public or private libraries. Such a volume would obviously be of great assistance to the antiquarian scholar,

---

1. Hearne, vol.vii, p.233. It was often the custom to accompany proposals for printing with a specimen page, generally conjugate with the proposals, and this was the method adopted by Gibson in his proposals for the Britannia. I have not seen any such specimen for the Notitia, but one is mentioned in a letter from Jonathan Kimberley to Charlett (MS. Ballard 30, f.50) and in a letter from Churchill to Tanner (MS. T. 25 f.181). Care must be taken to avoid creating a "ghost" and these instances may well refer to the Account, but Churchill, who was the publisher of the Notitia, does not seem likely to have described the Account as a "specimen". Both proposals and specimens are usually associated with the more expensive books in folio, and if Tanner was not seeking subscriptions he would hardly need a specimen.

and as Gibson said to Charlett "The world wants it; and we that deal in those sort o' Studies cannot be without it".[1]

After the appearance of the Account Tanner began to think seriously about getting his work into the press and Gibson renewed his efforts on Tanner's behalf with the London publishers; on 31 May he wrote to Charlett asking for general instructions as to how he was to manage his side of the affair and promising to do all that he could for his friend.[2] Gibson's own publisher was Awnsham Churchill, one of the leading booksellers of the day, and he was naturally the first person that Gibson approached. Churchill had an excellent record for encouraging learned works, but he was also a business man and he probably had the reception accorded to the Monasticon uppermost in his mind when, on 13 June, Gibson was forced to relate that Churchill did not seem inclined to accept the Notitia.[3] But Gibson persisted, emphasising the academic value of the book, and Churchill began to relent. Hard on the heels of his earlier letter Gibson was able to send another containing a detailed account of his efforts:

---

1. MS. Ballard 5, f.48v, Gibson to Charlett, 21 Jun. 1694. Gibson was particularly enthusiastic over Tanner's work and, even before it was published, he told Charlett that he knew "noe one thing can possibly be a greater assistance to persons who deal in English Historie than Mr Tanner's Notitia Monast."; MS. Ballard 5, f.39, 24 May 1694. His enthusiasm was to prove justified; cf. pp. 175-180.

2. Cf. MS. Ballard 5, f.40, Gibson to Charlett, 31 May 1694.

3. Cf. MS. Ballard 5, f.47, Gibson to Charlett, 13 Jun. 1694.

... I have us'd all the Rhetorick I am Master of in the business of the Notitia Monastica, and endeavour'd to convince Mr Churchil of the real value of the book and probabilitie of the sale. But he says he dare not venture upon an Impression of above 500, and that nothing is ever got when a Copy will bear noe more. But however he proffers 10^s a sheet let it make as much as it will; tho' even that he pretends to bid more out of respect to the Author and the real usefulness of the book, than out of any thoughts for the quick sale or profits. The concern I have to get it presently publisht both for my own use and the rest of the world, makes me extreme sorry it should meet with noe better encouragement. But soe it is; trading men must follow the humour of the kingdom; and when you can perswade the rest of the nation to have as true a zeal for the good old Devotion, and respect for the remains of Religions, as you express'd for the ruines of Reading-Abbey; you'l then find your price rise, and the gratuity agreeable to the Labour. But instead of a good plain piety we are [i.e. have] now nothing but new quarrels, and almost new Religions; and how well those humours are like to relish the standing bottoms of Antiquitie, (that part especially that's like to fly in the face of half the kingdom for Sacrilege) do you judge. In short, I despair of raising him any higher, or finding out a more eligible method; but upon your orders I'le do what I can with another Bookseller that I have in my eye who 'tis possible may be more liberal; unless you had rather Mr Churchil should have it than any other. But there's noe thinking of raising it near 20^s a sheet.[1]

There were obvious advantages in having the work published by so eminent a bookseller and Gibson, apparently without even waiting for Tanner's reply, continued to try and improve the terms of any agreement that Tanner might make:

By a letter from Mr Cruttenden,[2] I find you are inclin'd to close with Mr Churchil. I have got you this addition

---

1. MS. T. 25, f.166, Gibson to Tanner, 15 Jun. 1694?

2. Almost certainly Henry Cruttenden, the Oxford printer; cf. H.R.Plomer, A dictionary of ... printers and booksellers ... 1668-1725 (Bibliographical society), (Lond., 1922) s.n. Cruttenden. He died not long after this letter was written, being buried on 12 October 1694; cf. Wood, Life and times, vol.iii, p.470. Hearne later said that Gibson had underteken his

[cont on next page]

> to your bargain, that if ever he makes a Second Impression, he shall give you 5[l] more: and if it never bears that, I think truly he ought not. Every Impression that comes out, since noe man but your self can make the Additions to it, you may make your own terms for them: a price of power that's good armour against a Bookseller, and very lucky when 'tis lodg'd in conscientious hands,[1] that will only make use of it to secure their own right.

There was no reason whatsoever why Tanner should not accept Churchill's offer, which in any case could probably not have been much bettered elsewhere, because he was primarily seeking to establish himself as a scholar and the work had been undertaken without any real thought of monetary gain. Thus began a connection between Tanner and the bookseller which was to last for many years in spite of the fact that Churchill was not to see any return for his financial outlay over Tanner's projects, and his encouragement was later to meet with what can only be described as perpetual but well-intentioned procrastination on Tanner's part.

On 21 June 1694 Gibson had heard that Tanner had "struck up a bargain" with Churchill and optimistically he added that "there's nothing now but clapping it in the Press",[2] but it does not seem to have been until mid-July that Churchill made his arrangements for the actual printing of the work.[3] However,

---

2 cont. edition of Quintilian in order "to gratify one Cruttenden (a broken Printer and a great Acquaintance of D[r] Charlett's)"; Hearne, vol.i, p.217.

1. MS. T. 25, f.169, Gibson to Tanner, n.d.

2. MS. Ballard 5, f.48v, Gibson to Charlett, 21 Jun. 1694.

3. On 18 July 1694 Churchill wrote to Tanner "Pray fit y[e] Notitia for as soon as I hear from M[r] Hall in answer to mine this day [I] shall fix it at Presse"; MS. T. 25, f.181.

before the end of June Gibson knew that the printing was to be executed by John Hall, the Oxford printer, and after warning Tanner that Churchill was "slow and wants pushing forward a little" he suggested that one way to expedite publication would be "to get an exact account under John Hall's hand how much the charges will be, and upon sending that up to urge him to return what quantity of paper is necessarie".[1] Tanner quickly put the finishing touches to his copy[2] and by 21 August Gibson had received the first sheet for his criticism,[3] nor were his fears about the slow-

---

1. MS. T. 25, f.175, Gibson to Tanner, 28 Jun. 1694.

2. The catalogue of the Tanner manuscripts describes MS. T. 457 as the autograph copy of the Notitia "as prepared for the press" but, whilst this is substantially true, the volume contains a great deal of material that it was not intended should be included in the printed version: there are, for instance, three separate series of entries for Berkshire (ff. 54,55; 56-67; 300-311) and there are duplicate entries for several counties. The hard core of the work (apart from ff.9-49 containing a slightly imperfect version of the Preface) seems to be ff.56-290 which consists of a draft paged by Tanner 1-14 and then foliated by him 15-234. This he subsequently interleaved with his supplementary notes and it therefore follows a similar arrangement to his preliminary draft for Wiltshire; cf. p.116, note 1. This portion seems to contain all the information in the text of the finished Notitia. The volume also shows (ff.345-362) that Tanner himself compiled the unusually ample indices of names and places that were so vital if the work was to be a satisfactory reference-book. The two supplementary tables on pp.286-288 of the printed version are to be found ff.51,52.

3. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.198, Gibson to Tanner, 21 Aug. 1694(?). Gibson's criticisms are confined to sheet A and are very minor, but it is interesting that Tanner should have acted on only one of the fifteen perfectly valid suggestions made by his friend. This related to p.10, l.6, which had apparently contained the misprint "al." for "ol.", but why Tanner should have made this alteration and yet have failed to incorporate the word "of" into the first line of page 7 after its omission

[cont. on next page]

ness of the Oxford press[1] substantiated for by the same day Charlett had heard from Tanner that two more sheets had been printed off.[2] As the sheets came from the press so they were circulated among various people for their criticism and, in addition to Gibson, there are indications that friends who helped in this way were Charlett,[3] Kennett,[4] Wake,[5] and Wharton.[6]

Charlett was also busy recommending the Notitia to his many friends and he encouraged Tanner with the news that the Account had met with a favourable reception from all the "Learned" he had shown it to.[7] At the time Charlett was summering at Bath and on his recommendation Henry Hammond, a

---

3 cont. had been pointed out to him is a mystery, particularly as he appears to have intended to include it; cf. MS. T. 457, f.61v. Other criticism was mainly of spelling (e.g. Gibson preferred Cistercian to Cistertian; Abbot to Abbat) and the only major alteration that Gibson recommended was in the form of reference to manuscript sources: Tanner had given these in the Latin accusative, dependent upon the first vide, and Gibson suggested that this word should be given a distinctive setting to make the dependence clearer in the longer lists. It will be noted that Gibson prefers, and Tanner rejects, what might be described as "modern" usage. Gibson's suggestions for the Dedication, however, were acted upon (cf. MS. T. 25, f.278 with Notitia, sig. a2) but in this case Gibson seems to have been criticising a manuscript draft, cf. p. 165, note 4.

1. Cf. p. 155.
2. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.200, Charlett to Tanner, 21 Aug. 1694.
3. Cf. ibid.
4. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.201, Kennett to Tanner, 22 Aug. 1694.
5. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.200.
6. Cf. ibid.
7. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.208, Charlett to Tanner, 2 Sept. 1694.

bookseller of the town who was already acquainted with Tanner, wrote to Tanner asking for a "dosin or two" copies of the forthcoming book because he was "Confident my Worthy friends the Neighbouring clergie ... will buy 'em".[1] From Wiltshire John Byrom asked for copies for presentation to the Earl of Abingdon and his chaplain; "I know they would receive them wth respect, &", he added, "it might be a means to introduce you farther into my Lord's favour".[2] The news of Tanner's undertaking became common knowledge: Dr. Thomas Smith, the librarian of the great Cottonian collection, would have offered his obviously valuable assistance had he not known that the work was already in the press[3] whilst, perhaps as late as January 1695, Wood was lending Tanner "baskets" of old writings relating to monasteries,[4] and certainly in that month William Elstob was sending information about the religious foundations in Berkshire.[5] By now, however, the work must have been well advanced because Gibson had earlier

---

1. MS. T. 25, f.196, Hammond to Tanner, 16 Aug. 1694.

2. MS. T. 25, f.249, Byrom to Tanner, 19 Oct. 1694.

3. Cf. Hearne, vol.iii, p.56.

4. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.280. Some idea of the extent of the last-minute help Tanner received from Wood may be gathered from this letter that Tanner wrote on returning some borrowed papers: "I have carefully tied them in several bundles as they were before ... What other Charters, Rentalls or other Monastic writings you have this bearer will be very carefull in bringing to me, if you please to send them, they shall be return'd to morrow"; MS. Wood F 51, f.15, Tanner to Wood, 10 Jan. 1695.

5. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.284, Elstob to Tanner, 7 Jan. 1695.

expressed the hope that he would receive a copy of the Notitia as a New-Year's gift for 1695.[1] On 23 February Churchill was discussing the lay-out of the title-page with Tanner[2] and on 13 March 1695 Henry Aldrich, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford, affixed his imprimatur[3] and the book was very soon ready for distribution.

Tanner's main object in the publication of the Notitia was to attract patronage and consequently the matter of the dedication was of prime importance. Such people as Bishop Burnet and the Earl of Abingdon must have crossed his mind as men of his acquaintance who might be inclined to use their influence on his behalf but, as it happened, Tanner managed to obtain the patronage of Leopold William Finch, Warden of All Souls, in the form of a chaplaincy of the College, before the Notitia was published. Finch had also hinted at future preferment for Tanner[4] and, as he was a person of some importance outside the University as well as within it,[5] he was

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.271, Gibson to Tanner, 27 Nov. 1694.

2. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.305, Churchill to Tanner, 23 Feb. 1695. Tanner had originally intended to include a long descriptive passage of the contents of his book on the title (cf. MS. T. 457, f.1) but it was Churchill's simplified title that was eventually used even though he had expressed his willingness to use a contracted form of Tanner's description. This is another example of Tanner preferring old-fashioned usage; cf. p. 161, note 3.

3. Notitia, sig. a1v.

4. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.252, Gibson to Tanner, 23 Oct. 1694.

5. He was one of the many children of Heneage Finch, second Earl of Winchilsea.

altogether a suitable dedicatee: it is not surprising that Gibson wrote "I need not ask you for whom you design your Notitia, because ye favour of your late preferment seems to have determin'd that matter".[1] Nevertheless, Finch could scarcely be expected to be pleased at having a work dedicated to him that was subsequently received by the general public in a hostile manner[2]- an event which we have seen that Tanner thought quite possible - and the terms of the dedication were a matter of some delicacy: the work was recommended to Finch's patronage because "the World must needs be convinced, that the Knowledge of Monastical affairs is neither barbarous nor insipid, when it is countenanced by One, in whom are to be found Politeness, Exactness, and all other Accomplishments becoming a Noble Birth and Academical Education".[3] Tanner prudently submitted a draft[4] of this dedication to Charlett for his approval; a few alterations were made[5] and these were

---

1. MS. T. 25, f.273, Gibson to Tanner, 13 Dec. 1694(?).

2. Finch was in fact such a polemical character that he probably would not have worried if Tanner's work had provoked a major outburst of criticism. For an account of his stormy Wardenship of All Souls see M.Burrows, Worthies of All Souls (Lond., 1874) pp.287-314.

3. Notitia, sig. a2v.

4. Now MS. T. 457, ff.4,5. This cannot be Tanner's first draft because it incorporates the suggestions made by Gibson in MS. T. 25, f.278; cf. p. 161 , note 3 .

5. It is interesting that Tanner's statement that without Finch's help he must have left Oxford (Notitia, sig. a4) which is so often quoted in any account of Tanner (cf. p. 25 ; D.N.B., s.n. Tanner; C.G.Robertson, All Souls college (Lond., 1899) p.160; Wilton, op. cit., Wiltshire archaeological and natural history magazine, vol.xiii, p.68; &c.) is in fact partly of Charlett's composition.

incorporated into a fair copy[1] which, with minor variations, was printed in the finished volume.

No less important than the Dedication was the matter of presentation copies. In the seventeenth century to give a person of influence a copy of one's work, perhaps in a special binding and certainly accompanied by a letter of careful and flattering composition, was an established and proven method of attracting patronage. Gibson was well aware of this aspect to the publication of the Notitia and, after one of his meetings with Churchill, he was able to promise Tanner "a convenient number of Copies to throw among your friends";[2] it seemed to him such an important part of Tanner's agreement with the publisher that he also mentioned the matter to Charlett as being one of significance.[3] If these copies could now be identified they would be of particular interest because they would show not only whom Tanner regarded as his best friends but, more important, also the people that in 1695 he thought might be likely to offer him advancement in one form or another.

In a search for presentation copies the first person to be considered is Finch who, as dedicatee, could hardly have been excluded from amongst the recipients and, oddly enough,

---

1. Now MS. T. 457, ff.6,7.
2. MS. T. 25, f.174, Gibson to Tanner, 26 Jun. 1694.
3. Cf. MS. Ballard 5, f.76, Gibson to Charlett, n.d.

it is this copy that provides a key to the search although it is itself as yet unidentified. As might be expected it seems to have borne some holograph inscription, for when it passed into Richard Rawlinson's possession some time before October 1735[1] he immediately recognised which copy it was and told Tanner of his acquisition. Tanner replied that he was very glad that his "present book to Dr Finch" had fallen into his friend's hands and added the information that "there were but 10. printed in that Royal Paper - all wch I gave away, but none of them bound as that was".[2] Although the Rawlinson collection in the Bodleian Library contains a copy of the 1695 Notitia it is not the presentation copy to Finch nor is it on fine paper;[3] moreover, Finch's copy is not to be found among the books that Rawlinson bequeathed to St. John's College, Oxford.[4] It is extraordinary that a collector of Rawlinson's standing, knowing the associations of this

---

1. Finch had died in 1702. His books do not appear to have been sold by public auction.

2. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.32, Tanner to Rawlinson, 2 Oct. 1735. Finch's letter of thanks is to be found MS. T. 24, f.8.

3. 8° Rawl. 1079. This was formerly in the possession of Hearne and contains many annotations in his hand. There are also (p.10) annotations by Browne Willis.

4. I am grateful to Mr.H.M.Colvin for verifying this; there is no copy of the 1695 Notitia at St. John's College. Rawlinson was also a benefactor and keen supporter of the Society of Antiquaries and, to a lesser extent, of the Royal Society. The librarians of these two societies have been kind enough to verify that neither now has a copy. However, a copy appears in the Catalogue of the library of the Royal Society (Lond., 1825): this was presumably destroyed during the war.

volume, should have disposed of it - the more so because, as we shall see, it was not a duplicate of the copy that remains in his collection - but it is possible that it was sold posthumously as lot 835 in the 1756 sale of his books which contained those items that he had not specifically disposed of.[1] It seems certain, however, that if this copy is still extant and not excessively mutilated it can be definitely identified as Finch's copy and is not to be confused with any other fine paper copies that are to be met with.[2]

However, one of the several copies[3] of the 1695 Notitia

---

1. Bibliotheca Rawlinsoniana; sive, Catalogus librorum Richardi Rawlinson (Lond., 1756). All future references to catalogues of book auctions will be made by giving the name of the owner of the books and the date of the first day's sale, e.g. this catalogue would be referred to as "the Rawlinson sale of 29 March 1756". Further details can generally be found in the List of catalogues of English book sales, 1676-1900, now in the British Museum (Lond., 1915).

2. Even if Rawlinson only understood its provenance by hearsay there is still the question of the binding: all the fine paper copies described below have similar bindings, but differing over gold-leaf edges, and Tanner states that Finch's copy was in a better binding than the others.

3. In addition to the Rawlinson copy there are seven others in the Bodleian Library. 8° A 26 Jur. is apparently the Stationers' Hall copy; the remaining six are in the Gough collection. Gough Eccl. top. 5 formerly belonged to E.Baxter, and Gough Eccl. top. 1 to John Carte, brother of Thomas, the historian and benefactor of the Bodleian, and son of Samuel Carte the antiquary. The Carte copy appears to have had the signature of a former owner removed from the upper free end-paper. A copy of the 1695 Notitia with manuscript notes by Thomas Carte's brother Samuel was sold as Lot 893 of the Ducarel sale of 3 April 1786 and this is now in my possession, being obtained from a London bookseller, Colin Richardson, in September 1960. It bears extensive notes by Andrew Coltee Ducarel and, even

[cont. on next page]

now in the Bodleian Library is printed on fine paper, being slightly larger and nearly twice as thick as an ordinary paper copy; it is moreover, properly speaking another issue of the work because the imprint is of a different setting.[1] This copy[2] was presented by Tanner to White Kennett,[3] thus showing

---

3 cont. more interesting, it formerly belonged to and bears notes in the hand of Thomas Smith, the Cotton librarian, some of whose books are now in the Tanner collection, cf.pp. 381,382. The provenance of the remaining four Gough copies is reviewed on pp. 169,170,180. A ninth copy was put on one side in 1788 by the Bodleian authorities as a duplicate (cf. L.P.Duplicates ~~seen~~ examined and allowed, f.17) and the existence of a tenth may perhaps be indicated by the removal of a shelfmark from the slip in the transcribed catalogue but this may merely be the result of a transcriber's error. That there is no confusion between the ninth and tenth copies is shown by the annotations in the 1843 catalogue. Either of these might possibly have belonged to Tanner himself, but his working copy ~~(if he had one, cf. p. p.)~~ would probably have passed into John Tanner's hands and not have been deposited in the Bodleian.

1. The imprint on the fine paper copy is "OXFORD, Printed at the THEATER, 1695." as opposed to the normal imprint "OXFORD, Printed at the THEATER, and are to be sold by A. and J.Churchill at the sign of the Black Swan in Pater-noster-row, LONDON. 1695.". This variation unfortunately does not produce different imprints in those catalogues which confine their information to place and date of publication and format, thus making identification more difficult. The second issue does not appear in D.Wing, Short-title catalogue ... 1641-1700 (New York, 1945-51) but it is entered in W.G.Hiscock, The Christ Church holdings in Wing's Short-title catalogue (Oxf., 1956). The practice of having a special issue for presentation copies was not altogether uncommon at the Oxford press at this date, another example is to be found in M.Vellei Paterculi quae supersunt (Oxf., 1693) which was edited by J.Hudson under Charlett's sponsorship; both issues are in the Bodleian. I have checked on all the copies recorded in Wing, op. cit., and fine paper copies are only to be found in the Bodleian and in Cambridge University Library, the only possible exception being Yale University who are at present unable to find their copy.

2. Gough Eccl. top. 28. It is interesting to note that sheet U is supplied in ordinary paper.

3. It is endorsed, ad initium, "Wh. Kennett. Ex dono

[cont. on next page]

that the fine paper issue was not specifically reserved for prospective patrons. On the other hand the mere knowledge that a copy existed in the library of one of Tanner's friends is far from indicating that it is of fine paper because it was particularly incumbent upon his friends to purchase a copy, and even the knowledge of the existence of two such copies is of little use because Le Neve - who seems not to have become acquainted with Tanner until a slightly later date - certainly owned two copies,[1] and Kennett himself probably possessed two ordinary paper copies in addition to Tanner's gift.[2]

---

3 cont. Auctoris mihi conjunctissimi studijs et amicitia" and contains several annotations by Kennett. The volume passed, with many of Kennett's books into the hands of James West and was bought by Gough as Lot 634 of the West sale of 29 March 1773, where it is noted as being on large paper. Gough bought many items at this sale, paying particular attention to provenance, with the result that his collections now contain several of Kennett's books.

1. Cf. Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, p.415. One of Le Neve's copies is now in the Bodleian, Gough Eccl. top. 30, having passed into the hands of Thomas Martin and later sold as Lot 1400 of the Martin sale of 5 June 1773. No copy appears in the Le Neve sale of 22 February 1731.

2. Kennett was in the habit of writing the motto "Verba Animi proferre, et vitam impendere Vero" on the title-leaves of his books and this appears on his fine paper copy and on Gough Eccl. top. 31, an ordinary paper copy of the Notitia, which also passed to West. The volume is interleaved and contains annotations by both Kennett and West: it was bought by Gough as Lot 633 of the West sale of 29 March 1773. In December 1959 Saunders, booksellers of Oxford, had an ordinary paper copy traditionally associated with Kennett which I was kindly allowed to examine, and the few annotations certainly bore a marked resemblance to Kennett's hand. For another example of Kennett having annotated two copies of one book see p. 132, note 3.

Two people of some influence who gave Tanner particular encouragement at this period were Pepys and Wake, and the Pepysian library at Magdalene College, Cambridge, contains a copy of the fine paper issue[1] as does the Wake collection at Christ Church, Oxford.[2] There is, however, yet another fine paper copy at Christ Church which bears no indication of its provenance[3] and its existence must always be borne in mind in any assessment of the possible whereabouts of a particular copy. Another fine paper copy is to be found in the Cambridge University Library but as it formerly belonged to Bishop Moore, who did not meet Tanner until after 1695, it is not certain whether this can properly be regarded as a "presentation" copy.[4] I have as yet failed to discover any more fine

---

1. p.b. 1738. I am grateful to Mr.D.Pepys Whitely, the Pepysian librarian, for verifying this for me. The covering letter that Tanner wrote to Pepys is reproduced in Hist. MSS. Comm., 15th report, Appendix, pt.2; Hodgkin, p.182. Pepys' complimentary reply is to be found MS. T. 24, f.22.

2. Wake Cabinet 4. It is in excellent condition and contains annotations by Wake, whose letter of thanks is to be found MS. T. 24, f.6. Tanner's covering letter does not seem to be preserved amongst the Wake manuscripts at Christ Church.

3. B 4. 9 Arch. inf. It contains no annotations and is in very poor condition. I am particularly grateful to Mr.W.G. Hiscock, the deputy librarian, for bringing this second copy at Christ Church to my notice and for discussing various points with me. Mr. Hiscock suggests that this copy was perhaps presented to Dean Aldrich who, as Vice-Chancellor of the University, licensed the Notitia for publication. On Aldrich see W.G.Hiscock, Henry Aldrich of Christ Church (Oxf., 1960).

4. It is now shelfmarked Syn. 6. 69. 9. I am grateful to the Librarian, Mr.H.R.Creswick, and the Secretary, Mr.A. Tillotson, for information regarding the provenance of this copy. It is of course conceivable that Tanner did not give away all his fine paper copies immediately and that this is

[cont. on next page]

paper copies but in addition to these five examples it is unthinkable that Tanner could have failed to present one to Charlett and another to Gibson. At his death Charlett's library was purchased by Samuel Wilmot, an Oxford bookseller, and immediately dispersed but, if extant, his copy could apparently be identified.[1] No copy is to be found amongst Gibson's books at Lambeth.[2] It also seems likely that a fine paper copy was presented to Captain Charles Hatton[3] for, in returning his thanks to Tanner for the gift of a Notitia, he describes it as "a very curious Copy of a truly valuable Booke".[4] Possible candidates for the honour of receiving the

---

4 cont. in fact a genuine presentation copy; however, a reference in MS. T. 22, f.26 suggests that Moore may have had a "standing order" for fine paper copies from the Oxford press and it seems possible that this copy is not to be reckoned amongst the ten fine paper copies that Tanner mentions.

1. On 20 September 1704 Tanner wrote to Charlett "I can't at present find my Copy of D^r. Bathursts ⟨Curious letter⟩ to S^r. Will. Dugdale, therefore beg the favor that you'l let my Bro⟨ther⟩ transcribe another for me from that wch I writt at the end of ⟨that⟩ Notitia Monastica wch you have"; MS. Ballard 4, f.74. He mentioned this letter again in 1712, cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.107. It seems just possible that Tanner's memory is here at fault and that the letter he inscribed in Charlett's copy was in fact one from Bathurst, the President of Trinity College, Oxford, to Gerard Langbaine, the Keeper of the University Archives, to whom Dugdale had communicated some of his collections for the Monasticon. Tanner mentions this letter in the Preface to the Notitia (sig. a6) and a copy of it in his own hand is to be found in his manuscript draft, MS. T. 457, f.8.

2. I am grateful to the Librarian, Mr.E.G.W.Bill, for making a search on my behalf. It is possible that a copy was destroyed during the war.

3. Tanner ~~[illegible]~~ met Hatton in connection with the Bibliotheca, cf. p. 212.

4. MS. T. 24, f.37, Hatton to Tanner, 20 May 1695. No copy appears in the Hatton sale catalogue of 26 November 1723.

remaining fine paper copies come crowding in and there are several references among Tanner's correspondence and elsewhere to his having presented various people with copies, so many references in fact that it becomes obvious that some of these gifts must have been of the ordinary paper issue. Tanner is known to have given copies to Dr. Lancaster,[1] William Aubrey,[2] Anthony Wood,[3] John Archer,[4] Henry Worsley,[5]

---

1. Lancaster gave much kindly encouragement to Tanner at this period; cf. p.23. His letter of thanks is to be found MS. T. 24, f.53. Lancaster's books do not seem to have been sold by public auction.

2. Cf. MS. T. 24, f.175. William was the brother of John Aubrey and had helped Tanner with Wiltshire, cf. p.114. His books do not seem to have been sold by public auction.

3. Tanner's gift is noted in Wood's Diary for 29 March 1695; Wood, Life and times, vol.iii, p.482. It was among the Wood collections deposited in the Ashmolean Museum after his death but it had strayed before 1837 (ibid., p.452, note 11); when the collection was transferred to the Bodleian in 1858 about fifty volumes were found to be missing; cf. Macray, Annals, p.365. Should this copy ever come to light it could be identified by its shelfmark, Wood 201.

4. Archer matriculated at Queen's College, Oxford, on 9 April 1690, four months after Tanner, but by the time of the publication of the Notitia he had removed to St. John's College, Cambridge, where he became B.Med. in 1695; cf. Foster, Alumni Oxonienses; Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, s.n. Archer. His letter of thanks is to be found MS. T. 24, f.29. A subsequent letter of his is dated 7 August 1698 (MS. T. 22, f.102) but there is nothing to indicate whether their friendship continued after this. He died 4 December 1735, a few days before Tanner, and was buried at Kendal; cf. Venn, loc. cit. His books do not seem to have been sold by public auction.

5. Worsley was admitted as a student of Lincoln's Inn on 30 April 1690 (cf. The records of the Honourable society of Lincoln's Inn. Admissions (Lond., 1896) vol.i, p.342) and subsequently matriculated from St. Edmund Hall on 14 August, aged 15. Although destined for a political career he had developed literary tastes (cf. MS. T. 25, ff.162, 172v, 176, 178) but he does not seem to have fulfilled his intentions of

[cont. on next page]

and William Salkeld[1] but it would seem that an equally good, or even more pressing, claim could be advanced on behalf of the Earl of Abingdon,[2] Bishop Burnet,[3] Robert Woodward,[4] and John Aubrey[5] and perhaps also Humfrey Wanley,[6] John Byrom,[7]

---

5 cont. publishing something. He had apparently made substantial collections and Tanner borrowed his manuscripts; cf. MS. T. 24, f.10; 25, ff.306,310; cf. also p.155, note 3. He died unmarried on 15 March 1740; cf. Foster, Alumni Oxonienses, s.n. Worsley. There is no record of his friendship with Tanner continuing in later life. His letter of thanks for the Notitia is to be found MS. T. 24, f.18. Worsley also had connections with the copy that Tanner gave to Finch, for it appears (ibid.) that he actually delivered it to Finch whilst the latter was in London and at no little inconvenience to himself. He was also connected with the copy presented to Salkeld; cf. MS. T. 24, f.10.

1. Cf. MS. T. 24, f.10. Salkeld matriculated 22 April 1687 from St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, was admitted 2 May 1692 to the Middle Temple, and eventually became Sergeant-at-Law; cf. Foster, Alumni Oxonienses, s.n. Salkeld; J.Hutchinson, A catalogue of notable Middle Templars (Lond., 1902) p.213. Tanner apparently met him in connection with Gibson's edition of Camden's Britannia; cf. p.118, note 2. No copy of the Notitia appears in the Salkeld sale catalogue of 27 June 1716.

2. Cf. p.24. I have been unable to discover the precise fate of Bertie's library but it presumably passed to his heirs. The Earl of Lindsey is the present Earl of Abingdon but I have been unable to establish contact with him. No copy appears in the various Bertie sale catalogues that I have consulted.

3. No copy appears in the Burnet sale catalogue of 19 March 1716.

4. A copy appears as Lot 20 on p.18 of the Woodward sale catalogue of 30 November 1702. The annotated catalogue in the British Museum gives no price so that it is possible that it was not sold until later.

5. No copy appears to have been deposited with Aubrey's books in the Ashmolean Museum.

6. Wanley gave his annotated copy to Thomas Granger (cf. Hearne, vol.ix, p.186) and it was later sold as Lot 992 on p.70 of the Granger sale catalogue, 9 October 1732. This sale did not take place until 15 January 1733. This copy, which is on ordinary paper, is now in the British Museum, Add. MSS. 47842. Tanner apparently borrowed it from Wanley in order to transcribe the annotations; cf. Hist. MSS. Comm.; Portland vi, p.27.

7. [See next page].

and William Nicolson.[1] Foundations too could be powerful patrons and these might also qualify for presentation copies.[2]

Once published, the public reaction to the Notitia must have fulfilled all Tanner's hopes. Warden Finch paid him a great many compliments about his book and termed the dedication an "honour",[3] whilst Gibson and Nicolson publicly referred to the work in terms calculated both to excite the curiosity and increase the sale.[4] Nicolson was quick to lay stress on the value of the book for locating the dispersed monastic archives:

> ... we have had an excellent Manual, given us by Mr. Tanner; whose Notitia Monastica does not only afford us a short History of the Foundation and chief Revolutions of all our Religious Houses, but presents us also with a Catalogue of such Writers (noting the Places where we may find them) as will abundantly furnish us with further Particulars as we shall have occasion for. The ... Compilers of the Monasticon Anglicanum took care to make the like References; and to let the World know from whose Hands they had the perusal of the Records of this or the other Monastery. But, as many new Discoveries have been made since their Time, so several of the

---

7 [From previous page]. No copy appears in the Byrom sale catalogue of 10 February 1718 but a copy on ordinary paper that belonged to him is now in the London Library. I am grateful to the Librarian, Mr.S.G.Gillam, for information relating to this copy.

1. I have been unable to discover the fate of Nicolson's library; it does not seem to have been sold by public auction.

2. Tanner presented ordinary paper copies to Queen's and All Souls, the latter gift not being made until 1697. I am grateful to Mr.R.Drummond-Hay and the late Sir Edmund Craster for this information.

3. Cf. MS. T. 24, f.56v, Tanner to his father, 30 Aug. 1695.

4. Cf. Camden, Britannia, 1695, sigs. a1v; g1 and Nicolson, English historical library, Pt.II (1697) p.116.

> Books they met with have changed their owners; and therefore their Defects are not only here supply'd, but the present Proprietors of what they mention, much better ascertain'd.[1]

Nicolson himself had been contemplating a similar work but he admitted that Tanner's researches completely overshadowed his own efforts and he entered a plea for a second edition.[2] More pleasing to Tanner than the praise of his friends must have been the approbation of the eminent scholar George Hickes, who asked Charlett "to give the worthy young author ... my share of thankes, that are due to him from all learned men, but especially his Countrymen for so curious, exact, and usefull a work" adding that "when ever I travell it shall be one of my vade mecums".[3] Such a compliment was not out of place for Tanner's "natural inclination to History and Antiquities"[4] had helped him to the completion of a work which was immediately accepted by the scholars of the day as an indispensable tool for historical research. But when Hickes playfully told Charlett that he wished that the world still had every word that Charlett had "blotted out" of Tanner's

---

1. Nicolson, English historical library, Pt.II (1697) pp.189,190.
2. ibid., pp.190,191.
3. MS. Ballard 12, f.105, Hickes to Charlett, 20 May 1695. It was Charlett who gave the Notitia to Hickes; ibid., cf. also f.110. This copy appears as Lot 276 on p.47 of the Hickes sale catalogue, 15 March 1716, but it is unlikely to have been on fine paper.
4. Notitia, sig. a4.

preface[1] he was merely giving voice to what several other scholars perceived and what, in all probability, Tanner himself had hardly suspected: that the preface to the Notitia was as valuable as the text. As an introduction to his work Tanner had given a long account of the growth and organisation of the monasteries and this study was the only narrative of its kind in print; extremely original, and simple and direct in style it must have proved highly acceptable even to the foremost antiquaries of the day. In a letter to Tanner John Byrom also drew special attention to its value,[2] whilst the ageing Thomas Smith, Bishop of Carlisle, had it read over to him so many times that one of his chaplains told Tanner that he must visit the border diocese himself if the bishop "intend to reap any more pleasure from it".[3] This preface alone might well have served to introduce Tanner to the learned world but, as it was, his immediate purpose was more than accomplished: the proposed Notitia, together with the efforts of his friends, had obtained for him his position at All Souls and there was every probability that the success of his book would of itself lead to higher things. The world now had excellent proof of his "mighty Genius for

---

1. MS. Ballard 12, f.105. There does not seem to be any evidence that Charlett made any alterations, but he may have revised a draft earlier than that contained in MS. T. 457, ff.9-49.
2. MS. T. 24, f.78, Byrom to Tanner, 30 Oct. 1695.
3. MS. T. 22, f.190, George Fleming to Tanner, 8 Jul. 1698.

Historical Studies and Antiquities".[1]

Tanner had committed his work to the press knowing full well that it was far from free of errors and omissions,[2] but now the urgent necessity of making himself known was past he diverted his attention to the preparation of the Biblio-Britannico-Hibernica, a work commissioned by Churchill at the same time that he had accepted the Notitia.[3] Slightly more than a year after the appearance of his work Tanner still had no fixed idea of issuing a second edition,[4] but as his rise in the academic world opened more libraries to him and his work on the Bibliotheca led him to examine their contents more and more closely so he must have found much material that he had omitted in the Notitia. However, it was not only upon his own unaided efforts that Tanner had to rely and in subsequent years there appeared several works which must have been of great assistance. Tanner himself had worked upon Bernard's Catalogus but the publication of the completed work in 1698 provided him with much new material, as did Dr. Thomas Smith's catalogue of the Cottonian collection;[5]

---

1. G.Hickes, Some discourses upon Dr. Burnet and Dr. Tillotson, (Lond., 1695) sig. b1.

2. Cf. Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, p.408, Tanner to Le Neve, 13 Jun. 1696.

3. Cf. pp. 209-211.

4. Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, p.408, Tanner to Le Neve, 13 Jun. 1696. Tanner seems to have renewed work on the Notitia in 1697, see p. 155, note 3.

5. T.Smith, Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum bibliothecae Cottonianae (Oxf., 1696). On 30 January 1697 Nicolson wrote

[cont. on next page]

and even the growing popularity of book auctions[1] with their printed catalogues must have helped him to trace a few items. Several of his friends were also engaged upon literary research in the great libraries of the kingdom and these were not slow to inform Tanner, in the most helpful way, of any defects they might notice in the Notitia; not the least of these was the exceptionally gifted Humfrey Wanley who was himself to compile a catalogue of part of the great Harleian collections.[2]

Once Tanner had become comfortably settled as Chancellor of Norwich and had made some progress with the Bibliotheca he began to think more seriously of a second edition of the Notitia, and he was no doubt encouraged in his thoughts by the price that his book was fetching on the second hand market. Originally published at a price of about four shillings[3] it was reported within six months from Gloucestershire that a

---

5 cont. to Tanner "I have gotten D^r. Smith's Catalogue of ye Cotton Library; which has clear'd a deal of Mists and Scruples that were upon me. It also supplies a great many Defects in your Notitia: as, I suppose, I need not tell you"; MS. T. 24, f.153v.

1. Cf. pp. 317, 318.

2. This was not published until 1808, after the collection had passed to the British Museum. In 1699 and 1700 Wanley was employed by Hickes in searching various libraries for Anglo-Saxon manuscripts in preparation for Hickes' Linguarum vett. septentrionalium thesaurus grammatico-criticus et archaeologicus (Oxf., 1705, 03).

3. Cf. The Flemings in Oxford, ed. by J.R.Magrath (Oxford historical society), (Oxf., 1904-24) vol.iii, p.268. Cf. also Hearne, vol.vii, p.266.

copy was not to be had "for Love or money, but they are all bought up by ye Gentry".[1] A few years later Thoresby observed that the Notitia was selling at a "great rate"[2] and in 1708 Tanner, who seems to have been surprised that his book should fetch seven shillings in an auction,[3] was horrified to hear that Browne Willis had been offered a copy at exactly twice that amount and, although he knew that the work had been "pretty Scarce some time", he expressed surprise that any one should "have the conscience" to ask such a price.[4]

By now, however, Tanner had interleaved a copy of the Notitia and was keeping a careful note of the additions that his friends had sent:[5] he meant to be prepared whenever Churchill, who had a "right to the Copy", should judge that the

---

1. MS. T. 24, f.62, Richard Parsons to Tanner, 18 Sept. 1695. Tanner seems to have retained some copies for his own use: in 1697 he presented one to All Souls (cf. p.175, note 2) and in 1698 he was able to give a copy to the Herald's Office; cf. Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, p.411.

2. Thoresby, Diary, vol.i, p.342. Thoresby's copy of the Notitia is now in the Bodleian, Gough Eccl. top. 29; he has noted on the title-leaf that he paid 4/6d for it.

3. MS. Willis 95, f.283, Tanner to Willis, [1708].

4. ibid. Tanner told Charlett of this event and emphasised that the 14/- had been asked for an ordinary paper copy (cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.90): this may indicate that he knew that at least one fine paper copy was no longer in the possession of the person to whom he had given it. The appearance of the much enlarged second edition soon reduced the price of the first and in the tenth part of the Heber sale in 1836 a copy was sold for the original price of 4/-. Today the volume is fairly rare and antiquarian interest has increased its value, but prices vary: £2. 15/- was recently asked for a copy (E.G. Allen & Son, Catalogue, new ser. 20, lot 497) and £15 was the price set on the Kennett "association" copy; see p.170, note 2.

5. Cf. MS. Willis 95, f.283, Tanner to Willis, [1708].

market was ready for another edition.[1] These additions, although exceedingly welcome, were so numerous that they presented a problem of their own for, being "design'd only for a Manual; and Repertory wth directions to the Printed Books & MSS. Registers",[2] Tanner's main concern was to keep the Notitia within manageable proportions. In September 1709 Tanner told Hearne that a considerably improved edition of his work was ready for the press,[3] but it does not seem to have been until 1712 that Churchill definitely approached Tanner on the project.[4] Ecclesiastical commitments delayed him for a while but when Tanner became a Prebendary of Ely, and thus obliged to perform an annual period of residence at that cathedral, he saw his opportunity, and December 1713 found him "never more Monastic than at present, being got here into the stall and lodgings of the Subprior, Celarer, or some such Officer - and hither I have brought the Notitia Monastica, in order to revise it for a new Edition".[5] His earlier revision was not as complete as he had hoped and, with his return to Norwich, he was forced to postpone publication for a while. Hearne understood that printing was to begin at Michaelmas

---

1. Cf. MS. Willis 95, f.283, Tanner to Willis, [1708].
2. [B.M.] Add. MSS. 15932, f.2, Tanner to Willis, 21 Jun. 1708.
3. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 37/38, f.243v, Hearne to Baker, 10 Sept. 1709.
4. MS. Ballard 4, f.107, Tanner to Charlett, 20 Oct. 1712.
5. MS. Willis 44, f.31, Tanner to Willis, 16 Dec. 1713.

1714[1] but although he was eager for the new edition he was by no means surprised when it did not appear.[2]

Tanner's working copy had by now received hard use and he borrowed one of Le Neve's Notitiae in order to have it "interleaved fair for the press",[3] but he had not done this by April 1715 and there was so little prospect of his finding sufficient free time that he returned the book to Le Neve.[4] If the Notitia were to remain a small volume for easy reference[5] an interleaved copy indicating his corrections and additions was probably Tanner's easiest method of preparation. In August 1715 Hearne seems to have thought that printing was actually taking place[6] and he was still expecting publication in the following May,[7] but meanwhile Tanner had only just settled down at Ely to what had become his annual attack on the Notitia; on this occasion, however, he was armed with a hamper of books borrowed from Le Neve and, with the expectation of more to come, during the months of April and May 1716

---

1. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 111, f.31v, Hearne to Rawlinson, 2 Feb. 1715.

2. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 111, f.31v.

3. Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, p.415.

4. ibid., p.416.

5. As late as 5 December 1713 Tanner wrote to Charlett of the Notitia: "I think to enlarge it no further, but keep it still as a Manual - referring to other Books"; MS. Ballard 4, f.111.

6. Cf. Hearne, vol.v, p.105, Hearne to M.Fothergill, 30 Aug. 1715. Fothergill later asked Hearne to buy two copies of the Notitia for him; cf. Hearne, vol.v, pp.109,135,141.

7. Cf. ibid., p.215, Hearne to J.Bridges, 3 May 1716.

he began to "perfectly new-model" his work.[1] This time his determination was more successful and, in spite of having considerably enlarged his design, he told Willis after his return to Norwich that he hoped to have his first volume in the press "sooner than perhaps you may imagine".[2]

It was now more than twenty years since Tanner had published anything and nearly five years since Churchill had approached him about a second edition; although Tanner's erudition was everywhere acknowledged even his friends were beginning to wonder about his ability to actually get a work into print. Nor were they entirely without justification for, in spite of the fact that Tanner's duties as Chancellor left him little free time, this was an age of part-time scholars, many of whom led very full lives and yet were able to issue numerous works which, considering their comprehensive nature, seem to have been prepared in a remarkably short space of time. But Tanner, like all conscientious scholars, was keenly aware of the imperfections of his work and he was always ready to postpone his final preparations for the press whilst there still seemed room to him for improvement: Thomas Baker's description of him as being "over slow, whilst he is over accurate"[3] is particularly apt. Nevertheless, at this

---

1. Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, p.417.
2. MS. Willis 44, f.165, Tanner to Willis, 6 Jun. 1716.
3. MS. Willis 44, f.146v, Baker to Willis, 23 Mar. 1717.

juncture Tanner seems to have been very near to bringing his second edition to completion. On 6 April 1717 he told Charlett that he had sent Churchill some of the first sheets of the Notitia, which by now had become "not so much a New Edition as a New Book",[1] and in May he was good-naturedly complaining to Willis that he was being "dun'd almost weekly for my ... book"[2] - perhaps for copy. In spite of the fact that in October he was still borrowing books from Le Neve in order to make his account more perfect,[3] a specimen page to accompany proposals for printing[4] was produced by December for Tanner himself mentioned it in a letter to Willis, and at the same time he gives us an interesting sidelight as to how far his scholarly conscience had driven him to develop the work beyond its original concept as a handy reference manual:

> I had extracted all the Mannors, Rectories, and Lands belonging to the several Religious Houses in some Counties (according to the Specimen I sent you) - but found it would delay too much the publication of this New Edition - therefore keep it back for a II^d part - for, (God preserving my Life & health) I design not only that, but a III. IVth &c - in a method that I am willing to hope you and other monastic Friends will not mislike. But I must get thro' what I have at present upon my hands first.[5]

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.122, Tanner to Charlett, 6 Apr. 1717.
2. MS. Willis 44, f.148, Tanner to Willis, 25 May 1717.
3. Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, pp.418,419.
4. I do not know of the existence today of any such specimen.
5. MS. Willis 36, f.200, Tanner to Willis, 4 Dec. 1717.

Gibson, too, saw this specimen and it must have represented a marked enlargement of the original Notitia for he told Charlett that he could easily guess what "prodigious pains" Tanner must have been at in preparing this second edition for the press.[1]

Early in 1718 Tanner was still transcribing his work as fast as he could[2] and it seems that possibly it was not only Tanner's natural procrastination that prevented the appearance of a revised Notitia soon after this. In 1717 certain changes took place in the Churchills' bookselling business[3] that may well have resulted in a change of their policy, a change possibly also brought about by the slow but inevitable entrance of other scholars into the field of monastic history.[4]

---

1. MS. Ballard 6, f.130v, Gibson to Charlett, 23 Aug. 1718.

2. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.123, Tanner to Charlett, 29 Jan. 1718.

3. It was in 1717 for instance that the imprint on the seventeenth volume of Rymer's Foedera (Lond., 1704-35) changed to "Per W.Churchill" as opposed to the "Per A.& J.Churchill" of the earlier volumes. It was also in this year that William Churchill ceased to be M.P. for Ipswich, and in the June a patent was granted to him, together with Edward Castle, for the sole furnishing of stationery to several offices of His Majesty's Revenue. Awnsham Churchill did not die until 1728. Cf. D.N.B., s.n. A.Churchill; Plomer, A dictionary of ... printers and booksellers, 1668-1725, s.n. Churchill, Castle.

4. In 1700 there appeared anonymously at London An account of the several monasteries, priories, [&c] ... which were demolished in the reign of k.Henry viii and in 1717, also at London, A summary of all the religious houses in England and Wales, with their titles and valuations at the time of their dissolution. John Ecton had published a work on valuations in 1711, see p. 188, note 4. Browne Willis was known to be working on An history of the mitred parliamentary abbies and conventual cathedral churches (Lond., 1718,19) and John

[cont. on next page]

Tanner was probably disheartened by the fact that in spite of his recent efforts the Notitia was still unpublished and he seems to have turned his attention elsewhere. The appearance of the other works on monasticism hardly worried him at all and he was able to dismiss them as "projects barely calculated upon the interest of Booksellers";[1] they were in any case sufficiently removed from the Notitia to leave unruffled the man who had earlier displayed such patient resignation and good temper when Anthony Hall had deliberately forestalled him on his other undertaking.[2] Moreover Tanner was inwardly pleased to postpone his work once again because he was still having trouble in assembling his materials; the prejudice that had greeted Dugdale's Monasticon had by no means died away and the study of monastic

---

cont. Stevens was preparing two supplementary volumes to Dugdale's Monasticon entitled The history of the antient abbeys, monasteries, hospitals, cathedrals, and collegiate churches (Lond., 1722,23).

.. [B.M.] Stowe MSS. 749, f.89, Tanner to Anstis, 8 Feb. 1720. It was the prospectus of Stevens' continuation of Dugdale that occasioned the present remark; nevertheless Tanner half-heartedly offered to subscribe for a copy. His name, however, does not appear in the list of subscribers printed in vol.1 nor in the supplementary list in vol.2. Tanner might have been expected to have collaborated on this edition, but from the tone of this letter he did not; Anstis, Thoresby, and Willis are all named in the Preface [redacted] as having furnished materials. There is no record of Tanner ever having possessed a copy, but John Tanner often refers to this work in the 1744 edition of the Notitia.

. Cf. pp. 237-242.

bibliography was still unpopular with many people: as somebody Tanner had asked to assist wrote from Wales:

> The trueth is - The Nobility & Gentry, who are now possessed of these old Religious Houses, or a principall p^t^ of y^e^ - & are p^s^sumed to have old deeds & charters relating thereto in their hands - are very loath to p^r^duce y^m^ for fear any body s^d^ make discoveries in p^e^judice to their title - or their exempting y^m^ fm paying tieths - For so tis gen^lly^ in these p^ts^ - y^t^ all or most of y^m^ claim an exemptio^n^ from all maners of tieths.[1]

For some time after this the Notitia is hardly mentioned in Tanner's correspondence and, although in 1719 he told Browne Willis that during his residence at Ely he had done as much in seven weeks as he could manage in as many months of diocesan life,[2] it was not until 1723 that he again seriously had thoughts of publication:

> I ... have endeavored to employ that quiet of this winter in discharging part of my obligations to the Public - wch at my time of day (49. last St Paules Conversion) must not be delayed more than necessity absolutely forces me, nor indeed has been of late years any further than barely has been consistent wth the busy station Providence has fixed me in. I have got 4. parts in 5. of the Notitia new modell'd and transcribed fair for the press, and should hope to finish this summer but that our New Bishop[3] intends to visit the whole Diocese, the consequences of wch and attendance thereupon will take up much of my time - however I will do what I am able.[4]

---

1. MS. T. 342, f.23, J.Jones, Dean of Bangor, to Humphrey Foulkes, 13 Sept. 1718.

2. Cf. MS. Willis 37, f.187, Tanner to Willis, 16 Nov. 1719.

3. Tanner is here referring to Thomas Green who was consecrated to the see on 8 October 1721.

4. MS. Willis 64, f.49, Tanner to Willis, 18 Feb. 1723.

In the spring of 1724 Tanner put his new position as Canon of Christ Church to good use by examining the archives of that foundation in a search for material for the Notitia[1] and, whilst he was in Oxford, he told Hearne that his book was almost ready for the press and that it would consist of "two hundred Sheets in a Pot Folio".[2] A year earlier he had told Hearne's compositor that he would bring the book with him when he returned to Oxford and that it would then be ready for the press;[3] but in September 1725 he was forced to confess that his decision to include valuations - to be prepared by John Ecton[4]- would delay him for another year.[5] Ten months later the Oxford diarist observed that Tanner was avoiding the subject of the Notitia when they met and correctly deduced that the work was not yet in the press.[6] He soon heard from Baker that Tanner was still working on the Yorkshire section of his book and that, as this was a large county and the whole of Wales remained to be finished, there

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.viii, p.204.
2. ibid.
3. ibid., p.412.
4. Ecton had already published Liber valorum & decimarum, being an account of the valuations and yearly tenthes of ... ecclesiastical benefices in England and Wales (Lond., 1711).
5. Cf. Hearne, vol.ix, pp.31,32. See also E.S.Lindley, "A short study in Valor ecclesiasticus", Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire archaeological society, vol.lxxvi, pp.98-117.
6. Hearne, vol.ix, p.169.

was every probability that in view of the author's commitments the Notitia would not be appearing for yet another year of two.[1] On one of his visits to Tanner's rooms at Christ Church Hearne took the opportunity to try and find out the exact state of the Notitia from Tanner's amanuensis: he was told that it was on the point of being finished and that the Bibliotheca too was very nearly ready for the press.[2]

Still Tanner's work failed to appear, and when in March 1727 Hearne happened to meet John Ecton, to whom he had only spoken once before, he eagerly asked him how his work on the valuations for the Notitia was progressing. Ecton replied that he "had done nothing as yet, but that he would set about it as soon as he understood the D^{r}. was in good earnest. He said, the D^{r}. talked of having this from him seven years ago, but he believes him not to be in earnest, and he added, that the D^{r}. is afraid to publish his book, and he was of opinion, that it would not come out in his lifetime, wch I [Hearne] took great notice of, and said, "I suppose then the D^{r}. expects other Preferment, and may be afraid lest this book may obstruct it". "I know not for that," replys M^{r}. Eckton, "but it will open a new Scene of Affairs and displease abundance of people that are now in possession of the Abbey Lands, because as it

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.ix, p.183.
2. Cf. ibid., p.186.

will shew what Livings and Estates belonged to them, so it will set forth their true value".[1] To this Hearne added the observation that Ecton seemed to him to be a "good sort of man" but he later noted in the margin "So I thought then ... but since I am informed that he is very covetous and uncommunicative".[2]

Whatever character Ecton bore, his belief that the Notitia would not be published in Tanner's lifetime proved to be correct even if he seems to have arrived at his opinion for the wrong reasons. Apparently Tanner made yet another effort before May 1728 to complete the work[3] and there does not seem to be any reason to suppose that he was afraid of the possible consequences his book might have on his ecclesiastical career. True, he had by now begun to set his eyes more firmly upon a bishopric and could hardly afford to run foul of the landed classes, and it must also be admitted that whilst his careful avoidance of controversy had brought him no enemies it had also failed to bring him any powerful patrons; but Tanner placed a high value on pure scholarship, and it was for this very quality that the episcopal bench of his day was renowned. It is equally true that almost as soon as he had obtained his bishopric Tanner told Samuel

---

1. Hearne, vol.ix, p.286.
2. ibid. The original observation was written 13 March 1727, the annotation 22 January 1728.
3. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.10.

Knight that he was resolved to set about printing the Notitia;[1] but, although this might lead his impatient critics to believe that political considerations were influencing his scholarly pursuits, the truth is that he refrained from putting the work to the press for the simple reason that it was not finished. It was still incomplete at his death. The slow progress that he made with the work in later life is almost certainly to be ascribed to his failing health and his increasing public responsibility.

The decline in Tanner's health was evident to his friends, and in 1733 Hearne and Willis fell to discussing the fate of the Notitia in the almost inevitable event of Tanner dying before it was published.[2] Willis expressed the hope that Hearne would inherit the manuscript[3] but Hearne, who in any case did not think that this was Tanner's intention, guessed that Willis really wished to have it for himself;[4] and indeed the Notitia would have made an excellent companion volume to Willis' own publications, especially his History of Abbeys.[5]

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.xi, p.77.

2. Cf. ibid., p.279.

3. In the event Hearne predeceased Tanner; he died 10 June 1735.

4. After Tanner's death Baker told Rawlinson that "Dr. Knight hopes Mr. Willis will undertake & perfect The Notitia Monastica, to wch M^r W: does not seem averse"; MS. Rawl. A 498, f.28v.

5. As early as 23 March 1717 Baker had writ^r written to Willis: "I presume, you know, Our worthy Friend Dr Tanner is about a second edition of his Notitia Monastica, that will make a second part or supplement to your Book, & will give us a compleat account of places, as you have done of Persons, & they will come out very seasonably about the same time; tho' what forwardness he is in, I cannot well say"; MS. Willis 44, f.146.

But on the day following this conversation Tanner, who had just recovered from a recent illness, told Hearne that "he was thinking of giving the finishing stroke to his Notitia Monastica. He said, that Wales and Yorkshire wanted still to be done, tho' I [Hearne] formerly understood from him, that all but Wales was compleated. He talked about printing Paper, as if he now were in good earnest about putting it to the Press".[1]

In what little time he could spare Tanner slowly continued with his work on the Notitia. On 2 October 1735 he wrote to Rawlinson:

> I am not unmindfull of the Scarcity of that little book compiled when I was scarce 20. years old, and am as fast as my leisure will permit preparing for a New Edition, to wch end I have fairly transcribed as far as the midle of Yorkshire and want only the remainder of that Country - and Wales to review and transcribe, wch if it please God to allow me health and give me no avocations, I hope to finish by the Spring, and then put it to the Press - wch I was not willing to do before all was ready, knowing the tormenting of Devils, Printers, & Booksellers for Copy &c. Tho' I keep to the old method, yet in my new way - I believe it will amount to 200 Sheets & upwards and must be in a Small Folio,[2]

Before Christmas Tanner was dead.[3]

The manuscript of the Notitia, together with all the relevant material that Tanner had collected over the many years that he had been preparing for his second edition,

---

1. Hearne, vol.xi, p.279.
2. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.32.
3. Tanner died 14 December 1735.

passed into the hands of his brother John. Fortunately John Tanner was able to devote more time to the project than his more eminent brother had found possible and, although the revised Notitia did not appear until 1744, he had apparently completed the greater part of his task by 1736.[1] It is interesting to compare Tanner's regular announcements of imminent publication with John Tanner's account of his editorship: "In several counties, one place or other was omitted till he [Tanner] could see some book, or get some intelligence he thought needful. These, therefore, Peterborough, and seven other places in Northamptonshire, the latter part of Yorkshire, and all Wales, are of my doing. A great many little notes were left for altering his account of several houses according to such better informations as he received, after he was made canon of Christ Church in Oxford, and had the use of many things there which he could not have elsewhere. I made all those alterations, and was for the most part obliged to draw up the account of such houses anew. I have added some references, made extracts of many books that were barely referred to, and would have made more, if I had had, or could have borrow'd, books for it. The author's close writing, and frequent interlineations, obliged me to transcribe a great part of the work".[2] It is immediately evident that, in

---

1. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 114[*], f.192, S.Knight to Rawlinson, 8 Sept. 1738.
2. Notitia (1744) pp.xlii,xliii.

spite of having received the promotion which was once alleged to be delaying the Notitia, Tanner had made no real progress over the last ten years. Ecton must have believed that Tanner had been hoping for still further promotion; nor would this have been an unreasonable assumption, for in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the comparatively poor Welsh bishoprics were regarded as the bottom rung of the episcopal ladder and suffered sadly from the rapid translation of their bishops to the richer English sees. But John Tanner has said that his brother was delayed by his clerical duties,[1] and there certainly seems to be no real reason to doubt his word. Tanner's health, his office, and - perhaps above all - his parallel interest in the Bibliotheca had all played with telling effect upon his procrastinating nature.

The second edition of the Notitia appeared in one folio volume in 1744;[2] it was dedicated to Edmund Gibson as "the

---

1. Cf. Notitia (1744) p.xlii.

2. John Tanner, who was Precentor of St. Asaph, presented a copy to the cathedral library; it is now no.338. He presented another copy to Thomas Martin (cf. Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, p.436) and this appears as lot 44 of the Martin sale catalogue of 5 June 1773; but unlike Martin's 1695 Notitia it did not find its way in to the Gough collection in the Bodleian; cf. p.170, note 1. The collection contains two 1744 Notitias: Gough Eccl. top. 85 contains Tanner's signature cut from one of his books on the verso of the dedication, and Gough Eccl. top. 86 was formerly in the possession of Edward Rowe Mores, the antiquary. Both copies contain copious manuscript notes. Before p.1 of the text in Mores' copy is a letter from John Tanner to Browne Willis dated 1 April 1746 in which he says that he was more than £80 out of pocket over his edition of the Notitia. The Gough collection therefore contains six 1695 Notitias (cf. p.168, note 3), two 1744, and one 1787 (Gough Eccl. top. 84).

kind encourager of the author's first studies in antiquities" and the printing was executed by William Bowyer[1] at the expense of the Society for the Encouragement of Learning.[2] It does not appear to have sold very well. When John Tanner "remaindered" his copies to John Whiston,[3] a bookseller in Fleet Street, he was told that there was no prospect of their being disposed of in the near future,[4] and when he was later in London he did not even trouble to visit Whiston's shop to see how sales were progressing.[5]

Nevertheless the work eventually became difficult to obtain and Thomas Evans, a bookseller in the Strand, issued proposals for another edition,[6] a project which Richard Gough applauded.[7] Evans joined forces with John Nichols, another

---

1. One of Bowyer's ledgers is in the Bodleian Library, MS. Don. b. 4, and it contains (f.101) his accounts for the 1744 Notitia and for the Bibliotheca.

2. An account by C.Atto of this Society is to be found in The Library, 4th ser., vol.xix, pp.263-288. In 1746 it was announced that the Notitia had been so successful that "it is daily expected that the editor will reimburse the society, and take the remaining copies into his own hands" but the announcement was somewhat premature and of 500 copies only 195 were sold by the Society; ibid., p.277.

3. The booksellers who handled the publication for the Society were John Whiston, John Osborn, and Francis Changuion.

4. Cf. MS. Willis 64, f.65v, John Tanner to Willis, 21 Jan. 1751.

5. ibid.

6. Cf. Nichols, Literary anecdotes, vol.ii, p.163. I have not seen one of these proposals, but the authority is Gough who probably had a copy. See also the following note.

7. ibid., pp.163,164. Gough's words were "Our modern publishers judge of the value of books by their arbitrary price, and have been misled, to their cost, to re-print some books, whose whole merit is their scarcity. This is by no means,

[cont. on next page]

ondon bookseller, and they commissioned James Nasmith[1] to dit the work. A letter was inserted in the Gentleman's agazine for September 1784[2] appealing for literary assistnce from interested parties and the completed work appeared n 1787; it was published under the patronage of the University f Cambridge, who bore the cost of printing, and of Tanner's on.[3] Five hundred copies were printed[4] but Evans died efore it was published and Nichols "accordingly purchased he whole impression, on the idea that, from the long list of ames which had been given-in as encouragers of the re-publiation, there would be a great demand for the book; but strange to say) in the number of names set down, at least

---

cont. however, the case with the "Notitia;" which is as aluable as it is scarce, and, if reprinted with such improveents as it is in the power of several gentlemen to bestow on t, would be an acceptable present to the publick". Gough's riginal was perhaps contained among his collections for a hird edition of his Topographical antiquities which Nichols wned. These collections, including many proposals, were ought for £100 by the Bodleian from Nichols in 1811; they ere at that time boxed in a disordered state but have since een arranged and bound as Gough Gen. top. 363-366. The elevant portion does not seem to be present.

. James Nasmith, 1740-1808, antiquary. He had recently (1777) ompleted a catalogue of the books that Archbishop Parker had iven to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

. Gentleman's magazine, vol.liv, p.659.

. Tanner's son sent his uncle's annotated copy of the Notitia o Nasmith as well as promising financial help, but he died efore the edition was completed and his patronage was continued y his son-in-law, Richard Milles; cf. Notitia (1787) Preface. have been unable to discover whether Tanner's original collecions for a second edition are now extant.

. Cf. Nichols, Literary anecdotes, vol.ii, p.97n. The same umber of copies of the second edition were printed; cf. owyer's accounts, MS. Don. b. 4, f.101; and perhaps also of he first, cf. p. 159.

ine out of ten proved men of buckram; and by far the greater art of the work, after continuing warehoused for twenty years, as consumed in the fatal conflagration of Feb.8, 1808;[1] an vent by which the "Notitia" is again become scarce, and robably will ever so continue."[2]

No further complete edition of the Notitia has ever been ublished, but in 1821 Sir Richard Colt Hoare issued a work t Shaftesbury entitled Monasticon Wiltonense; containing a ist of the Religious Houses in North and South Wiltshire ompiled chiefly from Bishop Tanner's Notitia Monastica.[3] his contained the additions that Sir Henry Ellis[4] had entered n his copy of the 1787 Notitia[5] and the same source was used or the "Notitia Monastica for Cornwall" that appears in avies Gilbert's Parochial History of that county.[6] Apart rom these two works there has been no direct lineal descen- iant of Tanner's Notitia and the tendency has been to return to his earlier concept of a handy reference work by limiting the scope. Today historical reference to monastic foundations

---

1. i.e. a fire in Nichols' warehouse.
2. Nichols, Literary anecdotes, vol.ii, p.164n.
3. This edition was limited to twenty-five copies.
4. Sir Henry Ellis, 1777-1869, antiquary and principal Librarian of the British Museum.
5. [B.M.] 482 g. 13.
6. D.Gilbert, The parochial history of Cornwall (Lond., 1838) vol.iv, pp.319-336.

is best found in the work of David Knowles and R. Neville Hadcock;[1] whilst reference to the whereabouts of original monastic muniments is to be had in Neil Ker's edition of Medieval Libraries of Great Britain[2] and its many supplements, of which a revision is in preparation. There is, however, no modern publication that of itself completely supersedes Tanner's work, as is evidenced by the many footnotes referring to the Notitia that are to be found in the Victoria County Histories of England. It is only fitting that Tanner's work should still be remembered and used, for it is unlikely that such a comprehensive work on monasticism will ever be contained in one volume again.

---

1. D.Knowles & R.N.Hadcock, Medieval religious houses, England and Wales (Lond., 1953).

2. Medieval libraries of Great Britain, a list of surviving books, ed. by N.R.Ker (Lond., 1941).

CHAPTER IV

THE BIBLIOTHECA BRITANNICO-HIBERNICA

The work for which Tanner is today best remembered is the Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica, a biographical and bibliographical account of all the writers who had flourished in Great Britain up to the end of the sixteenth century. This was obviously a major undertaking requiring many years of hard research but, as Tanner himself observed, it was a work "very much desired and much wanted"[1] and the judgement of posterity fully supports his claim. However, as the Bibliotheca is invariably cited as Tanner's main literary achievement and its preparation is almost the only aspect of his life to have received the attention of scholars,[2] we must be careful not to assume ipso facto that Tanner himself had a higher regard for this work than he did for the Notitia. The Bibliotheca was originally undertaken from purely financial considerations, but it was in such accord with his natural interests as an antiquarian and bibliophile that he was happy to pursue it for the rest of his life, and apparently to place it on an equal footing with the Notitia which was a subject of his own free

---

1. MS. T. 469*, f.1. See p.220, note 1.

2. The subject was first discussed by Mr. W.T.Davies in "Thomas Tanner and his Bibliotheca", The Times literary supplement, 14 December 1935, p.856, and more recently by Dr. R.W.Hunt in "Tanner's Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica", Bodleian library record, vol.ii, pp.249-258. The present account owes much to the work of these two scholars.

choice. Nowhere does he indicate any real preference for either work and he seems to have divided his time more or less equally between them.

An important part of Tanner's source-material for the Bibliotheca lay in the extant catalogues of the various libraries of Great Britain. These can hardly be said to date from much earlier than the second half of the twelfth century[1] and even at that period they were so slight and lacking in definition as to be of little use. The earliest catalogue with which we need concern ourselves is John Boston's Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum.[2] Boston was a monk,

---

1. Cf. D.M.Norris, A history of cataloguing and cataloguing methods (Lond., 1939), p.14-25; cf. also J.S.Beddie, Libraries in the twelfth century, their catalogues and contents (Cambr., Mass., 1929).

2. Boston's work is in fact partially based on the "Registrum librorum Angliae" compiled in the second half of the thirteenth century by the Franciscan friars. There is no evidence that Tanner made any real use of the Registrum but it merits consideration because he owned a very fine copy of it (now MS. T. 165, ff.101-120) and it is mentioned in the Preface to the Bibliotheca, pp.xv,xxv. It is bound together with the register of William Molash, who was elected Prior of Canterbury in 1428, and in 1566 the whole volume was owned by William Bowyer; cf. ff.1,3. In 1686 Thomas White, Bishop of Peterborough, gave it to Archbishop Sancroft (cf. f.3) amongst whose papers Tanner presumably obtained it. Cf. also E.A.Savage, "Notes on the early monastic libraries of Scotland, with an account of the Registrum librorum Angliae", Papers of the Edinburgh bibliographical society, vol.xiv, pp.1-46; P.Lehmann, "Alte Vorläufer des Gesamtkatalogs", Festschrift Georg Leyh, (Leipz., 1937), pp.69-81; M.R.James, "The list of libraries prefixed to the catalogue of John Boston and the kindred documents", British society of Franciscan studies, vol.x, Collectanea Franciscana ii, (Manch., 1922), pp.37-60.

nd perhaps librarian,[1] at Bury St. Edmunds early in the ifteenth century and his catalogue surveyed the works of 73 authors to be found in 191 libraries. Few copies seem o have survived the Dissolution because in the seventeenth entury any example was to be "esteemed the Rarity of Rar- ties by the Lovers of Antiquitys"[2] and it was accordingly ne of Tanner's first tasks to take a transcript.[3] Today is is the only known copy of this important text[4] and it as been said that this transcript must be printed in full before any really thorough investigation of ancient English ibraries can be undertaken".[5]

Boston was not without his followers. Alanus de Linna, rior of the Carmelite monastery of Lynn in Norfolk, is said o have made an enlargement of, or an index to, Boston's

---

. Cf. M.R.James, On the abbey of S. Edmund at Bury (Cambridge ntiquarian society, 8° publications, 28), (Cambr., 1895) p.40,41.

. T.Fuller, The history of the worthies of England, ed. by .Nichols (Lond., 1811) vol.ii, p.20.

. Cf. pp. 212,214,215.

. This is now in the Cambridge University Library, Add. MS. 470. Dr. James, who examined this transcript closely, came o the conclusion (Boston and kindred documents, p.42) that the general faithfulness of [Tanner's] copy need not be oubted". Mr. Savage (op. cit., Papers of the Edinburgh biblio- raphical society, vol.xiv, p.21) is seriously in error when e says that this transcript is not in Tanner's hand. A acsimile of one page of the text is prefixed to his article ogether with another from Tanner's copy of the Registrum.

. James, Abbey of S. Edmund at Bury, p.34.

Catalogue[1] and a Carthusian monk of Lincoln is also said to have compiled a "Catalogus Doctorum Angliae"[2] but both of these have since disappeared.[3]

It was John Leland who was the first to interest himself in authors as well as their books. The third volume of his Collectanea contains references to over eight hundred books that he had seen on his visits to the English monasteries[4] and, as these were nearly all immediately dispersed if not actually destroyed, his notes were almost the equal of Boston's Catalogue in value. Even more important for Tanner's purposes was the fourth volume of the Collectanea, known as De Viris Illustribus; sive, De Scriptoribus Britannicis, which contained biographical accounts of some five hundred British authors. Leland's work was well known and, as has

---

1. Cf. Nicolson, English historical library, Part II (1697) p.226 and Tanner, Bibliotheca, p.xv. This belief is apparently based on the unsubstantiated statement by J.Pits in Relationum historicarum de rebus Anglicis tomus primus (Par., 1619), p.602, that Alanus de Linna had compiled an index "In opus de Scriptoribus Britanniae". For an account of Pits' work see pp.205,206. Bale (see pp.203-205) does not ascribe any such work to Alanus de Linna.

2. Cf. Pits, op. cit., p.52. T.D.Hardy, Descriptive catalogue of materials (Lond., 1862), vol.i, pt.1, p.xxxvii, appears to believe that the two are identical.

3. No copy of the second was known to Pits in 1619, cf. Pits, op. cit., p.52.

4. These are very scattered but they are listed in S.Jayne, Library catalogues of the English Renaissance (Berkeley, 1956) pp.65,76,84,85. The introduction to this work contains much material that is of interest with regard to the present study. The Tanner collection was examined (cf. op. cit., p.195) but most of the catalogues that Tanner obtained were post-Renaissance and these are now mainly to be found MSS. T. 268-275*, some having been purchased amongst the Sancroft papers.

been already pointed out, several transcripts of it were probably in circulation[1] but there was a general desire on the part of scholars to have a printed version[2] and it was from an intended edition of Leland's De Scriptoribus with Boston's Catalogus that the larger design of Tanner's Bibliotheca was to develop.

Long before this, however, Leland's manuscript had been put to good use by his contemporary and acquaintance John Bale, Bishop of Ossory. Bale had studied at Cambridge as a Carmelite friar but he became influenced by the Lutheran movement and later forsook his monk's habit, turning his polemical pen to the production of anti-Catholic literature with such telling effect that he was twice forced to leave the country.[3] Bale, like Leland, was also dismayed at the systematic destruction of the monastic libraries and he too set out to examine and record the contents of as many of them as possible. Although he was without the official backing that smoothed Leland's path he made considerable progress and his were the first efforts in this field to appear in print when in 1548 he issued his Illustrium Maioris Britanniae

---

1. Cf. pp. 106,107.

2. For an account of the first printed edition of the De Scriptoribus see pp. 237-242.

3. Modern accounts of Bale are to be found W.T.Davies, "A bibliography of John Bale", Oxford bibliographical society, Proceedings and papers, vol.v, pp.201-246; J.W.Harris, John Bale, a study of the minor literature of the Reformation (Urbana, 1940); and H.McCusker, John Bale, dramatist and antiquary (Bryn Mawr, 1942).

Scriptorum Summarium.[1] At about the same time he managed to obtain Leland's manuscript of the De Scriptoribus[2] and he used this for the much enlarged edition of his work that was published at Basle in 1557 under the title Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Britanniae ... Catalogus. There was a supplement in 1559.[3] The work has an unfortunate anti-Catholic

---

1. Tanner possessed a copy of part of this, containing the "Centuria quinta", interleaved and with notes by James Harrington (1664-1693) of Lincoln's Inn. It is now MS. T. 420. Harrington was also the compiler of MS. T. 402,403 which are similarly concerned with English writers and Tanner later stated (cf. p.242) that Harrington had intended to publish an edition of Leland's De Scriptoribus. Tanner probably inherited all three of these volumes from Wood, with whom Harrington was very friendly; a note and a letter from Harrington to Wood are to be found MS. T. 27, f.215,216. Harrington's interleaved copy of Bale is mentioned in Wood's Life and times, vol.ii, p.498.

2. Cf. Harris, op. cit., p.113. ~~He apparently obtained it from Sir John Cheke, ff. p.~~. Bale's transcript of Leland is now at Trinity College, Cambridge, MS. R 7. 15.

3. Tanner was able to examine Bale's own annotated copy of the 1557 Catalogus and his notes from it are to be found in the British Museum, Add. MSS. 6261, ff.101-103; 166,167. At the time it was in the possession of William Glynne, Kennett's patron, and it later passed to Kennett. Thomas Baker is also known to have used it; cf. McCusker, op. cit., p.49. It is now in the British Museum, C. 28. m. 6. For further references to this copy see Hearne, vol.x, pp.147,151,162,166,173, 211,212. It is interesting in this connection to note that Tanner probably examined all of the relevant Bale manuscripts reviewed by McCusker, op. cit., pp.97-110. He certainly examined MS. Bodley 73, for on f.216v appears the note by Hearne "June 28th 1710. This book was this Day deliver'd up by Mr Tanner (Chancellor of Norwich) to be plac'd in the Bodlejan Library" (cf. also Hearne, vol.i, p.155); and he also examined its companion volume, now missing; cf. Summary catalogue, nos. 27635,27636. The other relevant material in the Bodleian was readily available, as presumably were those manuscripts now in the British Museum but at that time in the Harleian and Cottonian collections with whose librarians Tanner was acquainted. Moreover, MS. Harl. 1819 was formerly owned

[cont. on next page]

bias,[1] but where this does not obtrude the one thousand or so biographies that it contains render it of great importance and it is largely this work that has recently led to Bale being described as "almost the first real scholar in the history of English studies".[2]

Bale's literary successor was John Pits, a Catholic divine, who matriculated at New College, Oxford, in 1579.[3] His religious beliefs led him into voluntary exile and he became a priest and was later appointed confessor to the Duchess of Cleves, on whose death he was presented to a deanery of Liverdun. Pits' principal work, which was published in 1619, three years after his death, was the incomplete Relatio Historicarum de Rebus Anglicis[4] the only volume of which is now generally better known as De Illustribus Britanniae Scriptoribus. As was only to be expected in a work compiled by an exile who had last seen England at the age of

---

1 cont. by Wanley and MS. Harl. 3838 by Baker. The most important of Bale's manuscripts, MS. Selden supra 64 in the Bodleian, has since been published as J.Bale, Index Britanniae scriptorum, ed. R.L.Poole and M.Bateson (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Mediaeval and modern series, 9), (Oxf., 1902). Tanner possessed a scrap in Bale's autograph which is now MS. T. 314, f.216.

1. Anthony Wood said that "all R. Catholics, nay zealous Protestants, have little or no kindness [for Bale] at all, because his book is stuff'd with revilings and such language that befits rather a huckster at Billingsgate, than the meanest or worst of scholars"; Athenae, ed. Bliss, vol.ii, column 175.

2. Davies, John Bale, p.203.

3. Accounts of Pits are to be found in Wood, Athenae, ed. Bliss, vol.ii, columns 172-177; and the standard works of biographical reference.

4. Ioannis Pitsei ... relationum historicarum de rebus Anglicis tomus primus (Par., 1619).

twenty this production was extremely derivative; moreover, like Bale, Pits had allowed his religious persuasions to adulterate his scholarship and he omitted to record the writings of John Wycliffe and his followers with the result that the main value of the book now lies in the accounts of a number of Roman Catholic writers who had left England at the Reformation and whose lives might have otherwise gone unrecorded. Pits reviewed Bale's work most unfavourably[1] and claimed to have worked directly from Leland's De Scriptoribus[2] but it is hard to see how, in his exile and as an unestablished scholar, he could have obtained a transcript. It has long been accepted that Pits primarily based his work on Bale's Catalogus.[3]

The productions of Leland, Bale, and Pits were the direct lineal predecessors of Tanner's Bibliotheca but there were several other compilations of more limited scope that held rich stores of information suited to Tanner's purpose. Foremost amongst these must be mentioned Wood's Athenae Oxonienses for it is at once obvious that many of Tanner's later subjects would have been connected in one way or another with one of

---

1. Pits, op. cit., p.53. Tanner himself commented on the differences between Bale and Pits in a letter to Hearne, 14 Oct. 1727: of William of Worcester he said "tis observable they both give him a good character, wch is rarely to the same person by those Warm men"; MS. Rawl. lett. 9/10, f.284.

2. ibid., p.52.

3. Cf. Wood, Athenae, ed. Bliss, vol.ii, sc. column 175; cf. also Biographia Britannica, vol.v, p.3367, note D.

the two great universities of the realm; Tanner must often have wished that there was a similar work relating to Cambridge. He was particularly fortunate in this respect because, as we shall see in the following chapter, he was for many years the only person to have access to Wood's manuscript notes and there can be little doubt that he used them widely. There were several other works of more general interest and even the writers of Scotland and Ireland had already been the subject of literary research. Sir James Ware's De Scriptoribus Hiberniae,[1] although slight, covered twelve centuries and must have provided much information; of less value was Thomas Dempster's fairly weighty Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Scotorum[2] which has since been described as "chiefly remarkable for its extraordinary dishonesty".[3]

Library catalogues, too, had begun to appear in print.[4] In 1600 Thomas James had published Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis[5] containing an index of manuscripts to be found at Oxford and Cambridge and even in its early days the Bodleian Library, with James as its first librarian, had issued printed

---

1. Sir J.Ware, De scriptoribus Hiberniae libri duo, (Dubl., 1639). An English edition was issued in 1705.

2. T.Dempster, Historia ecclesiastica gentis Scotorum, (Bononiae, 1627). Dempster had earlier written Scotorum scriptorum nomenclatura, (Bononiae, 1620).

3. Cf. D.N.B., s.n. Dempster.

4. Tanner would, of course, have been well acquainted with all those reviewed in Nicolson's English historical library, Part I (1696), Preface.

5. T.James, Ecloga Oxonio-Cantabrigiensis, (Lond., 1600).

catalogues.[1] But all catalogues were completely overshadowed by the great Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae edited by Edward Bernard.[2] Without this work the Bibliotheca must have been seriously defective in many points but there is also a symbolical significance in the corporate nature of its production. The post-Restoration scholars were not slow to communicate information to one another and although such a work as William Cave's Scriptorum Ecclesiae Historia Literaria[3] with its continuations by Henry Wharton and Robert Gery was of much interest to Tanner, the researches that made it possible were probably of even greater value. More than once the answers to many of his problems must have been supplied quite incidentally by the work of such men as Hearne, Wanley, and even Nicolson, as well as others much less well known to him.

For a project that was to become the work of a lifetime Tanner's first connection with the Bibliotheca was casual in the extreme. We have already seen that the period following graduation was in normal circumstances financially difficult for the student who intended to take Orders and Tanner's case was no exception. At the end of 1693 Gibson was recommending the unfinished Notitia to the London publishers and when he

---

1. Cf. G.W.Wheeler, The earliest catalogues of the Bodleian library, (Oxf., 1928), p.34 et passim.

2. Cf. pp. 17-19.

3. W.Cave, Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum historia literaria, (Lond., 1688,98).

heard that his own publisher, Awnsham Churchill, was looking for a reliable scholar to take an accurate transcript of Leland's De Scriptoribus and Boston's Catalogue with a view to preparing an edition of them he eagerly put Tanner's name forward. He pointed out to Tanner that such an arrangement would enable him to live in London whilst the Notitia was being printed and that he would be able to revise the proofs on the spot which in a book involving, as it did, many references would be a distinct advantage. Moreover, if the transcript ~~was~~ were well done there was every possibility that Tanner might be asked to see the whole work through the press and that in any case a subject of this nature was a "very honorable" one to be connected with.[1] Tanner eagerly assured Gibson that "if for ye Transcribing and Edition of them (wth my History of Monasteries) the Bookseller can afford to make me a hansome allowance to defray my charges and the loss of my time, I shall stand to any bargain you shall make".[2] In February 1694 Gibson was still negotiating on Tanner's behalf, and he again emphasised that the main advantage in such employment was that Tanner's presence in London was "indispensably necessary" if the Notitia were to be prepared as

---

1. MS. T. 25, f.116v, Gibson to Tanner, 30 Jan. 1694. Part of the letter here referred to is printed in Hunt, op. cit., p.250.

2. MS. T. 25, f.117v, Tanner to Gibson, Draft; pr. in Hunt, loc. cit.

accurately as possible.[1] It was not until the end of March, when it had become more obvious that Churchill might well employ Tanner, that Gibson began to seriously discuss the forthcoming edition with Charlett:

> If Leland goes forward, our Oxford-press must scarce have the honour of it: the quick dispatch here in London makes a quick return of their money; and there's noe consideration can engage a bookseller to quit his interest. Mr Tanner may satisfie himself that I will omitt nothing that lyes in my power, which may make the work easy and profitable to him. But I think 'tis the best way (and I am perswading Mr Churchil to it) for him to come down to Oxford, with all his papers relating to that business; by which Mr Tanner will be better able to apprehend the difficulties of it. There's noe man soe cautious in engaging himself as he that's to undergo the trouble; and I find by experience that ye utmost care and consideration never discovers one half of the labour. Mr Tanner is the only man I know of that's capable of doing it. In Dr Gale's hands it would be a 7 years work, and Dr Plot has such a jealousie of all Booksellers, that 'tis twenty to one but some misunderstanding or other would tempt him to breake off in the middle. Besides, 'tis impossible ever to goe through such a work without the assistance of Bodley's or some other vast Librarie.[2]

Although Gibson was not as yet a fully established scholar his recommendation was sufficient to encourage Churchill to make further enquiries[3] and when Charlett proved equally convincing as to Tanner's suitability for the task Churchill decided to journey to Oxford to meet the young student for himself. Gibson obviously believed that to be forewarned

---

1. MS. T. 25, f.119, Gibson to Tanner, 8 Feb. 1694.
2. MS. Ballard 5, f.23, Gibson to Charlett, 31 Mar. 1694.
3. Cf. MS. Ballard 33, f.10, Charles Hatton to ~~Churchill~~ Charlett, 10 May 1694; pr. in Hunt, op. cit., p.250.

was to be forearmed: "Mr Churchil will be with you about Monday or Tuesday night", he wrote to Tanner on 2 May 1694, "You'l find him a sensible man and a very fair-dealer; and when you come to the subject of Leland (which is his only business) I'd have you talk your mind freely, and let him know, 'tis a business you are in noe way a stranger to".[1] "I am in hopes", he wrote not long after, "Mr Churchil will bring us the news of an edition of Leland going forward, when he returns to London. He brings down with him whatever relates to that work, and I should be extreme sorry to hear that any differences in the way of trade should take it out of your hands. Tho' I have noe reason to fear it; since Mr Churchil has soe good an opinion of you at a distance, & I noe way doubt but the opportunity of a little conversation will make your opinion of him very favourable".[2]

Churchill made the journey some time soon after 10 May 1694[3] and by the eighteenth Tanner and he had agreed upon articles of employment.[4] Churchill was an acute business man and the owner of one of the most reputable publishing houses of the day; moreover, the publication of Leland and

---

1. MS. T. 25, f.143, Gibson to Tanner, 2 May 1694.
2. MS. T. 25, f.148, Gibson to Tanner, 13(?) May 1694.
3. He brought with him Hatton's letter of 10 May 1694, see p.210, note 3.
4. Gibson had seen these articles when he wrote to Tanner on 18 May, cf. MS. T. 25, f.152; cf. also ibid., f.154. Both these letters are pr. in Hunt, op. cit., p.251.

Boston seems to have been one of his pet projects[1] and it therefore says much for Tanner's character that Churchill employed him on the work. It seems also that Tanner was intended from the very beginning to perform more than the straightforward transcription of Leland and Boston that had originally been suggested: he had apparently pointed out to Churchill that the mere publication of these texts would perhaps be commercially profitable, but that with corrections and additions the work would be a considerable contribution to scholarship. Churchill agreed, and when Gibson heard of this development he observed that it was "a good generous thought to consider what account a work may turn to in other respects beside downright interest, and I am glad the undertaker has entertain'd it. Hang't man", he continued, giving us some insight into the agreement reached by Tanner and Churchill, "to lay too much stress upon filthy lucre is below the dispensation of Learning and a scholar; not but a great many good uses may be made of 40[l]. too."[2]

Whatever his editorial capacity was to be Tanner's first task was to make the necessary transcripts and Churchill provided him with Captain Charles Hatton's copy of Leland and Sir Roger Twysden's copy of Boston.[3] That Tanner should work

---

1. Cf. p.221 and the general tone of Churchill's letters to Tanner.

2. MS. T. 25, f.152. Dr. Hunt, op. cit., p.251 comments on Tanner's reaction to this letter.

3. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.116v and MS. Ballard 33, f.10, both pr. in Hunt, op. cit., p.250.

from a transcript of Leland when the original manuscript was available in the Bodleian Library and had in fact already been used by him[1] is interesting. Admittedly, it was still an age when scholars did not always work from original material even when it was possible to do so but Tanner, at least, was aware of the importance of this principle, and when he had been forced to use a transcript of Leland in preparation for his History of Wiltshire he had taken care to check it later against the original. It seems the intention was that the principal text to be used was that supplied by Hatton, but that this was to be supplemented by constant reference to the original.[2] Tanner must have felt such a course to be somewhat unscholarly and his friend John Byrom most certainly did: "I cannot digest", wrote Byrom vehemently, "ye comparing of another Copy wth y^t of Leland's own writing. It may be of use to observe ye various readings in books, when we are not assured wch was written by ye author; but to what purpose is it to note ye faults of a transcriber, when you have ye true original?".[3] Byrom, as Tanner fully realised, was quite right but he did not entirely appreciate Tanner's difficulties. The originals were not in the best of condition and were only available during the hours in which the Bodleian was open - and that great library, wisely apprehensive of the danger of

---

1. Cf. p. 132, note 2.
2. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.244, Byrom to Tanner, 15 Oct. 1694.
3. MS. T. 25, f.249, Byrom to Tanner, 19 Oct. 1694.

fire, kept to the hours of daylight.[1] Moreover, it was still perhaps intended that the work should be prepared in London and if progress was to be made as quickly as possible then he would of necessity have to use a transcript. It was at one time suggested that he should take a new one of his own[2] for Hatton could hardly be expected to allow his copies to remain on indefinite loan but Tanner apparently did not do this because after his move to Norwich he began to use a transcript at Cambridge.[3] Whatever the ideal preparation might have been, circumstances forced Tanner to use at least three different copies of Leland's work in the preparation of the Bibliotheca.

There was less choice over the copy for Boston because Twysden's was the only one available; fortunately it seems to have been a good quality transcript and it was almost certainly of a highly distinguished provenance.[4] On 26 May Churchill

---

1. Cf. Macray, Annals, p.262.

2. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.160, Churchill to Tanner, 26 May 1694.

3. Cf. MS. T. 470, f.4, a draft prospectus to the Bibliotheca; pr. in Hunt, op. cit., p.253. This was presumably Bale's transcript at Trinity College (see p.204, note 2) which cannot possibly be Hatton's copy because it was presented to the college in 1667, cf. M.R.James, The western manuscripts in the library of Trinity college, Cambridge (Cambr., 1901) vol.ii, p.230. Dr. Hunt (op. cit., p.256) also mentions the two transcripts.

4. Gibson thought that it was possibly unique (cf. MS. T. 25, f.116v) but on 30 July 1695 Churchill told Tanner that Thomas Gale had previously made an unauthorised copy of the transcript; cf. MS. T. 24, f.47. From MS. T. 23, f.38; 24, f.47; and MS. Smith 127, f.303 it appears that among previous owners and users may have been such men as William Camden, Sir William Dugdale, Archbishop Ussher and Edward Stillingfleet, Bishop of

[cont. on next page]

instructed Tanner that Boston was to be transcribed "as soon as may be"[1] and although he was in the midst of preparing his Notitia for the press he had apparently completed this part of the work by the end of July.[2] Some twenty years later he said that he was prepared to answer "pretty well for its being faithfully done"[3] and modern scholarship supports his claim.[4]

Transcription, however, was the most straight-forward part of the project. Even before Churchill had formally commissioned Tanner there had been some earnest discussion on the shape that the forthcoming work was to take, and presumably Tanner's grasp of the difficulties facing him had in no small measure impressed Churchill. Was it to be a dictionary of authors or a chronological literary history?

Were the transcripts to be kept separate from the additions?

Were the authors surveyed to be English or British? A letter

---

4 cont. Worcester, as well as Gale and the Twysden family but these references may perhaps relate to more than one transcript. A number of similar references are listed in Savage, op. cit., Papers of the Edinburgh bibliographical society, vol.xiv, pp.19-21. The only entry relating to Boston's Catalogue to appear in Bernard's Catalogus is to be found in vol.ii, pt.2 (Irish collections) p.7, col.1 among the Clarendon manuscripts, but this probably relates to a contemporary transcript.

1. MS. T. 25, f.160, Churchill to Tanner, 26 May 1694.

2. Churchill had heard that the task was "near done" on 18 July (cf. MS. T. 25, f.181) but he did not receive the manuscript until after 11 October; cf. MS. T. 25, f.235.

3. [B.M.] Stowe MSS. 749, f.36v Tanner to Anstis, 2 Feb. 1719.

4. Cf. p.201, note 4.

written by Gibson on 14 May - and Churchill did not meet Tanner until after the tenth - shows that such questions had already been discussed in some detail[1] and by 26 May the

---

1. MS. Ballard 5, f.37, Gibson to Churchill, 14 May 1694. The relevant part of this letter is worth reproducing:

> By the time that this comes to your hands, I hope you may have made a good progress in the business of Leland, and should be sorry to hear that it must fall into any hands but Mr Tanner's. He is (as I always told you) the most proper person I know of, and will be able to give the best judgment of the method and other things. But as to the Alphabetical order, I can never be reconcil'd to it; tho' I confess the authority of those great men that seem to favour it, makes it too great presumption in me to say soe. But pray consider that nothing is got by it, but what may be amply supply'd by the help of an accurate Index; and there is noe reckoning up those many advantages [that] are lost by it. When a book of this kind is drawn down according to the several Ages, it gives one presently a view of the Learning of each time, to what degrees they were arriv'd, to what studies they were principally inclind (for every age falls in by some accident or other upon a peculiar sort of study). Now if you mangle it for the sake of an Alphabet, this is entirely lost. Besides, several points of Controversie may have been toss'd about, which being manag'd by Contemporary writers, a man has a much better prospect of the original, drift, and design of it when such a Work is done according to order of time, than when you are to seek for the Patrons of each party. 'Tis a vulgar error that Books of this nature are only to be kept by one like Dictionaries for incidental uses; they are certainly to be study'd and read over, and are the best Histories of Learning, soe also indeed of both Ecclesiastical and Civil affairs that one can possibly have recourse to: for such as have had the managem.^t^ of Church or State have been very often eminent for their writings, and have took care to exercise their pens in favour of that party which they particularly espous'd. But a Historie reads but very coldly and confusedly, where you must be forc'd to goe from Henr.I to Henry the 8. and while your thoughts are intent upon an age wherein the Pope's Authority is an Oracle, presently be oblig'd to step into another wherein they tread him underfoot. Now this an Alphabetical order does necessarily oblige one to: but if all these rubbs were out of the road, methinks you ought to pay some respect to poor Leland's Text; which however is not to be chang'd, or indeed mangl'd without a visible necessity, or at least a more manifest convenience than does at present appear to me.

general lines had been settled, at least temporarily.[1] The work was to be arranged chronologically and to include Scottish and Irish writers within its scope.

Although Gibson had eagerly praised Tanner's qualities to Churchill there remained one small doubt, and he confided to Charlett that "Mr Tanner is every way qualify'd for Leland, unless it be in his Latine pen, which a man of his sense & industry will easily make himself master of".[2] The dress of Latin was now quite often discarded for learned works; and this was a situation which in itself encouraged the growth of antiquarian study because living in the country and in the large towns were many people of academic disposition who had not fully mastered the second tongue. Tanner had quite naturally prepared the Notitia Monastica (in spite of its title) in English but the Bibliotheca was to be an authoritative work of reference and one, moreover, that would have a limited appeal abroad. As such it was felt that it should be prepared in Latin but, because it was a work of reference, it called for a directness of style that was a little removed from the everyday Latin with which scholars were acquainted. Gibson broached the matter to Tanner carefully:

> Since I writ last to you, I have been considering, your new Work will put you under a necessitie of using your Latin pen very much, & reading suitable Authors. Besides

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.160, Churchill to Tanner, 26 May 1694; pr. in Hunt, op. cit., pp.251,252.
2. MS. Ballard 5, f.19, Gibson to Charlett, 28 Mar. 1694.

> the bare business of language, there are 2 things methinks I would recommend as peculiar to your undertaking; Quintilians judgment upon all the Authors (in Lib. x. as I remember,)[1] and Cicero's Brutus: both which writers are soe nice and elegant in giving their characters, that he who seeks for a better pattern, will in my mind lose his labour.[2]

In a later letter he again laid emphasis on the importance of style: "You'l agree with me", he wrote, "that there is something in a good language which makes very indifferent things neat and taking; and in bad, which renders solid pertinent sense very awkard[sic] and ridiculous."[3] When reading Gibson's letters there is so much solid common-sense contained in his advice that it is sometimes difficult to remember that he was only a little older than Tanner and it would be hard to underestimate the good influence that he exerted during Tanner's stay at Oxford. Tanner must have sought Gibson's advice as eagerly as his own was later to be sought, but although he himself was not lacking in the encouragement of others - notably Francis Blomefield - he seems to have failed to transmit to them his inherited high standard of scholarship.[4]

---

1. In 1693 Gibson had himself published an edition of Quintilian's De institutione oratoria, cf. p.117.

2. MS. T. 25, f.155, Gibson to Tanner, 22 May 1694.

3. MS. T. 25, f.167, Gibson to Tanner, Jun. 1694.

4. It would be particularly interesting to investigate this point in more general terms. It has been pointed out that later eighteenth century antiquarian research lacks the vitality of that of the seventeenth century and one reason for this may perhaps be that such men as Tanner became so absorbed in their own detailed search for historical accuracy that they failed to transmit any substantive tradition of scholarship to the subsequent generation.

It is probable that during the latter part of 1694 and the first three months of 1695 Tanner was unable to do very much in the way of original research for the Bibliotheca. Not only was the Notitia being printed but he also took Orders and entered upon his new post as chaplain of All Souls'. Churchill must have realised that in the circumstances delay was inevitable for on 31 January 1695 he wrote to Tanner saying "when your leisure allows [I] shall be glad to hear how Leland goes on",[1] but Tanner apparently hastened to assure the publisher that he was making steady, if slow, progress; Churchill was later to thank him for the care he had taken to make Leland "as compl^t as may be".[2] In a work such as this, however, no one man could hope to make any approach at completeness without a modicum of co-operation from other scholars and it was judged that the time had come to make the undertaking more widely known. As early as July 1694 Hatton had been discussing the Bibliotheca with everyone that he met who might be interested in it[3] and in February 1695 Churchill announced in one of his publications that the work was under way.[4] Later he asked Tanner for a Specimen and Title[5] and

---

1. MS. T. 25, f.295, Churchill to Tanner, 31 Jan. 1695.
2. MS. T. 24, f.68, Churchill to Tanner, 4 Feb. 1696.
3. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.184, Churchill to Tanner, 21 Jul. 1694.
4. Cf. Hunt, op. cit., p.252. The advertisement was inserted after the preface to Sir R.Blackmore's Prince Arthur which was published in February 1695. A similar advertisement appears on sig. a2v of Gibson's edition of Camden's Britannia.
5. Cf. MS. T. 24, f.135, Churchill to Tanner, 5 May 1696.

Tanner accordingly drew up a draft set of proposals.[1] No printed copy is known to have survived and it seems probable that none were ever issued;[2] Gibson had not seen a copy more than a year later[3] and, with his widening circle of influential friends, he would surely have been one of the first to have received a copy.

Once the Notitia had been published it is to be supposed that Tanner was able to devote the greater part of his time to the Bibliotheca and in May 1695 Gibson reported to Thoresby that Tanner was "very busy with his Leland, which ... will be a most complete work, and exceed the expectation of the world"[4] and in a later letter he prophetically added that, because of this, the edition would not be likely to appear just yet.[5] Tanner's friends gave him every encouragement: Byrom told him that if Leland's "ashes could speak you would not want thanks, but I hope there are enough living y^{t} will do it";[6] Le Neve assured him that in this undertaking

---

1. A draft of the proposals in Tanner's hand is to be found MS. T. 469*, f.1; Dr. Hunt has printed this as an Appendix; op. cit., pp.257,258.

2. A letter from Byrom to Tanner dated 15 Oct. 1694 (MS. T. 25, f.244) seems at first glance to refer to printed proposals but this can surely be discounted because of the early date. The "Printed Proposalls for Leland" that Churchill mentioned to Tanner on 16 July 1695 (MS. T. 24, f.48) relate to a completely different undertaking.

3. Cf. MS. T. 24, f.151, Gibson to Tanner, 14 Oct. 1696.

4. Letters of eminent men addressed to Ralph Thoresby, vol.i, p.205; Gibson to Thoresby, 9 May 1695.

5. Cf. ibid., vol.i, pp.211,212; Gibson to Thoresby, 30 Jun. 1695.

6. MS. T. 24, f.78v, Byrom to Tanner, 30 Oct. 1695.

his "abilitys are no where question'd";[1] whilst Gibson heartened him with the cheering information that the Churchills were "mighty fond of their Leland: I wish", he added with his usual down-to-earth common sense, "they may mend your bargain, as much as you improve their Book".[2] But Tanner had need of more than verbal encouragement and mere good wishes. Firstly, as has already been pointed out, he needed some scholarly collaboration; this was immediately forthcoming from his friends and, as the work became more widely known, such men as Dr. Bernard and Dr. Cave offered their undoubtedly welcome assistance.[3] Secondly, he needed a position in which he would be free to travel to many different libraries and the forthcoming election to a Fellowship of All Souls seemed to supply an ideal solution to this problem; as Gibson so succinctly pointed out, the design of the Bibliotheca "does ill suit the circumstances of a chaplain,

---

1. MS. T. 24, f.114, Le Neve to Tanner, 16 Jun. 1696.

2. MS. T. 24, f.116, Gibson to Tanner, 21 Jun. 1696.

3. Cf. MS. T. 24, f.148, Churchill to Tanner, 16 Apr. 1696. It is possible that Cave's assistance was never forthcoming: the original offer is contained in a letter that Ralph Frank, a Fellow of Merton College, Oxford, wrote to Tanner on 2 Mar. 1698 (MS. T. 23, f.105):- "I rec^{d} yours, & am exceedingly obliged to you for ye large acc^{t} you have given me of your present design. Dr Cave is mightily pleas^{d} wth it, & wishes you may live to complete ye work. He gives his service to you, & would willingly give you w^{t} assistance he can in promoting so usefull & noble an undertaking: but those Collections y^{t} he has made are but very few, & those not at present to be met wth, because they are scattered amongst several other papers; however he will look them out, & if he finds they will do you any service, he will write to you & send them".

but would be mightily further'd by the preferment you aim at; which (as I take it) is very easy in point of Residence".[1] When the election proved successful it was not only Gibson who stressed its value for the preparation of the Bibliotheca[2] but also Kennett, who exhorted Tanner to remember "the greater Encouragement and the better Opportunity You now have for Restoring the Past and Obliging the Present Age and Posterity".[3]

Even before the election had been held Gibson had been planning Tanner's future travels and at the same time doing his best to further his friend's interest:

> About a fortnight agoe (upon a motion of his Grace's [i.e. Tenison's], to have Bale and Pits reprinted) I mention'd your design to him;[4] and he was very glad to find that these two Authors are like to be superseded by a much more complete and accurate Work. If you succeed, you'l be at liberty to consult the librarys at Cambridge, London, and Lambeth; which your present station will hardly give you leave to doe; at least, not without some inconvenience. At Cambridge, my Lord's interest in Bennet College (which will be your main treasure) will make things very easie to you there: and I doubt not but by the same assistance, you'l have free access to Cotton's Library. As for Lambeth, all the help that this Library affords is at your service; and would be soe, tho' a Friend of your's had nothing to doe in it.[5] As you'l find his Grace very ready to promote your Undertaking; soe (I hope) you will not think fitt to seek out any other Patron of the Work; especially if your success in the election gives you a nearer relation to the College; and his Grace a better title to the Dedication.[6]

---

1. MS. T. 24, f.227, Gibson to Tanner, 20 Oct. 1696.
2. Cf. MS. T. 24, f.210, Gibson to Tanner, 5 Nov. 1696.
3. MS. T. 24, f.212, Kennett to Tanner, 13 Nov. 1696.
4. Cf. MS. T. 24, f.151, Gibson to Tanner, 14 Oct. 1696.
5. At this period Gibson himself was the Lambeth librarian.
6. MS. T. 24, f.215, Gibson to Tanner, 27 Oct. 1696.

William Wake also did what he could to smooth Tanner's path in distant libraries and later promised him "a kind reception, in Generall, at Cambridge".[1] Although Gibson was half expecting Tanner to come to London in the spring of 1697[2] the visit was apparently delayed until the following year;[3] possibly his work on Bernard's Catalogus detained him but it seems more probable that the real reason was that he had not yet exhausted the resources of Oxford's many libraries. Unfortunately the early preparatory work that Tanner performed on the Bibliotheca has not come down to us as it has with both the Notitia and Wiltshire but two little notebooks now in the British Museum seem to have been begun at about this date; they do not, however, indicate what stage Tanner had reached.[4]

During 1697 Nicolson kept the publicity flag flying with a highly commendatory notice in the second part of his English Historical Library[5] whilst Tanner himself enlisted the valuable assistance of Edward Lhuyd, the Welsh scholar who was Curator of the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. Lhuyd was particularly helpful:

> You were desireing I think at parting y^{t} I should give you some Account of our Welsh writers: Those few y^{t} remain of them; you'l find at ye end of Dr Davies's Welsh

---

1. MS. T. 23, f.119, Wake to Tanner, 4 Mar. 1697.
2. Cf. MS. T. 24, f.151, Gibson to Tanner, 14 Oct. 1696.
3. Cf. pp. 29,30.
4. Cf. p.228, note 2.
5. Cf. Nicolson, English historical library, Part II (1697), pp.232,233.

> Dictionary;[1] most of which I have seen in my Travails and can (if that may be acceptable to you) acde the person's names in whose possession they are at present. I have indeed some share of them myself; thô myne are almost all modern copies; transcribd within these 2 or three last yeurs.[2]

This was particularly generous of Lhuyd since he himself intended to publish some account of Welsh writers[3] and the publication of Tanner's work would in some measure cut the ground from under his feet; nevertheless he was not to be deterred from "contributing my mite to so General a Design".[4] It will be remembered that a similar relationship had existed between Tanner and Aubrey over the preparation of the History of Wiltshire and once again Tanner hastened to assure his prospective collaborator that he would not "play the plagiary";[5] he promised that he would "always gratefully own from whence I had my instruction" and pointed out that his work "being to be in Latin, I am willing to believe will not much interfere or hinder ye esteem of yours, wch will be read by several of our own Country, where mine will never come".[6] Lhuyd was as good as his word and his contribution reached Tanner at the end of April 1698, just before Tanner set off on what appears

---

1. i.e. J.Davies, Antiquae linguae Britannicae ... dictionarium duplex (Lond., 1632); sigs. Iii 5v, 6.
2. MS. T. 23, f.152, Lhuyd to Tanner, 25 Sept. 1697.
3. Cf. MS. T. 23, f.54, Lhuyd to Tanner, 20 Oct. 1697.
4. ibid.
5. Cf. p.122.
6. MS. Ashm. 1817b, f.5, Tanner to Lhuyd, ~~2 May 1698~~ 1 Nov. 1697.

to have been his first determined effort to examine libraries outside Oxford.[1] He intended to visit both London and Cambridge during the summer months and then to put the Bibliotheca to the press towards Christmas time.[2]

The correspondence between Tanner and Lhuyd is of particular interest because it helps us to understand the method that Tanner employed in the preparation of his work and to see it in its early stages. If Tanner had not in fact examined any libraries outside Oxford before the summer of 1698 and if he was seriously considering preparing the work for the press before the Christmas of that year he must surely have already compiled a large body of notes and brought them to some order; and such a volume has survived.[3] It is a folio

---

1. Cf. MS. Ashm. 1817b, f.6, Tanner to Lhuyd, 2 May 1698.

2. Cf. ibid.

3. MS. T. 470. This volume did not come to the Bodleian with the bulk of Tanner's papers. It was once no.19032 in the collection of Sir Thomas Phillipps and was purchased by the library as lot 1090 in the Phillipps sale of 21 March 1895. The most obvious account of its provenance would seem to be that after Tanner's death it was handed over to David Wilkins who prepared it for the press (cf. p.250) and then placed it amongst his own books. Wilkins had married a sister of the sixth Lord Fairfax and his library came together with the valuable Fairfax manuscripts, the whole collection being sold at Christie's on 10 January 1831 as the property of George Wilkins, a sale often referred to as the Leeds Castle sale. Phillipps is known to have bought widely at this sale (cf. A.N.L.Munby, Phillipps studies, no.3 (Cambr., 1954) pp.44,45); he certainly acquired a number of Tanner-Wilkins manuscripts in this way, and these later appeared as lots 425, 496-500, 502 and 505 in the Phillipps sale of 6 June 1898. It seems, however, that this cannot be the real provenance of the volume, for Phillipps, in his privately printed catalogue, arranged his material in groups according to place of purchase and no. 19032 is "Ex Bibl. Miscellaneis" whilst the Tanner papers at

[cont. on next page].

volume containing notes arranged in alphabetical order of Christian names, and covering the letters A - H.[1] Knowing that Tanner had originally intended to arrange the work chronologically - an idea he had not completely abandoned much later[2]- it seems at first that these collections may perhaps be of a later date than 1698 but a close examination seems to indicate that this volume was probably commenced in 1697 - possibly earlier - and certainly that it represents Tanner's primary collections. He has arranged his notes in single columns on the inner half of each leaf, and after making a brief biographical entry he has left a small space and then entered the bibliographical information; a larger space follows and then the next entry appears, a method which left a large part of each leaf available for future additions. These have been liberally made but if they are ignored it becomes apparent that the work was basically compiled from such printed sources

---

3 cont. nos.10425-10429 are entered as "Leeds Castle MSS". There is no specific entry in the Wilkins sale catalogue for this volume, or for any other Tanner material, and it seems that Phillipps' purchases must have been covered by the general entry for lot 113; a note in the British Museum copy of the sale catalogue (PR. 1. b. 38) suggests that the transcript of Boston was contained in this lot. Boston was no.10428 in Phillipps' collections and was bought by Cambridge University Library as lot 500 in the sale of 6 June 1898, cf. p.201. Phillipps certainly obtained some Tanner material from sources other than the Leeds Castle sale, e.g. from Craven Ord, cf. MS. Phillipps 3828, 3842, 4094.

1. There would therefore seem to be at least two volumes missing; cf. also p.246. They were not included in the Phillipps sale and their whereabouts is not known.

2. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.92, Tanner to Charlett, 4 Feb. 1709; see p. 242.

as the works of Bale, Pits, Wood, and Dempster and from such manuscript sources as were available in Oxford and in most instances in the Bodleian itself. All this is self-evident because of the admirable care that Tanner took to quote his authorities, but his references to material contained in libraries outside of Oxford appear to be additions, as does the information supplied by Lhuyd[1] which we know that Tanner had in his possession in April 1698. It seems therefore safe to assume that this alphabetically arranged volume was drawn up by Tanner at a time when he was still contemplating a chronological arrangement for the final volume, and this is hardly surprising because, as has been pointed out,[2] it would have been difficult to organise a mass of notes to which constant reference was necessary in any other way.

In spite of financial complications Tanner's proposed visit to London in the summer of 1698 did in fact take place. His fellowship was more generous in point of time than in monetary reward and the £40 (if indeed that was the sum) that he had received from Churchill four years ago had no doubt considerably dwindled if it had not entirely disappeared. A letter from Gibson shows that once again his invaluable help

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 470, ff.91v, 94v, &c. On one occasion (f.160) notes based on Lhuyd's information (or rather on Davies' Dictionary) appear to fall into the original alphabetical arrangement but a closer examination shows that the leaf is of different paper and has been inserted.

2. Cf. Hunt, op. cit., p.256.

had been enlisted:-

> This morning, I talkt to Mr Churchil, with the indiff-erence you order'd, as to coming to London, Lambeth, and Cambridge. He expressd all the dissatisfaction about it, that you or I could desire which gave me an oportunitie of suggesting the extraordinary and unforseen charges. He agre'ed with me in every particular, and desir'd me to invite you hither, soe soon as you can conveniently come; giving all assurance (under a direct promise) that he will be ready to consider the charges of travelling and living here, separate from ye original bargain.[1]

Thus encouraged, and armed with material for noting the addi-tions to the framework that he had already prepared,[2] Tanner spent the summer months in London examining the contents of as many libraries as possible, but in August circumstances forced him to return to Oxford with his researches unfinished.[3]

---

1. MS. T. 22, f.201, Gibson to Tanner, 3 May 1698.

2. Two volumes of notes that Tanner made for the Bibliotheca are to be found in the British Musuem, Add. MSS. 6261,6262. They were presented by John Loveday. The notes were appar-ently made on loose pieces of paper but the present order is that adopted by Tanner because he has numbered the leaves and attempted to compile an index; Add. MSS. 6261, f.190v. Cer-tain items are dated and the earliest of these that I have noted is 29 April 1696 when Tanner visited the library of Lincoln College, Oxford (6262, f.114); Tanner was still making notes after 1715; cf. 6261, f.89v. Nearly all the libraries visited were at Oxford, Cambridge, and London.

3. Cf. MS. T. 22, f.105, Tanner to Moore, Aug. 1698. Tanner had not as yet completed his researches in Oxford: [B.M.] Add. MSS. 6261, ff.28-31, contains memoranda on printed books in the library of New College and is dated 20 October 1699. His investigations were undoubtedly thorough and in Add. MSS. 6262, ff.96-159, are to be found notes on the libraries of Corpus Christi, University, Lincoln, Balliol, Oriel, The Queens, Magdalen, Merton, Christ Church, Trinity, Brasenose, and Exeter Colleges. Many of these notes are dated 1696 or 1697. In addition to several other foundations in Oxford he also consulted the University Archives, cf. Add. MSS. 6261, ff.1-9, 11 et alia.

He had, however, been introduced to John Moore, Bishop of Norwich, whose private library was one of the foremost in the land. Moore promptly made Tanner his private secretary and chaplain and promised him every assistance.[1] This appointment, which soon resolved itself into the office of librarian,[2] was apparently intended by Moore primarily to assist with the Bibliotheca, and he later told Tanner that "perhaps no man more desires the finishing of the Learned work in your hands, or will be more pleased wth it when it is publisht than I".[3] Indeed, the free use of Moore's library must have been a great help because it was so large that even Moore himself, ardent bibliophile though he was, "like a man over rich", did not always know just what it contained.[4] At about this time it consisted of "five rooms, besides Closets"[5] but it was rapidly growing, a process which Tanner himself did much to assist, and it was not long before Thoresby was

> "surprised with the Bishop's yet growing library, eight chambers (as I remember) that almost surround the quadrangle, and which is most valuable, many of them most noble manuscripts, and the rarest editions of printed authors, with

---

1. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.32v, Tanner to Charlett, 11 May 1698. (P.S. dated 12 May).
2. Cf. pp. 315,316 .
3. MS. T. 21, f.81, Moore to Tanner, 2 Jun. 1699.
4. Cf. MS. T. 21, f.181, Wake to Tanner. 14 Nov. 1699.
5. W.Nicolson, "Diary", in Transactions, Cumberland and Westmoreland antiquarian and archaeological society, new ser., vol.i, p.39.

emendations and additions under the authors' own hands, &c."[1]

Part of Tanner's duties as librarian was to attend book-auctions and these, together with their catalogues, provided yet another source of research for the Bibliotheca.[2] Nevertheless, Moore's patronage eventually lead to a position where it ceased to help the preparation of Tanner's work and even became a major factor in its failure to appear. Meanwhile, however, Tanner was able to prepare the Bibliotheca in fairly pleasant circumstances for the next two and a half years.

In November 1698 Bernard's Catalogus finally appeared and for the first time Tanner was able to make an accurate assessment of the amount of material available that should be consulted before his work went to the press. Probably he had prepared some sort of organised plan of campaign when he journeyed once more to London in the following summer but unfortunately illness intervened; research was out of the question and his condition became so bad that there were fears for his life. On his recovery Moore wrote to him and admitted:

---

1. Thoresby, Diary, vol.ii, p.116.

2. [B.M.] Add. MSS. 6262, f.194, shows that Tanner had examined nearly all the catalogues of the sales until the close of 1678 that are listed in the British Museum List of catalogues of English book sales (1915). These, as it happened, were available among Wood's collections but there is every reason to suppose that Tanner consulted several later sale catalogues, and notes from some of these are to be found [B.M.] Add. MSS. 6261, ff.82-85, 88v; 6262, f.20v. Cf. also MS. Eng. misc. f.66, pp.44-47, which is a small notebook containing several notes for the Bibliotheca.

> I did grievously Lament the loss, there was so much cause to suspect, we had suffer'd. I will take the pleasure to tell you, what under those fears I declared to others: that the work you was pursuing was most useful, & y^t^ no hand could bring it to the perfection you would have done: however that I would joyn wth your Learned friends & spare neither labour, cost, nor trouble to animate & aid them in finishing & making it public, & doing the greatest right we could to y^r^ memory.[1]

The illness was smallpox and, because of the effect that this had on his eyes, Tanner was ordered to avoid reading. He went to recuperate in the country at his father's house at Market Lavington[2] and once more the publication of the Bibliotheca was postponed.

The following year, 1700, the battle was renewed and the summer saw Tanner again making the journey to London in search of materials for his design, but on this occasion he also managed to visit the libraries of Cambridge[3] and other East Anglian repositories[4] before he returned to Oxford in the September.[5] A month later he wrote an interesting letter to Lhuyd in which he reviewed his researches to date and added "I hope I have pretty well got together most of the Materials

---

1. MS. T. 21, f.108, Moore to Tanner, 28 Jun. 1699.

2. The illness was in the June, cf. p. 41 . He had apparently renewed his researches in Oxford by 20 October, cf. p. 228, note 3 .

3. Tanner's notebooks do not contain many references to Cambridge libraries, but among those colleges visited were Corpus Christi, Emmanuel, Gonville and Caius, Trinity, and Pembroke Hall; cf. [B.M.], Add. MSS. 6261, ff.109-129, 138, 139-141; 6262, ff.167, 168, 185.

4. e.g. Lincoln Cathedral, cf. [B.M.] Add. MSS. 6261, ff.143-154.

5. Cf. MS. Ashm. 1817b, f.8, Tanner to Lhuyd, 11 Oct. 1700.

England will afford, and shall this winter begin to drew them up for the Press".[1]

As usual Tanner's good intentions came to nothing and at the beginning of the following year Moore's patronage brought him the post of Chancellor of the diocese of Norwich. This appointment filled Tanner's time most effectively and the work that he had been unable to bring to completion in the quiet academic atmosphere of his Fellowship of All Souls had now to be continued amongst the hurly burly of diocesan administration in a city which, as Tanner was often to complain, was ill-provided with libraries. Even Moore kept the greater part of his collections at London[2] so that this source was not readily available although it was no doubt not impossible to have such books as he needed transferred to Norwich. Moore must have known that this appointment would seriously impair the preparation of the Bibliotheca and it is to be supposed that it was conferred on Tanner not as the prospective author

---

1. MS. Ashm. 1817b, f.8. The relevant portion of this letter is printed in both Davies and Hunt, opp. cit. It is interesting to compare this letter with the account that Bale gave of his preparation for his Catalogus a century and a half earlier: this is given on sig. G2 of his edition of Leland's Laborious journey and it will be seen that in general his sources were the same as Tanner's. A list of the libraries that he visited at Oxford and Cambridge is given at pp.575,577 of Bale's Index. Cf. also J.W.Harris, Bale, p.113. It was at about the same time as Tanner's journeyings that Wanley undertook a very similar pilgrimage; cf. C.E.Wright, "Humfrey Wanley", Proceedings of the British academy, vol.xlvi, pp.105,106.

2. Cf. p. 318.

of a learned work in which Moore was interested but as the prospective husband of a young lady in whom the bishop was interested to an even greater degree - his eldest daughter. Hearne firmly attributed Tanner's immediate failure to publish the Bibliotheca to this marriage[1] and, whilst this certainly falls short of the truth, it must be admitted that the two events were not entirely unconnected.

Whatever Tanner's position in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, in the world of scholarship at large there was still the same need for a work of this kind that had existed when he undertook the project in 1694 and it is hardly to be wondered at that other scholars began to encroach upon his academic preserves. But it was perhaps surprising that this encroachment should take the direct form that it did and, moreover, that it should come from such an unexpected quarter. Anthony Hall, a member of Tanner's former college, with the encouragement of Edward Thwaites and some others of his colleagues on the foundation of Queen's, proposed to issue an edition of Leland's De Scriptoribus, and if Hearne's allegations that the motivating force was purely to attack Tanner[2] are true then the modern assessment that the whole event was "one of the shabbiest tricks in the whole history of English scholarship"[3]

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.ii, p.9. See also p.243, note 3.
2. Cf. Hearne, vol.ii, p.164.
3. Douglas, English scholars, p.162.

is certainly to be accepted.

At the end of 1704 Charlett broke the news of Hall's edition to Tanner and for once Tanner forsook his usual procrastination over his correspondence:

> Your Letter of the 15th. instant miss'd me at London and did not come to my hands till Saturday morning last. I take the opportunity of this first post to thank you for your intelligence about a new Editor of Leland, wch I am not a little concern'd to hear! The Gentleman named is a person of good industry & abilities and much fitter perhaps for that Work than I am: however I must crave leave to say, that he may oblige the World wth many things out of the Bodleian Library wch may be as much to his credit and advantage; without injuring or slurring a Brother Drudge. He and those that set him upon it, well know, that I have spent a great deal of time and pains upon that design, and double the mony the Copy will ever bring in, 'twould therefore have been I conceive but good manners to have sent to me to know, whether I had laid that design aside? I have always declared the contrary and am almost every week preparing my Collections for the Press: whither they will be sent as fast as the many avocations of a troublesome office will permit me. I hope upon 2d thoughts these Gentlemen will not be so hasty, some of Mr. Hern's neighbors have been as tedious as my self, I believe upon no better reasons. I shall thank you for your endeavors to stop it at Your Press, and am willing to believe that you and the rest of the Delegates will not countenance such disingenuous and ill usage: I cant help terming it so. If you hear that it goes on, I beg the favor of another Letter on this subject.[1]

The rival edition was publicly announced in August 1705[2] and soon after this Hearne happened to meet with Thwaites who denied that Hall was to publish the De Scriptoribus, and even asserted that the announcement had been made without

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.71, Tanner to Charlett, 21 Dec. 1704.

2. History of the works of the learned, vol.vii, August, (Lond., 1705) p.511. I owe this reference to Hearne, vol.i, p.44.

Hall's consent;[1] but a week later Thwaites was ready to admit that Hall's edition had in fact been started and that it would certainly be published "unless Mr. Tanner does it very quickly".[2] Charlett had by now rallied to his friend and former protégé's side and in the following month he was able to report that Hall had been persuaded to give up the rival edition on the assurance that Tanner was in fact making every effort to get the De Scriptoribus into print.[3] Tanner must have felt extremely relieved at this welcome news and he doggedly continued with his researches.

Nearly three years later the Bibliotheca still had not appeared and Charlett, who fully realised that this continued procrastination was beginning to tax scholarly patiences, started to urge haste; but Tanner, in distant Norwich, replied that he was working as fast as he could and complained that he possessed neither the facilities nor the time to complete the work to his satisfaction:

> I have both your kind letters before me, and heartily ask pardon for not sooner answering your former, and thanking you for your very obliging offer therein of the Conveniencies of your House, when Leland shall be put to the Press. That is an affair you have very often mentioned to me, and in truth you have a right so to do, as having been the occasion of putting that Work into such an idle Fellows hands. 'Tis true, that I could have done what was first proposed, the bare Printing Leland & Boston of Bury and supplying what was wanting by

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.i, p.44.
2. ibid., p.47.
3. ibid., p.58.

wholesale out of Bale and Pits within a twelve month as our agreem^{t} was, and this perhaps might have answered the Booksellers end, and been satisfactory enough to many other people: But when I enlarged the Design and could not be perswaded to take characters of men and notices of books upon trust, there was a necessity of longer time, and you can witness as well as any body, how closely I follow'd it in the Libraries at Oxford, London, and Cambridge - and thereupon spent the prime of my youth, and more money (than ever I shall receive for the Copy) and endangered my Life when I had the small pox in that service. Since Providence placed [me] in this post here, I have met with many unexpected avocations, wch have much hindered me in finishing that Work, tho' I have done weekly something toward it, and do by the grace of God fully intend to go on with it and endeavor to answer the expectation of the World and my Friends as fast as the busy station (wherein I have reason to believe I do some good, or at least prevent a great deal of mischief) I am in, will possibly permit. I can do no more. I am not, nor have any more inclination than ever to be, lazy - Nor have any private ends to serve by it - but shall rather be content to sit down wth the loss of my time, pains, expences and credit, rather than it should want the improvem^{ts} of a better hand. I shall be ready to comply wth any thing you or any other Friend shall advise as trouble - I'm sufficiently dunn'd of all hands, the B^{p}. has told the Queen of it, this year or two - M^{r}. Churchill who has the most reason to be uneasy, has been extremely civil on this occasion - but I hope in reasonable time I shall give tolerable satisfaction to all.

One g. discouragem^{t} to me here is that we have nothing in this town that deserves the name of a Public Library, and the Supellex literaria in private hands diminishes dayly; that varlet H.Wanly came down into this Country and privily carried of the best Library in the Diocese for the use of Secretary Harley I mean Sr Simonds Dewes's. D^{r}. Trimnell last year carried hence as many books (tho' not so good) as you have and now the B^{p}. is packing up 2. or 3. Rooms he had here.[1]

Charlett's letter was not without its effect and a fortnight later John Tanner told Hearne that his brother was now very hard at work on Leland and that it would soon be ready for the press.[2]

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.84, Tanner to Charlett, 25 Jun. 1707.

2. Cf. Hearne, vol.ii, p.25.

Expedition was well-advised for academic discontent with Tanner's performance had spread far beyond the walls of Queen's College and even his friends were somewhat perturbed: Browne Willis believed that Tanner would "hardly ever publish Leland"[1] and Hearne, who was beginning to turn his attentions to Leland on his own account, complained that Tanner was stopping the way for other editors.[2] Even Tanner's father-in-law, Moore, admitted that Tanner was "not very forward"[3] with the work and that they may have to "wait a great while yet"[4] for the Bibliotheca, whilst Thomas Smith deliberately, but privately, expressed the wish that Hearne, or some other competent editor, would forestall Tanner with another edition of Leland.[5] Smith's unscholarly wish was soon gratified for within six months Hearne was able to tell him regretfully that Hall had resumed his former task.[6] Tanner was not long in being informed of this new development and he aired his grievances in a letter to Charlett:-

> I have had the same complaint to make agst. our old friend the Rector of Lambeth[7] as you have, for not writing above 2. Letters this year and half. I was pretty much concern'd at his last, wherein he gives me an account of

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.i, p.45.
2. Cf. ibid., vol.ii, p.53.
3. Cf. ibid., p.35.
4. Cf. ibid., p.53.
5. Cf. ibid., p.58.
6. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 37/38, f.161, Hearne to Smith, 15 Feb. 1708; see Hearne, vol.ii, p.94.
7. i.e. Edmund Gibson.

an 8° Edition of Leland going on at the Theater under the care of Mr Hall and the encouragem.t of Mr Professor Thwaites. I am sorry I had no friend in the University that would send me notice of their intentions, before so many sheets had been work'd off, perhaps other methods, not less for the Public Good, might have been suggested. I could not, I confess, have expected such usage from my own College; especially from my old acquaintance, whose friendship I am not sensible I had any way forfeited. Surely, it had been but fair, (when they knew I had so long since laid my hands on this Book and been at so great expence of time & money in getting materials toward the improvem.t of it) to have first known my Resolutions about publishing it, I should have given them a full and civil answer - but I am now printed upon without the least notice, tho' I was more than once last year in company w.th the Gentlemen concern'd - and every where declared my fixed intentions of publishing that Work and my own Collections as fast as my leisure would possibly permit. It is now printed I'm told at the University charge, w.ch is a favor I should not have ask'd nor expected, tho' you, Sir, well know I should have some pretence thereto, from the many little services I was employ'd in while I lived in Oxford in sorting Mr. Wood's Papers, Cataloguing them, dividing his Books, making several Catalogues of MSS &c. - without so much as a single Copy from the Public. Your particular kindnesses to me indeed were so many and so great, that I thought whatever pains I took fully recompensed by your acceptance and encouragem.t of them - and tho' from the Publick, who had the benefit, I never hoped for any gratuity or so much as thanks, yet it was not unreasonable to think one might [have] been thereby preserv'd from such a manifest slight and indignity - not to say, injury; for tho' the Copy no doubt was free to any other member of the University as well as to me, yet after I had spent so much time and been at great charges in transcribing, collating, and collecting materials for the improvem.ts necessary to a Work so long since compiled, it is some kind of hardship to be deprived of the advantage of the Copy. But I ask pardon for troubling you so much about an affair; when 'tis too late to remedy it, and tho' upon my first writing I can't help expressing some resentm.t of it, and therefore hope from your prudence & Friendship that you'd keep these my thoughts about it to yourself - and let things work out as they will.[1]

It is easy to feel sorry for Tanner over this matter, but one can also see Hall's point of view for Tanner had not produced

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.89, Tanner to Charlett, 12 May 1708.

the work as had been promised nor was there any apparent prospect of his doing so. Most scholars sympathised with Tanner; but whilst Hall was generally condemned for his behaviour, which was regarded as a breach of good manners[1], there was also a widespread feeling of relief that Leland's text was at last to appear. As Smith observed, Tanner had been very ill dealt with but as he had not published his edition of Leland according to his undertaking of thirteen or fourteen years ago "one might have imagined that he had wholly laid aside that designe".[2] Hearne anticipated Smith's sentiments when he wrote in his diary that "however M^r. Hall, & the rest of Queen's Coll. may brag of the Performance, they are & will be condemn'd by all men of Ingenuity & sincerity, such as are guided by a publick spirit, & are not for discouraging Men of known Abilities, such as M^r. Tanner is, who is, I really believe, the best qualify'd (considering his own Natural Genius, & the Great Assistance from M^r. Wood's Papers, & other Papers communicated to him by Friends) for making this a compleat Work of any Man in England. Yet I am very glad the Book is printed, provided he had had M^r. Tanner's Leave".[3]

---

1. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 37/38, f.205v, Hearne to Smith, 18 Jan. 1709.
2. Cf. MS. Smith 127, f.303, Smith to Hearne, 26 Jan. 1709.
3. Hearne, vol.ii, pp.164,165.

Hall's work[1] was published early in 1709[2] and Hearne immediately fell to criticism, rapidly finding that Hall had "committed most gross Errors" and coming to the splenetic but unlikely conclusion that neither Hall nor the people that he employed could read the original manuscript.[3] It is well known that all Hearne's criticism must be carefully weighed before it can be accepted for he was a man of acute likes and dislikes and these often coloured his opinions of a man's scholarly ability. He obviously disliked Hall[4] but

---

1. J.Leland, Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis, nunc primus ed. A.Hall, (Oxonii, 1709).

2. Cf. Hearne, vol.ii, p.164. Hearne sent Smith a copy on 1 February (cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 37/38, f.208) and Tanner had received a copy by 4 February; cf. pp.24,242. The imprimatur is dated 11 December 1708.

3. Hearne, vol.ii, p.174.

4. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 37/38, f.211, Hearne to Smith, 27 Feb. 1709; pr. in Hearne, vol.ii, pp.171,172:
"As for Mr. Hall's Design of another Vol. of English Historians, I believe at present 'tis nothing else but amusement, he being a Man of no Industry, it being common with him to lye abed 'till very near dinner time, and to drink very freely of the strongest Liquors. About a Fortnight since I din'd in Queen's College, and being afterwards in the Common-Room with Mr. Thwaites, and only two more of the Fellows, Mr. Hall's Advertisement was mention'd, and they all agreed that it should not have been added, they being sure, that he would never do anything. Mr. Thwaites at the same time condemn'd the latter Part of his Edition of Leland, as being negligently done, which he said might have been done much better if he would have condescended to have let him look over the Sheets, as he did the first Part, which he said was very well corrected, and accurately perform'd, tho' I knew the quite contrary, notwithstanding I said nothing."

in this instance it must be remembered that he was particularly qualified to offer criticism because he was himself in the course of setting new standards of editing and he had, moreover, particular access to the original manuscript. His final assessment that the work was entirely unsatisfactory[1] was based on a careful collation of the printed and original texts.[2] But Hearne's high standards were by no means general and it would perhaps be fairer to Hall to say that compared with the general run of contemporary editors his work was little below average and was by no means without its value. It is still the only printed edition of this interesting text. Tanner, at last face to face with the offending edition, was less inclined than Hearne to be censorious:

> .. I am obliged to you ... for the printed Leland, wch I just now received by the London Waggon. I have not had time to run it over, but it seems to be handsomly and, I believe is, correctly printed, and I must acknowlege the respectfull mention of my self, tho' I neither feared nor expected any ill words from the Editor, as having deserved no bad usage at his or any of his Encouragers' hand. During the whole dependance of this undertaking, you, to whom I have writ my thoughts freely, know that I

---

1. Cf. p. 243.

2. Hearne's copy of Hall's edition is now in the Bodleian Library, 8° Rawl. 57. It bears many notes of the discrepancies that Hearne found between the two texts until on p.135 appears the note "So far I compared this very faulty Ed. w^e with the original MS. before I was ejected (upon account of ye Oaths) the publick Library, After which time I could not have liberty (as I desir'd) to compare the rest. The Corrections which come after are only some that I did now and then before my Ejectment. But I designed to have examin'd the whole most nicely, as it ought to be done". Hearne had been deprived of his office of Under-Librarian of the Bodleian on 23 January 1716, cf. Macray, Annals, p.193.

> have shew'd as little resentm.t as any body so nearly concern'd possibly could, always thinking it my duty to sacrifice my own private sentiments and interest to what in the better judgment of my superiors would so much advance the public state of Learning. My design was last year and is still, as much as it was 13. year since to print Leland entirely, by interweaving his Writers w.th my own, as they shall happen in order of time or Alphabetically making his works the Text - but finding that he had entirely omitted above 2000. British Writers, and that of those he dos mention he had given a very imperfect account of their Writings, I could not satisfy my self that the bare edition of Leland's book (w.ch undoubtedly exceeded everything in the kind before his time) without the addition of such new Authors and Writings as later searches of Libraries have discovered, would answer the expectation of the world or turn to the Booksellers account. M.r Harrington you also know M.r intended great improvements;[1] if it had pleased God to have afforded him Life and Leisure, his happy pen would have done Leland more honor and the world more service[2] than M.r. H[all] or I can pretend to.

The general tone of this letter hardly conveys the impression that the Bibliotheca was ready for the press, so that the notice that Tanner inserted to that effect in the Daily Courant for 22 March 1709[3] can only be regarded as a gesture of defiance; at all events the work did not appear. But both this advertisement and the publication of Hall's edition revived public interest in Tanner's undertaking and many of Hearne's correspondents mentioned it with anticipation.[4] Hearne himself seems to have summed up the general feeling when he wrote that he would be "mightily glad to see M.r.

---

1. Cf. p.204, note 1.
2. MS. Ballard 4, f.92, Tanner to Charlett, 4 Feb. 1709.
3. I have not myself seen this; I owe the reference to Hearne, vol.ii, p.177.
4. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 23-25, f.521, Wolf to Hearne, 29 Mar. 1709 and MS. Smith 127, f.313v, Smith to Hearne, 2 Apr. 1709.

Tanner's long expected Work ... For the truth of it is the Queen's College Edition is a very pittifull Performance".[1] As late as 10 September Tanner was still expecting to complete the work by the end of the winter[2] but, as usual with all his attempts to get either of his works to the press, when it came to the point he seems to have felt that his researches were insufficiently complete to warrant publication and he avoided the issue with yet another postponemont.

Hearne published an edition of Leland's Itinerary between 1710 and 1712[3] and whilst this was in progress he began to prepare the ground for a companion edition of the Collectanea by borrowing some manuscripts from Roger Gale.[4] Gale's father, Thomas Gale the eminent historian,[5] had at one time proposed to publish an edition of the De Scriptoribus and although he had made no great progress with it he had made a few additions to the text, and among his collections was

---

1. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 37/38, f.228, Hearne to Smith, 4 Jun. 1709.

2. Cf. Hearne, vol.ii, p.254.

3. Cf. pp.107. In 1705 Sir Andrew Fountaine had encouraged Hearne to publish an edition of Leland on the grounds that "if it depends upon Mr Tanner we shall, I beleive, hardly ever see any thing new of that Author. I'de fain know what any man is able to publish that has a young wife and a law suite upon his hands? I doubt the husband has spoilt the Editor; therefore pray Mr Herne take care of Matrimony?", MS. Rawl. lett. 28/29, f.80v. Sir Andrew was referring to Tanner's marriage with Rose Moore and to the legal dispute over his Chancellorship.

4. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 39, f.13v, Hearne to R.Gale, Draft, 14 Dec. 1711.

5. Thomas Gale, 1635?-1702, Dean of York; many of his publications were closely allied to Tanner's researches.

much relevant material.[1] He had even ~~acquired a manuscript~~ taken a transcript of Boston of Bury.[2] After Tanner advertised the Bibliotheca in 1709 Roger Gale had offered to communicate these additions to Tanner[3] but whether the offer was accepted or not is not clear; in any case Gale does not seem to have been particularly impressed with Tanner's efforts to put the work to the press even if he thought highly of his abilities. When he readily offered Hearne, who had an excellent publishing record, all that that scholar might require for his edition of the Collectanea he enquired good humouredly enough after the Bibliotheca but added that he could not imagine "what any body can propose by promising the printing of a book, when he designs no such thing, he certainly contracts a debt by it, that in honour he ought to pay if capable".[4] Tanner soon heard of Hearne's intentions and he hastily wrote to Oxford to find out if Hearne was going to print the De Scriptoribus in with his edition of the Collectanea.[5] In fact Hearne, who firmly believed that "no one should enter upon it till M^r. Tanner had thrown it by",[6] had no such intention, but even

---

1. Cf. MS. Ballard 17, f.47, Gale to Charlett, 14 Jun. 1709.
2. Cf. p. 214, note 4.
3. Cf. MS. Ballard 17, f.47. The manuscripts which Roger Gale inherited from his father and which Tanner was being offered the use of are listed in Bernard's Catalogus, part III, p.185.
4. MS. Rawl. lett. 5/6, f.303, Gale to Hearne, 21 Dec. 1711.
5. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.107, Tanner to Charlett, 20 Oct. 1712.
6. MS. Rawl. lett. 37/38, f.205v, Hearne to Smith, 18 Jan. 1709.

before Tanner knew this he had said that whatever happened he would continue to work at the Bibliotheca as fast as he possibly could.[1] Indeed, there was much to be said for such an attitude because, as Hall had earlier pointed out,[2] a straightforward edition of the De Scriptoribus was not so very closely connected with the much wider project that Tanner had in hand; and Nicolson, too, laid stress on the comprehensive aspect of the Bibliotheca when he wrote in the second edition of his English Historical Library that Tanner had corrected innumerable errors in the works of Leland, Bale, and Pits and that he had "those many and large Additions to all that they could tell us, that we shall have reason to look upon the Work as entirely new and his own".[3]

The activities of Hall and Hearne seem to have disheartened Tanner with the result that he diverted his attentions to other matters, and when Samuel Knight mentioned the Bibliotheca to him in 1720 Tanner's reply showed that Hall's treatment of him still rankled; nevertheless he repeated his fixed intention of printing the work when his time would permit, and added that he believed that Knight knew him well enough to vouch "that I am as seldom idle as anybody, having not for some years allowed myself a week's time to relax

---

1. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.107.
2. Leland, De scriptoribus, ed. Hall, Preface, sig. a4.
3. Nicolson, English historical library, Part II (1697) p.233.

amongst my friends, especially in London".[1] Two years later it was announced in the Bibliotheca Literaria[2] that Tanner's work was preparing for the press, but once again this announcement seems to have been nothing more than an attempt to keep the work in the public eye and three years after this Hearne was rapidly coming to the conclusion that Tanner would never publish Leland or Boston - "I begin now to despair of seeing them from him" he wrote on 7 August 1725.[3] Later in the same year he was discussing the affair with a small group of antiquaries: together they decided that Tanner must by now have abandoned the work and Hearne undertook to edit Boston himself if he could obtain a transcript; it was suggested that Awnsham Churchill, the originator of the project, might perhaps have one.[4] Hearne quickly abandoned his plan when, a fortnight later, he called on Tanner at Christ Church and found him with "about six Folios before him, wch he said were what he had done for his Scriptores Britannici, which I understood from him he still prosecutes with as much Industry and Application as his Affairs will permit. Which I am glad of. For, indeed, I was afraid that he had laid aside this worthy Design".[5] Hearne's expectation was renewed in the following year when

---

1. Nichols, Literary history, vol.iv, p.326.
2. Bibliotheca literaria. No.1 (Lond., 1722), p.46.
3. Hearne, vol.viii, p.412.
4. ibid., vol.ix, p.24.
5. ibid., p.31.

Tanner's secretary told him that the second edition of the Notitia was nearly completed and that Tanner "when that Work was ended, would put to the Press another, w^ch, I suppose, may be that de Scriptoribus Britannicis".[1]

By now, however, Tanner's ecclesiastical commitments were beginning to mount up; less and less free time was available for his studies and when he had become a Canon of Christ Church in 1724 his academic friends were almost inclined to regard the appointment as meaning yet further delays, in spite of the fact that it once more opened up the vast library resources of Oxford to him. His "multiplicity of other business"[2] inevitably resulted in slow progress with the Bibliotheca and Thomas Baker was only giving voice to what was patently obvious when he observed that if Tanner could "abstract himself from the World ... he might do better service in the History of Learning".[3] But Tanner was the conscientious chancellor of a large diocese and the Church might offer him material rewards that were not to be looked for in the literary world; he had, moreover, friends in high places and, as he had attained the academic eminence that seemed to be a partial consideration in the selection of the members of the episcopal bench without the bother of publishing any work since the 1695 Notitia, there was really no question as

---

1. Hearne, vol.ix, p.186.
2. MS. Rawl. lett. 23-25, f.291, Baker to Hearne, 14 Oct. 1725.
3. ibid.

to which way his energies should be directed. Nevertheless, it was obvious that time was running out; he was now in his fifties - Baker was already expressing the hope that Tanner would live to complete his works[1]- and when to his other offices was added that of Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation Hearne correctly surmised that there was now "no great prospect of our having any publick Work of Learning from him during his Life".[2] Tanner died on 14 December 1735 with the Bibliotheca still unpublished.

It will be seen that the fate of the Bibliotheca was very similar to that of the Notitia, and this is hardly surprising when in both cases their failure to appear sprang from the same fundamental defect that was part of Tanner's character; but there was an essential difference in the nature of the two works for the Notitia was commenced and had been continued as a labour of love, whilst there was a commercial element about the Bibliotheca that makes its non-appearance the more interesting. From the beginning Awnsham Churchill showed himself remarkably tolerant over Tanner's continued procrastination, although he may in fact have lost much of his personal interest in the project after his entry into politics in 1705;[3] nevertheless, the Churchill firm remained very much to the fore in

---

1. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 23-25, f.291.
2. Hearne, vol.ix, p.401.
3. Churchill was a member of Parliament for Dorchester from 1705 to 1710, cf. Plomer, Dictionary of booksellers, 1668-1725, s.n. Churchill.

the publishing world and it is only to be expected that they should look for some return from the money that had been invested. Tanner's conscience seems to have pricked him in this matter and he eventually came to some arrangement with Churchill whereby the publisher waived all his rights in the work on the promise that "if he had any nephew[1] a Bookseller he should have first refusall of a Copy upon a reasonable gratifaction".[2] Churchill died in 1728 but it is not clear how long before this the agreement was reached;[3] in any case its terms show that the eventual publication of the work was thought to be some considerable time hence.

In his will dated 22 November 1733 Tanner had made provision for the continuation of the Bibliotheca after his death. He directed that his collections towards illustrating Leland together with the transcript of Boston of Bury should be "put into the hands of some industrious scholar who hath a love and Genius for English history and the Antiquities of this

---

1. Churchill was unmarried but his brother John, with whom he was in partnership, and who had probably died soon after 1714, had three sons, two of whom, Joshua and William, became booksellers. Churchill must mean "any nephew still a bookseller" because Joshua, at least, is recorded as being in business long before this agreement could have been reached. Cf. Plomer, op. cit., s.n. Churchill.

2. Cf. Tanner's will at the Principal Probate Office. Not given in the transcript in the East Anglian.

3. The latest direct reference to Tanner visiting Churchill that I have noticed occurs MS. Bodl. 1013, f.54, Tanner to T.Moore, [26 May 1715]. The reference itself is perhaps of interest in the present context: "I have been at Mr Churchills 3. or 4. times, but have miss'd him, thô I have business of concern wth him".

nation such as my executor[1] with the advice and assistance of the Dean of Christ Church and the Provost of Queen's College Oxford[2] with the Approbation of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Edm. Gibson, Bp. of London, shall think most proper in order to compleat and finish the same in the method I proposed". Mindful of his forty years of labour he stipulated that due acknowledgement should be made of his pains and, also mindful of the little fruit that these pains had borne, in addition to whatever profits the work might realise he offered his continuator a gratuity of fifty pounds should it be completed within ten years of his death.

It was not long before David Wilkins had been selected as the scholar with a genius for English history to see the Bibliotheca through the press; Richard Rawlinson was quick to voice his disapproval[3] and, indeed, it must be admitted that Wilkins - whose real name was Wilke, he being a migratory student of Prussian parentage - was not an obvious choice. But he possessed in great abundance the very qualities that Tanner lacked for by 1736 he had an impressive list of publications on English history to his name. Tanner and Wilkins had been colleagues: Wilkins had been Archdeacon of Suffolk

---

1. His brother, John Tanner.

2. At the time of drawing up the will these two dignitaries were John Conybeare and Joseph Smith respectively. They were still in office long after this clause in Tanner's will was fulfilled.

3. Cf. MS. Ballard 40, f.40v, Rawlinson to George Ballard, 30 Nov. 1736.

and they had therefore been members of the same cathedral chapter. Tanner had in fact given Wilkins some assistance with his Concilia.[1]

Wilkins set to work on Tanner's far from completed collections but the amount of editing that remained to be done resulted in further delays and the Bibliotheca was not ready for the press until late in 1744 or early in 1745.[2] At that time Wilkins envisaged that the work would be published in two folio volumes, each "about the Size of the last Edition of the Bodleian Catalogue of printed Books"[3], the division coming after the letter H. This is disclosed in a letter that Wilkins wrote in 1745 to Tanner's son to whom he had returned the completed manuscript, a letter that contains some interesting observations on the problem of actual publication:-

> Considering the Situation of Public Affairs, & the low Ebb of Encouragement from Booksellers, in my Opinion it is adviseable not to hurry ye Impression of the Bibliotheca now; but proper Steps ought to be taken to find out ye easiest Method of getting it printed, or rather going to ye Press wth it towards next Winter. I hope to God, I shall be ready at any Time to give my Assistance in correcting the Press.
>
> But give me leave to tell You, y^t^ You would act quite contrary to B^p^. Tanner's express Words of ye Will, by

---

1. Cf. p. 99.

2. Cf. [B.M.] Add. MSS. 6190, f.147, Wilkins to Tanner's son, 19 Feb. 1745.

3. Wilkins is referring to the two volume catalogue of printed books published in 1738. The work finally appeared in one volume and in view of Wilkins not inconsiderable publishing experience it is possible that his manuscript was further edited before printing. This manuscript is now unknown and unless it is found the point is unlikely to be resolved.

> bestowing ye Present of 50£ upon me, who am not in any wise entitled to it, till the Book is publish'd. If it should be decreed above, that I should not live to see y^t^ done; I beseech You to let my true Pains in copying Your Father's Bibliotheca be a lasting Monument of my Duty, & High Esteem of His Goodness, Merit, & Learning.[1]

Wilkins in fact did not live to see the work in print for he was to die later in 1745, and even in January 1747 John Tanner knew nothing about the work being put to the press.[2] The Bibliotheca[3] finally appeared, complete in one volume, in 1748 and was published at the expense of the Society for the Encouragement of Learning, which four years earlier had issued the Notitia Monastica.[4] The title-page of the work implies that Wilkins had done no more than to contribute the prefatory matter but this is far from the truth: when he received Tanner's papers he found that they were still at a stage where it was necessary for him to determine the shape and even nature of the whole work. Wilkins decided that it should be purely a work of reference and he accordingly re-arranged Tanner's notes into an alphabetical sequence of surnames and incorporated Leland's De Scriptoribus within each entry, thereby

---

1. [B.M.] Add. MSS. 6190, f.147.

2. Cf. [B.M.] Add. MSS. 5841, f.25, John Tanner to ?, 12 Jan. 1747. Transcript.

3. T.Tanner, Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica: sive, De scriptoribus ... commentarius (Lond., 1748). John Tanner presented a suitably inscribed copy to St. Asaph cathedral library; St. Asaph 339. The Bodleian possesses three copies of which one, Gough gen. top. 54, has several scraps in Tanner's hand prefixed.

4. Cf. The Library, 4th ser., vol.xix, pp.285-287, where some mention is made of the poor sales enjoyed by the Bibliotheca.

completely abandoning - as Tanner himself may perhaps have done[1]- the original idea that the Bibliotheca should supply the text of Leland's work. The latter decision may easily be defended on the ground of the existence of Hall's edition, but it was a less happy choice that led Wilkins to print only an abbreviated form of Boston's Catalogue instead of a complete text. These and other editorial decisions have been discussed elsewhere[2] and it only remains to say that Wilkins performed his task in a more than adequate manner, for he judiciously moulded Tanner's many and accurate notes into a scholarly work of reference that is still an indispensible aid to all literary research that falls within its sphere.

As was to be expected of a work whose author had died with his researches unfinished and whose editor had died before it was in print there were many faults to be found. Five years after its publication it was described as "a very imperfect work & full of Errors" but although this statement was penned by an eminent antiquary it may well be suspected as being somewhat biased[3] and the assessment made in 1862 by

---

1. Cf. Hunt, op. cit., p.256.

2. Cf. ibid., pp.254-256.

3. Cf. MS. Ballard 42, f.215, Charles Lyttleton, Bishop of Carlisle to Ballard, 28 Apr. 1753. Lyttleton wrote: "Tanner's Bibliotheca is a very imperfect Work & full of Errors. Y^e^ Article of Littleton is a strong Proof of ye great carelessness of ye Compiler & Editor, and so are many others that I could point out". An account of Bishop Lyttleton is given in the D.N.B. Horace Walpole, 4th Earl of Orford also made some biting criticisms in his Catalogue of the royal and noble

[cont. on next page].

a Deputy Keeper of the Public Records needs little qualification today: "On all questions connected with the early literature of our nation" he wrote "Tanner's Bibliotheca, notwithstanding its many omissions, defects, and redundancies, is still the highest authority to which the inquirer can refer. As a storehouse of historical materials, it is invaluable".[1] Comment may be made on peculiarities both of content and style[2] but the final conclusion must be very similar to that reached with the Notitia: that Tanner's researches were both comprehensive and - by and large - accurate. As a specialist work of reference the Bibliotheca has today no successor[3] and its value can perhaps best be traced in the Dictionary of National Biography where it is often quoted as source-

---

3 cont. authors of England (Strawberry-Hill, 1758) vol.1, pp.iv, 1, 3, 4, 23 &c. but he was in part answered by James Nasmith in the preface to the 1787 Notitia Monastica, note b. A note prefixed to one of the Bodleian copies of the Bibliotheca (Douce T. subt. 30) calls Tanner the "greatest and most contemptible fool that ever attempted such a work" but Francis Douce himself has added a more favourable opinion of Tanner.

1. Cf. T.D.Hardy, Descriptive catalogue of materials (Lond., 1862) vol.i, pt.1, p.xlii. The work is still cited as an authority today: cf. N.Toner, "Augustinian spiritual writers of the English province in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries", Sanctus Augustinus Vitae spiritualis magister (Roma, 1959) vol.ii, pp.495, 507, 511, 515 and The Arundel Harington manuscript of Tudor poetry, ed. by R.Hughey (Columbus, 1960) vol.ii, p.444.

2. Cf. Davies, op. cit., Times literary supplement, 14 December 1935, p.856, col.3.

3. It has in part been superseded by J.C.Russell, Dictionary of writers of thirteenth century England (Bulletin, Institute of historical research, special suppl. 3), (Lond., 1936).

material.[1] Either the Notitia or the Bibliotheca is in itself sufficient to earn Tanner a place among the great antiquaries of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the age in which antiquarian research flowered as perhaps in no other period of our history, but together they display such devotion to historical research that he must surely be regarded as one of the most conscientious scholars that this country has ever possessed.

---

1. The Bibliotheca commands a moderately high price: £35 was recently asked for a copy; cf. B.Quaritch, Catalogue no.780 (Lond., 1956), item 280.

CHAPTER V

THE CONTINUATION OF WOOD'S ATHENAE OXONIENSES

Any account of Tanner as a scholar must inevitably contain a consideration of his association with the second edition of Anthony Wood's Athenae Oxonienses, and yet it may well be said that this was an affair that he had as little connection with as he possibly could. It is unfortunate that, partly for this reason, less material has remained to shed light on this particular facet of his life than on his other undertakings, but even if a tentative account is all that can be given it would seem to be worth while if only to assess the truth of the acid comments that the whole affair evoked from Hearne.

Anthony Wood[1] was born at Oxford at the end of 1632 and received his education at New College School and Lord Williams's School, Thame, at a time when there was considerable disturbance in Oxfordshire from the Civil War. He matriculated at Merton College in 1647 but did not proceed to the degree of B.A. until 1652. In 1655 he took his M.A. degree and was then unsuccesful in obtaining a Fellowship of his college although there were very close family connections that might well have

---

1. Wood's life is well documented and the main source is The life and times of Anthony Wood ... 1632-1695, described by himself, ed. by A.Clark (Oxford historical society), (Oxf., 1891-1900). Other sources are reviewed in that work, vol.i, pp.1-5. The rev. Andrew Clark made a close study of Wood and the main biographical details given here are taken from this work and his article in the D.N.B.

been regarded as constituting a reasonable claim on the foundation. It has been said that this failure was due to an inherently unpleasant disposition. Fortunately he had sufficient means to support himself and when, in 1656, he read Dugdale's Antiquities of Warwickshire and conceived the idea of preparing a similar work on Oxfordshire[1] he was able to fit out one of his rooms as a study and devote the greater part of his time to the undertaking. After making brief collections in the county he began to concentrate his work upon the City and the University and although his account of the former was not published until after his death[2] he was able to publish that part relating to the University in 1674.[3] The Dean of Christ Church, Dr. John Fell,[4] was instrumental in obtaining its acceptance by the University press and it was on his suggestion that Wood incorporated into his work brief biographical notices of Oxford writers. Wood passed the remainder of his life in the development of this idea into a comprehensive work in its own right: the Athenae Oxonienses.

---

1. Cf. p. 102, note 7.

2. A.Wood, The antient and present state of the city of Oxford, ed. by sir J.Peshall (Lond., 1773). The authoritative edition is entitled Survey of the antiquities of the city of Oxford, ed. by A.Clark (Oxford historical society), (Oxf., 1889-99). This second edition contains a valuable biographical account of Wood; vol.i, pp.1-31.

3. Wood, Historia et antiquitates Universitatis Oxoniensis (Oxf., 1674).

4. John Fell, 1625-1686, subsequently Bishop of Oxford.

Wood was by nature admirably adapted for routine historical research and in his accounts of Oxford he had spared no pains to check and counter-check his sources;[1] he displayed the same thoroughness with his new undertaking and in the course of his voluminous correspondence he received a great deal of co-operation from John Aubrey. But the Athenae allowed more rein to his disagreeable disposition than his former work had done and in any case his temper had increased rather than mellowed with the years. He quarrelled with nearly everyone that he met: family, acquaintances, and patrons all received the same treatment and his partial deafness and hermit-like existence did little to bring him any new friends. The biographies that finally appeared in the Athenae Oxonienses[2] reflected Wood's nature to the full and there were few living of his subjects or descendants of those dead that felt anything other than animosity towards the author and his work. Not long after the appearance of the second volume in 1692 Wood was prosecuted in the Vice-Chancellor's court at Oxford for a libel which, incidentally, was based on information supplied by Aubrey.[3] Wood lost his case and the second

---

1. For an appreciation of Wood's qualities as a research worker see Clark's edition of the City of Oxford, vol.i, pp.29,30.

2. Wood, Athenae Oxonienses (Lond., 1691,92).

3. Wood was prosecuted by Henry Hyde, second Earl of Clarendon, for a libel on his father, Edward, the first earl. Documents relating to this trial are reproduced in Wood, Life and times, vol.iv, pp.1-50.

volume of the Athenae was publicly burnt in the yard of the Sheldonian Theatre. Nevertheless, the embittered but determined old scholar continued to make collections for a further volume and although the affair brought Wood many enemies those few of his remaining acquaintances that could see the academic and historical value of the work were confirmed in their friendship.

It was not to be expected that such a man would, unprompted, take any interest in a young student and it was not until some time after Tanner had taken his B.A. degree that his name first appeared in Wood's diary. The introduction was probably effected by Charlett, one of Wood's stauncher friends, who on 24 May 1694 gave him a copy of the prospectus that Tanner had issued for the Notitia Monastica.[1] Wood, who had possibly also heard of Tanner from Aubrey, was naturally interested. By the end of the year he was rendering active assistance[2] and when the work was finally published Tanner expressed his gratitude by presenting Wood with a copy.[3] But the acquaintanceship was not confined to literary assistance and the two men sometimes met on more social occasions such as friendly gatherings at the Fleur-de-Lys inn[4] or on more private walks around Oxford in eearch of antiquities.

---

1. Cf. p. 156, note 3.
2. Cf. p. 163.
3. Cf. p. 173.
4. Cf. Wood, Life and times, vol.iii, p.483.

Wood has recorded[1] how they walked to the chapel at Binsey and then on to the nunnery at Godstow and how he talked to Tanner about the history of both these places; Wood had spent a lifetime on research into these very things and Tanner was undoubtedly an eager listener for he was now fully indulging in those interests that he had formed some years before in the school at Salisbury. It seems clear that Wood must have played a large part in the formation of Tanner's character by transmitting to the young scholar some of his own high standards of historical research. Unfortunately, within a month of their visit to Godstow, Wood fell ill and there followed a sequence of events that was to affect Tanner for the rest of his life.

Late in November 1695[2] Charlett realised that he had not seen Wood for several days and, upon enquiry, learnt from relations that Wood was dying from a "Total Suppression of Urine"[3] and that although eleven days had elapsed he had as yet done nothing to put his affairs in order. Charlett hastened to Wood's house and although Wood peevishly insisted that he was still perfectly well Charlett eventually made him see reason:

---

1. Cf. Wood, Life and times, vol.iii, p.491.

2. Charlett gives the date as 22 November in a letter headed 1 December 1695 (MS. Eng. misc. d. 10) but one of his letters dated 21 November (MS. T. 24, f.87) was obviously written after the event.

3. MS. Eng. misc. d. 10. See p.261, note 2.

I [Charlett] was forced to debate ye Point wth him, till at last, upon mentioning a Parallel Case of a Common Acquaintance, wth whom I was conversant every day, He yeilded and sayd, Y^e^ L^d^ will must be done. What would you have me do? I desired him to lose not a minute, in vain Complaints and Remonstrances, but proceed directly to settle his Papers, that were so Numerous and Confused. He then askt, who could he trust? I advised him to Mr Tanner of All Souls, for whose Fidelity I could be responsible. His answer was, he thought so too, and that He would in this and all ye other particulars follow my advice, promising me immediately to set about his Will, and prepare for ye Sacrament ye next day, (he having otherwise resolved to receave on Christmas day). I was extremely glad to find him in so good a Temper, and having discourst him about several Things, I told him I never expected to see him again, and therefore took my last Farewell, telling him that I should heare constantly by Mr Tanner.

After I came home I repeted all that I had sayd in a long letter to Him,[1] being somewhat Jealous of Him,[2] and sent it by Mr Tanner.

On 23 November Wood sent for Tanner[3] and he, together with James Bisse of Wadham[4] and Nicholas Martin, the Vice-Principal

---

1. This letter is identified by Clark (Life and times, vol.iii, pp.498, note 2; 500), as MS. T. 24, f.82(recte 87) and is printed by him on p.500. It is by no means a "long" letter, merely commending Tanner to Wood as a man who will be "carefull, true, faithfull, and discreet" in the disposition of his papers and urges him to make his will. The identification is, however, almost undoubtedly correct.

2. MS. Eng. misc. d. 10, Charlett to [Archbishop Tenison], 1 Dec. 1695. Pr. in Wood, Life and times, vol.iii, pp.497-499, in Wood, History and antiquities of the University of Oxford, ed. Gutch, vol.i, sig. g 3,4; and in Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, pp.403,404.

3. Tanner recounted the events leading to the disposal of the Wood collections in a letter dated 24 November 1695 to Charlett, MS. Ballard 4, ff.28,29. This letter is reproduced in Wood, Life and times, vol.iii, pp.501,502, in Wood, History and antiquities of the University of Oxford, ed. Gutch, vol.i, sig. g 2,3, and in Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, pp.402, 403. Further details are to be found in Charlett's letter to Tenison of 1 Dec. 1695, MS. Eng. misc. d. 10.

4. James Bisse, 1670?-1748. Little is known of Bisse; cf. p.268, note 1. Cf. also Foster's Alumni Oxonienses.

of Hart Hall,[1] set about looking over Wood's papers, "tumbling and separating ... till it was dark",[2] with the result that Wood ordered "about two bushells full"[3] to be put on one side to be burnt at his death. He was then prevailed upon to make a will bequeathing his collections to the University for deposit in the Ashmolean Museum and Charlett, Tanner, and Bisse, or any two of them, were to act as the intermediaries. But in spite of arranging for the destruction of many of his papers the memory of his recent conviction for libel was still uppermost in Wood's mind and he appealed to his friends to "look over all his MSS. before they are expos'd to the Public View, to see that there [are] no loose foolish Papers in them, that may injure his memory".[4] However, not all of Wood's papers were suitable for immediate deposit in the Ashmolean and, without making any special provision in his will, he verbally committed his more private papers to the joint care of Tanner and Bisse, with Charlett as an "Overseer",[5] and with the stipulation that they were not to be made public for seven years.[6] His collections for a third volume of the

---

1. Hart Hall was later incorporated in Hertford College.
2. MS. Ballard 4, f.28.
3. MS. Eng. misc. d. 10.
4. MS. Ballard 4, f.28v.
5. MS. Eng. misc. d. 10.
6. Because of this omission in Wood's will Hearne was later to question Tanner's and Charlett's part in the transaction, cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.9. From Hearne's entry it appears that the "private papers" were also to be deposited in the Ashmolean after the seven years had elapsed but the contemporary accounts

[cont. on next page].

Athenae Oxonienses, which he had continued preparing until a month before his death, he gave with "great Ceremony"[1] on the day before he died to Tanner, presumably on the definite understanding that he should complete and publish the work as such and not for any value that it might have as source-material for the Bibliotheca. Wood died on 28 November 1695 and as he expired the papers that he had ordered to be burnt were committed to the flames.[2]

Tanner's feelings may well be imagined. Even if Wood had been disliked as a person his scholarly abilities were highly thought of and it was therefore a matter for some pride that one so young should have been selected by the great man to carry on his work; but this pride must have been more than offset by the rather disquieting fact that a young student with a career to make could hardly afford to offend anyone at all and he now found himself entrusted with the continuation of a work that had caused many hard words and, even worse, had been the inspiration of litigation. There must have been

---

6 cont. by Charlett and Tanner make no mention of this provision, although Tanner appears to have later agreed that the papers were in fact intended for the Ashmolean, cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.9; and see infra, pp.266-268. Whilst there is reason to believe that a large number of these papers are today in the Wood collection they were not deposited under any such terms, cf. S.G.Gillam, "Arthur Charlett's letters and manuscripts", Bodleian library record, vol.iv, pp.110-112. A transcript of Wood's will is to be found in Wood, Life and times, vol.iii, pp.502-504.

1. MS. Eng. misc. d. 10.

2. ibid.

many people who viewed Wood's private papers with an apprehensive eye and consequently regarded Tanner in his editorial capacity as a potential embarrassment. Moreover, from Tanner's point of view the continuation was even more dangerous than the original work for it dealt with his contemporaries and immediate predecessors at Oxford[1] and these were the very men who might well later in life be in a position to offer him advancement. It is therefore hardly surprising that he did not immediately set to work on an edition of the Athenae. He was in any case heavily committed with his own researches on the Bibliotheca[2] and, at the time, Gibson told Thoresby that Wood's continuation was in such an imperfect state that Tanner was unlikely to publish it until he had considerably more leisure in which to perform the necessary editorial work.[3]

Tanner was by no means indifferent to the great value of Wood's collections: "This benefaction", he wrote, "will not perhaps be so much valued by the University as it ought to be, because it comes from AnTony[4] Wood; but truly it is a most noble gift, his Collections of MSS. being invaluable, and his printed books most of them not to be found in Town".[5] The

---

1. The original work came down as far as 1690. Tanner matriculated in December 1689.

2. Cf. pp.220,221.

3. Letters of eminent men addressed to Ralph Thoresby, vol.i, p.238; Gibson to Thoresby, 7 Jun. 1696.

4. Tanner at first wrote Tony and later prefixed the "An".

5. MS. Ballard 4, f.28.

volumes designated by Wood for deposit seem for the most part to have been faithfully placed in the Ashmolean and there is some evidence that in this matter Tanner performed rather more than he was called upon to do by the bare terms of Wood's will. He had, for instance, only been entrusted with the continuation of the Athenae but he carefully gathered together a number of Wood's odd notes relating to the already published volumes and pasted them into the relevant places in Wood's own proof copy which had been included in the deposit, thereby making a basis for a revision of the earlier work.[1] But his connection with the collection was to be considerably more close than a careful supervision of the deposit. At the time of Wood's bequest work on Bernard's Catalogus was proceeding apace. Edward Lhuyd, the Museum's first Keeper, received a payment of £10. 10s. for "taking a Catalogue of the bookes in the Museum"[2] and in the Catalogus he is credited with the lengthy list of the Ashmole collection.[3] No name appears against the Wood catalogue[4] and it is to be wished that a later Keeper had been more explicit when he said that it had been compiled by "a Person whose Abilities for this Purpose

---

1. Cf. MS. Wood F 51, f.51, Tanner to [Tonson?], 15 May 1713; and Hearne, vol.x, p.9.

2. Cf. Wood, Life and times, vol.iv, p.83. Cf. also R.W.Hunt, "The cataloguing of Ashmolean collections of books and manuscripts", Bodleian library record, vol.iv, pp.161-170, sc. p.165.

3. Catalogus, pt.i, pp.315-357.

4. ibid., pt.i, pp.359-370.

were unquestionable".[1] A further payment was made to Lhuyd specifically for work on the Wood collections[2] but he had already expressed his intention of employing somebody else to do the work for him.[3] Tanner himself tells us that he arranged and listed Wood's papers whilst he was at Oxford.[4] It seems certain that he is referring to the compilation of this particular contribution to the Catalogus and that he had been employed to do it by Lhuyd.[5]

The precise fate of Wood's "private papers" is not known but they certainly were not deposited in the Ashmolean after seven years had elapsed as appears to have been Wood's original intention. Charlett was found at his death to have many such papers still in his possession and these were subsequently

---

1. W.Huddesford, Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum ... Antonii à Wood (Oxf., 1761) sig.a2.

2. Cf. Wood, Life and times, vol.iv, p.85.

3. Cf. Hunt, op. cit., p.163.

4. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.89, Tanner to Charlett, 12 May 1708; the relevant part of this letter is reproduced on p. 238.

5. It is usually necessary for the first compiler of the catalogue of any collection to number the parts or foliate the leaves of a collectaneous volume before an adequate description can be made. Examination of the numeration and foliation of the Wood volumes for which analytical entries have been made in the 1697 Catalogus reveals what is almost certainly Tanner's hand; e.g. MS. Wood E 3 (Catalogus 8567) and F 33 (Catalogus 8495) foliation; and F 27 (Catalogus 8489) numeration. Identification of numerals can only be at best a hazardous affair but I think that a comparison of those in MS. Wood E 3 with Tanner's draft of the Bibliotheca (MS. T. 470) is fairly conclusive. This is virtual proof that Tanner was responsible for the catalogue. Dr. Hunt suggested (Bodleian library record, vol.iv, p.165) Tanner as the probable compiler, but he was then unaware of the corroborative statement in MS. Ballard 4, f.89.

deposited with the rest of the Wood collection.[1] It is possible that in his capacity as "overseer" he did in fact retain them all in his possession and the collection is today more or less complete; however, there are now in the Tanner collection some of Wood's papers to which Tanner clearly was not entitled as the continuator of the Athenae[2] and the private

---

1. Cf. S.G.Gillam, op. cit., Bodleian library record, vol.iv, pp.111,112. It was only by John Whiteside's, the Keeper's, intervention that the papers were obtained for the Ashmolean. After seeking Tanner's opinion that Charlett's collection of Wood papers had in fact been intended for the Museum he laid a successful claim to them from Charlett's executor, cf. Hearne, vol.viii, p.199.

2. The Wood manuscripts in the Tanner collection may be partially identified from the index to the Tanner catalogue and also from Clark's appendix to Wood's Life and times, vol.iv, p.250. (Clark's inclusion of MS. T. 438 is probably a typographical error; this particular volume was apparently obtained by Tanner amongst the papers of Archbishop Sancroft whose signature appears ad initium). Tanner was no doubt entitled to many of these papers as forming part of the continuation of the Athenae and even the materials for a biography of Wood (e.g. MS. T. 102, ff.1-129) might well have been retained for publication as an introduction to that work. On the other hand it would be almost impossible to justify the presence of certain other items: e.g. MS. T. 416, ff.1-99 which consists of missing leaves from MS. Wood E 3 (Catalogus 8567), a volume which had been entirely numerated by Tanner and also described by him in some detail in the Catalogus as being in the Ashmolean at which time the leaves now in MS. T. 416 were stated to be present. It seems that Tanner himself must have deliberately removed them. Similarly, MS. T. 456a, ff.63,64 supply missing leaves in MS. Wood D 2 (Catalogus 8513) pp.250-254. If Tanner was the culprit, as it seems that he must be, he was by no means alone for the Wood collection, in common with all the Ashmolean collections, had suffered serious depredations by 1751 when Huddesford compiled his Wood catalogue, as that industrious Keeper lamented in his preface. The result is that the Wood papers described by Tanner in the Catalogus are sometimes to be found in part in other eighteenth century Bodleian collections such as the Rawlinson and Ballard manuscripts, e.g. MS. Rawl. D 807, ff.9,15,17,18 (Catalogus 8495); MS. Rawl. D 912, ff.609-612 (Catalogus 8567); MS. Ballard 11, ff.3,4; 8,9; 20-23 (Catalogus 8493); cf. also Gillam, op.cit., Bodleian library record, vol.iv, pp.112,113.

papers may have been shared between Tanner and Bisse (and possibly Charlett), Tanner later entrusting his share to the care of Charlett when he himself moved to Norwich. If this is the case then Bisse's portion - he died in 1748 - must be regarded as lost unless he too deposited his papers either with Charlett or in the Ashmolean.[1]

As we have seen, Tanner was for various reasons unable to get even his own works ready for the press and it is hardly a matter for surprise that he scarcely started to prepare a continuation of the Athenae.[2] His specialist knowledge as the cataloguer of the Wood collection was always at the disposal of his friends,[3] and so that he might the better answer their requests for biographical information contained in the papers that he retained he compiled a finding-list for his own use;[4] but although such approaches for information were apparently

---

1. Bisse had acquired a reputation as an antiquarian in his younger days but he later became a doctor of medicine and retired to the country. Hearne heard that he was a low spirited man, cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.291. It seems that he may well have had some of Wood's "private papers" because Tanner thought that Bisse might have taken some additions to the Athenae, cf. p.279, note 1. MS. Rawl. J fol. 1 is a copy of the 1691 Athenae in which John Le Neve has entered (ff.504-507) a manuscript "Continuation ... which was Copied from Mr Anthony Woods own Papers, & Communicated to me by my very good Friend J s B e MD. of C t B y in H d S e"; i.e. James Bisse, M.D., of Codicot Bury in Hertford Shire. The volume has also been owned by Bishop Burnet and Mansfield Price.

2. Tanner apparently made some attempt to prepare a continuation before he left Oxford for Norwich, cf. pp. 280, 308.

3. Cf. MS. T. 23, f.148, Tanner to Kennett, 5 Apr. 1697.

4. Cf. MS. Wood F 51, f.51, Tanner to [Tonson?], 15 May 1713.

made,[1] and the answers doubtless supplied, as late as 1713 Tanner was able to say that nobody had as yet seen the papers[2] and it was perhaps not until another six years had elapsed that he permitted anyone to give them even a superficial examination.[3]

It is not difficult to suggest why Tanner should have guarded this legacy so closely for, although he was always ready to assist even comparative strangers with their undertakings, he must have felt the need to impose some sort of censorship over Wood's less judicious observations unless he might stand accused of having communicated a libel published by somebody else, and indeed such caution was not ill-advised. Men of a less good-natured disposition than Tanner might have seen the situation in a different light and have regarded the papers not as an obstacle but as a means to preferment. Wood's unrestrained account of Nathaniel Lord Crew, the still living Bishop of Durham, later evoked the comment from one who had seen it that "if such a Paper had been in his possession he would have managed it so as to have got a Prebend of Durham".[4] As the person that passed this observation was

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.ii, p.4.
2. Cf. MS. Wood F 51, f.51.
3. Cf. p.270, note 1.
4. MS. Ballard 4, f.131, Tanner to Charlett, 22 Apr. 1719. Pr. in Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, pp.405,406.

almost certainly Laurence Echard,[1] who was subsequently concerned with the enlarged Athenae, the unknowing bishop had good cause to be thankful that his reputation and character was "safer in the hands it is, of one that scorns such mercenary views, and without such is inclined to let nothing pass wch is inconsistent wth good manners".[2] There seems little doubt that Tanner found his charge somewhat of an embarrassment and that had the matter been left entirely to him then the continuation of the Athenae would not have been published until after his death, when perhaps some less sensitive editor might have seen the work through the press; nevertheless, Tanner's scholarly conscience must have been troubled for he could hardly have convinced himself that he was doing anything other than committing a breach of faith with the dead Anthony Wood. He must therefore have felt some relief when an approach was made to him by which he was enabled to transfer to another the trust that a careful regard for his own future coupled with the burden of his professional and academic undertakings would not permit him to fulfil.

---

1. Tanner said (MS. Ballard 4, f.131) that this paper "by chance came uppermost to the sight of a Certain Archdeacon to whom I last summer shew'd these Papers for half a quarter of an hour - and who unwarily, and ag^st^ the confidence I reposed in him mention'd it at Cambridge - where it got wind - and about which I could tell you a good deal - if it was worth while, or time would permit." Echard was Archdeacon of Stow and is known to have examined these papers ~~first~~ before 12 February 1719, cf. p. 273.

2. MS. Ballard 4, ff.131,132.

Late in April or early in May 1713 Tanner seems to have received a letter[1] from the well-known London bookseller, Jacob Tonson, asking for particulars of Wood's continuation of the Athenae. Tonson had purchased the copyright of the first edition from Wood's heirs[2] and was intending to issue another edition, complete with the continuation if it was both suitable and available for publication. An archidiaconal visitation prevented Tanner from satisfying Tonson's curiosity immediately[3], but by July 1713 he had examined the papers in his possession and supplied a list of the names of all the people whose lives were to be included in the third volume, [redacted] with the observation that there were "some hard Characters, wch not being true, nor just, I shall be unwilling to have any hand in publishing to the World, unless they be softned a little".[4] To all outward appearances he had reconciled himself to the publication of the documents in his charge and Tonson could hardly wait to meet Tanner in person.[5] A month later, however, Tanner still had not made up his mind about his "old Friend's manner of writing" and he asked

---

1. Tanner's reply, dated 15 May 1713, is now MS. Wood F 51, f.51.
2. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.110, Tanner to Charlett, 21 Sept. 1713.
3. Cf. MS. Wood F 51, f.51.
4. MS. Wood F 51, f.52v, Tanner to Tonson, 8 Jul. 1713. This list must have approximated to the sheet in Tanner's hand entitled "Oxford writers living at the time of Mr Wood's death ... of whom there are large Memoirs" that is now to be found MS. Rawl. J fol. 13, f.1.
5. Cf. MS. T. 305, f.111, Tonson to Tanner, 4 Aug. 1713.

Charlett for his opinion on the matter.[1] Charlett had long ago prophecied to Wood that his work would be consigned to the flames[2] and, although his reply to Tanner does not seem to have been preserved, a subsequent letter from Tanner shows that he advised publication, but with caution.[3] Strangely enough Tonson, who had been "very pressing"[4] with his original request for the continuation seems to have been content to let the matter rest for quite some considerable time,[5] and naturally Tanner was not inclined to remind him of the undertaking. Tonson's request, however, should have given Tanner an opportunity to decide exactly what his own attitude towards the publication of these papers was.

It was not until the summer of 1718 that Tonson again broached the matter but Tanner, with his by now almost habitual procrastination, was still unable to give him a definite answer; the papers, he felt, should be carefully censored before they were published and preferably before they left his possession.[6] This time Tonson's request was in earnest for he had arranged for the transcription of the notes that Tanner had carefully pasted into Wood's copy of the Athenae

---

1. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.110.
2. Cf. MS. T. 114, f.54v, Charlett to Wood, 6 Mar. 1690.
3. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.111v, Tanner to Charlett, 5 Dec. 1713.
4. Cf. MS. Willis 95, f.281v, Tanner to Willis, 16 May 1713.
5. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.111v.
6. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.128, Tanner to Charlett, 12 Aug. 1718.

in the Ashmolean Museum.[1] The incorporation of these notes might well recommend a revised edition to the public but Tonson, who was a bookseller of some repute, probably felt that a revision of any real worth could hardly fail to embrace Wood's later researches. But even the most reputable of booksellers could not ignore the fact that the general outcry and the lawsuit that had followed the appearance of the first edition and the aura of semi-mystery that surrounded its continuation would have a certain appeal to some people, who would purchase the work with no thought for its scholarly worth and who would search in it for scandals rather than for biographical information. Accordingly Tonson asked Laurence Echard, Archdeacon of Stow, to visit Tanner at Norwich and make a report on the true state of Wood's continuation,[2] for as yet he knew little more about it than the names of the people whose lives it contained. Tanner apparently allowed Echard to make a very brief examination of the papers, thus departing from his usual practice of keeping them to himself,[3] and on hearing that they were most suitable for the forthcoming edition the publisher immediately offered Tanner fifty pounds for the manuscripts.[4] Whilst conveying this offer to

---

1. Cf. MS. Wood F 51, f.53, Echard to Tanner, 12 Feb. 1719.
2. Cf. MS. Wood F 51, f.53.
3. Cf. ibid.; see also p.270, note 1.
4. ibid.

Tanner Echard added, somewhat unfairly to Tonson, that if this sum were too small then Tanner must name his own price and that if possible his demands would be met;[1] but Echard knew that Tanner would only part with the papers for a "valuable Consideration" because he had already received an offer of one hundred pounds for them.[2] The final agreement between Tanner and Tonson does not appear but, inspite of Echard's warning that the "whole Work, with Mr Wood's Additions he has already, together with Yours, will be vastly expensive, and not a little hazardous to Mr Tonson",[3] it does seem that Tanner may have tried to raise the price[4] and in view of his previous offer this is very understandable - if one ignores the question of whether he was entitled to set any monetary value on them at all. Late in February 1719 Tanner still had not sent Tonson a definite answer about the papers but he wrote to Charlett that he was "inclined to let him have them, there not being like to be a better opportunity of answering the trust the Old Gentleman was so kind as to repose in me".[5] By 22 April his mind was made up; he had finally come to the conclusion that it would be unscholarly to deprive the world

---

1. Cf. MS. Wood F 51, f.53.
2. Cf. MS. Wood F 51, f.18, Echard to [his brother?], n.d.
3. Cf. MS. Wood F 51, f.53.
4. Cf. Wood, The history and antiquities of the University of Oxford, ed. Gutch, vol.i, sig. fl$v$.
5. MS. Ballard 4, f.129v, Tanner to Charlett, 20 Feb. 1719. Pr. in Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, p.405.

of the fruits of Wood's labours, which undoubtedly contained certain information that was not to be found elsewhere,[1] and he agreed to part with the papers. But there was still the vexed question of censorship. From the way he seems to have worried over this point[2] it is fairly clear that he still thought himself under some obligation to Wood's memory or to the specific terms of Wood's verbal charge to render a faithful text of the continuation of the Athenae. This uneasiness corresponds unfavourably with his later statement that he had been given full power to "add or alter or leave out"[3] what he thought fit, and in the meanwhile he was forced to ease his conscience with the observation that there were "higher and antecedent Obligations not to be instrumental in publishing Scandals, esp. when in all probability they are for the most part taken up without any good grounds".[4] It must be admitted that in this matter Tanner displays all the symptoms of a man who is unable to come to terms with his conscience over a matter of honour but who, after he has broken faith and found that subsequent events are not as bad as he feared, is able later to produce a version or mild perversion of the truth that to his own mind completely justifies

---

1. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.131, Tanner to Charlett, 22 Apr. 1719. Pr. in Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, p.405.
2. He must have repeatedly asked Charlett for his opinion of censorship; cf. MS. Ballard 4, ff.111v,128,129v,130,131.
3. Cf. p. 308.
4. MS. Ballard 4, f.130, Tanner to Charlett, 20 Feb. 1719.

his actions.

Whilst examining the papers in some detail before they were sent to Tonson or Echard, Tanner gradually became aware that they did not contain such scandals and calumnies as the world at large appeared to believe and he was forced to the opinion that the greater part of the more contentious documents must have perished in the fire at the time of Wood's death.[1] He had, for instance, expected to find a life of Dr. John Wallis[2] "not set forth to advantage, against whom ... Mr W. had entertain'd a g^t. aversion",[3] but it was not to be found and nor were several others of a similar nature. It seems fairly clear that Tanner must finally have contented himself with a sort of "blue pencil" censorship - the striking out of the occasional word or phrase that might cause offence - and that the remainder of Wood's text was left untouched: he could, he felt, in view of Wood's "manner and bias being so long and so well known",[4] hardly be called to account for any general prejudice that might pervade that scholar's work but he might well be held responsible for any individual

---

1. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.131, Tanner to Charlett, 22 Apr. 1719.

2. John Wallis, 1616-1703, mathematician; Savilian professor of Geometry, Oxford, 1649-1703; Keeper of the University Archives from 1658. Wallis was offended, even to the point of contemplating litigation, by references to himself in the first edition of the Athenae, cf. Wood, Life and times, vol.iii, pp.395,396,398. Wood's "g^t aversion" was caused by a dispute over access to the archives and is displayed ibid., vol.ii, pp.507,508.

3. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.131.

4. ibid.

libellous statements. Nevertheless, he took particular care to prevent his name being used as that of an editor and stipulated to Tonson that it should not even be given any prominence in the published volume.[1] With all these precautions Tanner felt fairly safe in permitting Wood's continuation to appear.

The news of the forthcoming edition was received with mixed feelings. Hearne had long been harping on the need for the publication of the third volume of the Athenae[2] although he was extremely displeased when Tanner "declared that he had surrendered up M^r. Wood's Papers to another, but y^t he had no hand in the Edition it self. If so" he added, "this is base in the D^r., who hath betrayed his Trust, when he promised to print the Papers faithfully himself, & to perfect & compleat them". But Hearne knew full well why this had been done and observed that Tanner was "a Whig, & is therefore afraid he shall disoblige the Party".[3] Hearne was completely and utterly prejudiced against the new edition and immediately forecast that "Anthony's Accounts will be strangely disguised";[4] but less prejudiced men than Hearne also worried on the same account and Rawlinson, for example, was well aware that the potential danger of Wood's papers might lead to

---

1. Cf. p. 279.
2. Cf. Hearne, vol.v, p.109.
3. ibid., vol.vii, p.27.
4. ibid., vol.vii, p.94.

unwarranted alterations in the text.[1] Others however were not sure that they wanted to see any edition at all: Robert Shippen, the Principal of Brasenose and Vice-Chancellor of the University, reported that "'tis fear'd D^{r}. Parry gave some papers out of ye Musaeum or D^{r}. Tanner has parted with his & we may I fear see many things we may not like w^{n} 'tis printed".[2] Even Archbishop Wake was somewhat apprehensive when he heard that a new edition with "great additions by the Author" was in the press and he lamented to Charlett that he supposed the publishers had "got his MS into their Hands, and will now print all the ill-natured Reflections which were omitted in the former Edition".[3] Tanner was not long in being informed of Wake's fears and he hastened to reasaure the Archbishop in a letter which probably gives us a more accurate picture of his connection with the revised Athenae than can

---

1. In the light of subsequent events Rawlinson's actual words are of interest: "from him [Tanner] indeed we may expect ... Justice to be done to all Parties, as he bears too high a Regard to the last Will, as well as Memory, of his Friend, to permit any Alterations to be made, unless upon the most sensible Conviction of Error, and in such a Case Alterations are necessary; but not to satiate Party-Spleen, or to make a Court to Villany however dignify'd or distinguish'd"; R.Rawlinson, The English topographer (Lond., 1720) pp.196,197.

2. MS. Ballard 21, f.213v, Shippen to Charlett, 12 Feb. 1720.

3. MS. Ballard 3, f.159, Wake to Charlett, 9 Feb. 1720. Some restraint had been put on Wood when the first edition of the Athenae had been published and Tanner had cited this as some justification for his present censorship; he felt that he could "fairly take the liberty of leaving out now and then a hard word, or line - now he is dead - as his best friends, B^{p} Fell and Mr Harrington, did wth his papers while he was alive", MS. Ballard 4, f.130, Tanner to Charlett, 20 Feb. 1719.

ever be gleaned from all his subsequent apologiae:

> ... I verily believe Your Grace is misinform'd that the New Edition of Mr Wood's Athenæ Oxon. will have all the ill natured reflections, wch Mr Harrington and other Friends persuaded him to leave out in the first. For those truths (as he used to call some Secret Histories) were I dare say long since destroy'd, I assure your Grace that I never saw them among the Papers wch pass'd thro' my hands after his death. Mr Bennet having only the benefit of the first Impression, the right of the Copy came to Mr Wood's neices and Executrix's, who sold their Interest in the same to Mr Tonson some years since. He has talk'd a great while of reprinting this Work - and sent sev^l^ messages and Letters to me, about the MSS. Additions wch were bequeathed to me under some sort of Confidence of having them publish'd one time or other. I have been backward enough in that affair, but Mr Archd. Eachard being here last year prevailed upon me to comply wth Mr Tonson, and to improve his intended New Edition wth the Papers, wch were design'd by A.Wood for a third Volume. I would not suffer the Bookseller to make use of my name as Editor - for some, I thought, good reasons - and obliged him to consent to the omitting or softning any hard expression or Character I should think fit - so that, tho' I shan't care for answering for all things wch will in hast pass - yet your Grace may depend upon it, that what goes out of my hands for the Press, will not be worse than what was publish'd in his Life time; I don't know that there is any thing to be inserted from other people.[1] For my own part I have all along declared, that I would not be so far a partaker in any other man's

---

1. Less than a year after Tanner wrote this it was reported that he had "refused to accept of the additions made by Dr. Kennett to Wood, which were very large, and which the Dr. offered to have published in the way of notes", cf. Athenæ, ed. Bliss (1813) vol.i, Preface, p.13. Kennett's interleaved and copiously annotated Athenæ is now in the Bodleian, Gough Oxford 92,93. In May 1698 Kennett wrote a letter to Tanner giving certain corrections, this is now MS. T. 22, f.50. Kennett also obtained from Bisse some of Bishop Humphreys of Bangor's additions; these passed to Baker and then to Hearne who published them in his edition of Thomæ Caii ... Vindiciæ (Oxf., 1730) pp.607-678. When Tanner first heard of Humphreys' papers from Hearne he "knew nothing of them" (Hearne, vol.x, p.280) but he later recollected that he had seen them, presumably amongst Wood's papers, and he suggested that Bisse had taken them (Hearne, vol.x, p.291). A letter from Wood to Humphreys thanking him for corrections is to be found MS. T. 25, f.403.

Guilt, as to send abroad into the World & hand down to posterity any thing contrary to good Manners and Religion, and wch the Author in a good mind and upon better information would have himself altered. On the other hand, there will be now publish'd many corrections and improvem^ts^ to the old Lives and writings, many additional accounts of writers before 1690. wch Mr W. found out since to have been of our University. The Lives of all Oxford Writers from 1690 where ye 2^d^ printed Volume ends to 1695, when the Old Gent^n^ died - and memoirs of all those persons who were then alive and had publish'd any thing - ranged under their several Colleges & Halls.

As for a continuation, it can be expected from no body that has been so long absent and lives at that distance from Oxford that I do - I did do a little, while I staid there, with this view - but not worth owning - so there will be nothing (except the title of a book now & then) but what is Mr W.'s own [but to your Grace I may confess there will not be quite all]. For as I would not have the world deprived of the usefull parts of my old Friends pains, so I would not be instrumental in aspersing the memories of other men. This is my intention, if any things thro' inadvertance or otherwise escape wch should be untrue or unjust, it would be a grief to

My good Lord
Your Graces most dutifull & obliged
Servt
Thom. Tanner.[1]

The second edition of the Athenae Oxonienses was finally published in 1721 under the combined imprints of Robert Knaplock, Daniel Midwinter, and Jacob Tonson.[2] As Tonson had promised, no direct mention was made of Tanner's part in the proceedings although it was announced by the three booksellers that the "new Lives were communicated to us by the Person to

---

1. [Christ Church] MS. Arch. W. Epist. 21, item 206, Tanner to Wake, 22 Feb. 1720. Pr. in W.Beloe, Anecdotes of literature and scarce books (Lond., 1807-12) vol.ii, pp.304-307.

2. It is interesting to note that whilst Bisse subscribed for a copy Charlett and Tanner did not; cf. also p.296, notes 1,2. A list of subscribers is to be found Athenae Oxonienses (1721) sig. cl.

whom Mr. Wood bequeathed the Original Copy upon his Death-bed".[1] Nor was any mention made of an editor.[2] The publishers, moreover, foresaw criticism of the editorial work and further announced that Wood's original manuscript [redacted] "is still preserved under his own Hand, and may be seen at Mr. Knaplock's Shop by any Gentleman, who has the Curiosity to satisfy himself how faithfully, and with what due regard to the Memory of the Author, and other persons therein mentioned, the same is now publish'd".[3]

As was to be expected the work attracted criticism both from those who had not wanted its publication and from those who had; the former objected to Wood's unrestrained observations and the latter, as Tanner had prophecied, found less scandal than they had expected and therefore alleged that there must have been extensive and unwarranted alterations in Wood's text. In spite of Tanner's watchful eye the work

---

1. "The Booksellers to the Reader"; Athenae Oxonienses (1721) ad initium.

2. Echard may perhaps have been the editor, but his correspondence with Tanner nowhere indicates that he was anything more than an intermediary in the transfer of the papers from Tanner to Tonson.

3. "The Booksellers to the Reader". It is said in Gutch's edition of Wood's History and antiquities, vol.i, sig. f1v, f.2, that "It was a report current at that time, which is still remembered by persons now living [1772], that Dr. Tanner promised to execute his task with the utmost fidelity and adherence to the Author's manuscript; and, as proof of his having done so, to deposite the original in the Bodleian Library, for the inspection of the public. The latter part of this engagement has never been fulfilled, which has given rise to a suspicion that the other also was not strictly observed". There does not seem to be any evidence that Tanner ever promised to deposit the manuscript in the Bodleian and possibly Gutch is thinking of the deposit in Knaplock's shop. Tanner knew where the original was in 1735, cf. p. 308 (thought he)

still contained odd phrases that some people found distasteful and although he had been particularly careful with the account of Bishop Crew that had already caused some comment,[1] Vice-Chancellor Shippen was extremely perturbed at the final version which still contained a passage that he "would not for all the World the B^p. should see".[2] Crew had been a great benefactor to Oxford University and Shippen might well worry about future benefactions from the same source for he was not to know that three weeks later the generous bishop would be dead.[3] Hearne's prejudice was in no way abated by the eventual appearance of the Athenae and he considered that Tanner had "neither done Justice to Anthony, nor got any Credit by letting the Papers come out in this manner"[4] and that it was "so very paultry and silly a Book, that nothing can be worse",[5] but it was not until he had examined the edition more closely that he allowed his prejudice to develop beyond all bounds and he fell into the habit of referring to it as the "spurious edition".[6] Hearne was by no means alone in his condemnation and Thomas Collins of Magdalen College expressed his views rather neatly when he

---

1. Cf. p.269. For the suppressed portion of this life see Athenae, ed. Bliss (1813) vol.iv, columns 886-888. Cf. also "Memoirs of Nathaniel, Lord Crewe", ed. by A.Clark, Camden miscellany, vol.ix (Camden society, new ser., 53) pp.43-46.
2. Hearne, vol.vii, p.272. 28 August 1721.
3. Crew died 18 September 1721.
4. Hearne, vol.vii, p.273.
5. Hearne, vol.vii, p.281.
6. Cf. Hearne, vol.viii, pp.47,109,171; ix, p.262; x, p.215; xi, pp.32,124; et passim.

said that Wood "if living, would be glad if the University would burn the new Ed. of Athenae Oxon., tho' he was much displeas'd that they burnt the first".[1]

Tanner was disinclined to take the blame for all the defects of the second edition:[2] he denied that he was the responsible editor and he moreover denied that he had even seen the proofs; in particular the blame for the alterations in the lives that had already appeared in the first edition must be attributed to those who had transcribed Wood's notes from the Ashmolean copy and this, he asserted, had been done by "very careless and unskilfull hands".[3] Of the additional lives he admitted to having struck out a few phrases but not to having made any alterations; these lives had then been given to the publisher and he had had no more concern with the edition. On the whole, therefore, he felt that people "ought not to be much angry, they knew Mr Woods & his manner of writing and ought [to] make some allowances for the many memoirs of their Famous Men, wch otherwise would have been lost".[4] Hearne reacted in his usual manner to Tanner's

---

1. Hearne, vol.vii, p.281.

2. Tanner wrote a lengthy explanation of his part in the revised Athenae to Charlett (MS. Ballard 4, f.143v,144; reproduced on pp.285,286) and, much later, another to Rawlinson (MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.27v,28; reproduced on p.308). He also discussed the matter with Willis (cf. MS. Willis 64, f.52) and with Baker (cf. p.284).

3. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.27v, Tanner to Rawlinson, 29 Aug. 1735.

4. MS. Willis 64, f.52, Tanner to Willis, 28 Apr. 1722.

excuses and the following extract from his diary displays his spleen to the full:

> Nov. 22 (Wed.). Out of a Letter to me from the Rev. M^r. Thomas Baker, of S^t. John's-Coll., Cambr., dated Nov.15, 1721:-[1]
> I heard lately from D^r. Tanner. I find he owns no other hand in the new Edition of that Work (Athenae Oxon.) except the additionall Lives, & is not pleased with the Printer or Publisher, & not without reason. The D^r. in his Letter has these words, wch I send you in his Vindication: <u>There were (I must own to you) several hard words & passages more in the Original, which I thought good manners & Christian Charity, and a regard to the old Gentleman's memory, obliged me to strike out. - This I had also authority to do from the Author, as by writing under his hand; - for w^ch, perhaps, I may be blamed, as I am by others for not striking out more.</u>
> So far from M^r. Baker's Letter. D^r. Tanner's Vindication is very poor & mean, & notwithstanding his pretended regard to the old Gentleman's Memory (for in a contemptuous manner he is pleased to stile him <u>the old Gentleman</u>), he hath done more injury to it than by any one thing he could think upon. He hath altered all things so, & made him talk in such a manner, as if M^r. Wood had been a downright Villain, & had not known what even the most ignorant Scholar knows. How comes it, otherwise, to pass that more than once Gentlemen, when they are matriculated, are represented to take the Oaths of Allegiance & Supremacy? M^r. Wood could not write so, since nobody knew better that the Oath of Supremacy only, & not the Oath of Allegiance, is then taken. Nor does the Statute require an Oath of Allegiance at that time. But this was added to bring a slur upon the University, and out of a trimming Design, as it was also out of Design to please the Trimmers that the D^r. hath left out the just Characters of D^r. Wallis & D^r. Bathurst, wch he ought to have kept in certainly as well as that of D^r. South. But there is a vast Multitude of other Objections. I do not doubt but Tanner was guided by his Crony, D^r. Arthur Charlett, commonly called the stupid Incumberer of the Ground, a great Admirer of Wallis & Bathurst, & a hater of South. What the D^r. pretends about something under M^r. Wood's own Hand to justify his Managem^t, is stuff. I am sure it cannot extend to the Liberty that hath been taken. When Tanner was recommended to M^r. Wood (on his Death Bed) by Charlett, &, it may be, others, M^r. Wood vehemently ask'd, <u>Hath he Courage, will he be honest?</u> repeating the words over & over. And when he was assured

---

1. This letter is now MS. Rawl. lett. 21/22, f.52.

> he had both Qualifications, he committed the Papers to him. But how he hath betray'd his Trust, this spurious Edition is a most wofull Instance. Nor does his blaming the Printer & Publisher clear him one bit. His Pretence to good manners & X^tian Charity is likewise slurring M^r. Wood, as if he had not regard to either. Had Tanner kept strictly to either, he would not have permitted such a strange, spurious Ed to come abroad.[1]

Two days later he continued his animadversions and henceforth the "spurious edition" is intermittently mentioned throughout the remainder of his diaries. Baker, in Cambridge, later thought that Hearne had been "too hard" on Tanner[2] but Hearne found a measure of agreement in the University of Oxford, which after all was the community most closely concerned, that the edition was not all that could be desired. Tanner thought that this criticism was unjustified and that it overlooked the great care that he had taken not to print any dubious material about benefactors to the University:

> I was sorry to hear some time since that several in Oxford were very angry wth me on account of the New Edition of the Athenae Oxon In the part of wch wherein I was concern'd you knew my mind and I had your good advice wch I follow'd as carefully as I could, and thought not thereby to have deserv'd any very hard Censures. I have formerly hinted to you the difficulties I was under, on one hand to discharge honestly the trust my old Friend had put in me on his Death-bed, and on the other not to be concern'd in publishing (wth the many good Memorials wch would otherwise have been lost and are to be had no where else) several unbecoming things. Upon the Design of a New Edition of the Old two Volumes, by Mr Arch^d Eachards means, I was indeed prevail'd upon to let Mr Tonson have the additional Lives wch were bequeath'd to me, thinking [it] a proper time to get rid of those papers wch were known

---

1. Hearne, vol.vii, pp.300,301.

2. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.214, Baker to Rawlinson, 14 Oct. 1735.

to be left in my hands, and wch the world expected from me. I may without vanity say they might have fallen into worse and more careless hands, who might have given more just Offence. There is no answering for every passage in so g^t a variety; I can truly say there was not by me one Sentence nor so much as one hard word added; and in the few things omitted I believe Mr W. memory nor Truth /[neither] will much suffer. Tis pity it should, while the only regard therein was to Good Manners and the doing Justice to the Characters of Men otherwise of unspotted reputation, or that the Charity and Munificence of a Noble person or two to the University itself should not be allow'd as a good reason for the covering some of their Sins, some false steps in their conduct. One thing was particularly said to be clamor'd at viz, the inserting the word confident in some part of ArchB^p Lauds Character - but as to any passages added or altered in the Old Lives, I have very little to answer for, those not coming from me, but transcribed by some among your selves from the interleavd Book in the Musaeum - and if all were like some part that I saw, very unaccurately by one that could not read Mr Woods hand. What work in printing they have made wth either what came from Oxford or hence I am not able to say, for Mr Tonson would never let me see one sheet as they have printed it wither before or since the Publication of this New Edition - Which by chance I once saw for a quarter of an hour in a Friends Study; for I have not yet been able to get one Copy from them for my self or Friends,[1] tho' by express agreem^t I was to have six, and desired Mr T. that he would take [care] that one in large Ppaer might be early sent down to You at Oxford as from me[2] - wch by what has happened to my self, I suppose is left undone. Nor is this the only thing wherein the Booksellers have done unhansomely by me who dealt generously by them.[3]

In spite of Hearne's assertion that he called the revised Athenae "spurious" because "all People that I have heard

---

1. Tanner subsequently obtained a copy; it is now in the Bodleian, MS. Top. Oxon. b. 8,9.

2. Charlett's copy of the Athenae Oxonienses (which edition does not appear) had a long note by Tanner in it, cf. Hearne vol.ix, p.105.

3. MS. Ballard 4, ff.143v,144, Tanner to Charlett, 2 Apr. 1722.

mention it call it so"[1] the general feeling at Oxford seems to have been one of relief that the work was no worse than it was, and the attitude of the dignitaries of the Church from Archbishop Wake downwards must have been much the same. When Tanner was installed as a Canon of Christ Church not long after[2] it was Hearne's opinion that he owed this preferment to his handling of the situation.[3] This appointment, with its obligations of residence, brought Tanner more frequently to Oxford than hitherto and consequently into much closer contact with Hearne who, in spite of the scholarly friendship that existed between them, never let an opportunity slip of commenting on Tanner's part in the "spurious edition". As most other scholars soon found themselves inclined to disregard the alleged defects, or at any rate not to lay the blame for them at Tanner's door, Tanner found Hearne's strictures particularly galling and he repeatedly asked him to justify them.[4] But Hearne would only point to a minor alteration that had been made in Wood's account of Bishop William Lloyd[5], and as this account had appeared in the original edition and was not one of the additional lives Tanner was able to deny that

---

1. Hearne, vol.vii, p.292.
2. Tanner was installed 15 February 1724.
3. Cf. Hearne, vol.viii, p.171.
4. Cf. p. 308 .
5. Lloyd was described as Bishop of Worcester but he had not been translated to the see until 1700 and as Wood had died in 1695 he could not possibly have written this.

the responsibility was his. Because he was able to show that Hearne's comments were unjustified he found Hearne's refusal to accept his explanation somewhat annoying. This alteration had been one of the first things that Hearne had noticed about the second edition[1] and it shows uncharacteristic restraint on his part that he would only cite this one error to Tanner for he had made several notes in his diary about other lives and he might well have asked for more details of errors or omissions concerning Ralph Bathurst,[2] Robert South,[3] John Wallis,[4] John Bradshaw,[5] and Nathaniel Wanley.[6] On the whole, however, Hearne's comments even in the seclusion of his diary were only of a superficial nature and, in view of the fact that he had never actually seen the original text, totally unjustified.[7] The work did in fact contain several errors but these were only to be expected and

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.vii, p.281.

2. Cf. Hearne, vol.vii, p.301 (cf. p.284).

3. ibid.

4. ibid. It will be remembered that Tanner had expected to find a life of Wallis amongst Wood's papers but had not done so, cf. p.276. Hearne apparently believed it to be still in existence in 1730; cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.359.

5. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.200.

6. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.220. Hearne suspected that an account of Wanley had been "dropt by D^{r}. Tanner ... out of respect to Humph. Wanley, son of this Nathaniel & a great acquaintance of Tanner's".

7. Nine years after the publication of the second edition Hearne was asked by Cuthbert Constable to justify the use of the word "spurious" to describe the enlarged Athenae and he still merely cited the anachronism in the life of Lloyd and another minor point; cf. Hearne, vol.x, pp.353,349.

even today the vast amount of research that is lavished upon our biographical dictionaries cannot render them immune to mistakes. What Hearne had wanted was an accurate edition of Wood's text however defective it might be, but it was not long before he stood alone in this and other scholars settled down to regarding the enlarged Athenae as the useful work of reference that it undoubtedly was.

Rawlinson had long been interested in the Athenae and he soon set to work in making corrections to the second edition.[1] He generously sent these to Hearne[2] who was making similar collections but his interest must have been well known to Tanner who, in 1735, encouraged Rawlinson to think more seriously about publishing a continuation of Wood's work.[3] Rawlinson eagerly turned his energies to this end and rapidly accumulated a great deal of material. He too had to undertake a wide correspondence and to make his task easier he dispensed with letter-writing and circulated a printed questionnaire, an idea which was immediately praised by Tanner.[4]

---

1. An account of Rawlinson's continuation of the Athenae is to be found in Dr. Enright's thesis, MS. D. Phil. d. 1786, ff.244-268.

2. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, pp.417,423,439.

3. Cf. p.308; cf. also MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.31v. Rawlinson later said of the Athenae that he was "putt on this affair much by the late excellt. Bp. Tanner from whom I recd many favours, for a line of his was such"; MS. Ballard 40, f.35.

4. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.32, Tanner to Rawlinson, 2 Oct. 1735.

Rawlinson's industry soon brought the project to the notice of an extremely wide section of the public and Tanner was at last able to see Wood's heritage firmly transferred to another. Rawlinson's enthusiasm was in no way diminished by Tanner's death and was finally brought to a halt only by his own demise in 1755. The work has never been published but the collections for it remain intact in the Bodleian and are a fertile source of information for the biographer.[1]

On the available evidence it is impossible to come to any firm conclusion as to the precise part that Tanner played in the second edition of the Athenae Oxonienses but there are several observations that may well be made. Tanner's own testimony to his friends was consistent: he repeatedly asserted that he simply gave the additional lives to the publishers but that before he did so he struck out a few minor phrases (except in the account of Crew in which substantial omissions were made) and that after this he had no further connection whatsoever with the edition. It is well known that Hearne was a partial observer and that in this connection he was particularly prejudiced, but he does not seem to have been given to fantasies of pure invention and when he asserts that Tanner's secretary told him that Tanner had in fact been closely connected

---

1. These manuscripts are now known as "MSS. Rawl. J." "An index to Rawlinson's collections (circa 1700-50) for a new edition of Wood's Athenae Oxonienses" by S.and M.A.Gibson is to be found in the Oxford bibliographical society. Proceedings and papers, vol.i, pp.67-95.

with the Athenae whilst it was printing[1] it would be unwise to dismiss the incident as purely apocryphal, particularly as it appears in his private diary. Rawlinson, who was a less prejudiced observer than Hearne, also believed that Tanner had been more closely concerned with the second edition than he cared to admit.[2] These suspicions have echoed over the years and a contemporary writer has said that "it is hard to acquit Tanner completely of having in this matter committed a breach of trust".[3] If Tanner was in fact guilty of dissimulation the only way that it can be proved would seem to be by

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.215; "Yesterday D^{r}. Tanner called upon me, & told me that he never saw so much as one sheet of the second Edition of the Athenae Oxon. till after the Book was printed, at wch I could not but admire, when I have been assured from several, & particularly more than once from his servant or secretary Jackson, that the sheets constantly came from the Press to the D^{r}., from whence may be gathered, how willing the D^{r}. is to excuse himself about having a hand in the managing of that spurious Edition, in wch such strange work was made by omissions and Alterations, & yet he never will be able to get it over, the Ed. being most certainly to be ascribed to him, and 'twas he that communicated the Copy". Cf. also ibid., p.170.

2. Rawlinson, in a letter to Thomas Rawlins dated 15 April 1737, wrote "I am also to thank you for your extracts from A.W.'s papers, tho' I observe many of them are inserted in the last Edition of Ath.Oxon. which was certainly from the authors own book in the Musaeum, and the additions were also his, and notwithstanding our freind [sic] Mr Hearne's assertions, legitimate, and I sincerely believe published by the late Bp Tanner, tho' he might think it too triffling to own. It is certain that Ant. W's papers were putt into his hands at his death ... Bp. Tanner has assured me that there was no alteration in any one character, except an omission in that of Bp. Crewe, who was spared as he had been a great benefactor to the University and Lincoln College. The original was left many months in a bookseller['s] hands for the satisfaction of all that were curious"; MS. Ballard 2, f.18.

3. Cf. Douglas, English scholars, p.160.

reference to Wood's original manuscript.

From the moment that Tanner was entrusted with the continuation of the Athenae it was always spoken of as Wood's "third volume" or in similar terms that immediately make one think of a fair copy prepared for the press. The fact that it was convenient to display Wood's original in Knaplock's shop lends colour to this idea and subsequent scholars have tended to assume that the original was in much the same state as the manuscripts that he prepared for his accounts of the City and University of Oxford.[1] Although Wood died with his work unfinished, the Athenae could by its very nature be in an advanced state of preparation whilst in fact it remained what was to all appearances a mass of notes, and the fact that Tanner says that the life of Crew was the one of a number of papers that "by chance came uppermost"[2] seems to indicate that what was deposited in Knaplock's shop was no more than a bundle of loose papers.[3] These remained on display for several months but there is no immediate record of anyone having consulted them and the last time that I have noted

---

1. These are now to be found MS. Wood F 1,2 (University) and MS. Wood F 29a (City).

2. Cf. p. 270, note 1.

3. It would be interesting to know more of Tanner's association with Knaplock. All the correspondence that I have consulted seems to indicate that Tanner dealt with Tonson, but an entry in Hearne (vol.x, p.203) might possibly indicate that he was not unacquainted with Knaplock. [The reading Knap Cock is a transcriber's or compositor's error]. The third bookseller, Midwinter, is nowhere mentioned by Tanner.

their being mentioned as still extant was in 1735 when Tanner referred to them in terms which do not make it clear whether they could still be consulted at the bookseller's or not.[1] It will be remembered that they had been purchased from Tanner so there was no question of their being returned to him and it is probable that they remained at Knaplock's shop in some cupboard until there was no likelihood of their being required again. It would not be out of keeping with the times that Knaplock or his heirs should then have burnt them or used them for packing paper but it seems more likely that a bookseller would try to sell them _in toto_ or piecemeal to antiquarian collectors. Rawlinson leaps immediately to mind as the probable purchaser of such documents; not only was he a collector on a hitherto unprecedented scale but his particular interest in the _Athenae_ was well known. Unfortunately there is no such volume of "Wood papers" in the Rawlinson collections today but a search has revealed some interesting additional information.

In 1792 it was said by John Gutch that among the Rawlinson papers in the Bodleian there were "some loose sheets of the ATHENAE OXON. in Mr Wood's hand writing, in which several passages are erased and cancelled with a pen drawn over them, and a connection made between the upper and lower paragraphs

---

1. Cf. p.308. Rawlinson referred to them in 1737, cf. p.291, note 2.

by (as it appears from the hand) Dr. Tanner".[1] A careful search has not revealed any great quantity of these papers but unfortunately for Tanner's reputation one has survived that shows that his account of his part in the edition is not to be taken entirely at its face value. Wood's life of Thomas Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln, is to be found MS. Rawl. D 912, f.642 and it contains sufficient material lacking in the printed version to make absolute nonsense of Tanner's assertion that the only large omission was in the life of Crew. This excision is indicated in a hand that can be positively identified as Tanner's. The omission was probably every bit as justifiable as that to which he admitted[2] and could have sprung from much the same reasons,[3] but that is hardly the point; why should Tanner admit to censorship in the case of Crew and not in the case of Barlow? There does not seem to be any obvious answer to this problem, although it is not out of place to observe that Barlow had died some twenty years earlier whereas Crew may well have been still alive when Tanner struck out the offending passage. Possibly some assesament of the risk of prosecution tempered Tanner's editorial fidelity.

---

1. Cf. Wood, History and antiquities, ed. Gutch, vol.i, sig. f4v.
2. The excised portion is given in the Appendix to this chapter, p.307.
3. Barlow, too, had been a generous benefactor to the University.

In the same Rawlinson volume there is another leaf[1] that might perhaps be held to indicate that Tanner actually edited the additions to Wood. It is in Tanner's hand and consists of a list of the names of those Oxford writers who were alive at the time of Wood's death. After many of the names Tanner has added queries for further information and these queries are of such a nature that they seem to indicate serious research on Tanner's part[2] thus excluding any possibility that this might be his finding-list or the list of the names that he sent Tonson.[3] It is, however, possible that it may represent preliminary work done at Oxford at a time when he intended to publish the continuation of the Athenae himself[4] and it would be very hard to prove that there was any direct editorial connection between this list and the biographies that appear at columns 933-1134 of the second volume of the printed Athenae.

MS. Rawl. D 912 also contains a number of relevant scraps in Wood's handwriting[5] but these could hardly be advanced as any indication that Rawlinson obtained Wood's continuation

---

1. MS. Rawl. D 912, f.641.

2. e.g. After Edward Young, of New College, Tanner has written "When Pell. of Winch.? What preferment beside his Prebend of Sal.?"; after James Parkinson, of Lincoln College, "Where does he live now? What employment since his expulsion"; &c.

3. Cf. pp. 268, 271

4. Cf. p. 280.

5. MS. Rawl. D 912, ff.562-645^{v}.

from Knaplock, nor can they be identified as the papers referred to by Gutch in 1792. The most likely explanation of their provenance would seem to be that Tanner himself gave them to Rawlinson as material not unconnected with the projected second continuation, but it must also be admitted that another possibility is that Rawlinson "borrowed" them either from the Wood collection in the Ashmolean or from the Tanner collection in the Bodleian during the course of his researches.[1]

There are however some further documents in the Bodleian Library that seem to belong to Wood's continuation and these have been inserted in Tanner's annotated copy of the 1721 Athenae.[2] It is here that Wood's account of Crew is to be found. At first sight it would seem that the documents must have been placed in the volumes by Tanner as a supplement to the many notes that he has written in the margin[3] but a further investigation shows that this is not necessarily so, and in the case of certain insertions not in Wood's hand it is absolutely impossible for some of the documents are letters addressed to Rawlinson and dated after Tanner's death.[4] As

---

1. For examples of Wood manuscripts in the Rawlinson collection that definitely do not belong there see p.267, note 2.

2. MS. Top. Oxon. b. 8,9. These have been mistakenly described in the Summary Catalogue as being of the 1691 edition.

3. These notes were incorporated by Philip Bliss into the third edition of the Athenae (Lond., 1813-20). Tanner had apparently made some notes in a copy of the first edition because not long after his death such a volume was obtained by Rawlinson; cf. MS. Ballard 40, f.35. Its present location is unknown.

4. e.g. MS. Top. Oxon. b. 9; the inserted letter at column 900 is from Francis Peck to Rawlinson and is dated 19 June 1740.

the volumes have at one time been referenced with the Rawlinson collection[1] and have also been said in the Summary Catalogue to have "no doubt" belonged to him[2] it would be easy to assume that these papers were inserted by Rawlinson and to argue that this increases the likelihood that he did in fact obtain the continuation from Knaplock. Unfortunately, these volumes were apparently in the library in 1750[3] when they seem to have been ordered by Rawlinson himself[4] and, moreover, the transcripts that Rawlinson made from Tanner's manuscripts after they were deposited in the Bodleian show that the life of Crew that is now inserted at volume II, column 1177, was at that time in MS. T. 454, possibly a bundle of loose papers.[5]

---

1. As MS. Rawl. J. fol. 4,5. At some other time it was apparently intended to shelve them with the "Gough adds." collection.

2. Cf. Summary catalogue, vol.v, p.374; after no. 27860.

3. They are in all probability to be identified with the copy of the Athenae that was amongst Tanner's folios that were dispersed from the collection, cf. pp.354,355.

4. On 20 October 1750 Rawlinson ordered "Tan. Wood's Athenae Oxon.", cf. L.P. Entry book, 1749-52. This seems to imply that the volumes were then still unreferenced. Cf. also pp.353,354.

5. Rawlinson's transcript of the life of Crew is to be found MS. Rawl. J. fol. 2, ff.456,457. Rawlinson also transcribed from MS. T. 454 much correspondence relating to Wood and the continuation of the Athenae. These transcripts are now MS. Rawl. J. fol. 12, ff.270-275 but the originals are no longer in the Tanner volume and are to be found in MS. Wood F 51. As well as letters from Tanner this Wood volume contains others addressed to him and there can be little doubt that more of the material than Rawlinson transcribed, if not the contents of the whole volume, passed through Tanner's hands. MS. Wood F 46-50 consists of a collection of Wood papers that were found in a large wooden box in the Bodleian Library in 1883 after the Wood collection had been transferred from the Ashmolean. They were bound in their present form in 1884. They are very similar to the papers now in MS. T. 454 and their provenance

[cont. on next page]

From this it would seem that the staff of the library must have inserted the papers, perhaps from various sources, at some time between 1755 when the Rawlinson collection was received and 1813 when the third edition of the Athenae refers to them as being in the present volumes,[1] Whilst it cannot be proved that all these papers were ever in Rawlinson's possession it is still just possible that they may be the papers described as being in his collection in 1792.

There is little need here to review these papers in detail for they were examined for the third edition of the Athenae, in which anything found to be omitted in the 1721 edition was included with a note of the source of the information. Material in Wood's hand for the continuation is far from plentiful and it is hardly surprising that for the most part such variations are of a minor nature but, in addition to the much-mentioned life of Crew, there is also an account of Thomas Jones[2] which was printed in the second edition in a very abbreviated form.[3] The editor of the third edition blames Tanner for this[4]

---

5 cont. and connection with Tanner and Charlett has been reviewed by S.G.Gillam, op. cit., Bodleian library record, vol.iv, pp.110-112.

1. Cf. Athenae, ed. Bliss (1813) vol.iii, column 708; vol.iv, column 511, &c.

2. MS. Top. Oxon. b. 9; insertion at column 361.

3. Cf. Athenae (1721) vol.ii, column 361. An account of Archbishop Tillotson is inserted in MS. Top. Oxon. b. 9 at column 508. It is extremely long and takes up three columns of small print in Athenae, ed. Bliss (1813) where it is printed vol.iv, columns 511-513. Tillotson, however, was a Cambridge man.

4. Cf. Athenae, ed. Bliss (1813) vol.iii, column 708.

and the leaf does in fact contain an annotation in Tanner's hand although the omission has not been indicated by him as it has in the life of Barlow. The life of Jones does not form part of Wood's continuation proper but is really a 1721 addition to the original text of 1692[1] and for this reason it is to be supposed that it must at least have been supplied to the printer by Tanner.

It will be seen that there are today in the Bodleian a number of papers in Wood's hand that relate to the continuation of the Athenae,[2] the three most interesting of which are fairly lengthy biographies containing portions suppressed in the 1721 edition. It would seem to be extremely likely that these papers have been preserved for this very reason, a preservation that may well have stemmed from the fact that because of these variations Tanner never sent them to Tonson. Nevertheless, there would still seem to be a reasonable possibility that some at least of the papers now in the Rawlinson and Tanner collections and in Tanner's copy of the Athenae, together with those in certain portions of the Wood collection,[3] may have formed part of the originals that were available for

---

1. It is inserted after the life of Francis Cheynell, which appears at vol.ii, column 245 of the 1691 Athenae.

2. A conspectus of all the papers relating to the Athenae now in the Bodleian is to be found in Wood, Life and times, vol.iv, pp.232-235.

3. See p.297, note 5.

inspection in Knaplock's shop. From one point of view it is hard to see how they could fail to be so for some of this material appears in the printed version and Knaplock would have had to have been able to produce something under Wood's hand to correspond to everything that had been printed; moreover, if the very lives that were called into question were not present it could only lead to greater suspicion that the text had been tampered with. On the other hand it is unlikely that Wood ever bothered to rewrite the lives of Barlow, Crew, and Jones - he had apparently intended to print his third volume abroad in order that he might enjoy the greater freedom of expression[1]- and since the original accounts of these men displayed every sign of editorial "condensation" it is hard to see how they could ever have been produced in support of a text which was far from a verbatim transcript.

Of the lives of Barlow, Crew, and Jones, Tanner undoubtedly made alterations to the first and second and may be presumed to have altered the third; moreover, his excuses are demonstrably false in one point and may well be so in others. In the light of present evidence, however, it is impossible to make any real assessment of his part in the edition although it is certain that it is more than he was willing to admit. After careful enquiry the Rev. Andrew Clark, an expert on

---

1. Cf. MS. Wood F 51, f.18.

Wood, came to the conclusion that "except for cutting out a few harsh reflections, the printed copy faithfully represented Wood's text".[1] Whilst it can in some instances be shown that the "few harsh reflections" were extensive it is possible to say that we cannot now definitely ascribe to Tanner any editorial alterations in the text of the Athenae that could not be justified on the grounds of having "regard ... to Good Manners and the doing Justice to the Characters of Men otherwise of unspotted reputation".[2]

There still remains, however, the question of whether in making these alterations Tanner did not break faith with Anthony Wood. The precise terms of Tanner's undertaking are not clear. It has been pointed out by Andrew Clark that Charlett's statement that the continuation was given to Tanner "without any restrictions" can mean something entirely different when read in its full context and also that it is "absolutely incredible that the jealous old antiquary should have made a present of his cherished papers to a mere stranger to dispose of them as he thought fit".[3] Clark's observations, however, seem to need further qualification. Firstly, Tanner was by no means a "mere stranger", having been well acquainted with Wood for a sufficient time to enable that scholar to

---

1. Wood, Life and times, vol.iv, p.232.
2. Cf. p. 286.
3. Cf. Wood, Life and times, vol.iii, p.499; Wood, City of Oxford, vol.i, p.25.

assess his antiquarian abilities,[1] and it should also be remembered that Tanner had been strongly recommended by Charlett. Secondly, insufficient allowance seems to be made for the fact that on his death-bed Wood organised the destruction of some of his collections and arranged for the examination of others to ensure that any "loose foolish Papers" should not reach the public.[2] Charlett's statement must, I think, continue to be regarded at best as ambiguous. On one occasion Tanner said that Wood had given him "full power on his death bed to add or alter or leave out what I thought fit"[3] and he is also reported to have claimed that he had "something under M^r. Wood's own Hand" to justify his conduct,[4] but on the other hand he admitted to no less a person than Charlett his difficulty in reconciling the faithful discharge of Wood's trust with the necessity of abridging the papers.[5] The only other two people immediately concerned, Bisse and Martin, seem to have been silent on the matter and any possible further evidence could only come at second hand. A review of this chapter, which was undertaken partly to enquire into Hearne's allegations of editorial infidelity, will show that most of such evidence is supplied by Hearne

---

1. Cf. pp. 163, 259, 260.
2. Cf. p. 262.
3. Cf. p. 308.
4. Cf. p. 284.
5. Cf. p. 285.

himself. He is, however, an unreliable witness: it has long been accepted that most of his observations are coloured and over-emphasised and it is not altogether unreasonable to rule his evidence as inadmissable (although particularly interesting) unless corroborated elsewhere. No such corroboration appears with respect to the terms of Wood's bequest and it now seems to be impossible to come to any verdict as to the fidelity of Tanner's discharge of his trust.

Tanner's connection with Wood was in later life largely confined to his association with the Athenae but from time to time he was consulted on other matters relating to the Oxford scholar; indeed, in 1721, Hearne was able to say that Tanner knew more about Wood than any other man alive.[1] Not only were some of Wood's private papers still in his possession, prominent among them Wood's autobiography,[2] but after Charlett's death in 1722 he was the only person within the Oxford circle who had ever been on really intimate terms with Wood and it

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.ix, p.370

2. Hearne was particularly interested in this and believed that Tanner had at some time owned more than he admitted to, a belief shared by other scholars. Tanner was even accused of having destroyed part of Wood's autobiography but I have found no evidence to support this. Cf. (inter alia) Hearne, vol.iii, p.54; vol.ix, p.408; vol.x, pp.213,214; 276. Hearne published part of Tanner's material relating to Wood's life at pp.438-603 of his edition of Tho. Caii Vindiciae. The constituent parts of the diary and life are reviewed in Wood, Life and times, vol.i, pp.1-3.

was to Tanner that Hearne turned for the personal anecdotes that he so much wished to hear.[1] It was probably his reputation as an expert on Wood that lead to the suggestion in 1720[2] that he should undertake the publication of an English version of Wood's Historia et Antiquitates Universitatis Oxoniensis which had already been prepared by the author. When the suggestion was put to Robert Shippen, the Vice-Chancellor, the reply was that "D^{r}. Tanner ... hath done injury enough to the University already" and steps were taken to discourage the enterprise;[3] Shippen, it will be remembered, had already been somewhat disturbed at the account of Crew that Tanner had permitted to appear in the Athenae. Tanner, however, needed little discouragement for he had already refused the undertaking on the undoubtedly valid grounds that he could not spare the time.[4] The suggestion, however, did bring to light a somewhat embarrasing situation. The original manuscript of the English version of Wood's work had been described as the first item in the catalogue of his collections as deposited in the Ashmolean but it was not to be found in that library. John Whiteside, the Keeper, was well aware of this

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.viii, pp.183,184; vol.ix, pp.168,308; vol.x, p.80; vol.xi, p.406.

2. Cf. MS. Rawl. D 742, f.42v, a transcript by Rawlinson of a letter from Tanner to S.Knight, 1 September 1720. I do not know the whereabouts of the original of this letter. Cf. also Hearne, vol.vii, p.285.

3. Cf. Hearne, vol.vii, p.307.

4. Cf. MS. Rawl. D 742, f.42v.

deficiency for he had asked Tanner where it was in 1717 and had been told that Charlett had had it ever since Wood's death.[1] Charlett, it appears, had conveniently regarded it as forming part of Wood's private papers and had used this as a pretext for retaining this interesting work in his own possession. A little before 1720 the Keeper of the University Archives, Bernard Gardiner, who was also Warden of All Souls, undertook similar research and in order to assist him Charlett deposited Wood's manuscript amongst the archives. But with such a prominent entry in Bernard's Catalogus there was little doubt as to where the volumes really should be housed and Tanner, when his opinion was sought, categorically stated that they belonged to the Museum.[2] The volumes, however, remained with the archives and, whilst Hearne caustically asserted that this was mainly because the successive Keepers might lack sufficient Latin to be able to consult the original,[3] Gardiner put forward the theory that the £100 paid by the University for the copyright of the Latin version extended to the English manuscript as well.[4] This was hardly true for Wood had regarded the English version as a second work rather than a translation of the original text (which

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.vi, p.68.
2. Cf. Hearne, vol.viii, p.199; vol.x, p.3; vol.xi, p.6.
3. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.3. Hearne actively disliked Gardiner.
4. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, pp.470,471; vol.xi, p.6.

had itself been a translation of a manuscript prepared in English) but Gardiner's version was accepted as being a sufficient reason to allow the volumes to remain where they were for the present. The general dissatisfaction with this arrangement eventually had its effect and it was not over long before they were finally restored to the Wood collection to which they had rightfully belonged since 1695.[1] The whole dispute was little more than a storm in a teacup but it came at a time when Tanner had just been roundly criticised in some quarters for allegedly tampering with the text of the Athenae and it seemed to emphasise the fact that perhaps he had not completely discharged Wood's last wishes in the way that scholar had intended. He was, in short, unable to give any "satisfactory account" of how the volumes came to be housed anywhere other than in the Ashmolean.[2] Twenty-five years after Wood's death Tanner was, therefore, still feeling the embarrassing effects of a charge that had sprung chiefly from Charlett's desire to help a worthy young scholar.

---

1. They are now MS. Wood F 1,2.
2. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.2.

Appendix.

Wood's original of the excised portion in the life of Barlow is to be found MS. Rawl. D 912, f.642v:

[f.642r] So y^t^ he being installed in y^t^ dignity on y^e^ [f.642v] 13 of June 1664, thought thereupon y^t^ he was put into the road to gaine higher preferment [excision begins] but he was altogether mistaken: for his former complyance with Presbyterians & Independents, and acquaintance, if not intimacie, with Anabaptists & other sectaries was so notoriously knowne, y^t^ & so consequently represented to the Fathers of the Church, y^t^ Dr Sheldon Archb. of Canterbury did often protest yt so long as he lived he should never be a Bishop. These things being well knowne, he grew much discontented, looked awry upon certaine Doctors of this Universitie who had made a representation of him & his qualities to the said Fathers of the Church, (with which the King was also acquainted) & others. In the meane time his Lodgings were open to all commers, especially such yt were discontented or wanted preferment, nay & to Presbyterians & Independents too of the old stock: to whom he would make his braggs y^t^ if it had not been for his endeavours & those of Dr Tho. Tully the University would have been overspread with Pelagianisme after his Maj. returne. Furthermore also when a report passed thro the University y^t^ the Doctors & Bachelaurs of Divinity would not re-choose him to his Margaret professorship (for the professor is according to statute to be re-elected every two yeares) he seemed to resent the matter so much yt he protested more than once, to some of his acquaintance, yt if they would not re-choose him, he would retire with his books to his farme in the North, & there pick such holes in the service book, Homelies, Canons &c y^t^ they should find work enough to stop them up againe, or to yt effect. At length after long expectation, he, by flatteries, epistolarie courtments, rewards he [excision ends] procured the Bishoprick of Lincolne.

Instead of the excised words there is substituted, in Tanner's hand, the phrase "and after long expectation he". There are also other amendments. However desirable such omissions might be it will be seen that they do not correspond with Tanner's own accounts of his part in the edition which are to be found MS. Ballard 4, ff.143v,144, Tanner to Charlett,

2 April 1722; and MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.27v,28, Tanner to Rawlinson, 29 August 1735. The first of these has been given on pp.285,286; the second is given here:

I never could get T.H[earne]. to explain himself with regard to the hard names he always gave the last Edition of the Athenae Oxon. The only passage he would ever shew me to make it spurious was B^p^ Lloyd (formerly of S^t^. Asaph) being call'd B^p^ of Worcester - wch to be certain he was not till after A.Wood's death. This is not in the additional Lives, but owing to the transcribers of the interleaved old Edition, wch was put up wth the rest of his books in the Musaeum. This the Booksellers when they bought the Copy of Mr A.Wood's Executrix got transcribed by very careless and unskilfull hands, and tho' some paine was taken at a distance from Oxford to put those scraps into their right places, yet to be sure there must be some mistakes. A.Wood having left the additional Lives to me, with full power on his death bed to add or alter or leave out what I thought fit - for some few years I had thoughts of continuing that work - but being shortly after engaged in another public design, and ere long call'd away from Oxford, I was forced to drop all attempts of that nature. But when Tonson and the other Booksellers were about to reprint the Athenae, and applyed to me by Laur. Echard to let them print the Additions also, I thought it became me in pursuance of the trust my old Friend had reposed in me to let them have the same. What went from me was all in Mr Woods own hand without the least addition from me and wch originals they have to shew. There was in about 4. or 5. places a hard and as there was g^t^ reason to think an untrue Epithet drop'd but not one sentence omitted unless in the Life of B^p^ Crew. on whom on account of an old Grudge AW had bore very severe, but that B^p^ having been so very generous to the University, to his College and to many other public Buildings, I was unwilling to have him branded to that degree and thought his benificence & Charity should cover some of his Faults, if they were true, wch I trust all were not, so sent up only an Abridgm^t^ - this was the only alteration that I know of. Indeed I did not see one Sheet after it was printed of, till the publication. But the Originall under Mr Woods own hand will justify every body concern'd, and it will appear that scarce any posthumous Work was more faithfully printed.

I heartily wish some industrious Oxford man would continue that work. I would encourage and assist all that was in my power; I have a pretty many additions in the margins of my own books.

CHAPTER VI

THE TANNER COLLECTIONS

a: Formation and History

In spite of Tanner's wide academic interests and the meticulous care that he put into the production of his scholarly works there can be little doubt that in the twentieth century he is best remembered as a collector. Tanner was amongst those who demonstrated by the high standard of their work that worthwhile research must be based on original sources and modern scholars have found a rich store of materials in the library that he formed; the manuscripts are an important source for the study of English history and there are some exceedingly rare printed books. Considered valuable during his lifetime, his collection is now one of the prides of the Bodleian Library where, by his bequest, it is housed.

It is not surprising that the author of such works as the Notitia and the Bibliotheca should have formed a particularly fine library; moreover, the Tanner collections are by no means limited to the scope of these two undertakings. The compilation of the Bibliotheca, in particular,[1] enabled Tanner to bring to his collection a discernment of the true values of bibliophily that his contemporaries often lacked, and which

---

1. It is known that Bale, too, had been an ardent book-collector; cf. McCusker, John Bale, p.29.

largely accounts for the exceptional importance of the Tanner printed books today. In reference to a later period the distinction has been drawn between book-collecting and the mere formation of a library[1] and Tanner was, in his day, one of the best of collectors; a man, in fact, who collected books not only because he liked them but also because he appreciated them. His manuscripts display no substantial evidence of an omnivorous appetite for scraps of old paper, such as can be seen amongst those of his friend Richard Rawlinson. These formed the largest single collection ever to be given to the Bodleian and have since been described as containing "the choice of book-auctions, the pickings of chandlers' and grocers' waste-paper, everything, especially, in the shape of a MS., from early copies of Classics and Fathers to the well-nigh most recent log-books of sailors' voyages".[2] In a later age Sir Thomas Phillipps was to bring a similar furious energy to the amassing of books,[3] and both Rawlinson and Phillipps were able to absorb into their libraries material that Tanner had himself written or collected and which might otherwise have perished.[4]

---

1. Cf. J.Carter, Taste & technique in book-collecting, 2nd impr. (Cambr., 1949) pp.1-10. General accounts of private collectors are to be found in S.de Ricci, English collectors of books & manuscripts (Lond., 1960) and R.Irwin, The origins of the English library (Lond., 1958) part ii.

2. Macray, Annals, pp.233,234.

3. Cf. A.N.L.Munby, Phillipps studies (Cambr., 1951-60). Nos. iii, iv.

4. Cf. pp. 350, 403, 404

An examination of the formation and history of Tanner's collections is particularly interesting, the more so because the presence of some unexpected items has caused comment. The late Professor Jenkins advised students in quest of ecclesiastical records which have strayed never to omit to consult the catalogue of the Tanner manuscripts,[1] whilst others, particularly the historians of East Anglia, have been more outspoken and Tanner has been described as an "arch- (if well meaning) thief"[2] and, more recently, as a "most flagrant jackdaw as far as MSS. were concerned. For him there was no meum or tuum; and with his own journeying there drifted to other parts the appropriated parchments".[3] In the Historical Manuscripts Commission's report on the collections of the Dean and Chapter of Ely it was said that "It is impossible to acquit Bp. Tanner of something more than carelessness in his dealings with such records as were under his custody, or to which his position gave him access".[4] It is true that after the Tanner collections were deposited in the Bodleian certain items were restored to other institutions[5] and claim was also laid to several other documents,[6] but even if Tanner were to be

---

1. Cf. C.Jenkins, Ecclesiastical records (Helps for students of history, 18), (Lond., 1920) p.36.

2. W.Rye, History of the parish of Eaton (Rye's monographs of Norwich hamlets, 1), (Norwich, 1917) p.3.

3. E.H.Carter, The Norwich subscription books (Lond., 1937) p.xvii.

4. Hist. MSS. Comm. 12th Report. Appendix. Pt.ix, p.392.

5. Cf. p. 351.

6. Cf. pp.330-332.

proved guilty of stealing, and it does not necessarily follow that he did any such thing, these instances must be viewed in the light of the general behaviour of his brother antiquaries, most of whom thought it no crime to ensure the preservation of valuable documents by the simple expedient of removing them from the doubtful care of their rightful owners. Tanner, of course, cannot always be even partially justified on these grounds because many of the suspect documents would appear to belong to institutions where they might reasonably seem to be safe; however, some of these are known to have passed into his possession by purchase from a third party and in this respect we can only conclude that Tanner was no better and no worse than most of his fellow antiquarians.[1]

Tanner's father certainly possessed a collection of books of some sort[2] but there is nothing to show that it was any larger than that any country vicar might own and it is unlikely that Tanner came into contact with large collections until he matriculated at Oxford. Whilst Tanner was an undergraduate at ~~The~~ Queen's College the bequest of Bishop Barlow was being absorbed into the library, and it was partly as a result of Barlow's death that he was able to lay the foundation of his

---

1. Rawlinson spoke of the presence of suspect material in the Tanner collections but in terms that do not make it absolutely clear whether he thought that Tanner or Wood was responsible, cf. MS.Ballard 2, f.13v. That Wood might well be to blame in this matter was well known, cf. Hearne, vol.ii, p.44; vol.xi, p.242.

2. T.663-666 are endorsed in Tanner's hand "T.Tanner. Sep. 20. E. Lib: Patris".

collection of manuscripts when quite by chance he wandered into the rooms of an undergraduate acquaintance who was servitor to Henry Brougham, a Fellow of the College. Brougham, together with William Offley, had been one of Barlow's domestic chaplains and these two had been requited for their pains by the bequest of Barlow's Greek, Latin, and English Bibles and his original manuscripts with a rider that they were not to publish any of the latter after his decease. Tanner was not unnaturally horrified to find that his neighbour was just "making an end of a whole Hamper of Letters" addressed to Barlow.[1] Instructions had been issued that every scrap of Barlow's writing was to be preserved and this had apparently been interpreted as tantamount to ordering the destruction of everything that was not in the Bishop's hand. Tanner was able to save "3. or 4. [letters] to B^p Usher from B^p Bedel, Dr Twiss, Sibbs &c[2]- a very judicious one from B^p Sanderson to Dr Barlow - about an answer to B^p Taylor's Liberty of propheseying[3] and some few others" and he regretfully added that he had "ever since much lamented the destruction of the rest, wch were no doubt many of them from men of Note".[4]

Tanner carefully preserved these letters but his financial position did not permit him to add to them by way of purchase

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.125, Tanner to Charlett, 27 Feb. 1718.
2. Presumably now MS. T. 72, f.290; 65, f.83; and 314, f.55.
3. Now MS. T. 52, ff.172, 173.
4. MS. Ballard 4, f.125.

and in the academic atmosphere of Oxford he could not often have met with completely unwanted material. There were, however, such occasions as that when Thomas Clarges of Christ Church received his tobacco from the grocer's wrapped in the leaf of an old manuscript and Tanner was amongst those who "being more curious than ordinary finding it to be something historical, rescued what remain'd the next morning from destruction".[1] A most convenient, and presumably cheap, way of obtaining part of a fourteenth-century cartulary of Glastonbury abbey![2]

We have already seen how Tanner's university and literary career brought him into particularly close contact with libraries not only as a reader but also in what would today be regarded as a professional capacity. From 1694 he had been acquainted with the grace and elegance of Pepys' private collection and his later academic standing meant that he was able to make use of the large privately-owned libraries that were being formed. Amongst these he is known to have tapped

---

1. [B.M.] Add. MSS. 22934, f.3, Tanner to [Cox Macro], 10 July 1722. Tanner speaks of the event as occurring "30. years since".

2. What Tanner in fact obtained seems to have been the complete volume (apart from the preliminaries), now in the British Museum, Add. MSS. 22934. The pre-fixed letter (see note 1) indicates that Tanner parted permanently with the volume and it is not addressed to Beauvoir, as is suggested in the British Museum printed catalogue, but almost certainly to Macro; cf. Nichols, Literary anecdotes vol. ix, p.355. This is also shown in G.R.C.Davis, Medieval cartularies of Great Britain (Lond., 1958) p.50, no.440. Cf. also J.Williamson, Glastonbury abbey: its history and ruins (Wells, 1859) p.50.

the sources of the collections of both Sir Robert Bruce Cotton[1] and Robert Harley, first Earl of Oxford[2] which were amongst the best in the kingdom. When he came to form his own collections he had before him, therefore, the very best examples of both institutional and private libraries to work from. Moreover his studies in these libraries served to introduce him to many of the foremost bibliophiles of the day in much the same way that his work on Bernard's Catalogus had drawn him into the circle of Oxford men who cared - and talked - about books. His association with Humfrey Wanley, who was to become perhaps the greatest librarian of his age,[3] is particularly to be noticed.

Tanner thus became a competent young bookman and it was probably his obvious ability in this direction that prompted Bishop Moore to appoint him his chaplain-librarian in 1698 and so add administrative experience to Tanner's other accomplishments. In his discharge of this office Tanner was partly responsible for the arrangement of Moore's books[4] and

---

1. Tanner used this library in the summer of 1700, cf. MS. Ashmole 1817b, f.8.

2. For an example of Tanner's use of this collection, from which he was actually able to borrow books, see Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, pp.426,428. The Cotton and Harleian manuscripts now form the nucleus of the British Museum collection.

3. Cf. C.E.Wright, "Humfrey Wanley: Saxonist and library keeper", in Proceedings of the British Academy, vol.xlvi, pp.99-129.

4. Soon after Tanner had taken up his new office he wrote to Moore: "I have put your MSS. in the order as they are printed [in Bernard's Catalogus], so that your Ldship may easily find what you shall have occasion for. But if ever I come to

[cont. on next page]

also for such tasks as keeping accessions lists.[1] This library was undoubtedly amongst the foremost private collections in England and Moore has been described as "a collector ... of such multifarious knowledge, of such vivid and just perceptions, and unabating activity that ... he may be hailed as the Father of black-letter Collectors in this country".[2] This description has an unlooked-for literal ring because Tanner, a less notable but still famous black-letter collector, soon became Moore's son-in-law. As he became closer to the bishop so he became rather more an "assistant collector" than a mere assistant in the library and this meant that Tanner had to have a wide knowledge of the relative value of books coupled with a particularly close acquaintance with those that Moore already possessed. In this he must have derived a certain amount of assistance from those occasions when he entertained visitors in his capacity as Moore's librarian.

---

4 cont. London again with your L^dps leave the method and placing them shall be altered"; MS. T. 22, f.105.

1. The portion relating to accessions nos. 831-1025 is now bound with a copy of Bernard's Catalogus and preserved in Cambridge University Library, Oo. VII. 50. A contemporary three-volume catalogue of Moore's library, kept up-to-date by his various librarians is to be found divided between the Bodleian, MS. Add. D 81,81* (folios and octavos) and in the Cambridge University Library, Oo. VII. 49 (quartos). Tanner's hand is very occasionally to be met with, e.g. MS. Add. D 81, f.325.

2. T.F.Dibdin, Bibliomania (Lond., 1876) p.319.

When Christopher Bateman, the bookseller, wanted Sir John Hoskins to see the library it was with Tanner that he made the arrangements[1] and Ralph Thoresby has recorded his pleasure at a visit on which Tanner showed him items of interest.[2] Later in life Tanner was often to be consulted in his capacity as an expert on Moore's collection.[3]

Armed with his knowledge of Moore's books Tanner began to visit book sales on the bishop's behalf and part of the excellence of the library today can be attributed to the fact that during this period Moore had not only Tanner but also Wanley[4] buying in the auction rooms for him. Some of his instructions to Tanner are preserved amongst Tanner's correspondence[5] and they reveal that Moore was a liberal but selective purchaser at these sales; he was also generous enough and had a sufficiently high opinion of Tanner's competence in

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 305, f.144, Bateman to Tanner, n.d.

2. Cf. Thoresby, Diary, vol.i, p.342.

3. Cf. MS. Ballard 17, f.76, Anstis to Charlett, 14 Apr. 1713; Hearne vol.x, p.465.

4. References to Wanley acting as Moore's agent are to be found in the Tanner collection, e.g. MS. T. 22, ff.34, 92, 98.

5. e.g. MS. T. 21, ff.26, 55, 61, 65. When Moore quotes lot numbers as well as authors' names it is possible to compare these with the available sale catalogues of a date soon after that of the letter. In this way it can be shown, for example, that Tanner intended to visit the sale of 23 May 1699 held at "Tom's Coffee-house" in London. The lot numbers given in the catalogue, which is entitled Bibliotheca Graeco-Latina, cujusdam viri illustris, correspond with those in a letter from Moore to Tanner dated 16 May 1699, MS. T. 21, f.55.

these matters to allow him to judge the correct price without being consulted.[1] It was probably at these auctions that Tanner began to form his own collections for after 1696, when he obtained his Fellowship, his financial position was one that permitted him to buy books for himself.[2]

It would be easy, however, to lay too much stress on Tanner's association with this fine and valuable collection. Until 1701 his university commitments forced him to live in Oxford as afterwards his Chancellorship kept him at Norwich and although Moore kept two or three rooms in his episcopal palace for books[3] the bulk of the library was kept in his London house.[4] Undoubtedly Tanner's privileged position enabled him to borrow such books as he needed but essentially he only had access to the main collection on those occasions that he visited the metropolis. Moore's translation to Ely in 1707 curtailed Tanner's domestic use of the collection[5] and he was entirely deprived of all its resources on Moore's death

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 21, f.87, Moore to Tanner, [1699].

2. Cf. MS. T. 22, f.73, Moore to Tanner, 28 Feb. 1698: "if you have any intention to attend the auction upon your own account...". On 12 November 1699 George Fleming observed to Tanner that "... we poor Country Clerks cannot as Fellows of Coll. open our purses for every book y^t^a printed"; MS. T. 21, f.8.

3. Cf. p. 236.

4. Cf. p. 315, note 4 ; Thoresby, Diary, vol.i, p.342; vol.ii, p.116 (see supra, pp. 229, 230).

5. Cf. p. 236.

in 1714.[1] It is evident that, apart from his initial work as Moore's librarian, Tanner could not have been as closely associated with the collection as might at first appear, and that as a collector he probably benefitted to a greater extent by Moore's example and encouragement and his own enforced attendance at auctions than by actual physical contact with the books themselves. The library as a whole, however, must have served to underline just what could be done by an individual (and incidentally clerical) collector.

Tanner's move to Norwich really represents the beginning of a new phase in the formation of his collections for although Norwich was a great cathedral city its literary resources must have seemed somewhat sparse after the many libraries of Oxford. The best collections of books in East Anglia were privately owned and, with the exception of those at Cambridge, the institutional and public libraries were few and poorly equipped. His work in the Bodleian and with Moore's collection must only have emphasised the contrast for Oxford's great library was

---

1. Moore's library was bought for £6450 by King George I and presented to Cambridge University but it does not seem to have been generally available to readers for some years; cf. J.C.T.Oates, A catalogue of the fifteenth-century printed books in the University library, Cambridge (Cambr., 1954) pp.14,16. The library had previously been offered to Robert Harley for £8000 but had been refused. After this refusal Wanley, who had by then become Harley's librarian, would apparently have used his influence to assist Charlett, who was presumably making enquiries on behalf of the Bodleian Library (cf. MS. Ballard 13, f.130v) but the matter was not pursued.

world-famous and some idea of the relative size of Moore's collection may be gathered from the fact that on its deposit at Cambridge it tripled the holdings of the University library.[1] Tanner himself set about improving the resources of the public library at Norwich[2] and encouraged Archbishop Wake to do the same[3] but the whole situation was a great incentive to him to enlarge his own collections as rapidly as possible and he was now able to bring the whole wealth of his experience to the problem.

At that period booksellers' shops in the provincial towns were very rare,[4] and although occasional book auctions were held at Norwich[5] Tanner would hardly have been able to make any important acquisitions on what might be termed the local "open market"; ~~and~~ it is in any case unlikely that he would have regarded this as anything other than a very minor source. Collectors as far apart in time as Bale and Phillipps have

---

1. Cf. Oates, op. cit., p.14.
2. Cf. p. 346.
3. Cf. [Christ Church] MS. Arch. W. Epist. 23, items 62, 80.
4. Cf. F.A.Mumby, Publishing and bookselling (Lond., 1956) p.206.
5. The British Museum published list (1915) of holdings of book auction catalogues, which forms a far from complete series, does not show any sale to have been held at Norwich during Tanner's residence there and also indicates that there were fewer sales held at Cambridge than at Oxford. A Norwich sale is, however, entered at 16 December 1689 and the Bodleian possesses Norwich sale catalogues for 10 July 1693 [G. Pamph. 2188(11)] and 6 December 1725 [G. Pamph. 2196a(6)]. Tanner might well have attended the last of these.

lamented the fate of manuscripts at the hands of tradesmen[1] and countless volumes must have been converted into tailors' patterns, box linings, grease-proof paper and used in many other ways. Eighteenth century collectors never knew when they might make the most unexpected additions to their libraries[2] and before he left Norwich Tanner was able to say that he now possessed "many Papers of public concern wch I have been picking up & saving from pyes and worse uses ever since I came abroad into the world".[3] However such acquisitions, although often important, were not an everyday occurrence and he had to admit that it was "by great chance we in this barren corner of the Land can meet wth any thing curious, and are obliged to go thro' great heaps of rubbish for a little

---

1. In 1549 Bale wrote of the monastic manuscripts in his preface to Leland's Laborious journey (sig.B1) that "Some they solde to the grossers and sope sellers, & some they sent ouer see to ye bokebynders ... I knowe a merchaunt man ... that boughte the cotentes of two noble lybraryes for xl. shyllynges pryce, a shame it is to be spoken. Thys stuffe hath he occupyed in the stede of graye paper by the space of more than these .x. yeares, and yet he hath store ynough for as many yeares to come". About 1828 Phillipps wrote "My chief desire for preserving Vellum MSS. arose from witnessing the unceasing destruction of them by Goldbeaters; My search for charters or deeds by their destruction in the shops of Glue-makers & Taylors"; cf. A.N.L.Munby, Phillipps studies No.1, p.15.

2. Cf. B.J.Enright, "Rawlinson and the chandlers", in Bodleian library record, vol.iv, pp.216-227.

3. [B.M.] Lansdowne MSS. 1038, f.131, Tanner to Kennett, 11 Mar. 1727.

treasure".[1] There are numerous references amongst contemporary antiquarian correspondence to the rescue of manuscripts from the hands of tradesmen but such occasions could hardly have supplied Tanner with much of the material in his collection today and it was to another, more fruitful, source that he directed his main efforts.

The libraries formed by provincial scholars and antiquarians were often left to lie uncared for by their less academic heirs, and the country houses that Tanner visited in the diocese of Norwich yielded rich material.[2] It was presumably in this way that the many papers relating to the Hobart family came in to Tanner's possession. Sometimes such "finds" were totally unlooked-for, as when he went to dine at a gentleman's house and he "unexpectedly stay'd out 3. or 4. days being tempted wth the perusal of 3. or 4. large Boxes & Chests of old Writings" and on this occasion he was fortunate enough to be allowed to carry away five or six hundred old deeds and letters.[3] At other times more deliberate efforts had to be

---

1. [B.M.] Lansdowne MSS. 1038, f.158, Tanner to Kennett, 29 Mar. 1727.

2. The East Anglian, new ser., vol.vii, p. 351 says that on one occasion Tanner discovered that a map in a country farmer's house had been mounted on a valuable piece of parchment, but the authority for this statement is unknown to me. When Tanner lent one of his manuscripts to Gibson he apologised for its imperfect condition: "much of the latter part being eat of by the rats or mice while it lay in the Corn Chamber at Congham before it came into my hands"; [Lambeth Palace library. Unreferenced, but formerly St. Pauls 17 D 2; Dalton 9], Tanner to Gibson, 10 Oct. 1722.

3. Cf. MS. Willis 44, f.172, Tanner to Willis, 10 Nov. 1716.

made and in 1724 he told Browne Willis:

> I was last week abroad upon an Expedition into Suffolk in quest after some Books & Papers, wch I have bid a great sum of money for and hope they will not be snap'd out of my hands; and tho' they may come pretty dear, yet I have more set my mind upon the getting of them, than of the best B^pk^ or Deanry. I have not set a step after any of those things, but shall many a one after these.[1]

Amongst these acquisitions Tanner found much additional material for his collection of autograph letters and even by 1715 he had more than a thousand examples.[2] In that year, however, he seems to have resolved to concentrate on this particular part of his collection and in October he asked Willis for "any Original Handwritings of Men eminent for Learning, State affairs &c. or Nobility"[3] that he could spare, and at the same time a similar request was directed to Matthew Postlethwayte.[4] He also made enquiries about the present whereabouts of "the remains of Sr Ken. Digby's Study, and therein Letters to him

---

1. MS. Willis 36, f.283, Tanner to Willis, 13 Aug. 1724. This must surely be a reference to the Sancroft papers, cf. pp. 326-329.

2. Cf. note 4.

3. MS. Willis 44, f.161, Tanner to Willis, 26 Oct. 1715.

4. [Corpus Christi College, Cambridge] MS. 587, f.238, Tanner to Postlethwayte, 8 Oct. 1715. Tanner wrote: "You may remember that I told you something when you were last here of my Collection of the Original hands of persons eminent for their Birth, Learning, Military accomplishm^ts^ or the like - of wch I have got above 1000. I know your Uncle in the Course of his business and the regard that all good men that knew him had for him, must have a great many letters from considerable persons at home and abroad. Therefore in your looking them over I should take it as a great favor, if you'd please to oblige me wth any that are not about such concerns as may be necessary for you to keep - either from any of our Nobility, Bishops, or learned men or Forreigners".

from all the learned men of ye Age - but all I suppose now made Pie Paper".[1] Four years later he enrolled Charlett's assistance in terms that also indicate a renewed interest in autograph letters, for he now describes the hobby that he had embarked upon as an undergraduate as "but a late fancy come into my head".[2] The response of his friends must have been most gratifying ~~f~~ because he thanked Charlett for a "Cargo of Letters"[3] and Willis for a "considerable Addition to my Collection of Autographs".[4] Tanner looked to Charlett for his continued assistance and eagerly wrote:

> Inclosed is a list of most of those[5] I have any of the writing of since the Revolution - if you'l please to keep it by you, and before you burn any of your Letters, if they have nothing private, gr^tify my Curiosity wth a Packet by your Carrier to my B^r in London. You'l please to observe that those that are not scored under as Dean Aldrich &c. I have[6] only just their name or any imperfect piece of Writing and therefore should be glad

---

1. MS. Willis 44, f.161.

2. MS. Ballard 4, f.123v, Tanner to Charlett, 29 Jan. 1718.

3. MS. Ballard 4, f.125, Tanner to Charlett, [27 Feb. 1718].

4. MS. Willis 44, f.162, Tanner to Willis, 4 Jan. 1716. Postlethwayte was probably just as communicative. Before their deposit at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, his collections passed into the possession of Albert Hartshorne who has endorsed Tanner's letter (see p.323, note 4) "Wants autographs &c. & I fear he got them".

5. Unfortunately this list does not appear to have survived.

6. When Tanner only had a scrap of paper with a signature on it he was in the habit of pasting these on a single sheet. Examples are to be found in various volumes of the collection, e.g. MS. T. 305, f.99.

> of a Compleat letter. All Noblemen, & Bps, I take without exception, and as many others that are of any note whether for Learning, Sword or otherwise.[1]

It is obvious that Tanner's taste in these matters was comprehensive, so much so that he even kept the letters that he received from his friends for their value as autographs rather than for their personal interest: "I have several Letters of Edw. Llwyds, Gibson, B^p of Carlisle [Nicolson], Mr Wotten",[2] he wrote to Willis, "so you need not look out any of them, but shall be glad of Ld Stowells[3] or such other Quality as you can spare".[4]

It was whilst Tanner was at Norwich that he made two important bulk purchases which have considerably enhanced the value and fame of his manuscripts, and which indeed form so large a part of the collection that their acquisition must be reviewed in some detail. The first of these concerns the library of William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury,[5] who was one of the great men of the English Church. After actively opposing King James II and helping to bring about the

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.123v, Tanner to Charlett, 29 Jan. 1718.

2. These are now chiefly to be found in MS. T. 21-24. Tanner, I think, must be referring to William Wotton, D.D., 1666-1727, from whom he received a letter in 1699; now MS. T. 21, f.152.

3. i.e. Baron Stawell of Somerton. There are no letters by any of the barons in the Tanner collection.

4. MS. Willis 44, f.163v, Tanner to Willis, 4 Jan. 1716.

5. Sancroft lacks a modern biographer, but a large account of him is to be found in G.D'Oyly, Life of William Sancroft (Lond., 1821).

Revolution of 1688 he refused to take the oaths to William and Mary. Inevitably he was deprived of his office, with the result that instead of leaving his books and papers to the library at Lambeth, as he had perhaps once intended, he took some of them with him to his home at Fressingfield in Suffolk and placed the others in store. In addition to his ecclesiastical career Sancroft had been an eminent antiquarian and his collections were of considerable value.

Before his death in 1693 Sancroft[1] extracted from his printed books such volumes as might form a gentleman's library for his heirs and arranged for the much larger and more valuable remainder to be immediately deposited at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, with which he had extremely close connections.[2] His manuscripts, however, he retained at Fressingfield for his own use and he died without having made any specific arrangements for their disposal although his intention that certain classes should also go to Emmanuel College was known to several people. He had, moreover, during his lifetime offered Henry Wharton, one of his chaplains, the pick of the collection in terms that were capable of a most liberal interpretation and which were certainly intended to remain operative

---

1. A long letter from one of Sancroft's chaplains, William Needham, relating to the history and disposal of the collections is printed in D'Oyly, op. cit., vol.ii, pp.96-101.

2. The Master of Emmanuel's letter of thanks is now to be found MS. T. 25, f.89.

after his death. As these arrangements had only been made verbally, and in view of the value of the collection, it was not surprising that Sancroft's executors proved unsympathetic to representations: the manuscripts remained with the "gentleman's library"; Wharton had to be content with those that had already been given to him;[1] and the college failed to benefit as Sancroft had intended.[2] Charlett was apparently able to see the collection at Pressingfield in 1699[3] and Tanner himself visited it there at least once.[4]

The transaction which enabled Tanner to obtain a large part of these papers is somewhat obscure. It seems that by the end of the first quarter of the eighteenth century it became known in antiquarian circles that Sancroft's heirs would be willing to part with the collection. Harley, or his agent, at least, was rapidly on the scene and made a haul from the manuscripts[5] and Thomas Carte is known to have made

---

1. These eventually passed into the possession of Lambeth Palace library. Notice of Sancroft's connection with Lambeth library, and of the catalogues of it that he compiled and which are now amongst the Tanner manuscripts, is to be found in M.R.James, "The history of Lambeth Palace library", Transactions of the Cambridge bibliographical society, vol.iii, pp.15,20.

2. Some Sancroft manuscripts are to be found at Emmanuel (cf. M.R.James, The western manuscripts in the library of Emmanuel college, a descriptive catalogue (Cambr., 1904), p.[xii]) but these were apparently given in his lifetime.

3. Cf. MS. T. 21, f.138v, Charlett to Tanner, 10 Aug. 1699.

4. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.42v, Tanner to Rawlinson, 20 Nov. 1735. This letter contains a long description of the contents of Sancroft's collection.

5. Now in the British Museum; Harleian MSS. 3783-3798. They were in Harley's possession before 16 June 1726, cf. [Christ Church] Arch. W. epist. 23, item 102.

a less successful effort in the same direction.[1] By the time that Tanner arrived[2] the remainder of the collection was in the hands of Christopher Bateman, the bookseller, and it was apparently from Bateman[3] that Tanner purchased the collection for a price in the region of £90.[4] At all events Tanner

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.473: "M^r. Carte was about purchasing these MSS. before D^r. Tanner, but the very day he was to have had them, the Proclamation came out for his Apprehension". This dates Carte's attempt at purchase as August 1722; he was a Jacobite and had become involved with Atterbury. Other Sancroft manuscripts were obtained by James West; cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.453.

2. Tanner possibly made an offer for the papers in 1724, cf. p.323.

3. In his will dated 1733 Tanner says that he bought the papers from the Archbishop's executors, and in 1731 it was said of Sancroft's collections that the "Books were sold to a Bookseller: The Papers were sold by themselves to another Person for eighty Guineas", [N.Salmon], The lives of the English bishops (Lond., 1731) pt.1, p.49. Earlier however, on 16 June 1726, Tanner's acquaintance, Samuel Knight, told Wake that Tanner "was lately about bu[y]ing the remainder of [Sancroft's] Study but Bateman got it"; [Christ Church] Arch. W. epist. 23, item 102. In 1732 the Gentleman's magazine (p.583) and the Northampton mercury (cf. Hearne vol.xi, p.21), both probably working from a common original, said that Tanner's purchase had been made from Bateman and this was subsequently repeated in R.Gough, British topography (Lond., 1780) vol.i, pp.126,127 and in other accounts. Possibly Bateman was only acting as an agent and, if Knight was only half-informed, this might well have been on behalf of either party.

4. Gough (loc. cit.) says that Bateman bought the papers for eighty guineas which is the same price that it was implied that Tanner had paid direct to Sancroft's heirs; cf. supra, note 3. Hearne twice says that Tanner paid £90 (Hearne vol.x, p.473; vol.xi, p.6) but in a draft letter to Rawlinson of a later date (MS. Rawl. lett. 114*, f.135) he states the price to have been £70; however, this is probably due to a lapse of memory. A price of £90 would seem to represent a reasonable commission for a bookseller to charge on an outlay of 80 gns. However, in 1728 Tanner's fellow canon of Christ Church, William Stratford, understood from him that the collection had cost nearly £200 (cf. Hist. MSS. Comm.; Portland vii, p.461) and such a price is not beyond the realms of possibility. Harley had paid £500 for the collections of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, the

[cont. on next page]

believed that no more of Sancroft's papers were available after he made his purchase and the numerous items in his collection that can be shown to have this provenance indicate that he got value for his money.

The second of the large purchases that Tanner is known to have made was of some of the papers of John Nalson,[1] Canon of Ely, containing various items relating to the Puritan Revolution. In compiling his Impartial Collection[2] Nalson had had access to the Office of the Clerk of the Parliament from which he seems to have taken anything that he wanted. That these papers[3] could only have been regarded as being on temporary loan is shown by the fact that he was required to furnish a list of the papers which he had thus obtained.[4] Nalson had also had access to the Paper Office, and to the papers of the Duke of Ormonde which now form the Carte collection in the Bodleian Library. After Nalson's death

---

4 cont. purchase of which had been bewailed by Tanner in 1707 (cf. p. 236) and Sancroft's manuscripts were known to be of considerable value. Stratford does not seem to have thought £200 to be exceptional and although a price in the region of £90 seems more likely it must be pointed out that by 1725 Tanner's financial resources might perhaps have enabled him to afford the higher sum.

1. John Nalson, 1637?-1686, historian and Royalist pamphleteer.

2. J.Nalson, An impartial collection of the great affairs of State from ... 1639 to the murther of king Charles i (Lond., 1682,83).

3. Some account of the migrations of these papers is to be found in Hist. MSS. Comm. Portland i, p.v.

4. Cf. MS. T. 32, f.71.

the papers seem to have been neglected and eventually Tanner obtained some of them, whilst the remainder fell into the hands of Nalson's grandson, Philip Williams, who became President of St. John's College, Cambridge. When Tanner died Williams made claim through Samuel Knight to that portion of the collections which had formerly belonged to Nalson. At this event John Tanner wrote to Knight:

> I recd yours on Saturday last, with D^r. Williams's enclosed, which very much surprized me, who alwaye looked upon those letters as my late brother's own property, and think I have heard him say he bought them. I am the more of this opinion for that on ⟨most⟩, if not all the books and papers he had of other peoples, he had pinned or pasted a piece of paper, and wrote thereon whose they were,[1] and by this means I delivered several things (some belonging to the Chapter of Ely, to yourself) before they were enquired after. But the letters between 1640 and 1660, having been much in my own hands, and putt into order by me, I took particular notice of them, saw nothing of that nature on them, and found most, if not all of them bound up handsomely in volumes, which I think my brother would not have done, if he had not thought them his own. However he having by his will given all his volumes and bundles of public Papers &c. to the Bodleian Library, I delivered them about three months after his decease to the Keeper of that Library, and have it not in my power to do more relating to them, than in case of a dispute, to declare impartially the little I know concerning them.[2]

---

1. An example of such a slip of paper occurs on MS. T. 291: it reads "These six Books being the Journals, Copies of Orders &c belonging to Sr Thomas Allen, Admiral &c were given me by Sr Ric. Allen upon this condition: that if any of his Children proved to be Seamen, they should be restored upon demand".

2. MS. Rawl. lett. 108, f.234, J.Tanner to Knight, 6 Jun. 1737; transcript by Rawlinson; another copy by him is to be found ibid. f.236. A copy of this transcript is to be found MS. Ballard 4, f.145. The original is said to have been inserted in the index to the Nalson papers (now Dep. c. 176) but I have been unable to find it. There is another transcript of this letter prefixed to Toynbee's catalogue of the Tanner manuscripts in the Bodleian library records; L.P. Catalogue of the Tanner MSS.

Later, when Rawlinson was offered William's papers through Thomas Carte,[1] he made enquiries about the claim and was told by John Tanner:

> I remember Archdeacon Knight's writing to me to claim a parcel of Letters my Brother had, which were wrote in the troublesome times to the speaker of the House of Commons, as being the Property (as he asserted) of D^r. Williams of S^t. John's College, Cambridge, who I think was Grandson of D^r. Nalson. The particulars of my answer, I can't well recollect. But soon after I sent that answer, I had another Letter from the Archdeacon, That as the Letters my Brother had, were given to a place where the Public might have the benefit of them, D^r. Williams was content to wave the right he thought he had to them.
>
> All I can further say is, That it is suppos'd that D^r. Nalson was encouraged by some in power, soon after the Restoration to publish a Collection of Records to invalidate Rushworth's Collection, and to that end, had the use of the Publick Papers, and these Letters amongst others. Those that my Brother had, laid many years neglected at Ely, and were bought by him of one that had been long possessed of them, perhaps by inhabiting the House that D^r. Nalson lived in when he was Prebendary of Ely - and those which D^r. Williams had (and are now offered to sale) might be left at his Parsonage House. This is chiefly conjecture, but not my conjecture only ...
>
> In Le Neve's Fasti D^r. Turner is said to succeed D^r. Nalson at Ely, Apr. 1st. 1686. My Brother was not Prebendary there till Sept: 1713. and did not (as I think)[2] meet with these Papers at his first Residence - so that they lay'd at least 28 Years unclaimed before He bought them.[3]

---

1. Cf. MS. Rawl. C 969, f.169, Rawlinson to Humphrey Owen, 14 May 1751.

2. MS: "as (I think)".

3. MS. Ballard 4, f.146, John Tanner to Rawlinson, 12 Nov. 1753, Transcript. Rawlinson, however, was told by Zachary Grey that he knew "little of the Affair between [Williams] & Bishop Tanner. The D^r. I know, imagined, that the Bishop had several Papers belonging to the Collection: If he had, I think it could not be in the way of purchase, for M^r. Hutton in whose hands they were lodged by D^r. Nalson's Widow, had no right of disposal"; MS. Ballard 4, f.147, Grey to Rawlinson, 2 Feb. 1754, Transcript. I have been unable to find the originals of these two letters. There is another transcript of John Tanner's letter prefixed to Toynbee's catalogue; see also p.330, note 2.

Rawlinson did not make the purchase, and the papers eventually came into the possession of the Duke of Portland. They are now on deposit in the Bodleian so, once again, the whole of Nalson's collection is under one roof.

John Tanner was certainly correct in his assumption that his brother had not acquired these collections at his first residence at Ely. The earliest reference to them in Tanner's correspondence appears on 29 January 1716 when he told Charlett that he had "met wth lately a Noble Collection of Originals in Cromwells time, w^{ch} (God willing) shall one time or other come to Oxford wth the rest".[1] It is to be wished that Tanner had enlarged on this and told Charlett something of where he had found the documents but perhaps it was a case of the less said, the better.

These two acquisitions meant that Tanner's collections assumed quite considerable proportions and when he was raised to the episcopal bench and had to move from Norwich he resolved to base his library at Christ Church. This was a particularly happy position for not only did he spend a considerable portion of the year at this foundation, where he retained his canonry in commendam, but Oxford was also a resting place on the journey between his bishopric and London where his duties as a lord spiritual required his attendance. Moreover, it had the additional advantage of being near to the Bodleian Library

---

1. MS. Ballard 4, f.124, Tanner to Charlett, 29 Jan. 1716.

where he intended that his collections should be deposited after his death.[1] Such a move was not to be undertaken lightly and from Norwich Tanner wrote to Hearne apologising for not writing earlier and begging excuse "upon account of the vast fatigue I have this month & more been under, in leaving a place where I had lived comfortably above 30 years, putting up my old books for Oxford, and parting wth old Friends".[2] The books were to be transported by water and a major disaster occurred on their journey up the Thames when they were sunk in Benson lock and could not be raised for some twenty hours. Once recovered they were loaded onto wagons and continued by road to Oxford where they were taken to pieces and hung over lines to dry. Some measure of the contemporary value placed on the collection may be gathered from the fact that the event was widely reported in the press.[3]

It is hard to assess the damage sustained in this misfortune. Hearne believed it to be greater than was generally admitted and that the "revenues of Canterbury" could not

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.268 (26 Apr. 1730): "D^r^. Tanner being just returned to Oxford from Norwich, I called upon him yesterday in the Afternoon. He told me he had about 200 MSS. that he would give to Bodl. Library".

2. MS. Rawl. lett. 27c, f.221, Tanner to Hearne, 22 Nov. 1731.

3. Notices of the accident appeared on 8 January 1732 in the Country journal; or The Craftsman (p.2), the Universal spectator and weekly journal (p.2), and the Weekly register (p.3) and on 10 January in the Northampton mercury (cf. Hearne, vol.xi, p.16). The accident happened on 11 December 1731, cf. Hearne, vol.xi, p.9.

recompense Tanner for his loss.[1] Tanner's immediate reactions may be gathered from a letter that he wrote to Rawlinson:

> I have severely felt it, in the confusion & loss of so many little things wch for 40. years together I had been collecting, and defer'd making public in hopes still of making My Design more perfect. I had among other things very many Original deeds wth Seals of Kings, Noulemen, B^ps^, Religious Houses & old Families appendant - wch unluckily happen'd by the breaking of the box or large Case they were in to fare worse in the water than almost any of my other things; tho all, God knows, bad enough, to my daily greif [sic] - who slip'd away from Parlium^t^ Down hither in order to retrieve what I well can.[2]

The damaged volumes were repaired under Tanner's supervision and it was not long before the whole of his somewhat bedraggled library was housed at Christ Church. His visits to the diocese of St. Asaph opened new fields for his endless search and on at least one occasion he was able to rescue manuscript material from destruction in the ovens of North Wales[3], but there is no evidence that he ever made any really substantial additions to his collections during the last few years of his life. At his death his books were transferred to the Bodleian in accordance with the terms of his will and it is to be imagined that Tanner had long intended that this institution

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.xi, p.26. Some observations on the extent of the damage are to be found on pp. 342-345.

2. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.16, Tanner to Rawlinson, 18 Apr. 1732.

3. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.28, Tanner to Rawlinson, 29 Aug. 1735: "I have since I came down hither [St. Asaph] this summer recover'd great part of Old John Stow's Cronicle in his own hand writing containing vastly more than what Edm. Howes has printed in the 2^d^ Edition of that work, but a good deal had been destroy'd by Rats & Mice or by the women for to put under Pyes".

should form a final resting-place for his collection. It was by no means unusual for the antiquarians of that period to make similar arrangements for the disposal of their books[1] and indeed collections were often formed with half an eye on the erection of what was virtually to be a personal monument housed in a public institution; but if this is true of Tanner he differs from his contemporaries in one important respect for he was able to arrange for his collections to be deposited in the Bodleian confident in the knowledge that they would attract attention not for their quantity but for their undeniable quality.

In common with his fellow collectors Tanner did not confine his antiquarian interests entirely to manuscripts and printed books and his collection of charters led him to take a close interest in the seals that they bore. In 1719 John Anstis, Garter King of Arms, submitted the manuscript of a work on seals to Tanner for his criticism and received the following interesting reply:

> I hope to return it back to you shortly, with such improvements as my small Collections will afford; tho' I have not been the most inqurious that way, having pick'd up near 2000. old parchm^ts, and have preserved every bite of a tooth, end of an inkern, cloth-mark or the like where the seals remain, among whom I have about 100 (before Hen. VIII time) with Coats of Arms, many wth Helmet & Crest, some few wth Supporters or something like them as you truly observe often fancy of ye Person or his Graver. I have 4. brass Matrixs of Religious Seals, about 50. Impresses of Monasterie seals, and 30. of B^pps of Norwich and Ely. If from them I can collect any thing that either amends or

---

1. Cf. J.Carter, Taste & technique in book-collecting, p.13.

> justifies your observations, you shall be troubled wth them in a post or two.[1]

Unfortunately this part of Tanner's collection has failed to survive as an identifiable entity.

Another interest which Tanner held in common with his contemporaries was in coins and medals. Little is known of his collections in this field but his hobby was of long standing for it was mentioned as early as May 1694[2] and by 1698 he was sufficiently well versed in the subject to be able to help Nicolson with the numismatic sections of the English Historical Library.[3] In 1729, after he had lived many years in East Anglia, he complained to Anstis that he found it "almost impracticable here in the Country to make a compleat Collection or Series of the Roman Coins" and explained that he had therefore disposed of these and was now "very desirous of getting all the Gold, Silver, or Copper English, Irish, or Scotch money's [sic] since the Conquest - and have satisfied my curiosity in having picked up a g^t number".[4] Another of

---

1. [B.M.] Stowe MSS. 749, f.80, Tanner to Anstis, 21 Dec. 1719. A list of Tanner's collection of seals is to be found in the same volume, ff.80v,81, and further references are on ff.126-129, 136v, 139. Anstis' manuscript, entitled "Aspilogia, sive De iconibus scutariis gentilitiis commentarius" is in the British Museum, Stowe MSS. 665,666.

2. Cf. MS. T. 25, f.150, James Ivie to Tanner, May 1694.

3. Cf. MS. T. 22, ff.134,187.

4. [B.M.] Stowe MSS. 749, f.268v, Tanner to Anstis, 22 Oct. 1729. Two years earlier Tanner had given a more detailed indication of the scope and condition of his collection in a letter to Matthew Postlethwayte (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 587, f.247, 7 Oct. 1727): "I don't know whether I have not

[cont. on next page]

Tanner's friends with a similar interest was Browne Willis and Tanner's letters to him contain frequent references to coins.[1] By 1731 he had amassed "a very valuable collection"[2] and was "mightily for having an Account of our English coins drawn up and published" and offered to assist the undertaker of such a work to the best of his abilities.[3] Unfortunately a woman bedmaker stole part of the collection in 1732 and, although he was able to recover some, a few coins had already been melted down.[4] Perhaps it was this occurrence that prompted him in 1733 to give some coins to the Bodleian Library,[5] but these do not seem to have been very numerous.

---

4 cont. formerly desired you among other Friends, to gratify my Curiosity wth any pieces of old Gold or Silver English Coins. Now and then such things are to be met wth in some Families, where good people have made little purses of old pennies and odd pieces of Gold & Silver money, wch are often carried to the Goldsmiths, sold for weight & melted down, so that if you can reseue any such I would give a better price, than the Goldsmiths will if the owners have a mind to part wth them; if they have no mind to part wth them, and they are Curious pieces I should be glad of a sight of them by any safe Conveyance. Such Gold coins as I mean, are such as were of the Reigns before K. James I., and silver ones broad and fair any before the Restoration of K. Ch. II., the Common Coins since those two Epocha's I have I believe pretty compleat. I have given awey my Roman Coins, nor care for any forreign ones but only such of our own nation since the Conquest."

1. e.g. MS. Willis 45, f.149v; 64, ff.54v, 56. Willis' collection of coins which was very large was bequeathed to the Bodleian in 1760.

2. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.425.

3. ibid., p.438.

4. Cf. ibid., vol.xi, p.111.

5. Cf. Macray, Annals, p.212. In the same year Tanner directed in his will that his third wife, Elizabeth Scottowe should have the choice of ten of his silver or gold coins or medals.

Moreover, when Rawlinson drew up a list[1] of "Medalliats", past as well as present, Tanner's name was not included. It must be presumed that that part of his collections which reached the Bodleian was of little significance.[2] Some mention is made of Tanner coins in the correspondence relating to the transfer of the Bodleian collection of coins to the Ashmolean Museum in 1920[3] but his name is not now entered upon the list of benefactors that now hangs in the Heberden coin room of the museum.

---

1. MS. Rawl. C 811, f.34a.

2. At a time before the robbery Tanner possessed a silver groat of Richard III which Hearne considered "one of the greatest Rarities I ever saw"; Hearne, vol.x, p.425.

3. L.P. Transfer of coins to Ashmolean, 1912-20; a typed list entitled "Bodleian Library. List of Collections" p.4.

b: General Observations

Before passing to a more detailed survey of the Tanner collections it is necessary to consider to what extent the library formed by Tanner can be said to be represented by the books and papers accepted by the Bodleian authorities for preservation in the library. The disaster in Benson lock immediately demands a closer investigation but it would be foolish to ascribe all the defects of the Tanner collection to this single event. Proper care for their books always presented a problem to collectors and if the case of Edmund Castell, Professor of Arabic at Cambridge, is an extreme example it does at least serve to show the difficulties and disadvantages of moving a large library round the country.

On 13 April 1680 he told Sancroft in a letter that later passed into Tanner's possession:

> ... no less than 20 times have my books been variously transported, 6 times during ye space of London flames, about as many times before, & 8 times since; whereas according to ye old Say: Seven removes is as bad as a burning. At St Bartholomew tyde last was 2 years, a messinger was sent down to me on purpose to give me notice, y^t^ my Copies would be seased upon for my Landlords debt, by a superiour Landlord, if they were not presently taken away. I forthwith myself, my servant with some waggons & horses speeded out of Bedfordshire up to London: not knowing well where I should dispose of them. Unexpectedly I met with M^r^ ⟨Crisp⟩, who marryed my Brothers daughter, & onely child, who tould me he had a house empty at Wimbleton, which I might freely make use of. ... To y^t^ empty house so near your Grace, I sent ye greatest & best part of my Bookes; ye tender of which unto your Grace: with all Freeness, as also Ease to me, I hope will not be disdained, ye rest of my Bookes were carryed

> some into Bedfordshire, others into Middlesex, & a few to Cambridge. Y^e^ condition of some of these Warehouses hath been as infaust & mischievous to me: not some scores onely, but many hundreds of my Copies have been quite Spoyled, by sundry sad & unhappy accidents.[1]

If Sancroft did accept these books then some of them may today be found in the Tanner collection so that we must be careful not to conclude that any book was necessarily damaged whilst it was in Tanner's possession.

Similarly we must not conclude that all evidences of damp on Tanner's books stem from their immersion in the Thames. Leaky buildings were by no means uncommon and examination of almost any contemporary collection will soon reveal some water-stains. East Anglia, from where Tanner must have gathered the greater part of his collections, had its own particular problems in this direction for as soon as Celia Fiennes entered Norfolk in 1698 she observed: "its a low flatt ground all here about so that the least raines they are overflowed by the River and lye under water, as they did when I was there, so that the roade lay under water which is very unsafe for strangers to pass, by reason of the holes and quick sands and loose bottom".[2] Not only goods but also passengers were

---

1. MS. T. 37, f.12. Castell's library was eventually sold at Cambridge, the sale commencing on 30 June 1686. The catalogue listw 1,267 items.

2. C.Fiennes, The journeys of Celia Fiennes, ed. by C.Morris (Lond., 1949) p.146.

largely transported by water[1] and if Tanner made a habit of moving some of his books between Norwich and Ely some of them may easily have been damaged.[2] It even appears that he may have suffered similar losses in moving his books from Oxford to Norwich as he was later to suffer in moving them back again for, in September 1702, he told Charlett that "Among other my books I lost by sea-Carriage one was my little Oxf. Statute Book, wch I miss much".[3]

It will be seen therefore that no definite conclusions about the sinking can be drawn from a physical examination of

---

1. On 9 June 1720 Tanner told Le Neve, who was coming to visit him at Ely, that "There is a very convenient passage by the boat from Cambridge every Wednesday and Saturday morning; about ten or eleven they set out, and are here about five or six. The boat to Lynn goes hence on Tuesday afternoon or evening"; Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, p.424.

2. In this connection Celia Fiennes' observations on Ely (op. cit., pp.155,156) are not without interest: "I descended from a steep hill and so cross a bridge over water which enters into the Isleand of Ely, and so you pass a flatt on a gravel Causey which way the Bishop is at the charge to repaire else there would be no passing in the summer ... In the winter this Caussey is over flowed and they have no way but boates to pass in; ... the raines now had fallen so as in some places near the Citty the Caussey was covered ... There is another river that joyns with the Linn which composes this land into an Island; at this bridge is a gate but by reason of the great raines the roads were full of water quite to the town which you ascend a very steep hill into, but the dirtyest place I ever saw, not a bitt of pitching in the streetes so its a perfect quagmire the whole Citty, only just about the Palace and Churches the streetes are well enough for breadth but for want of pitching it seemes only a harbour to breed and nest vermin in, of which there is plenty enough, so that tho' my chamber was near 20 stepps up I had frogge and slow-worms and snailes in my roome - but suppose it was brought up with the faggotts".

3. MS. Ballard 4, f.63v, Tanner to Charlett, 14 Sept. 170[illegible].

the collection, but such an examination is even less informative than might have been expected. True, there are traces of damage that clearly occurred in this mishap[1] but they are few; moreover, the collection has been extensively restored and the printed books which were described in 1813 as being in a "sad condition" and having suffered "so much injury as to be perfectly useless, crumbling into pieces on the slightest touch"[2] are now not only perfectly usable, but to all outward appearances are in as good condition as their neighbours. It is true that a closer examination of the books reveals that many initial and final leaves, particularly among the earlier numbers, are severely damaged by damp[3] if not altogether wanting[4] but, generally speaking, little now remains that could be said to give any clear indication of the extent of the damage sustained in the sinking. Nevertheless, the event is of great importance to any study of the collection and even if no accurate assessment can be made there are still a few points that are worthy of comment.

Without exception contemporary accounts speak as if the

---

1. e.g. The impression of another binding that has offset onto the lower cover of MS. T. 415.

2. Letters written by eminent persons in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, ed. by J.Walker and P.Bliss (Lond., 1813) vol.ii, p.89.

3. e.g. T. 33(1); 70; 91.

4. e.g. T. 44; 64; 94(2). In some instances the missing leaves have been supplied by reproductions.

whole of Tanner's collections was involved but this is extremely unlikely. In common with most other church dignitaries Tanner held office in more than one place and it is possible that his library was never kept all together at any one time. The books involved in 1732 were those being moved from Norwich to Oxford and it seems that at the time Tanner was already keeping part of his collection at Christ Church where he had held a canonry since 1727. He often complained that the hurly-burly of diocesan life left little time for scholarly pursuits and the calm of Oxford might well have seemed a fitter home for many of his books and papers than the busy city of Norwich. It is particularly interesting to note in this connection that neither the manuscript of the Notitia nor that of the Bibliotheca seems to have suffered in the disaster for their production continued largely unimpaired; moreover, if they had in fact been involved it seems probable that some reference to the providential escape of a lifetime's work would have been penned by Tanner and preserved amongst his correspondence, as was his lament for the loss of some of his source material.[1] Perhaps these valuable papers were undamaged because they were already at Oxford.

Tanner is unlikely to have been in the habit of moving many of his books back and forth as his duties took him between the two cathedral cities and in 1726 canon William

---

1. Cf. p.334.

Stratford was able to see some of the volumes of the Sancroft papers in Tanner's rooms at Oxford, enough in fact to enable him to form a general idea of the whole series.[1] Much of Sancroft's collection was material that Tanner would not have needed for constant or even occasional reference and it would not be surprising if a considerable portion of Tanner's manuscripts was already permanently housed at Oxford at the time of the disaster; indeed, as a collection they now show fewer signs of an immersion than the printed books although they might reasonably be expected to show more. It is also interesting to note that the printed books do not seem to have been used by readers in the Bodleian until a decade after the manuscripts were first consulted[2] whereas it might well have been thought that they would need less processing and have been available earlier. Perhaps this delay stemmed from the need for general repairs as a result of the printed books - as a class - being more largely involved in the disaster than the manuscripts.

Obviously those books and papers which were already in Oxford, together with those that Tanner obtained between 1732 and his death, were not involved in the accident. Tanner also spent some part of the year in London on attendance at ~~it~~ the Lower House of Convocation and any books which he kept

---

1. Cf. Hist. MSS. Comm.; Portland vii, p.461. 7 May 1728.
2. Cf. pp.353, 354, 397.

there would probably not be moved to Oxford at all since he would be required to take his seat in the House of Lords.

According to the newspaper accounts the collection needed seven wagons to transport it to Oxford after the disaster, but this can hardly be held to give any real indication of the amount of material involved. In any case, even if the size of Tanner's collection just before the sinking was accurately known, there are so many other reasons why the collection as it stands today cannot be regarded as representative of Tanner's library at the time of his death that any comparison would be impossible. The only details of the accident that seem to have been preserved are those that appear in Tanner's letter to Rawlinson quoted on p.334. Unfortunately the "Original deeds" which seem to have suffered the most would in any case no longer stand with the collection so that their absence is in no way remarkable.[1] Perhaps a key to the whole problem lies in Tanner's determination to retrieve all that he possibly could for, accomplished antiquarian and eager collector that he was, it must be regarded as extremely unlikely that he would have discarded anything unless it was absolutely beyond preservation. Nevertheless some items were apparently past repair and nearly a year after the disaster Tanner still was not sure what he had lost.[2]

---

1. Cf. p. 408.
2. Cf. MS. Autogr. c.8, f.13[a]v, Tanner to Wilkins, 17 Nov. 1732.

It is not only as a result of misfortune that books once owned by Tanner are now no longer with the collection[1], and Tanner himself disposed of a number of items during his lifetime. Eager to encourage learning he made small gifts to the Public Library of Norwich soon after his installation as Chancellor,[2] and these gifts were the first of many;[3] moreover, his friendly and generous nature doubtless led him to give some of his books as presents to his friends,[4] and occasionally these friends failed to return other books that had been lent to them.[5] Later in life, to celebrate his elevation to the bishopric of St. Asaph, he made a large

---

1. The reasons why books should have become separated from the collection after their deposit in the Bodleian are reviewed in section C of this chapter.

2. Cf. A catalogue of the books in the library of the city of Norwich, in the year 1706. Tanner is credited with the gift of two books.

3. Cf. A new catalogue of the books in the publick library of the city of Norwich, in the year 1732. Tanner is now credited with 82 books and is mentioned (p.vi) as one of the notable benefactors of the library.

4. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.35v, Tanner to Rawlinson, 20 Oct. 1735: "I thank you for the Book of Articles. I had Wolf's original edition, wch I gave to my Countryman & School Fellow, Dr Tho: Bennet of Cripplegate ... and wch I believe he sent wth the other Editions to St Johns in Cambridge". There is a note on Bennet and the Book of Articles by S.Gibson, "Thomas Bennet, a forgotten bibliographer", The Library, 5th ser., vol.vi, pp.43-47.

5. Cf. Hearne, vol.ii, pp.111,112: "M^r^. Tanner sometime since lent a certain Gent. a Copy of ye Chronicon Saxonicum in wch he had inserted in the Margin divers notes of his own. The book was not return'd him; but he thinks 'tis in M^r^. Thwaites's hands, wch I really believe true, because M^r^. Thwaites once told me he had a Chron. Sax. wth MSS. Notes, but he said that he added them himself. He would not show me ye Book, wch makes ye Suspicion more just". The "certain Gent." was Sir Andrew Fountaine; cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.90.

donation of fifty-four books to the cathedral library.[1] As might have been expected Tanner does not seem to have ever given away anything of real value, and indeed may merely have been disposing of duplicate volumes. For example, among the books which he gave to St. Asaph was a copy of George Hickes' Institutiones grammaticae Anglo-Saxonicae et Moeso-Gothicae (Oxford, 1689,88)[2] and another copy is among the Tanner books in the Bodleian;[3] this second copy is by far the better copy of the two.[4] Other items of this gift can also be shown to be duplicates.[5]

That so many books could have been supplied by duplicates is not altogether unlikely. To encourage the author of a learned work scholars often subscribed for more than one copy and later failed to dispose of the unwanted volumes, whilst academic friends entered their names on each others subscription lists in support of a friendship that was later sealed with a presentation copy from the author. Browne Willis,

---

1. See Appendix E.
2. St. Asaph 1020.
3. T. 317.
4. It appears to be the presentation copy that the author gave to Sancroft.
5. See Appendix E. The books given to Norwich reveal few known duplicates, only superseded editions; e.g. P. van Marnix van Sant Aldegonde, Beehive of the Romish Church (1598); S.Fabritius, Sacrae conciones (1623); and L.C.de Saint Amour's Journal (1660). Tanner possessed subsequent editions of these respectively for 1636 (T. 947); 1641 (G 4. 4 Th.) and 1664 (see Appendix B; s.n. Saint Amour).

for example, subscribed for twelve copies of Hearne's edition of Leland's Collectanea[1] and White Kennett offered to dispose of as many as twenty copies if Wanley should print a catalogue of the Harleian library.[2] The unwanted duplicate must have been one of the hazards of eighteenth-century book-collecting. Tanner himself probably acquired some duplicates in this way because in 1719 he told Charlett that he had subscribed for six copies of Hudson's Josephus,[3] and there are some interesting remarks by him in a letter of the same year which show some of the inconveniences of the subscription system. He wrote to Charlett:

> If you have not [Browne Willis's] 2. last Volumes of the Hist. of Abbies, you shall give me leave to present you wth them, for I have a Set to Spare. Because he had put my name in the beginning of one of them, I was willing to encourage the Bookseller & sent for six; but the price that is sent to me I think is the highest that I have met for a Book without Cuts. I could not help saying that Gosling lived to near Curle, whose extravagant prices for but middling performances will I fear not help forward the Study of Antiquities.[4]

---

1. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 27a, f.150, Willis to Hearne, [17 Jun.] 1715.

2. Cf. MS. Ballard 7, f.129, Kennett to Charlett, 26 May 1716.

3. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.136, Tanner to Charlett, 28 Oct. 1719.

4. MS. Ballard 4, f.132, Tanner to Charlett, 22 Apr. 1719. Robert Gosling was the publisher of Willis's History of the mitred parliamentary abbies and conventual cathedral churches, 2 vols., (Lond., 1718,19) the second volume of which was dedicated to Tanner. Edmund Curll was a publisher with a notorious reputation who is accorded considerable space in the D.N.B. and who has been the subject of a full-scale biography: R.Straus, The unspeakable Curll (Lond., 1927); cf. also P.M.Hill, Two Augustan booksellers: John Dunton and Edmund Curll (Univ. of Kansas publ., libr. ser., 3), (Lawrence, 1958).

Apart from the possible total destruction of a number of books when they were sunk, the most significant fact concerning the dispersal of Tanner's books is undoubtedly contained in his will: the Bodleian Library was to receive "all my MSS. Books not only those which I bought of ArchBp. Sancrofts Executors but also all others which I have got together with all my Volumes & Bundles of Public letters, State Papers, Autographs & Old Deeds & all such my old black letter'd & other printed Books not being already in the said library as the Curators & Library Keeper shall think fit to accept & are not in this will specifically disposed of".[1] Few books come into the last category and if the provisions of this will had been carried out according to Tanner's intentions then we would today be able to regard the manuscripts, which are by their nature unique, as the whole, and the printed books as only a very small portion of Tanner's collections as they stood at the time of his death. Unfortunately we have

---

1. Tanner also requested his executors to burn all his "sermon notes and other little pieces and attempts in divinity and all my own private papers and letters which will no way tend to the service of the publick". Plainly these are not to be regarded as belonging to the collection proper but the loss of the correspondence is much to be regretted. The portion of Tanner's correspondence that has survived relates mainly to the years 1692-1699 and is to be found MS. T. 21-25. It seems probable that these had been incorporated by him, or at his instigation, into the series of letters which he kept for their interest as autographs (cf. pp.323-325) and were therefore not destroyed by Tanner's executors. Private correspondence of the eighteenth century is extremely rare in the collection and it must be assumed that this was nearly all destroyed in accordance with Tanner's wishes.

evidence to the contrary. At the beginning of MS. Rawl. lett. 59 Rawlinson has written:

> August 15, 1738. This collection of papers relating to Archbp. Sancroft, and his affairs I purchased from Mr Fletcher, Bookseller in the Turll at Oxford who had them with other books &c. from Bp. Tanner's Executors.

As it is difficult to see on what grounds this particular manuscript could have been rejected by the Bodleian it seems quite possible that some of Tanner's books never even reached the library. Nor was any provision made in Tanner's will for the disposal of such books as might be rejected and these too may have found their way into the shops of the local booksellers.

As Tanner was in the habit of borrowing books from his friends it is not surprising that at his death his study contained several items that did not belong to him, but he seems to have made some provision for their identification and John Tanner was able to return many of them to their rightful owners without any difficulty.[1] Moreover, Tanner had always been ready to furnish adequate guarantees for the return of the material that he borrowed[2] and many people must have laid claim to their property as soon as they heard the news of his death. Probably John Tanner's greatest difficulty

---

1. Cf. p.330.

2. Cf. Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, p.427, Tanner to Le Neve, 30 May 1722: "I have worked very hard ... upon an old Taxation of Churches, which I borrowed from the Library of the Cathedral of Lichfield, and have given a one hundred pounds bond for the restoring it before Midsummer"; cf. also ibid. p.424, 6 May 1721.

was in trying to sort out the results of the close association that had existed between Tanner and Moore which was all too evident in the collection, and even after he had supervised the deposit in the Bodleian he expressed his doubts as to whether some of the material did not more properly belong to Cambridge University Library.[1] He was, however, able to reassure himself with the thought that the association between the two men was also displayed in Moore's collection at Cambridge - and in this case to the Bodleian's disadvantage.[2] Nevertheless, after the first catalogue of the Tanner manuscripts had been made the Curators of the Bodleian felt constrained to order the return of a number of volumes to Cambridge[3] and it seems that other institutions also benefited in the same way.[4] As a

---

1. Cf. Nichols, Literary history, vol.iii, pp.435,436; cf. also Notitia (1744) p.506, note a.

2. There is, for instance, among Moore's books at Cambridge a copy of Cicero's De senectute (Westm., 1481) on which Tanner has written his name. He is unlikely to have done this if he had not thought the book his own property.

3. Cf. L.P. Curators' Order book, 1698-1770, f.35. Six manuscript volumes and one printed book were ordered to be returned, but one of these, the "Register" of Langley abbey, Norfolk, is still in the Bodleian as MS. Bodl. 242. Another, now MS. Ee II. 34 at Cambridge, should apparently have more properly been returned to Norwich cathedral, cf. A catalogue of the manuscripts preserved in the library of the University of Cambridge, vol.ii, pp.54,55.

4. Cf. Nichols, Literary history, vol.iv, p.447, F.Wise to A.C.Ducarel, 30 Apr. 1754. Wise, who was a Sub-Librarian of the Bodleian, says of Tanner's borrowings that "Many such books were found in his study, and came after his death to the Bodleian; but we were obliged to restore them to the several owners; some to Cambridge, some to Christ Church in Oxford; and I fancy that Chartulary, or whatever it might be called, may be found at Lambeth". The item that Wise was unable to find is in fact now in MS. T. 223.

result of this double examination there can be little contained in the collection today to which, by eighteenth century standards, Tanner was not properly entitled.

c: Printed Books

The Tanner collection of printed books as it stands today consists of 959 numbered volumes containing about 1,800 items. When the books were received by the Bodleian they were in extremely poor condition and little was done to improve matters until after 1813[1] when the library embarked upon a major programme of restoration. The rebinding of the collection, which was done to a uniform pattern, was not undertaken in strict rotation and probably the volumes that were the first to be dealt with were those in the worst condition but the whole project seems to have been completed in the space of about two years.[2] The work was executed by William Hayes, the Oxford binder. The need for rebinding at this juncture was probably largely due to the fact that the damaged books had been available to readers for some fifty years. The first use of Tanner's books to be recorded in the "Entry Book" of the library was on 20 October 1750 when Richard Rawlinson ordered Tanner's copy of Wood's Athenae,[3] but this has never

---

1. Cf. p.342. One of the lower free end-papers on T.704 bears the watermark date 1816.

2. Cf. L.P.Binder's book c. 1. On 10 January 1821 nos. 382, 434, 447, 504, 516, 563 and 582 were sent to the binder's. Subsequent entries appear for 19 October 1821, 8 January 1822, and in June 1822. On 16 August 1822 three parcels of Tanner books were sent to be lettered and repaired and another three parcels to be bound.

3. Cf. L.P. Entry-book, 1749-52.

stood with the collection proper and it had apparently not at that time received any shelfmark. On 1 August 1755 Benjamin Buckler, a Fellow of All Souls, ordered "Fol: Tan: 61. 62" and, although such a shelfmark could today only relate to the Tanner manuscripts, a printed book is plainly intended.[1] This was swiftly followed by an order by a Mr. Bleake of Oriel College for "8° Tann: 163"[2] but this shelfmark too is now obsolete because the Tanner collection is consecutively numbered and has no subdivision by size; however, the form of both shelfmarks is that which the Bodleian would have adopted for size-subdivision and is still to be seen in other collections.[3] The books were soon being ordered by what is apparently their current shelfmark[4] and it must be thought that the collection today stands more or less in the order that was originally adopted.[5]

Perhaps the most striking thing about the outward appearance of the collection is that it contains very few folios, a format which was very popular in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. At the time of Tanner's bequest it was the practice

---

1. Cf. L.P.Entry-book e. 16. Manuscripts are entered on the left hand side of the opening and printed books on the right.

2. Cf. ibid., 13 Aug. 1755. The name Bleake, however, does not appear in Foster's Alumni Oxoniensis or in C.L.Shadwell's Registrum Orielense (1893,1902).

3. e.g. the Godwyn and Rawlinson collections.

4. Cf. L.P.Entry-book e. 16; 7 Feb. 1756, 2 Aug. 1758.

5. The collection itself bears no traces of an earlier arrangement.

of the Bodleian to remove the larger books from a collection and to shelve them separately;[1] this was undoubtedly because the shelves in some of the older parts of the library were not adjustable and it was a considerable saving in space if books could be placed upon the shelves that fitted them best. Both the Tanner and Rawlinson collections were treated in this way, and the majority of the folios were incorporated where space was available (within the limits of a four-faculty classification)[2] in Duke Humfrey's library and Arts End. A list of the folios in the Tanner collection was taken and this is now preserved amongst the library records.[3] By examining all the copies which the library possesses of the books entered upon that list it is possible to identify a large number of the dispersed Tanner books and out of 123 items 74 have been identified.[4] The fact that "Fol: Tan: 61. 62" could be ordered in 1755 seems to indicate that the folios were still being kept as a separate series and not dispersed until after that date but as no such shelfmark is to be found on the books concerned this is far from certain.

---

1. There are still twelve books in the collection which could have been regarded for shelving purposes as "folio".

2. i.e. Arts, Law, Medicine, and Theology.

3. L.P. List of Bp. Tanner's folios.

4. See Appendix B. It must be remembered that many of the "unidentified" items may in fact be Tanner's books but without any distinguishing marks. For the identification of Tanner books see pp.364-368.

Even after the collection was housed in the Bodleian books seem to have strayed; a few have been stolen[1] but many more have been disposed of by legitimate means. As early as 1623 the Bodleian had begun to sell its duplicates.[2] Subsequent sales were held over the years and there appears to have been a much larger one in 1676.[3] When Von Uffenbach visited the library in 1710 he wrote:

> ... as Dr Hudson had boasted that they had excellent books in duplicate for sale (which they call duplicata), we hoped to find good ones amongst them, and to purchase them. He allowed Crab to conduct us into a wretched room in the gallery where about four hundred books were lying about in terrible confusion, from amongst which we selected some with great difficulty and put them aside until it should please Dr. Hudson to look through and price them.[4]

A few of Tanner's books may have been disposed of in this way to the casual visitor, but when, in 1862, dwindling finances prompted the Curators of the library to hold the first of three duplicate sales at Sotheby's some Tanner books were certainly involved, for the catalogue of the sale specifically notices some books as having his autograph upon the title-leaf. The second and third sales were held in 1865 and 1870 but unfortunately the catalogues make no notice of provenance,

---

1. Cf. Macray, Annals, pp.115 note, 212 note.
2. Cf. Macray, Annals, p.63.
3. Cf. Macray, Annals, pp.73, 144.
4. Z.C.von Uffenbach, Oxford in 1710, ed. by W.H. and W.J.C. Quarrell (Oxf., 1928) p.26. John Hudson was Bodley's librarian and Joseph Crabb was a sub-librarian.

possibly because any autographs may have been cut from the books before they were sold.[1] In the library there is a guard-book that contains no less than 185 such examples of Tanner's signature,[2] and the total number of books involved in the second and third sales was only 1,727. In view of the vast number of books in the library these sales seem to have involved a high percentage of Tanner's books, but it must be remembered that there are two reasons why the Bodleian authorities might decide to dispose of the Tanner copy out of two duplicates. Firstly, the second copy may have been contained in a collection that had been left *in toto* to the library whereas Tanner's will permitted the rejection of unwanted items, and secondly, as a result of the sinking, it is highly probable that the Tanner copy was in inferior condition and therefore the one that was sold. This second theory is borne out by the sale catalogues themselves. In the 1862 catalogue Lot 1661 is described as *water stained* and Lot 972 as *badly stained, and two leaves ... imperfect*.[3] Both these

---

1. Annotated copies of all three sale catalogues are to be found amongst the library records. For a list of the Tanner books known to have been concerned in these sales see Appendix C.

2. MS. Autogr. c. 7, ff.5-12. Fol.9 is reproduced on p. 409 b.

3. Many items are similarly described in all three catalogues. The significance of these two in particular is that the Tanner copy is known to have come to the library (see Appendix B, s.n. Gower, Philippson). The fact that they are unascribed in the catalogue that does notice provenance is unimportant because Tanner did not always sign his books. It must be admitted, however, that the signatures in MS. Autogr. c. 7 do not seem to have been cut from excessively damaged books.

works are entered on the list of the dispersed folios, as is Spenser's Fairy Queen (Lond., 1609). The two copies of this latter work which are at present in the Bodleian[1] do not appear to have belonged to Tanner, and it is therefore highly probable that the copy which was sold as Lot 335 in the 1865 duplicate sale was in fact Tanner's.

The question of the way in which the Bodleian selected the copies that were to be sold is an intriguing one. Choice was apparently "unfettered by sentiment" and it has long been thought that selection depended on the condition of the book, little regard being paid to provenance.[2] Nevertheless, fifteen years after the date of the third sale, the Librarian, E.W.B.Nicholson, had to assure his Curators first and foremost that a book was "not known to be a donation" before he was allowed to dispose of it as a duplicate.[3] There is evidence that a similar precaution was taken when the second sale was being prepared. Among the library records is a list[4] giving the shelfmarks of all the copies under consideration for this sale and a line has been drawn under the one selected for disposal. In nearly every case what would appear to be the "copyright" copy has been preferred to those in the "named"

---

1. Douce S 817; Mal. 7.
2. Cf. Craster, Bodleian Library, p.47.
3. Cf. L.P. Disposal of duplicates, 1727-1890, "Duplicates proposed for sale", 15 Dec. 1885.
4. ibid., "Books sold to Henry Stephens".

collections. Moreover, in one case three copies of a work are entered and all are in named collections: Crynes, Malone, and Rawlinson;[1] the entry has been endorsed "all Donations" and all three copies are still in the library.[2] It is evident that, even though the Rawlinson copy is imperfect,[3] it was decided that none of them could be discarded. Similarly, although not so endorsed, when the three copies under consideration[4] were in the Crynes, "Linc.", and Tanner collections the item does not appear in the catalogue of the duplicate sale.

Many of Tanner's books were considered as possibles for the sale[5] and although from their immersion they may well have been in inferior condition[6] they were generally rejected in favour of a copy with a less distinguished provenance. There was, however, another consideration in favour of the preservation of a Tanner copy. As we have already seen the collection had been rebound only half a century before and the

---

1. Cf. L.P. Disposal of duplicates, 1727-1890, "Books sold to Henry Stephens", item 181.

2. Crynes 919; Mal. 311; MS. Rawl. poet. 148.

3. This copy had the added attraction of having belonged to Hearne.

4. Loc. cit., item 20.

5. Sixteen Tanner shelfmarks are entered on the list.

6. But not always so. The Tanner copy (T. 864) of W.Baldwin, A myrrour for magistrates (1563) although stained and with its title and final leaf damaged, was apparently a better copy than 4° B 81 Jur. which was sold as Lot 264 in the 1865 sale. The latter is described as "wanting the first leaf of the Epistle, and small upper right hand corner of border of title, and the leaf errata at end".

majority of the volumes contained more than one work. Obviously, where two copies were in an equal state of preservation, it was better to dispose of the one that existed as a separate entity.[1] Some of Tanner's books may have escaped in this way but there is an interesting example where this was not the yardstick applied for selection and considerations of provenance seem to have carried the day. When the two copies of John Udall's Remonstrance[2] were being considered there was apparently little difference in their condition, but it was preferred to remove the "copyright" copy from its case, which also contained other works, rather than to dispose of the individually bound Tanner copy.[3] It can therefore be safely asserted that, as a matter of general policy, the Bodleian Library made every effort to preserve Tanner's copies.

Nevertheless the 185 examples of Tanner's signature in MS. Autogr. c. 7 have to be considered and if they were cut from books involved in the duplicate sales they present us with a problem. With a few exceptions the Tanner collection is consecutively numbered and bears no traces of ever having been numbered in any other way. Where then did the books in

---

1. This consideration would not often be material because it was the general practice to bind several slight works together.

2. J.Udall, A remonstrance, or plaine detection of some of the faults ... in ... A demonstration of discipline (1590).

3. Part of 4° B 48 Jur. was sold as Lot 350 in the 1865 sale, and is described as a "good clean copy but closely cut". T. 799 is in excellent condition.

the sale come from? Some of Tanner's books, apart from the intentionally dispersed folios, are to be met with in other parts of the library,[1] but they seem to be so few and in such varied positions that it is unlikely that they could supply such a large number of duplicates. One or two of these books may have been given by Tanner during his lifetime,[2] or perhaps have passed into a collector's hands whose books subsequently came to the library,[3] others may simply have become separated from the main collection either before or after Tanner's bequest was delivered to the library authorities. If the Tanner books involved in the sale had been taken from the collection then, in order to preserve the consecutive numbering,

---

1. Cf. Appendix K. Some of these dispersed quartos and octavos were returned to the collection in 1822; cf. L.P. Binders' book c. 1, 8 Jan. 1822.

2. Cf. Macray, Annals, p.212, note 1. I have been unable to identify any definite gift of Tanner's to the library.

3. An interesting example of this is to be seen in the collection of Francis Douce which did not come to the Bodleian until 1834 and which contains a book that was formerly Tanner's, Douce L 588. Similar examples are perhaps to be seen in the Rawlinson collection, but this is by no means certain, cf. p. 383. A number of Tanner books passed into the hands of Nathaniel Crynes, whose collections were received by the library in 1745: Crynes 864(2); Auct. 2 Q 3. 1; and S. Seld. d. 1 are all Tanner books owned by Crynes and in all three cases Tanner's signature has been defaced; however, the signature on Auct. 2 Q 5. 19, which was formerly Crynes 919, is untouched. Crynes was in the habit of buying duplicates from the Bodleian (he made a large purchase in 1727, cf. L.P.Disposal of duplicates, 1727-1890 item 1) and may possibly have obtained these books from this source. S. Seld. d. 1 probably ranked high among Tanner's possessions: it is a copy of the first book to be printed in the English language, Caxton's edition of Raoul Le Fevre's Recuyell of the historyes of Troye (Bruges 1475).

their loss must have been made good by other volumes; moreover, if the replacements were not second and better copies of the books removed but entirely different works then it would not only explain the inclusion in the collection of some rather unexpected items but would entirely vitiate any criticism of the content that might be made.

There are reasons why the practice of substitution might have been acceptable to the Bodleian. Shelf-space for the books was always at a premium and the retention of inferior copies of works that the library already possessed was wasteful not only of space but also of money. Besides there was a precedent for substitution. When Richard Gough, who wished his valuable collection to remain together, was considering leaving it to the Bodleian the Librarian, John Price, outlined his policy:

> With respect to your last Query, I can only say that there appears to me no difficulty or objection in keeping any Collection of Books together, with this Proviso, that, if there should be a better copy in our Library, we may be permitted to make an exchange in favour of such collection, and dispose of the Duplicate for the melioration of the Library. This has been lately the rule observed, in Christ Church Library, with respect to ABp. Wake's Books. His Grace had particularly enjoined in his Will, that all his Books should be kept together - and the Society apprehend that they have faithfully complied with his Wishes, by the above mode.[1]

From this it appears that only other copies are likely to have been substituted and that it is reasonable to comment on the

---

1. MS. Gough Middx. 9, f.92, Price to Gough, 8 Nov. 1799; pr. in Nichols, Literary history, vol.v, p.553.

content of the Tanner collection.

It seems probable that there was some criticism of the way in which known donations had been publicly disposed of in the first duplicate sale on the grounds that such a procedure was hardly likely to encourage future gifts. On the other hand it was scarcely good policy to dispose of the copyright copy and risk jeopardising this valuable privilege. The course to steer between this particular Scylla and Charybdis would appear to be the substitution of the copyright copy amongst a collector's books and, after removing all traces of its former ownership, to dispose of the superseded volume; moreover, the substituted copy would often be the one in better condition, even if sometimes less well bound. In this way a collector's library would be little impaired, the copyright copy would have been preserved, and the library could hope that both parties would be satisfied. This theory would not only explain how Tanner's collection can be consecutively numbered whilst several of his books were sold in the duplicate sales, but also why provenance should be noted in the catalogue of the first sale and not in the second and third. An example of such subetitution is supplied by T. 502[1], which must have been in inferior condition to the copy contained in 8° M 115 Th.

---

1. The iust censure and reproofe of Martin Iunior. Wherein the ... headlines of the foolish youth, is sharply mette with, and the boy hath his lesson taught him ... by ... Martin Senior, sonne and heire vnto ... Martin Mar-prelate [t]he great. (1598).

It is apparently the Tanner copy that appears as Lot 245 in the 1865 sale, and the better copy was placed amongst Tanner's books. The sale catalogue does not describe the condition of the work so that it can hardly have been seriously defective but the substituted copy is perfect. However, it can only be thought that such substitution is exceptional because of the Tanner books considered for the 1865 sale it can be shown that in the majority of cases it is Tanner's own copy that stands today in the collection. Strong general evidence against such substitution is to be seen in the general appearance of the books themselves: the many pamphlets stand in an order arranged and in a binding executed at a date considerably before that of the duplicate sales. This would seem to settle the question beyond all doubt; but the Tanner books in the sale must have come from somewhere and the only reasonable solution would seem to be that they were separated from the collection as duplicates when it arrived at the library, and that they remained awaiting disposal for more than a century.[1]

This brings us to a consideration of the ways in which a Tanner book may be identified. Tanner did not use a

---

1.This is quite possible, cf. Bodleian quarterly record vol.vi, p.296. For an account of one particular Tanner book involved in the 1862 duplicate sale, Saona's Rhetorica nova (St. Albans, 1480) see Appendix A.

bookplate as many of his friends and contemporaries did;[1] nor are there any distinctive marks on the original bindings that are still contained in the collection. The most obvious mark of identification, if not the only certain one, is the appearance of Tanner's autograph which is generally to be found at the foot of the title-leaf. Occasionally Tanner's hand may be discerned amongst other manuscript annotations but as a general rule he was not in the habit of writing anything other than his name on his books. Nor do there seem to be any other marks of identification such as may be seen in other collections with which Tanner was acquainted: both Rawlinson brothers, for instance, wrote "C. & P." in a book after they had collated it and found it to be perfect, whilst Hearne regularly endorsed his volumes with the motto "Suum Cuique".[2] Tanner's signature varies from a small neat, vertical "Thom: Tanner"[3] as on T. 186 to the rather sprawling, slightly sloping autograph which appears on T. 362 and, in spite of the fact that the size of the signature is influenced

---

1. e.g. John Aubrey and Richard Rawlinson. The fact that such a large proportion of the collection has been rebound is immaterial because there still remains a representative number of original bindings.

2. Many of Hearne's books are now in the Bodleian, the majority of them having been received amongst the Rawlinson collection.

3. This signature appears on Tanner's books but when signing a manuscript note Tanner often used the symbol ⊕; cf. MS. Aubrey 1, ff.48, 67v, 75v, 110 &c. An unexpected appearance of this symbol is to be found on MS. T. 342.

by the amount of space in the margin, its general appearance is of some help in dating approximately at what stage in Tanner's life the book came into his possession. A small signature in a large margin seems to indicate an early acquisition - perhaps before 1705 - whilst, conversely, a larger signature in a small margin is a strong indication of a somewhat later addition to the collection.[1] This is only a general impression and must not be taken as a hard and fast rule since it is extremely difficult to date precisely when the majority of the books did pass into Tanner's hands, and several of the books, as has already been mentioned, are wanting or have damaged title-leaves and therefore bear no signature. Exceptions are those books which were published during his lifetime and which appear to have been bought new.[2]

There are two points which must be made about this signature. Firstly, Tanner is by no means consistent in signing his books, in fact his autograph only appears just over 900 times or on approximately half the items in the collection,[3] so that the absence of a signature cannot be held

---

1. The whole range of Tanner's signature may be seen at a glance by reference to MS. Autogr. c. 7, ff.5-12. Fol.9 is reproduced on p. 409 b.

2. See Appendix G.

3. I have not thought it worth while to quote accurate figures because of the number of missing, damaged, and stained title-leaves. It must be remembered that some of the books now in the collection were probably never in Tanner's possession, but it is hardly likely that the copies substituted by the Bodleian in preparation for the duplicate sales could account for all of the unsigned items.

to show that an item was not Tanner's. Secondly, arising out of this, if Tanner purchased a bound volume containing more than one item he would probably have thought it sufficient to sign only the first one.[1] Where this is the case, in the absence of any conflicting evidence, it has seemed reasonable to suppose that such a composite volume did in fact come into Tanner's possession as a whole.[2] The more items a volume contains the more likely the assumption is to be correct.

Another occasional habit of Tanner's was to write "(B.B.)" after he had signed his name.[3] Where more than one part was bound in a volume he sometimes inscribed the first with "Thom. Tanner (B.B.)" and on the remainder simply wrote "B.B.".[4] Sometimes the entry reads "B.B.(ed.)"[5] and in a few instances "(Ed.)".[6] This has nothing to do with the Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica but is a reference to the Bodleian Library (Bibliotheca Bodleiana). On T. 113[7] Tanner has written the note "inter MSS B.B. alia ed." and there is in fact another printed edition of this work amongst one of

---

1. e.g. T. 1, 5, 88.
2. See Appendix H.
3. e.g. T. 1(1), 6(1), 10, 11(1), 12(1) &c. There are numerous examples throughout the collection.
4. e.g. T. 686, 745.
5. e.g. T. 639, 892.
6. e.g. T. 401, 592(1).
7. A.de Guevara, The golden boke of Marcus Aurelius emperour and eloquent oratour (tr. by J.Bourchier, lorde Berners), (Lond., 1559).

the Bodleian manuscript collections.[1] It appears that Tanner must have compared his copies with the Bodleian holdings, either physically or with the entries in the printed catalogue,[2] and an examination of those books bearing the endorsement seems to indicate that these are the ones of which no copy was to be found in the Bodleian.[3]

There is another peculiarity of the Tanner collection which it is apposite to mention here, but which in no way helps with identification. A large proportion of the books have a manuscript number written in what appears to be an eighteenth-century hand in the right hand margin of the title-leaf. The hand is almost certainly not Tanner's and

---

1. MS. Laud. misc. 690 is the 1535 edition. Tanner also possessed an edition for 1566 (T. 43) but it now wants the title-leaf. Another example of Tanner's use of the letters B.B. to represent the Bodleian Library is to be found MS. Eng. misc. e. 373, f.9 where he has noted that two or three volumes of Leland's works existed "under his own hand in B.B.".

2. On MS. T. 470, f.276 Tanner specifically says that in preparing for the Bibliotheca he used the letters B.B. to refer to the 1674 catalogue of printed books in the Bodleian compiled by the librarian, Thomas Hyde. On T. 244(4) Tanner has written "B.Ball" and MS. T. 470, f.276 shows that he is referring to the library of Balliol College, Oxford.

3. This is by no means certain. Not all the endorsed books have been examined but numerous "spot checks" have been carried out and the works compared with the entries in the 1674 Bodleian catalogue and the interleaved library copy of Pollard and Redgrave's Short title catalogue. However, the Tanner collection relates largely to a period for which the Bodleian holdings would have been notably deficient and the fact that the books endorsed "B.B." were not in the library may be quite incidental to Tanner's real purpose.

it would seem that these numbers must have been put on the books either by an amanuensis at his instigation or by the staff of the Bodleian.[1] The numbers range from 1 to 342 and individual numbers appear as many as seven times but on the average about three. A conspectus[2] showed an almost consecutive sequence of 1-100, with rather more missing numbers from 101-200, and only twenty numbers appearing from among 201-300. It also showed that the smaller the number the more likely it was to appear. Whatever their origin the purpose of these numbers is by no means clear: the endless recurrence of numbers shows plainly that they do not represent a previous shelf-order of the collection, and books bearing the same number seem to bear no relation to each other in regard to their size, date, language, author's names (either Christian[3] or family) or subject.

---

1. No such numbers appear on the Tanner books at Norwich (cf. p.374, note 2) or at St. Asaph and the uniform hand indicates that they were written all at one time, and not piecemeal as the collection was formed; it might be thought that this would most probably have been done by the Bodleian. However, examination of contemporary collections in the library has failed to reveal any treated in a like manner and the numbers do not seem to be related to any methodical process that the library might use; moreover, the fact that a few Tanner books in other parts of the library also bear these numbers (e.g. 8° Z 30 Art., 4° X 6 Jur., 4° Rawl. 411) possibly indicates that these numbers were present before the Bodleian dealt with them.

2. See Appendix L.

3. Tanner's notes for the Bibliotheca (MS. T. 470) are arranged in alphabetical order of Christian names.

It has been sufficiently stressed that any criticism of the collection must be directed at what it contains and not at its omissions, but to criticise the content of the collection at all is to invite disaster upon at least two scores. Firstly, the scope of the Bibliotheca is so vast as to warrant the inclusion of any work by, or connected with, any British author who wrote before 1600 and including editions of his work published after that date; and secondly, criticism of the unexpected item can only be made in the light of what we know of the manner in which a volume came into Tanner's possession. For example, T. 455 is a volume containing four pamphlets, the third of which is C.D.de Launay's Nouveau système concernant la génération, les maladies vénériennes, et le mercure (Paris, 1698). Since the book deals with a subject that one might not expect to find represented in the library of an antiquarian bishop, the enquirer who observes the mint condition of the book and remembers that it was published at about the time that Tanner is known to have been ill with the [small]pox,[1] might well come to an unfortunate conclusion. It can, however, be shown that the whole volume was almost certainly given to Tanner by Moore sometime after 1701: only the first item has been signed by Tanner, the fourth pamphlet is dated 1701, the tone of the whole volume is predominately medical,[2] and the first pamphlet formerly

---

1. Cf. p. 41.
2. For the significance of this see p. 376.

belonged to a person whose library is known to have in part passed into Moore's possession.[1]

In Tanner's day Latin could still be used as an international language but it was by no means unknown for scholars to study other tongues and Rawlinson, for example, spoke Italian[2] whilst Nicolson was well versed in German.[3] Tanner's books indicate that he, at any rate, was not an accomplished linguist. Of European languages[4] French, German, Italian and Spanish are represented in an absolutely negligible proportion and in any case it is highly probable that most of the Italian books were not deliberate acquisitions.[5] There are scarcely ten books in foreign languages contained in the collection of which the provenance or a reason for Tanner's interest cannot be indicated with confidence.[6] Tanner's

---

1. i.e. Thomas Knyvett; cf. pp. 379,380.

2. Cf. Hearne, vol.xi, p.106.

3. Cf. F.G.James, North country bishop, p.13.

4. T. 883,884 are works on oriental tongues, but the second of these at least was obtained with other books belonging to Thomas Smith, cf. pp. 381,382.

5. Cf. p. 385.

6. e.g. T. 20(1) is a work in French which was printed in London and it is bound together with its English translation which is mentioned in the Bibliotheca under the entry for Robert Pownell. The latter is W.Musculus, The temporysour (Zurich?, 1555). T. 482 is El Testamento Nuevo de nuestro senor Iesu Christo (Lond., 1596) and on this Tanner has shown that his interest was primarily bibliographical: "This translation & Impression was made against one of Qu. Elizabeths expeditions to Spain - in order to enlighten the Spaniards & make them see the errors of Popery". The only substantial work in a foreign language that Tanner is known to have possessed the presence of which cannot be explained on bibliographical grounds would seem to be L.Bouchel, La bibliothèque;

[cont. on next page]

correspondence nowhere reveals that he was well acquainted with any continental languages or that he ever travelled, or intended to travel, abroad; nevertheless he did possess a contemporary travel guide to the Low Countries and other parts of Europe,[1] a somewhat earlier (1603) one to Italy,[2] and a word-book covering seven different European languages.[3] Travel and topographical works relating to England figured more prominently on his shelves.[4] Tanner, however, is known to have studied Welsh. As soon as he embarked on ~~the~~ Wiltshire ~~Bibliotheca~~ he was warned that some knowledge of this tongue would be necessary to the undertaking[5] and in 1698 he mentioned that he had commenced his studies, but added that he could not as yet "pretend to any g^t^ proficiency" in the language.[6]

---

6 cont. ou, Trésor du droit francois, augmentée par I. Becheser, 3 vols., (Par., 1671), which is now shelfmarked 5 Δ 13-15.

1. T. 393.

2. T. 477.

3. T. 365.

4. e.g. T. 354-359; 888; B 6. 18 Art.

5. Cf. p. 129, note 3.

6. MS. Ashm. 1817b, f.6, Tanner to Lhuyd, 2 May 1698. Tanner had apparently bought John Davies Antiquae linguae Britannicae... rudimenta (Lond., 1621) and his Antiquae linguae Britannicae, et linguae Latinae, dictionarium duplex (Lond., 1632) and W.Salesbury, A dictionary in Englyshe and Welshe (Lond., 1547). None of the copies of these works now in the Bodleian belonged to Tanner who says (ibid) that his copies had been annotated by Henry Jacob (1608-1652) of Merton college "one of ye g^test^ linguists in his time". Tanner's transcript of some of Jacob's notes is to be found MS. Ashm. 1817b, ff.10,11.

There the matter seems to have rested until the 1730's for various entries in Hearne's Diaries seem to indicate that Tanner knew little or no Welsh before he was elevated to the bishopric of St. Asaph.[1] Fortunately the services in this cathedral were always held in English but those in the nearby parish church, which was served by four Vicars-choral, one of whom was Tanner, were always in Welsh,[2] moreover, the people in that part of Wales spoke little English.[3] Probably the appearance of a 1727 Welsh grammar in Tanner's collection[4] is the direct result of his hastily renewing his acquaintance with the language, for there is no evidence of a long and careful cultivation of the tongue amongst Tanner's printed books, manuscripts, or correspondence.

As revealed in his correspondence Tanner's interests are almost exclusively ecclesiastical and antiquarian; but even the most cursory glance at the collection shows that it contains many books that belong to the sciences rather than the arts. Where these are of the fifteenth and sixteenth

---

1. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, pp.458,467,478.

2. Cf. J.Loveday, Diary of a tour in 1732 (Roxburghe club), (Edinb., 1890) p.67.

3. Tanner possessed a letter (MS. T. 30, f.124) written in 1686 by Bishop William Lloyd, one of his predecessors at St. Asaph, in which Lloyd said that he had found it necessary to ordain non-graduates because most of the people in the diocese understood only Welsh.

4. T. 829(5): W.Gambold, A Welsh grammar; or, A short and easie introduction to the Welsh tongue. By W.G. (Carmarthen, 1727).

centuries they are hardly obtrusive in the library of a bibliographer and only reflect the wide range of subjects that was covered by the early printers;[1] but when the same subjects appear amongst books published after 1600 then Tanner's interest is less obvious, although such subjects as land purchase, and mensuration are probably complementary to Tanner's duties as chancellor.[2] We know little of Tanner's habits as a collector, but early in his career he told Charlett that he seldom bought sermons.[3] A little later he asked Thomas Moore to dispose of some books on navigation as he was not particularly interested in the subject[4] but if Tanner was not interested in navigation it is perhaps a little surprising to find amongst his books quite so many treatises on mathematics.[5] Books on gardening[6] are also somewhat

---

1. Cf. H.S.Bennett, English books & readers, 1475 to 1557 (Cambr., 1952) pp.65-151.

2. e.g. T. 474(2); 427. Tanner gave about forty law books (some are not signed) to the diocese of Norwich; these now stand with the diocesan records.

3. Cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.89v, Tanner to Charlett, 12 May 1708. The fact that the collection contains so few sermons today could also be due to this being a field in which the Bodleian would have been strong at the time of Tanner's bequest and any sermons accordingly rejected.

4. MS. Bodl. 1013, f.15, Tanner to T.Moore, 27 Dec. [1709]: "I met wth lately 3. books of Navigation, Sellers Sea-Atlas, his coasting Pilot: and English Pilot - full of Charts and directions for sailers. They are out of my way, I should be willing to part wth them by exchange or otherwise, if you could dispose of them at Yarmouth I would send them to you". None of these books is now in the Tanner collection (cf. ibid., f.8) but books on navigation are still to be found, e.g. T. 253(1).

5. e.g. 8° Z 18,19 Art.; T. 298(2); 364; 430; 431; 474(1) &c.

6. e.g. T. 202(1^{m}); 287; 455(2); 899.

unexpected. However, anyone who has come into contact with an ardent bibliophile will dismiss such criticisms as irrelevant in recognition of the fact that the mere desire to possess on Tanner's part can be sufficient explanation of the appearance of any of these books. There is, however, one subject that cannot be thus dismissed: a passing headache may have prompted the purchase of a comparatively modern book of medical cures[1] and the presence of E.Roesslin's Byrth of Mankynd (1552)[2] can be explained on bibliographical grounds rather than attributed to impending paternity on Tanner's part, and who could expect him to resist a copy of the almost unknown 1489 edition of the Gouernayle of helthe printed by Caxton;[3] but, taken as a whole, the number of medical books in the collection is most noticeable.[4]

It is by no means unusual to find eighteenth century clerics who were interested in ministering to the body as well as to the soul[5] but Tanner seems to have been exposed in

---

1. e.g. T. 415.
2. T. 240.
3. Kept as Arch. G. f. 10.
4. It is interesting to note that of the very few Tanner books that I have so far identified in other libraries two should occur in medical collections; one of these is noted on p. 380, note 1, and the other is to be found in the library of the Department of the History of Medicine, Medical Center, University of Kansas. For information regarding the second, a copy of A.Caesalpino, Daemonium. Investigatio peripatetica (Florentiae, 1580), I am indebted to Mr. R.J.Durling and Mr. D.G.Neill.
5. Cf. J.H.Whiteley, Wesley's Anglican contemporaries (Wesley historical society lecture, 5), (Lond., 1939) pp.37,38.

particular to the influence of two people who might have moulded his tastes in this direction and indeed from whom he may have obtained these books. Bishop Moore was very interested in medicine and even went so far as to prescribe for his friends; but it would seem equally important to remember that Tanner's brother Joseph was a successful surgeon who had academic interests.[1] At Joseph's death many of his possessions

---

1. Joseph Tanner was born in 1676 (cf. ~~Nixon, op. cit., p.76~~ p.4, note 1) and little is known of his education. Early in 1694 he was living in London at "Mr Wasse's, a Chirurgeon in Clement Lane near Lombard-street" (cf. MS. Aubrey 13, f.196) and when Gibson met him at about this time he reported that "He would have made an admirable Antiquarie; he seems inclin'd to dive into the true reasons of every thing, whereas your Surgeons here content themselves generally with a superficial knowledge, and run by note more than reason"; MS. T. 25, f.129. In the same year he had "an offer made him to goe to ye Hospitall at Brussels to continue there 'till ye end of ye Campagne" (MS. T. 25, f.131) and he is known to have travelled widely on the continent, an interesting account of one of his journeys being preserved at MS. T. 114, f.35. He was elected F.R.S., but does not appear to have been a very active member, and on 8 April 1719 he was appointed assistant surgeon at St. Thomas's Hospital, London; in 1721 he became a surgeon, but he did not receive the full stipend until 1723; cf. F.G.Parsons, The history of St. Thomas's hospital (Lond., 1932-36) vol.ii, pp.167,168,174,265; cf. also MS. Ballard 4, f.132. Bishop Tanner described him in 1700 as "truly virtuous diligent, and for his time a very good proficient in his Profession"; cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.38. It has not, I think, been hitherto noticed that this Joseph Tanner was the one who assisted Richard Mead in his edition of William Cowper's Myotomia reformata (Lond., 1724): in the "Advertisement" Mead says that Cowper "delivered his Papers into my Hands, and desired me, with the Assistance of his intimate Friend Mr. JOSEPH TANNER, an ingenious Anatomist and skilful Surgeon, to take Care of the Publication of his Book". Both Cowper and Mead were among the foremost medical men of the day, and Mead's signature is amongst those that appear on a testimonial in favour of Joseph Tanner, MS. T. 20, f.47, the other signatories including John Radcliffe, Sir Hans Sloane, and other well-known physicians. Mead, Radcliffe, and Sloane were all very eminent men in the world of books. Joseph Tanner died 19 November 1724 (cf. "Chronological diary" of the Historical

[cont. on next page].

passed directly into Tanner's hands[1] and these medical books may possibly have come from his library.

A general examination of the provenance of the Tanner collection is somewhat unrewarding. Scarcely any original bindings remain at all, but two of these are of some interest: T. 695 was originally the property of Sir William Pickering (d. 1575) and bears his arms on the covers[2] whilst DD 68 Art. appears to have once been in the library of King Henry VIII.[3] During the course of rebinding nearly all the free end-papers were removed and with them must have been lost many autographs of former owners and much other information of interest. Ownership is perhaps more regularly noted on the title than on the fly-leaf and it is to be hoped that the many autographs that still remain are at least representative of those that have been lost. But however interesting is the provenance of any individual item it can tell us little in relation to

---

1 cont. register, 1724, p.49) but apparently was not buried until 5 December; cf. [Christ Church] MS. Arch. W. Epist. 22, item 345. He spent "a great deal of Money in collecting" and when his collections were sold Mead bought "many fine things" (Hearne, vol.viii, p.340; other references occur ibid., pp.342,346).

1. Tanner apparently administered his brother's affairs at his death (cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.14) but the will was never proved and Tanner inherited the estate as an heir-at-law; cf. Tanner's will: East Anglian, n.s., vol.xiii, p.20.

2. This volume was noticed in E.G.Duff, "The bindings of Thomas Wotton", The Library, 3rd ser., vol.i, p.345. A more detailed survey of its provenance, by W.E.Moss, is pasted on the upper free end-paper.

3. Cf. Macray, Annals, p.212n.

the formation of the collection as a whole[1] and the present survey of provenance is directed at establishing whether the printed books display evidences of any bulk purchase such as Tanner is known to have made of the Sancroft and Nalson manuscripts. The survey was carried out on the assumption that where the same signature or mark appears on two different works then the probability is that Tanner obtained them from the same source.[2]

Several of the books have a manuscript shelfmark on the final leaf.[3] In libraries where the books were shelved with the fore-edge facing outwards this was not such an inconvenient place as we might nowadays suppose, and such an arrangement had the advantage that it was easier and cheaper to write an indication of the contents of a book on the fore-edge than to affix a label to the spine.[4] Where the books in question

---

1. Often individual provenance is some guide as to where Tanner obtained an item: e.g. T. 132(4) was almost certainly obtained in Norfolk where Robert and Thomas Chickering, who previously owned it, were eminent citizens; cf. Blomefield, Norfolk, vol. iii, pp.420,436. MS. T. 396 is a volume relating to Norfolk in the hand of Thomas Chickering. In his will Tanner left some money to the incumbent of Thorpe in order to improve the Rectory because he had been unable to purchase "the Close, next Thunder Lane, late Mr. Chickerings in order to annexe to [it]" [not given in the abstract in the East Anglian].

2. The purchase of several works already bound together has been discussed on pp. 367 ; two signatures appearing in such a volume have been disregarded. The survey revealed that on a number of occasions Tanner had noted that he had received a work as a gift and a list of these is given in Appendix F.

3. See Appendix D.

4. Cf. J.C.T.Oates, "Fore-edge titles in Cambridge University library", Transactions of the Cambridge bibliographical society, vol.iii, pp.163-165. At Cambridge this method of shelving continued until 1706 but private owners probably abandoned it much earlier.

are of sufficient thickness they have been treated in this way and there can be no doubt that these books formerly stood in a large library, as is evidenced by the shelfmarks themselves.[1] The most recent of the books is dated 1580[2] and the majority of them bear dates in the middle of the sixteenth century at which time the library seems for the most part to have been formed. On the title-leaves of nearly all of them is written the name of Thomas Knyvett. This often appears twice, in different hands. Some bear the name of Edward Flowerdew, generally in addition to that of Knyvett, and others have no provenance indicated at all. The history of the books seems to have been as follows: Edward Flowerdew, who died in 1586, was a judge whose family had strong Norfolk connections, and at his death some of his books passed into the library of another Norfolk family - the Knyvetts.[3] Some three

---

1. The library appears to have been divided into three main divisions: Auster, Dexter, and Sinister - presumably the three sides of a room, the door of which was in the remaining northern wall. Each division was subdivided into five "classes" and each book in the resulting section was given a running number. The shelfmark then appears as "2 Class. Austr. 51" (T. 639). In some cases the running numbers are well over 100, e.g. T. 568; 796. A similar system to this appears in the catalogue of the Norwich library to which Tanner made his donations; cf. p. 346.

2. T. 796.

3. The transfer was probably effected by purchase, but there is a connection between the families that is perhaps worth noting. A Simon Harcourt of Stanton Harcourt in Oxfordshire settled an annuity on Flowerdew in 1575, presumably for judicial services; cf. D.N.B.; s.n. Flowerdew. At this time Agnes, daughter of Sir John Harcourt, also of Stanton Harcourt, was married to John Knyvett and their son was the Sir Thomas who seems to have started the library.

or four generations later part of this library passed into the possession of Moore from whom Tanner obtained the items now under discussion[1] and the others subsequently found their way with the rest of Moore's books into the Cambridge University Library.[2]

---

1. One Knyvett/Tanner book was sold as Lot 232 in the 1862 Bodleian duplicate sale, and Thomas Knyvett had also owned Lot 1298(2) in the same sale. Number 149 in F.N.L.Poynter, A catalogue of Incunabula in the Wellcome historical medical library (Lond., 1954) has a Knyvett/Tanner provenance and a facsimile of the title is given. There are a few papers relating to the Knyvetts amongst the Tanner manuscripts, and a letter from Tanner to Le Neve concerning the Knyvett family is to be found in Nichols Literary history, vol.iii, p.420.

2. J.C.T.Oates in A catalogue of the fifteenth-century printed books in the University library, Cambridge notes nos.829, 2075, 4006, and 4197 as having a Knyvett provenance and all of these are in the Royal library, i.e. Moore's books given to Cambridge by George I. Merely to say that Tanner obtained the Knyvett books from Moore is to ignore the complications that arise on a closer inspection of the books. T. 866 bears the signature of three different Thomas Knyvetts whereas the majority bear two. The Knyvett who may be credited with forming the bulk of the collection is Sir Thomas (1539?-1617) at whose death the library passed to his grandson, also Thomas (1596-1658), since his son, another Sir Thomas, had died in 1605. The signature that appears on T. 866 and not on the other books is that of the grandson; cf. MS. T. 69, f.63. The two remaining signatures appear on all the Knyvett books except T. 639 which only bears the signature of the son. [T. 840(3) only bears the earlier signature, but is so damaged as to be discounted]. The son's signature appears on a bond dated 1573 in MS. Top. Norfolk c. 1 (f.143) and also on MS. Rawl. D 913, f.98, and D 1387, f.58, from which it seems that Thomas Rawlinson may have acquired some of the Knyvett library. Apparently Sir Thomas Knyvett gave his son books out of his library, which were returned with the addition of T. 639 and L 4. 11 Art. at the son's death. The library then descended to the grandson, whose brother Edmund at one time possessed T. 163 and 248(2), and was later purchased by Moore. L 4. 11 Art. bears the signatures of father and son, but appears to have been purchased by the son who has noted the price paid after his name. A pedigree of the Knyvett family is given in The Knyvett letters, ed. by B.Schofield (Lond., 1949) at pp.52,53. A number of Knyvett papers came into the possession of Peter Le Neve and may possibly have come to Tanner through him.

A number of books in the collection bear the autograph of Thomas Smith, the librarian of the vast Cottonian collection.[1] Smith had a wide knowledge of books and had acquired a fine library on his own account.[2] When he died in 1710 he left many of his books and papers to Hearne and the remainder was sold, Rawlinson being among the purchasers.[3] At Hearne's death a few items of Smith's bequest came directly to the Bodleian[4] and others passed with the rest of Hearne's collections into Rawlinson's hands, only later to be deposited in the same library.[5] The remainder of Smith's collection was perhaps not immediately as widely dispersed as might have been thought in view of the fact that it was in the hands of a commercial bookseller,[6] for on 29 August 1735 Tanner told Rawlinson:

> I bought out of Sr John Hollands Study in Norfolk a g^{t} many quarto Volumes of Pamphlets wch had been old Tograi's[7]

---

1. An account of Smith is given in the D.N.B. Tanner had some connection with Smith in his capacity as the Cotton librarian; cf. MS. Ballard 4, f.32; 5, f.122.

2. Cf. Hearne, vol.iii, p.50.

3. ibid.

4. Under one of the provisions of Smith's bequest to Hearne; cf. Macray, Annals, p.208.

5. ibid.

6. Christopher Bateman; cf. Hearne, vol.iii, p.50.

7. In 1668 Smith journeyed to the East and on his return he soon became known as "Rabbi" or "Tograi" Smith because of his pronouncements on the state of the Greek Church.

> - many of wch especially about the Revolution, concerning the Oaths, New-Schism &c - he had postill'd and put the names of the reputed Authors to,[1]

Rawlinson, who was compiling a list of non-jurors and their works, apparently asked for more details. On 20 October Tanner replied

> My pamphlets ever since the misfortune of having my books sunk in the Thames have not been sorted in the manner they were before, but [I] shall endeavor it ere long, and then will if I have any Minutes of old Toggai's or others about the Authors help out your Catalogue.[2]

Although the Tanner collection does contain a number of such pamphlets, the majority of them are not "postill'd" and it is disappointing that so few of them can be definitely traced to Smith, particularly as Tanner's purchase seems to have been a fairly large one.[3] It must be presumed that either some of them were so damaged by water that they were not worth preserving, or that they never reached, or were rejected by, the Bodleian.

It is a comparatively simple matter to identify those books that have a Rawlinson provenance[4] for the bold mark

---

1. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.27, Tanner to Rawlinson, 29 Aug. 1735.
2. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, f.35, Tanner to Rawlinson, 20 Oct. 1735.
3. On 29 March 1731 Tanner told Hearne from Norwich that "Since I have been a little well, I have diverted my self wth pulling in pieces and sorting about 120. Volumes of Pamphlets wch belonged formerly to your Friend Dr Tho. Smith - were after sold into this Country and at last got into my hands - he has mark'd the names < > of the reputed Authors of several Anonymous ones"; MS. Rawl. lett. 15/16, f.486v. For Smith books in the Tanner collection see Appendix J.
4. See Appendix I.

"C & P"[1] is hardly to be missed, but their relationship with the collection is less clear. The two men were close friends and there is no Rawlinson book in the collection that could not have been a gift to Tanner[2] but there seems to have been some connection, even confusion, in the way in which the two collections have been dealt with in the Bodleian, in spite of the gap of several years between their arrivals at the library.[3] Occasionally a Rawlinson book is to be found in the Tanner collection for no apparent reason[4] and, similarly, Tanner books are to be met with in the Rawlinson collection;[5]

---

1. Cf. p. 365.

2. There are, however, some books that apparently were not gifts to Tanner; see note 4.

3. The Tanner collection was received in 1736 and the Rawlinson collection in 1755.

4. e.g. T. 59. This volume has been endorsed "Bibl. Bodl: Ex Legat: Rich. Rawlinson LLD."

5. e.g. 4° Rawl. 369; 8° Rawl. 827. One volume, 8° Rawl. 169(3), Xenophons treatise of householde (Lond., 1573) raises particular problems. At first sight the whole work appears to have belonged to Tanner, whose signature appears at the foot of the title-leaf in the usual manner, but a closer inspection reveals that this leaf may well have been added to the book in order to complete a deficient text, probably when the book was bound which was apparently in the early part of the nineteenth century. At this time work was in progress on the Tanner collection. No copy of this book, with or without the title, is in the Tanner collection and no copy was sold in the Bodleian duplicate sales. The leaf appears to have been added after the book came to the Bodleian for the text bears marks of having been processed without the title, but the only shelf-mark on the book appears on the title. The stains on text and title in no way match but although only the title was certainly Tanner's the physical condition of the text also resembles that of many of the books in the Tanner collection.

moreover, in the dispersal of the books about the library Tanner and Rawlinson books are often to be found side by side, probably indicating that books from both collections were being dealt with at the same time.[1] Little can now be said of the Tanner/Rawlinson books other than that they belonged to both men for in the absence of any specific reference to a particular copy it is impossible to say which of the two was the last owner. Thomas Rawlinson had formed one of the largest private libraries ever to be collected, but his imprudently managed business affairs forced his younger brother Richard to sell the library at his death. Richard himself compiled the catalogues of the sales and as these came from the press so he sent them to Tanner for his perusal.[2] The sales took place between 1721 and 1734. The lot numbers of the books in the auction were usually indicated by pasting a diamond-shaped piece of paper on the books and where these

---

1. This seems virtually certain in those instances where Rawlinson and Tanner books stand intermingled. The following table shows a few examples of dispersed copies standing side by side:

Tanner	Rawlinson
8° Z 16-19 Art.	8° Z 20 Art.
8° Z 28, 30 Art.	8° Z 29 Art.
8° A 158 Linc.	8° A 157 Linc.
8° D 216, 224, 230 Linc.	8° D 217, 226, 232 Linc.
8° W 14, 18-20, 22 Med.Seld.	8° W 23, 24, 26 Med.Seld.

2. Cf. MS. Rawl. lett. 30/31, ff. 19, 21, 23.

distinctive numbers appear in the Tanner collection[1] the numbers can be compared with the items in various Rawlinson sale catalogues until the book is identified. Even this is not absolute proof that any such book is correctly shelved with the Tanner collection for Richard Rawlinson was himself a purchaser at these sales, but it may be regarded as "circumstantial" proof for it is unlikely that Tanner would have failed to have made some purchases at what was one of the greatest series of book sales of all time.[2]

A number of books which have no provenance whatsoever indicated may also be tentatively ascribed to Rawlinson. These are certain works in the Italian language. During his travels in Italy Rawlinson acquired a large number of books, the duplicates from amongst which he intended as gifts for his friends.[3] Dr. B.J.Enright has recently examined the Tanner collection in search of books with a Rawlinson provenance and he is of the opinion that the books in question were formerly in Rawlinson's possession.[4] This is very probably the case, but it seems just possible that these books may have belonged to Tanner's brother, Joseph, who is also known to have travelled in Italy.[5]

---

1. e.g. T. 304(3); 459(1).
2. Tanner's name does not appear in Rawlinson's list of purchasers at the March 1727 sale, MS. Rawl. D 661.
3. Cf. Enright, Rawlinson; MS. D.Phil. d. 1786, f.170, note 2.
4. Cf. ibid. Appendix B, p.lvi.
5. Cf. Hearne, vol.viii, p.340.

The appearance amongst the Tanner printed books of a presentation copy to Sancroft[1] indicates that Tanner's purchase of the archbishop's collection was not entirely confined to manuscript material, but since Sancroft himself disposed of the greater part of his printed books it must be thought that Tanner could not have obtained any great number. Sancroft's name is regularly to be seem amongst the Tanner manuscripts but it does not appear on any of the printed books; nevertheless those books that bear the signature of John Jackson, the ejected Rector of St. Bennett's, Paul's Wharf, London,[2] may have come from this source. Undue emphasis must not be laid on the fact that they were probably amongst the Sancroft material because one of them[3] bears the signature of Thomas Moore, but the following extracts from the Tanner manuscripts are of interest. On 28 May 1684 Jackson wrote to Sancroft:

> It would be too much presumption in me to offer soe trifling a p^r^sent to a person of yor degree & quality, & therefore leave it wholly to yor selfe, either to returne ye books, or, according to ye value yo^u^ may think good to putt upon them, wth either of wch I shall assuredly be well pleased.[4]

On 3 September Jackson wrote again:

> I sett no great value upon ye books (having none but girls to leave them to) & therefore was most free to

---

1. T. 317; cf. p. 347.
2. An account of Jackson is given in A.G.Matthews, Calamy revised (Oxf., 1934) pp.290,291. The books bearing his signature are listed in Appendix J.
3. T. 427.
4. MS. T. 32, f.61, Jackson to Sancroft, 28 May 1684.

> have accepted whatever value yor Grace would have putt on them in ye hands of a meere stranger.[1]

If Sancroft refused these books then it is surely a remarkable coincidence that some of Jackson's library should be contained in the Tanner collection today, but if these books were obtained with the other Sancroft material it is only the chance preservation of two letters that enables us to identify them and it must be presumed that the collection contains other books from the same source.

Between them the Knyvett, Smith, Rawlinson, and Jackson books amount to some seventy-five items out of a total of about 1,800 and represent the greater part of the recurrent autographs or marks, so that it may be said that although Tanner can be shown on occasions to have bought several books at one time, there is no evidence that he ever purchased printed books in bulk on such a scale as he is known to have bought manuscripts. The collection contains many other items of which the provenance is of interest in relation to Tanner but space does not allow of a detailed consideration of them and the most convenient way to notice these and other points is by means of the tables that are appended.

---

1. MS. T. 32, f.137, Jackson to Sancroft, 3 Sept. 1684.

d: Manuscripts

In passing now to a consideration of Tanner's collection of manuscripts it is perhaps as well to bear in mind that he would have regarded both printed books and manuscripts together as his "library" and that the present distinct physical division of the collection is connected with problems of library administration. However, since the manuscripts do not lend themselves to the same type of criticism as the printed books it seems justified in this present essay to perpetuate a distinction which Tanner himself probably would not have recognised. Nevertheless, it must always be remembered that the manuscripts and printed books together form one unit, and for this reason it is not proposed to describe at length the examination of the manuscripts, which has been conducted in a similar manner to that laid down in the consideration of the printed books, and the results of this investigation have been incorporated where appropriate in the appendices outlined above. There are, however, several additional observations that may be made.

Whereas scholars have uniformly praised the value of the Tanner manuscripts there has also been some criticism of the order in which the various items have been bound, and the arrangement of the collection has recently been described as

the "least satisfactory of any in the Library".[1] It is interesting to estimate the degree in which Tanner is implicated in these shortcomings.

The manuscripts, like the printed books, have been extensively rebound over the years and few original bindings remain; it is therefore difficult to envisage the condition of the collection when it arrived at the Bodleian. The repeated requests for information made by his friends must have meant that Tanner had to keep his papers in some sort of order, and the acquisition in the mid-1720's of the mass of material contained in Sancroft's collections could only have been rendered of any day-to-day use by methodical arrangement. It is hardly surprising therefore to find Tanner telling Kennett in 1727 that he had spent a great deal of his time in sorting his papers and in making up suitable volumes.[2] The task was obviously a long one. In 1728 Willis asked for the loan of some documents only to be told that they were not to be found: "I look[ed] in the Drawer wherein my Ely Papers use[d] to ly ... but how it is I know not - only upon the Change of my house, these & other papers are mislaid, so that I can't at present possibly find them, tho' I have made search every where I can think of".[3] Contemporary accounts of the

---

1. Summary catalogue, vol.i, p.xxxvi.
2. Cf. [B.M.] Lansdowne MSS. 1038, f.131, Tanner to Kennett, 11 Mar. 1727.
3. Cf. MS. Willis 45, f.108, Tanner to Willis, 11 Sept. 1728.

collection are unfortunately few and uninformative but we do know that much of Tanner's work of arrangement was literally undone after the immersion in Benson lock, when many volumes had to be pulled to pieces before they could be properly dried.[1] A description of the collection before this disaster was subsequently given by John Tanner in the preface to the 1744 edition of the Notitia Monastica where he states that it had been "bound up in volumes marked Willoughby, Jackson, Appleton, Bristol, etc.".[2] John Tanner was not aware that the greater part, and possibly all, of the collection had by this time been rebound by the Bodleian Library.[3]

There has been preserved a particularly interesting volume in Tanner's hand which seems to record his efforts at both binding and rebinding.[4] The first portion of this is written on the blank leaves of letters addressed to him at

---

1. Cf. p. 333.

2. Notitia Monastica (1744) p.xliv. No such titles are to be found on the volumes today, although MS. T. 129 relates to the diocese of Bristol and the greater portion of the correspondence of Isaac Appleton is to be found in MS. T. 69. There are now no volumes that could be satisfactorily labelled Willoughby or Jackson. In 1763 the article on Tanner in the Biographia Britannica stated [p.3910, note G] that his collections were bound in volumes "marked, for distinction-sake, with the several names of Appleton, Astley, Bristol, Hobart, Jackson, Jernegan, Willoughby, &c.". This is probably a derivative of John Tanner's original description and in any case seems to be something of an anachronism; any one who was then using the collection would probably have found it more convenient to refer to the volumes by their present numbers, cf. pp. 396, 397.

3. Cf. p. 395.

4. L.P. Bishop Tanner's catalogue.

Norwich and at first glance the jottings, for they are little more, appear to be some sort of general classification scheme.[1] Closer examination reveals that it is an arrangement, by subject, of his collections. Some allowance is made within this arrangement to accomodate volumes of varying sizes; thus each section (representing a volume to be bound) was marked with a letter of the alphabet and when these were exhausted the letters were duplicated, i.e. A-Z; AA-ZZ; certain letters were marked as being "folio", others as "quarto".[2] If this arrangement was indeed, as seems highly probable, adopted before 1731 it is interesting to note that very nearly all of the items contained upon the list which can be identified are still extant,[3] and this may perhaps indicate that the damage suffered in Benson lock was perhaps not as great as has been generally supposed.

If, after their immersion, a number of the papers required rebinding at least there was no need to rearrange them and many of the volumes that Tanner designated by letters can be equated

---

1. Similar notes occur in MS. Sancroft 136, f.1.

2. This may have been adapted from the system employed at the Bodleian Library where double letters were just beginning to come into use; cf. G.M.Briggs, "The general removal, 1723" Bodleian Library record, vol.iii, pp.213-222. In the Bodleian scheme the single letters represented folios and the double letters quartos.

3. But not necessarily in the Tanner collection: e.g. items P, Q, and R (f.3v of Tanner's catalogue) are now MS. Rawl. D 1347(7); 1366-1369.

with volumes now in the Bodleian.[1] However, Tanner's connection with the present arrangement is more clearly shown in the second part of his catalogue. Here he has drawn up lists[2] of the contents of fifteen volumes, and to each of these he has given a reference number in the form C.v.1, C.v.2, &c. As these volumes were returned from the binders so he wrote "bound" against the reference. Only the first eight entries are thus marked and these can easily be identified with volumes within the Tanner collection;[3] the contents of C.v.9 are, however, to be found in two volumes in the Rawlinson collection,[4] and it would appear that Tanner's rebinding programme never got past the eighth volume.[5] It seems probable that this work was being done after the immersion of the collection for volume C.v.7 contains an item dated 1730.[6]

It can therefore be shown that Tanner himself was

---

1. e.g. LL = MS. T. 142; NN = 143; OO = 131. MM is now divided between two volumes: MS. T. 145 and 161.

2. These are to be found on ff.10-13, 22-28, 34-41.

3. C.v.1 = MS. T. 102; C.v.2 = 91; C.v.6 = 88; C.v.7 = 306; C.v.8 = 279. C.v.3, 4, and 5 = MS. T. 280 and have been noted by Tanner in his catalogue as being bound together; one of his divisions is still to be seen in the volume at f.342 which is marked C.v.5. Other examples of this system of referencing are to be met with in the collection, e.g. MS. T. 229 was once O.2.16, MS.T. 182 was O.2.17 and MS. T. 216 was L.n.6. It will be noticed that the form of reference is inconsistent.

4. MS. Rawl. D 853 (7-10, 12-15); MS. Rawl. D 858 (1-3, 6).

5. The contents of C.v.11 are to be found in MS. T. 94 and 121; parts of C.v.12 are in MS. T. 93 and 99; and C.v.14 is divided between MS. T. 103 and 217. C.v.10 = MS. T. 281; C.v.13 = MS. T. 309; and the unreferenced fifteenth volume = MS. T. 447.

6. MS. T. 306(158).

responsible for the arrangement of a considerable number of the volumes, but the part that has been the most criticised as being in an unsatisfactory order is the large series of letters contained in the volumes now numbered 21-80. These are in chronological order but are reversed, volume 21 being the most recent in point of time and volume 80 the earliest.[1] Within each volume the earliest letters are to be found on fol.1 &c. It is difficult to believe that such an arrangement could have been adopted intentionally and it is now only possible to guess at the events which brought about this result.

The first section in Tanner's catalogue or binding-list concerns his folio manuscripts "besides those ranged under every K[ing] & Q[ueen's] reign"[2] and it is easy to imagine that, as the collection grew, so each volume originally intended to contain a reign would outgrow itself and the present chronological arrangement come to be adopted. There is much evidence to show that Tanner himself virtually put these volumes into order because it appears that he sorted his letters into bundles, each of which represented a year. This of course made it necessary to supply a year for any undated item and examples of his having done so are occasionally to

---

1. MS. T. 50 has been accidently misplaced for it was obviously intended to be the first volume of the series and would today stand most naturally after MS. T. 80. It was apparently the presence of this volume that gave rise to the impression that the letters were in two separate series; cf. Summary catalogue, vol.i, pp.xxxvi, xxxvii.

2. L.P.Bishop Tanner's catalogue, f.1.

be met with.[1] At the front of each bundle was placed a sheet of rough paper on which was written the year of the letters contained in it and in a number of cases these have been preserved.[2] The writing on these year-divisions is perhaps not in Tanner's hand but the sheets seem to have been in the collection during his life for some of them are water-stained;[3] moreover, in many instances outside the series of letters the divisions are made with printed sheets relating either to the financial relief of the widows of Norfolk clergymen or to the establishment of charity schools in that county, copies of either of which Tanner might be expected to have had in abundance.[4]

Although it is evident that Tanner arranged the letters there is no real evidence to show that he ever attempted to bind them and indeed the whole concept of one chronological series meant that if subsequent accessions were to be incorporated in sequence then binding could not be undertaken until the collection ceased to grow. They were apparently still

---

1. e.g. On MS. T. 31, f.272v Tanner has written "I can't tell where to settle these good papers but in 1 Jac. II", and MS. T. 63, f.1 bears the note "This must be agst Lent Assizes 1642/1 ...".

2. MS. T. 77 contains excellent examples of this accidental preservation. After ff.52, 60, 77, 114, 128 and 154 are to be found the divisions for the years 1593-1599.

3. e.g. the sheet for 1597 after MS. T. 77, f.114.

4. e.g. MS. T. 143, f.69; ff.1, 61, 111, and 143. Both these good causes benefited under Tanner's will. His copy of An exact account of the charge for supporting the poor of the city of Norwich (Lond., 1720) is now to be found 8° Z 28 Art.

unbound at Tanner's death.[1]

The Bodleian began to bind the papers almost as soon as they had had time to make a detailed examination of the bequest for in the Entry-Book for 1730-1741, undated, but almost certainly 1738, is a note by Thomas Sedgley, the Oxford binder, to the effect that he had received "bundles" of Tanner's letters beginning with the year 1640 and continuing through until 1699.[2] Not only does this indicate that

---

1. We shall probably never know the true binding history of these volumes for there is much conflicting evidence. John Tanner asserted (cf. p.330) that he had arranged the volumes for 1640-1660, but this does not always tie up with other evidence, cf. p.394, note 1. The writing of the year-divisions might well be John Tanner's and possibly the arrangement was a joint effort on the part of the two brothers. John Tanner goes on to say that these volumes were mostly, if not completely, "bound up handsomely in volumes" when they were transferred to the Bodleian, which is not supported by the fact that the library immediately dispatched these very volumes to the binders.

2. Cf. L.P. Entry-book, 1730-1741, 8 leaves from the end. Two points arise over this entry. Firstly, Sedgley has noted that he did not receive a volume for 1648 because it was already bound and this might perhaps indicate that Tanner had in fact commenced to bind up these letters. The volume for 1648, MS. T. 57, has since been rebound in two volumes so we cannot compare the binding with Sedgley's work. Secondly, the series has also been noted as wanting the year 1656 and there is still a deficiency for this period. The years 1653 to 1658 are all contained in one volume, MS. T. 52, whereas most other volumes contain only one or two years, and the years 1642-1648 occupy two volumes each. The mass of papers relating to the Civil War is understandable (cf. p.329) but apart from this it is extraordinary that in forming a general collection of autograph letters Tanner should find some years markedly less productive than others. The explanation would seem to be that so great is the influence of Sancroft's collections that the fact that he was either living quietly in the country or travelling abroad during the years 1653-1658 is reflected here. Sedgley has also noted that after the run of letters, numbering about 50 volumes, that he received on

[cont. on next page]

the Bodleian merely accepted Tanner's arrangement ad hoc but, more important, it shows that the volumes were sent to the binders in a normal "forward" chronological series and that therefore they were probably intended to be shelved in this manner. It is possible to conceive that the volumes might be returned in the correct order but that the assistant who put them on the shelves placed them there one by one starting from the wrong end of the series, a mistake which would have been the more easy to make if the volumes had been piled on the floor with the "earlier" volumes at the bottom of the pile. This is merely one explanation of the present arrangement, but at all events Tanner can be exonerated from any blame. It is not so easy similarly to acquit Thomas Toynbee, of Balliol College, who in 1741 was paid twelve guineas for "putting in order & making a catalogue" of the collection.[1] To rationalise the arrangement of volumes that were already bound would hardly have entailed a great deal of work, but it seems that Toynbee merely catalogued the collection as it stood on the shelves and that afterwards it was never thought to query or alter the order of his catalogue.[2] It is difficult

---

2 cont. 18 August 1738[?] he later received 16 bundles (6 September); 3 in quarto and 14 in folio (8 September); 13 bundles (10 September); and 17 bundles (4 October).

1. Cf. Summary catalogue, vol.i, p.xxxvii.

2. ibid. The actual numbering of the volumes was done by Humphrey Owen, Bodley's Librarian, 1747-1768.

to see why the arrangement has attracted so much criticism, for once the principle of a single chronological series of letters is admitted then it can hardly matter to the scholar if the volumes are shelved in a reverse order, particularly when the Bodleian Library does not permit access to the shelves on which the collection stands.

When the collection first arrived at the Bodleian it was stored "in a large press at the left hand of the entrance to the Picture Gallery".[1] Rawlinson immediately consulted it and within the year was rather unfairly complaining that it was "neither catalogued nor digested"[2] and that he could not use it as he wished, nevertheless he appears to have made extensive use of the collection before the end of 1739.[3] Rawlinson, perhaps, had received special permission to do this for although Toynbee's catalogue of the collection was completed in 1741 it was not until 9 August 1744 that the first reader's order for a Tanner manuscript appears in the Entry-Book.[4]

---

1. Cf. MS. Ballard 40, f.40, Rawlinson to Ballard, 30 Nov. 1736.

2. Cf. MS. Eng. th. c. 33, f.445v, Rawlinson to T.Brett, 4 Dec. 1736 (cited in Enright, "Rawlinson and the chandlers", Bodleian library record, vol.iv, p.220); cf. also MS. Ballard 19, f.81, W.Brome to T.Rawlins, 24 Sept. 1736.

3. Cf. MS. Eng. th. c. 34, f.493, Rawlinson to Brett, 11 Oct. 1739.

4. L.P. Entry-book, 1741-1745. In 1746 Joseph Sanford of Balliol College made extensive use of the Tanner collection and even possessed his own transcript of Toynbee's catalogue, now Exeter College MSS., no.184. Toynbee's catalogue is now in the Bodleian Library records and the final entry is MS. T. 463, subsequent entries being in another hand; Sanford's transcript ends at MS. T. 464.

Tanner's interest in autograph letters has already been mentioned[1] and his collection is now largely represented by the series of volumes whose arrangement has just been reviewed. It was probably this interest that prompted him to purchase both the Sancroft and the Nalson collections. Sancroft's manuscripts in particular seem to have been very numerous and it is no exaggeration to say that by far the greater part of volumes 26-45 consists of correspondence addressed to Sancroft. ~~and numerous~~ Many examples are to be met with elsewhere. It is reasonable to assume that all such letters, together with those addressed to Sancroft's secretaries, were part of the collections that Tanner purchased, but in identifying other items great care has to be exercised. In his catalogue/ binding-list Tanner has entered a list of some Sancroft manuscripts[2] but this type of literature is less easy to enter in a catalogue than a printed book and errors of identification can easily be made. A portion of a list that Sancroft made of his books has survived and the first item is "A Discourse conc. ye Art of Miniature, or Limning".[3] There is in the Tanner collection a copy of Edward Norgate's Miniatura; or, The Art of Limning[4] and it would be particularly easy to equate the two and to

---

1. Cf. pp. 313, 314, 323-325.
2. L.P. Bishop Tanner's catalogue, ff.14-21.
3. MS. Sancroft 135, f.281.
4. MS. T. 326. This manuscript, which is not in Norgate's hand, was edited by M.Hardie and published by the Oxford University Press in 1919.

ascribe the provenance of this volume as "Sancroft". However, the Tanner volume bears the signature of Sir John Holland, some of whose books Tanner is known to have purchased independently,[1] and a further search has revealed the Sancroft manuscript in the Rawlinson collection.[2] There are also examples of letters from Sancroft that were actually dispatched[3] and in the present context these cannot be regarded as having a "Sancroft"provenance. But if items which at first glance appear to be "Sancroft" later transpire to have another provenance the reverse is also true, particularly with items which appear from the general catalogue to have been collected by Tanner specifically for his East Anglian researches;[4] Sancroft, it will be remembered, also had close associations with the Fenland.

Examination of the Sancroft items listed in Tanner's catalogue shows that the Archbishop was in the habit of boldly inscribing his name on the upper right hand edge of the initial leaf of his more substantial possessions,[5] and a further search throughout the Tanner collection reveals several other ways in which a manuscript may be ascribed as "Sancroft". Fortunately Sancroft wrote in a very distinctive hand and even a short note or word can be identified with absolute

---

1. Cf. p. 381.
2. MS. Rawl. D 1361(11).
3. e.g. MS. T. 28(269).
4. e.g. MS. T. 136(1).
5. e.g. MS. T. 4.

certainty; moreover, he was a man fired with the methodising spirit of a librarian: individual sheets have often been endorsed with "short titles",[1] certain volumes have been prefixed with catalogues of their contents compiled by him,[2] some bear notes of collation,[3] and others, that would otherwise be without any indication of provenance, bear titles on their spines in his distinctive hand.[4] In assembling his vast collection, which contains many transcripts, Sancroft employed the help of an amanuensis on whose work he often inscribed additions and corrections,[5] but the neat hand can be identified even when it does not bear Sancroft's notes.[6]

Another identifiable habit of Sancroft's was that of paginating his volumes and this he did in the centre of the head of each leaf, numbering the recto of each leaf only.[7] It is unlikely that he would have done this until the items had been put into their final order, if not bound, but Sancroft's arrangement has now been entirely dispensed with and paginated items are to be met throughout Tanner's papers. When Canon Stratford saw Tanner's recent purchase in 1728 he observed that "Sancroft was a great but no very judicious

---

1. Cf. MS. T. 33, f.59v.
2. e.g. MS. T. 116, f.2v.
3. e.g. MS. T. 1, ad initium.
4. e.g. MS. T. 353.
5. e.g. MS. T. 459 which consists almost entirely of transcripts by Sancroft and his amanuensis.
6. e.g. MS. T. 103(4).
7. Sancroft used only odd numbers so the effect is that of pagination and not foliation.

collector. He binds together too a strange medley of papers, that have no relation at all to one another, and a great deal of riff-raff amongst a few good ones".[1] Tanner must often have been faced with the necessity of breaking up volumes in order to preserve his chronological series of letters and he was by no means averse to doing so (during one of his not infrequent indispositions in later life he "diverted" himself by "pulling in pieces and sorting" a number of bound volumes)[2] and, if Sancroft's binding was as haphazard as Stratford suggests, he would have felt little compunction at destroying the identity of the archbishop's collections.

A conspectus of Sancroft's pagination suggests that probably very few volumes are concerned,[3] but they appear to have been large[4] - perhaps too large for Tanner's convenience - and their contents are now widely dispersed throughout the Tanner collection. It must also be remembered that there are probably many unpaginated Sancroft volumes similarly dispersed.[5] The conspectus also shows that no completely paginated series could be reconstructed[6] and also that many

---

1. Hist. MSS. Comm.; Portland vii, p.461.

2. Cf. p.382, note 3.

3. The lowest number is four, for there are that number of leaves paged 81/82. Cf. Appendix M.

4. One contained at least 758 pages.

5. Sancroft may only have paginated a volume when he wanted to refer to it.

6. e.g. The only example of pp.59/60 is in a gathering paged 51-74 and there is no gathering ending at p.50. It is probable that many otherwise blank leaves were suppressed in rebinding.

combinations of pagination are possible.[1] Examination of the items themselves is of little help in this respect for such water stains as are to be met with do not match on consecutively paginated items, nor on the items which are now bound together. It must be presumed that Tanner had already unbound the Sancroft volumes before the sinking of the collection and that rebinding was not forced upon him on account of damage by the water.

The time-lag between Sancroft's death and Tanner's purchase of his collections prompts the question: might not these volumes have been unbound by somebody else before they passed into Tanner's possession? Here he is certainly to blame for specific items are recorded in his catalogue as being in their original Sancroft order and the same items also appear in the lists of the contents of the volumes which he arranged for rebinding.[2]

---

1. e.g. 1-4, 5-34, 35-40, 41-48 or 1-8, 9-16, 17-48. Both these combinations would have to continue with the single gathering paged 49-52. See note 2 where it is shown that in fact the second combination is correct and that the sequence was in fact not continued by pp.49-52.

2. It is possible to reconstruct one of these paginated Sancroft volumes. At f.17 of Tanner's catalogue appears a list of the contents of a bound Sancroft volume that has since been dispersed. The original volume was made up in the following manner:

a.	MS. T. 90(13)	pp. 1-8
b.	343(27)	9-16
c.	99(20)	17-48
d.	99(15-17)	51-74
e.	103(2) f.3 only	75,76
f.	102(9)	77-88
g.	93(7,8)	97-128

Pp.49,50 were probably a blank and destroyed in rebinding.

[cont. on next page]

An attempt at the identification of the material with a Sancroft provenance in the Tanner collection[1] shows that it is in an even greater preponderance than has hitherto been thought.[2] But many of the Sancroft manuscripts that Tanner acquired are to be found outside the Tanner collection and if these too are taken into account then the result is the complete overshadowing of Tanner's own efforts as a collector. Not that his reputation as an antiquarian is at stake for he alone was responsible for the preservation of such valuable material, but it does seem to be indisputable that a very large part of the Tanner collection was obtained by one simple transaction and that Tanner today enjoys a reputation as a collector of manuscripts that should equally belong to Sancroft.

The inscription on MS. Rawl. lett. 59[3] shows that in 1738 Rawlinson purchased some Sancroft/Tanner material from an Oxford bookseller and he was probably referring to this

---

2 cont. Reference to Appendix M shows that the missing pages 89-96 are probably to be supplied by MS. T. 99(29) and this would fit well with the general tone of this volume. As none of these items falls in the chronological series of letters it is hard to see any advantage in Tanner's rearrangement.

1. See Appendix N.

2. In the Summary catalogue some of the volumes which contain Sancroft material have been marked with an asterisk but, in spite of a caveat, the list is seriously deficient. It can be shown that volumes 25-67; 70-80 all contain Sancroft items but not one of these is marked; nor can I find any authority for the inclusion of volumes 309, 391 and 435.

3. Cf. p. 350.

volume when, a week later, he related that by means of a friend he had met with "several papers once the property of Archbp Sancroft ... They, like many other papers, were retrieved from wast, at little more than weight price",[1] but there are many other Sancroft items in his collections.[2] It seems likely that Tanner's executors only half fulfilled their trust[3] and that some of these should more properly stand with the other Tanner manuscripts. Others, however, may never have passed through Tanner's hands at all for Rawlinson did in fact obtain at least one Sancroft item on the open market whilst Tanner was still alive,[4] and it is only fair to add that most of the Sancroft material in the Rawlinson collection is not entered in Tanner's catalogue of his Sancroft possessions.

---

1. MS. Eng. th. c. 34, f.261, Rawlinson to Brett, 22 Aug. 1738; cited by B.J.Enright in "Rawlinson and the chandlers", Bodleian library record, vol.iv, p.221. This article is preceded by another which touches upon the inter-relations of the Tanner and Sancroft manuscripts: E.A.O.Whiteman, "Two letter books of Archbishops Sheldon and Sancroft".

2. See Appendix O.

3. Certain of Tanner's collections found their way into the library of Sir Thomas Phillipps and some of these were subsequently purchased by the Bodleian; cf. R.W.Hunt, "List of Phillipps manuscripts in the Bodleian library", Bodleian library record, vol.vi, pp.348-369. Nos.2509(?), 10322, 10425, 10426, 10429, 19032, and 21794 of this list relate to Tanner but some of these (e.g. 19032) would have been excepted from deposit in the Bodleian under the terms of Tanner's will. It also appears that John Tanner still had some of Tanner's manuscripts that did not relate to the Notitia in his possession on 28 February 1744; cf. MS. Eng. lett. e. 1, f.29.

4. Cf. Hearne, vol.x, p.450.

There is now in the Bodleian a collection of 145 volumes known as "MSS. Sancroft". These consist mainly of the archbishop's own notebooks, those of his uncle Dr. William Sancroft, Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and those of Dr. Richard Holdsworth, also Master of Emmanuel and at one time Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University. It is very difficult to ascertain whether these reached the library with the Tanner collection or with that of Rawlinson,[1] but there can be no doubt that they were once in Tanner's possession for they are entered in his own catalogue.[2] Toynbee's catalogue contains many (unascribed) Sancroft items but makes no mention of these particular volumes and it has been suggested that this indicates that they came with the Rawlinson collection.[3] However, it appears that the present division is possibly what Tanner himself envisaged[4] and if he himself had kept the two collections separately then it would have been a simple matter for the Bodleian to decide to accept the division and the volumes accordingly have been excluded from Toynbee's catalogue. Unless new evidence comes to light it is hard to come to any definite conclusion

---

1. Cf. Summary catalogue, vol.iii, p.81.
2. L.P. Bishop Tanner's catalogue, ff.29-32.
3. Cf. Summary catalogue, vol.i, p.xlix, note 1.
4. In his will Tanner seems to mention his Sancroft collections as being distinct from his other manuscripts; cf. p.349. The division, however, is not as clear as it might be: MS. T. 331 is a volume of sermons by Holdsworth which should more properly be standing amongst the Sancroft manuscripts.

in the matter.[1]

The purchase which Tanner made of the Nalson collection cannot now be distinguished with any certainty. Examination of the other series of Nalson papers, deposited in the Bodleian by the Duke of Portland,[2] has not revealed any way in which the Tanner collection could be physically examined for their identification in the way that it is possible to identify the papers of Archbishop Sancroft. It is possible to make certain ascriptions to Nalson by a comparison of the subject matter of the two collections, and this has already been touched upon by F.H.B.Daniell in the introduction to the first volume of the Historical Manuscripts Commission's report on the Portland manuscripts.[3] Such a comparison is dangerous because in some respects the collections of Nalson and

---

1. There is one peculiarity of the Sancroft collection in its relation to Tanner: in his catalogue Tanner has numbered each Sancroft item, but not consecutively. Labels bearing these numbers (in Tanner's hand?) are to be found affixed to the spines of some of the volumes in MSS. Sancroft; e.g. MS. Sancroft 109 = no.166 and is entered in Tanner's catalogue at f.29v. The Sancroft volumes in the Tanner collection which have not been rebound do not bear such labels; some of those in the Rawlinson collection do (e.g. MS. Rawl. D 1147, 1322) but care must be taken not to confuse these with any labels relating to the Rawlinson sales. It seems that these numbers relate to Sancroft items only and they range as high as 367; the total number of Sancroft volumes in the Rawlinson, Sancroft and Tanner collections would seem to be in the region of this figure.

2. This deposit consists of 22 volumes and an index, volumes 9 and 14 being bound in two parts. They are now shelfmarked Dep. c. 152-176.

3. Hist. MSS. Comm.; Portland i, pp.i-viii. This volume is a calendar of the Nalson papers.

Sancroft cover the same ground[1] but fortunately detailed identification is not necessary in the present context. Comment is however indicated on the probable number of Nalson papers now in the Tanner manuscripts. Mr. Daniell cites the fact that of the 365 transcripts in Volume XI of the Portland deposit, 164 of the originals are in the Tanner collection;[2] but this is an isolated case and the other Nalson volumes consist mainly of originals. Philip Williams, a former owner, has noted that Tanner obtained papers relating to the years 1640-1660[3] and these would now correspond to MS. T. 49; 51-65, but by far the greater part of Nalson's collections relate to the years 1642-1651. These now correspond to MS. T. 56-64, but it can be shown that some items in these volumes were formerly in Sancroft's possession.[4] As might be expected from the period they represent these volumes bear close relations to the Portland deposit and it certainly seems that, for these years, those letters to or from prominent Commonwealth figures - particularly Speaker Lenthall - may, in the absence of conflicting evidence, be thought to have

---

1. e.g. Dep. c. 170 (vol.17 of the Nalson papers) is a collection of papers relating to France, Spain, and Portugal. Certain Sancroft items also relate to these countries; cf. L.P. Bishop Tanner's catalogue, f.17.

2. ~~loc. cit., p.iv~~ Hist. MSS. Comm.; Portland i, p. iv.

3. Cf. Dep. c. 152, f.1.

4. This overlap of the two collections probably accounts for the Tanner volumes for 1642-1648 each being bound in two parts. It is interesting to note that both the Nalson and Sancroft collections appear to have been weaker for the years from 1653 to the Restoration.

formerly been in Nalson's possession. If these are compared with the Portland deposit it appears that Tanner obtained between a third and a half of Nalson's collections; but the significance of this estimate lies in the fact that, if correct, it shows that the purchase was by no means the large addition to Tanner's collection that the acquisition of Sancroft's papers was.

When Tanner's collections were received by the Bodleian they contained over 2,000 charters, rolls, and deeds.[1] These were arranged during 1753 and 1754 by E. Rowe Mores, the subsequently well-known antiquary[2] but unfortunately all the Bodleian charters were later arranged in one series and the identity of those formerly in Tanner's possession has been lost. The Calendar of Charters and Rolls preserved in the Bodleian Library[3] takes notice of some of them in the Preface,[4] and others were connected with Tanner's duties as Chancellor.[5] Although it is known that the majority of them related to East Anglia this is of little help in identification since the same may be said of the equally large collection of charters bequeathed to the library by Richard Gough.[6]

---

1. Cf. Craster, Bodleian library, p.100.
2. Cf. Macray, Annals, p.212.
3. This calendar was edited by W.H.Turner and H.O.Coxe in 1878.
4. pp.xiv, xv.
5. Cf. ibid., pp.230,231.
6. Cf. Craster, loc. cit.

The detailed examination of Tanner's books and manuscripts seems to reveal that his main interest lay in his printed books and this is hardly surprising. The Notitia and the Bibliotheca both covered manuscript and printed material in their bibliographical citations but the Bibliotheca inevitably laid emphasis on the printed books whose multiplicity had preserved the information on later authors that was often lacking for earlier ones. The value of Tanner's collection of printed books lies not in the fact that it contains several extremely rare items, but in that as a whole it has preserved a representative selection of early English printing which is an extremely valuable addition to the Bodleian Library. Reference to the interleaved copy of Pollard and Redgrave's Short title catalogue, 1475-1640 kept in the Bodleian's manuscript and early printed book reading-room readily displays how great this value is. The Tanner manuscripts on the other hand, although an equally valuable and in some respects more important addition to the library, seem to have been acquired in an almost haphazard manner and it is ironical to think that Tanner's name is now largely remembered as a result of the ever-increasing number of references to the "Tanner MSS." that appear in the footnotes of scholarly works. But probably this is the way in which Tanner himself would have preferred to be remembered.



MS. Autogr. c. 7, f.9.

EXAMPLES OF TANNER'S SIGNATURE THAT HAVE BEEN CUT FROM HIS BOOKS

(Actual size)

APPENDICES

Appendix A

SAONA'S RHETORICA NOVA (T. 905)

It has been suggested on p.364 that some of Tanner's books may have been put on one side as duplicates when the collection was being processed by the Bodleian Library; if this is the case then it may go in some way to explain part of the mystery which shrouds the copy of Laurentius Guliel-mus de Saona's Rhetorica nova (St. Albans, 1480) which formed the star attraction of the 1862 duplicate sale. Mr. J.C.T. Oates of Cambridge University Library, which possesses the copy in question, has written a note on this for the Bodleian Library Record and has underlined the problems.[1]

The Bodleian possessed three copies of this work, but Sotheby's cataloguer was apparently only aware of two and believed that the copy with which he was dealing had some associations with Tanner. The original copy was presented to the library by Joseph Maynard in 1635 and was shelfmarked 4° G 46 Art. and later moved to Auct. N. 5. 8. The second copy was received among Archbishop Laud's books and was shelf-marked 4° D 28 Laud, and afterwards Auct. 2 Q 5. 12. The third copy, which is wanting 28 leaves, is now T. 905.[2] The

---

1. Bodleian library record, vol.iii, pp.175,176.

2. It is gathered in eights and lacks sigs. a1-d1; f4,5; z1. It was in this condition during Tanner's lifetime for his signature appears on the initial leaf, d2, and perhaps lacked these leaves when it passed into his possession; from the state of the book they do not seem to be missing as a result of the disaster in Benson lock.

Maynard and Tanner copies are still in the library, and it must be presumed that it is the Laud copy that was sold as a duplicate.[1] Mr. Oates points out that the Laud copy does not appear in the 1674 catalogue of the library (where the Maynard copy occurs) and that it is not recorded in the annotated copy of the 1843 catalogue and refers to this copy's "somewhat ghost-like existence". He has not noticed that the Laud copy does appear with the Maynard copy in the 1738 catalogue. Mr. Oates suggests that the decision to dispose of the Laud copy was taken during the years 1837-1843 when the 1843 catalogue was being prepared. In this he may well be correct, but the decision might also have been prompted by the fact that transferring the two copies into the Auctarium would, at one and the same time, have superficially removed associations of provenance and emphasised that the library had more than one copy. At all events the Laud copy seems to have stood as a duplicate for at least twenty years.

It seems likely, however, that the Tanner copy was afforded similar treatment. T. 905, although bound at about the same time as the remainder of the collection,[2] is in an

---

1. Lot 1485 in the 1862 sale. As Mr. Oates points out, the cataloguer's remarks are far from clear and he only appears to believe that this copy is associated with Tanner.

2. The watermark on one of the end-papers is 1816.

entirely different style and since it stands very near the end of the series it is immediately suspect.[1] There can be no doubt that it was formerly Tanner's for it bears his signature. The annotation to the 1843 catalogue was made at some time after the original entry of the Maynard copy, and the work is similarly added to a superseded handlist of the Tanner collection which was prepared about 1855. It is hard not to come to the conclusion that this volume was returned to the collection when the 1862 sale was being prepared. Probably both the Tanner and Laud copies stood among the duplicates.

Mr. Oates has asked two questions: why was Tanner's imperfect copy kept and Laud's perfect copy discarded, and why did Sotheby's cataloguer think he was cataloguing Tanner's copy when he was in fact cataloguing Laud's? It can now be suggested that the answer to the second question is that it was generally known that Tanner's copy was among the Bodleian duplicates and that the cataloguer assumed that he was dealing with the Tanner copy. It is quite obvious from his survey of known copies that it would not occur to him that it might be any other.

---

1. T. 905 was endorsed as being defective by Henry Cotton (sub-librarian 1814-1822). It is also endorsed, probably by Cotton, as a duplicate. These endorsements were probably made in preparation for binding (circa 1816), but this raises the problem of why, if it was already decided to dispose of the book as a duplicate, money should have been spent on binding it.

The first question is a little harder to answer. We have seen that, three years later, where duplicate copies were both donations neither of them was disposed of. Nevertheless, the finances of the library were low and the Rhetorica nova was almost certain to be sold for a large sum; in the event this book alone realised one-seventh of the total price of a sale consisting of 1,703 items. Once the decision had been taken to sell one of the two duplicate donations, it was obviously the best policy, the library already having a perfect example, to sell the better copy of the two. It is not clear why, on considerations of the provenance of the two perfect copies, it was not preferred to retain Laud's, which would appear to have the more important provenance.[1]

It was obviously unthinkable that two copies of such a rare book should have been put on the market at the same time and the problem now becomes, why was Tanner's imperfect copy placed with his collection and not returned to the duplicates to await disposal at a later date? The latter course may indeed have been followed, and the book not returned until a few years later when it became an even more definitive practice not to dispose of donations.

---

1. There seems to have been no preference in the way these two copies were bound. Maynard's is bound with another work, and the case from which Laud's was taken is now MS. Laud misc. 749. The latter has been endorsed, perhaps by Cotton; "Joined with this was a printed book of xv century. It was removed to the Auctarium and being found to be a duplicate, was cut out".

Appendix B

FOLIO LIST

Examination of L.P. A list of Bp. Tanner's folios reveals the following books dispersed among the other classifications of the library:

A 4. 17 Art.
B 6. 18 Art.
C 2. 18 Art.
C 4. 6 Art.
H 5. 11 Art.
K 4. 8 Art.
K 4. 18 Art.
K 4. 25 Art.
L 2. 23 Art.
L 3. 8 Art.
L 4. 11 Art.
L 4. 23 Art.
L 6. 16 Art.

Auct. QQ supra II. 15
(kept as Arch. G. d. 29)

Bib. Eng. 1690 b. 1

4 Δ 38
4 Δ 39
4 Δ 40
4 Δ 41
4 Δ 42
4 Δ 43
4 Δ 44
4 Δ 45
4 Δ 46
4 Δ 47
4 Δ 48

5 Δ 13-15
5 Δ 16
5 Δ 17
5 Δ 18

fol. Godw. 258
fol. Godw. 263

A 4. 5 Jur.
L 3. 4 Jur.
L 3. 10 Jur.
R 5. 9 Jur.
S 8. 5 Jur.
S 8. 15 Jur.
V 5. 12 Jur.

R 1. 4 Med.

AA 42 Art. Seld.

A 20. 8 Th.
B 2. 11 Th.
B 2. 12 [13] Th.
D 1. 7 Th.
D 3. 10 Th.
F 2. 9 Th.
G 1. 3 Th.
G 4. 4 Th.
G 6. 5 Th.
G 6. 6 Th.
H 6. 2 Th.
I 3. 6 Th.
L 5. 14 Th.
L 5. 15 Th.
M 2. 14 Th.
M 9. 3 Th.
P 8. 8 Th.
S 3. 15 Th.
S 5. 4 Th.
S 5. 7 Th.
S 5. 14 Th.
T 6. 13 Th.
T 8. 4 Th.

MS. Top. Oxon. b. 8,9.

Vet. El c. 14

Appendix B cont.

Books entered on the list which are now shelved with the collection.

T. 342	T. 361	T. 363	T. 841
T. 345	T. 362	T. 747	T. 955

Books entered on the list, of which the Tanner copy cannot be identified in the Bodleian Library. "Examined and allowed" indicates that a book is entered in L.P. Duplicates examined and allowed, 1788-90.

BEDE the venerable.
Bedae opuscula complura ... cum scholiis, authore J. Nouiomago. Colon., 1537.

The Tanner copy was possibly sold as lot 306 in the 1862 Bodleian duplicate sale.

BIBLE.
The whole Byble, tr. by M. Couerdale, and newly ouersene and correcte. [Lond.], 1550.

This is a quarto.

BIBLIOTHECA.
Bibliotheca fratrum Polonorum, quos Unitarios vocant, instructa operibus omnibus F. Socini, J. Crellii, J. Slichtingii a Bucowietz, et J. L. Wolzogenii ... quae omnia simul juncta totius Novi Testamenti explicationem complectuntur. 8 [or 9] vols. Irenop., [post 1656].

There is a general title-leaf in the first volume and the works of Socinus &c. have separate title-leaves. Both the composite work and its individual parts are entered on the folio list with the exception of the volumes by Wolzogen. It is possible that Tanner's set was incomplete when it came to the library. The collective entry on the list does not mention the number of volumes.

A copy in 8 vols was examined and allowed 18 Oct. 1788, p.7. Endorsed "very bad".

Appendix B cont.

BRANDT (Geeraert).
The history of the Reformation ... in and about the Low Countries. 4 vols. Lond., 1720-23.

A copy examined and allowed 27 Apr. 1790, p.22.

BURKITT (William).
Expository notes with practical observations on the New Testament. 7th ed. Lond., 1719.

The folio list gives the date as 1718. There is no copy of the seventh edition at present in the Bodleian.

CHARAS (Moyse).
The royal pharmacopoea, Galenical and chymical. Lond., 1678.

CORTESIUS (Paulus) bp. of Urbino.
Pauli Cortesii sacrarum literarum omniumque disciplinarum scientia summi uiri, lib. iiii. Hieronymi Sauonarolae opera adiunximus. Basil., 1540.

A copy examined and allowed 14 Oct. 1788, p.3.

Bound with:

VERLENIUS (Hieronymus).
Commentariorum libri tres in omnes Psalmos Dauidicos. Lovanii, 1557.

The folio list gives the date as 1558.

CUNINGHAM (William).
The cosmographical glasse. Lond., 1559.

The Tanner copy was possibly sold as lot 126 in the 1865 duplicate sale.

DISNEY (John).
A view of ancient laws against immorality and profaneness. Cambr., 1729.

Appendix B cont.

ELLIES-DUPIN (Louis).
A compleat history of the canon and writers of the books of the Old and New Testament. 2 vols. Lond., 1699,1700.

No note is made on the list of the number of volumes and only the date 1699 is given. Possibly only the first volume came to the library.

EUSEBIUS bp. of Caesarea.
Ecclesiastica historia diui Eusebii: et Ecclesiastica historia gentis anglorum venerabilis Bede. Argent., 1500.

Bound with:

OROSIUS (Paulus).
[Begin, sig. a ii recto] Pauli Orosii uiri doctissimi historiarum initium ad Aurelium Augustinum [&c. End] Pauli Orosii ... ad Aurelium Augustinum ... libri septimi ac ultimi finis. Ven., 1483.

There is a bound copy of these two works in the Bodleian, L 3. 13 Jur., which is marked by damp and may very well be Tanner's copy. The binding is eighteenth century. The damp marks and worm holes match in both parts.

FULLER (Thomas).
The historie of the Holy warre. 3rd. ed. Cambr. &c., 1647.

GOWER (John).
Jo. Gower de confessione amantis. Lond., 1554.

The Tanner copy was possibly sold as lot 972 in the 1862 duplicate sale.

HAAK (Theodore).
The Dutch annotations upon the whole Bible. 2 vols. Lond., 1657.

A copy examined and allowed 16 Oct. 1788, p.6.

HALL (Joseph) bp. of Norwich.
The works of ... Joseph Hall. Lond., 1714.

Appendix B cont.

HUME (David).
The history of the houses of Douglas and Angus. Edinb., [1644].

JUSTINIAN I emperor.
Codicis ... lib. xii. Antv., 1575.

KENNETT (White) bp. of Peterborough.
A register and chronicle, ecclesiastical and civil. Vol. 1. Lond., 1728.

Tanner gave another copy of this to St. Asaph. It is St. Asaph 337.

LEDIARD (Thomas).
The naval history of England. 2 vols. Lond., 1735.

LIVIUS (Titus).
The Roman history. With the supplements of ... J. Freinshemius and J. Dujatius. Lond., 1686.

MACCHIAVELLI (Niccolo).
The works of ... Nicolas Machiavel. Lond., 1695.

MACKENZIE (George).
The lives and characters of the most eminent writers of the Scots nation. 2 vols. Edinb., 1708,11.

The folio list says 2 vol. but Tanner must surely have owned vol. 3 (1722) as well.

MADOX (Thomas).
Firma burgi, or An historical essay concerning the cities, towns and buroughs of England. Lond., 1726.

A copy examined and allowed 15 Oct. 1788, p.5.

MARLORAT (Augustin).
Genesis cum catholica expositione ecclesiastica [by A. Marlorat]. Postrema ed. Morgiis, 1585.

The folio list gives the date as 1584.

Appendix B cont.

MARLORAT (Augustin).
In Psalmos Dauidis et aliorum prophetarum explicatio ecclesiastica. Geneu., 1585.

MERCERUS (Johannes).
Io. Merceri ... commentarii ... in prophetas quinque priores, inter eos qui minores vocantur. Genev., [1583].

? A copy examined and allowed 14 Oct. 1788, p.3.

PARIS (Matthew).
Matthaei Paris ... Historia major, juxta exemplar Londinense 1640 verbatim recusa, ed. W. Wats. Lond., 1684.

A copy examined and allowed 13 Oct. 1788, p.1. Endorsed "badly stained".

PECK (Francis).
Academia tertia Anglicana; or, The antiquarian annals of Stanford. Lond., 1727.

A copy examined and allowed 15 Oct. 1788, p.5. Endorsed "stained".

PECK (Francis).
Desiderata curiosa. 2 vols. Lond., 1732,35.

PHILIPPSON (Joannes) Sleidanus.
A famouse cronicle of oure time ... concerning the state of religion and common wealth, during the raigne of the emperour Charles the fift, tr. by I. Daus. Lond., 1560.

The Tanner copy was possibly sold as lot 1661 in the 1862 duplicate sale.

REBUFFI (Pierre).
Praxis beneficiorum. Lugd., 1620.

A copy examined and allowed 14 Oct. 1788, p.3.

SAINT AMOUR (Louis Gorin de).
The journal of mons^r de Saint Amour, out of French by G. Havers. Lond., 1664.

A copy examined and allowed 15 Oct. 1788, p.5.

Appendix B cont.

SELDEN (John).
Joannis Seldeni ... opera omnia, collegit ac recens. ... D. Wilkins. 3 vols. [in 6 pt.]. Lond., 1726.

A copy examined and allowed 14 Oct. 1788, p.3.

SPELMAN (sir Henry).
The English works of sir H. Spelman. [2 pt]. Lond., 1723.

SPENSER (Edmund).
The fairie queene. Lond., 1609.

Tanner's copy was possibly sold as lot 335 in the 1865 duplicate sale.

SPARKE (Joseph).
Historiae Anglicanae scriptores varii. 2 vols. Lond., 1723.

A copy examined and allowed 13 Oct. 1788, p.1.

STEBBING (Henry).
Polemical tracts; or, A collection of papers written in defence of the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England. 5 pt. Cambr., 1727.

STOW (John).
A survey of the cities of London and Westminster ... brought down ... to the present time by J. Strype. 6 books. Lond., 1720.

A copy examined and allowed 27 Apr. 1790, p.22. Endorsed "Stained badly".

STRYPE (John).
Annals of the reformation and establishment of religion. 2 pt. Lond., 1709,28.

The folio list says 3 vols., possibly Tanner's copy was bound in this way.

A copy in 3 vols. examined and allowed 16 Oct. 1788, p.6.

Appendix B cont.

STRYPE (John).
Brief annals of the Church and State under the reign of queen Elizabeth. Lond., 1731.

A copy examined and allowed 15 Oct. 1788, p.5.

STRYPE (John).
Ecclesiastical memorials. Lond., 1721.

A copy examined and allowed 16 Oct. 1788, p.6.

STRYPE (John).
The life and acts of ... John Whitgift ... lord archbishop of Canterbury. 2 pt. Lond., 1718,17.

A copy examined and allowed 16 Oct. 1788, p.6.
Another (?) copy examined and allowed 3 May 1790, p.24.

STUART House.
A trewe description of the nobill race of the Stewards. Amst., 1601.

TAYLOR (Jeremy) bp. of Down and Connor.
Ἔνιαυτὸς, a course of sermons for all the Sundaies of the year. 3 pt. Lond., 1653.

WILLET (Andrew).
Synopsis papismi. Lond., 1634.

A copy examined and allowed 16 Oct. 1788, p.6.

WILSON (Thomas).
A complete Christian dictionary. 8th ed., enlarged by A. Simson. Lond., 1678.

YEAR BOOKS.
In hoc volumine continentur omnes casus ... qui acciderunt annis regum Henrici quarti, & Henrici quinti.
[Lond.], 1605.

Appendix B cont.

It should be noted that the 1862 duplicate sale catalogue indicates when Tanner's signature appears on the title-leaf. No such note appears against any of the items here noticed and this may be held to show that the Tanner copy is not the one concerned. On the other hand the description of some of the items bears comparison with what we know of the condition of Tanner's books, e.g. lot 1661 [Philippson] is described as water stained and lot 972 [Gower] as badly stained, and two leaves, N2 and 8 imperfect. The catalogues for 1865 and 1870 make no notice of provenance.

Two items on the folio list were unidentified:

Perspectiva literaria. 1567.

This does not appear in the chronological card index to the S.T.C. so is almost certainly not published in Great Britain, or an English work published abroad.

Anatomy - old Treatise of it - Imperf.

This may possibly be the second part of lot 1350 in the 1862 duplicate sale: Anatomie of Mans Body, black letter, plates, imperfect.

Appendix C

THE BODLEIAN DUPLICATE SALES

Library records 448 is a volume containing the catalogues of the three duplicate sales. Tanner books identified in these are:

1862 Sale.

Lots 121(2); 161; 232; 359; 567; 570; 703; 709; 844; 1031(1); 1142(2); 1226; 1229; 1541; 1602.

Tanner possibly owned lots 306; 863; 972; 1298; 1661

1865 Sale.

Lot 245.

Tanner possibly owned lots 126 and 335.

1870 Sale.

Lots 17; 30; 618.

Tanner possibly owned lots 15; 16.

At least 185 Tanner books seem to have been involved in the 1865, 1870 and other sales. Tanner's signature was cut from the title-leaves before sale and these have been preserved in MS. Autogr. c. 7.

Appendix D

TANNER BOOKS BEARING A SHELFMARK, OR WITH A FLOWERDEW OR KNYVETT PROVENANCE.

Bodleian Shelfmark	Shelfmark* on book	Provenance
T. 108	2 Class. Austr. 54	Flowerdew/Knyvett
T. 122(1)	-	Knyvett
T. 163	1a Class. Austr. 104	[Edmund] Knyvett
T. 168	3 Class. Austr. 97	Flowerdew/Knyvett
T. 248(2)	-	[Edmund] Knyvett [sig. A3]
T. 342	3 Class. Sinistr. 128	[Wanting initial leaves]
T. 455(1)	-	Knyvett
T. 470(3)	⟨3⟩ Class. Austr. 79	Knyvett
T. 514	1 Class. Austr. 19	Knyvett
T. 568	3 Class. Austr. 129	-
T. 569	4 Class. Austr. 47	Knyvett
T. 629	2 Class. Dext. 14	Knyvett
T. 639	2 Class. Austr. 51	Knyvett
T. 654	3 Class. Austr. 85	Knyvett
T. 762	5 Class. Austr. 44	Knyvett
T. 796	3 Class. Sinistr. 134	Knyvett
T. 818(3)	1a Class. Austr. 15	Knyvett
T. 822(4)	-	Knyvett
T. 840(3)	-	Knyvett
T. 866	5 Class. Dext. 105	Knyvett

* These shelfmarks have been unified and are not transcribed literatim from the books.

Appendix D cont.

Bodleian Shelfmark	Shelfmark on book	Provenance
T. 870	-	Knyvett
T. 912	2 Class. Dext. 42	Knyvett
T. 927	3 Class. Austr. 29	Knyvett
T. 955	3 Class. Sinistr. 62	Flowerdew
H 5. 11 Art.	3 Class. Sinistr. 78	Flowerdew
K 4. 8 Art.	3 Class. Sinistr. 105	-
L 4. 11 Art.	5 Class. Sinistr. 44	Knyvett
St. Asaph 211	5 Class. Sinistr. 37	Knyvett

Lot 232 in the 1862 Bodleian duplicate sale was a Tanner book formerly owned by Knyvett. Lot 1298 in the same sale was also owned by Knyvett but not necessarily by Tanner.

Books contained in the above list which have short titles written upon the fore-edge are:
T. 470(3); T. 514; T. 569; T. 629; T. 639; T. 762; T. 912; T. 927; H 5. 11 Art.; St. Asaph 211.

Other Tanner books with titles on the fore-edge are:
T. 460(1); T. 469; T. 549.

A 3. 3 Art. formerly belonged to Edmund and Thomas Knyvett, but cannot be definitely ascribed to Tanner. It was once shelfmarked A 4. 16 Art., and A 4. 17 Art. is a Tanner book

[cont. on next page]

so it may have come to the Bodleian at about the same time as the Tanner collection but it does not appear on the folio list.

G. Pamph. 1564(9) belonged to Thomas Knyvett and almost certainly to Tanner.

Douce GG 27 belonged to Thomas Knyvett but cannot be ascribed to Tanner.

Appendix E

TANNER'S GIFT OF BOOKS TO ST. ASAPH CATHEDRAL LIBRARY

The first number represents the entry in W.Morton, A catalogue of the books in the St. Asaph cathedral library (Lond., 1878). The books also stand in this order on the shelves of the library.

NLW. indicates that the book is on temporary deposit in the National Library of Wales.

Known duplicate copies possessed by Tanner are also indicated.

64	NLW	
65		
76		
78	NLW	
85		
98	NLW	
112,113		
168,169		
190	NLW	
204		
205,206		
211 ?	Missing at St. Asaph.	
228		
231	NLW	
254	NLW	
263,264	NLW	Dupl, MS. Top. Oxon. b. 8,9.
300,301		
307	NLW	
308		
316	NLW	
337	Dupl. See Appendix B, s.n. Kennett.	
342-344		
363	NLW	
395		
399	NLW	
400	NLW	
402		
403	NLW	
410		
443	NLW	
487		
488		
495		
503		
746	NLW	
860	NLW	
1017	NLW	
1020	Dupl. T. 317	
1025		
1047	NLW	
1090		
1091	NLW	
1126	NLW	
1202		
1204		
1207		

Two items of Tanner's gift were unidentified:

Lancoleti Epp. opuscula praeclara

Commentarius in Novum Testamentum

[cont. on next page]

Four items were apparently missing from the library in 1878 for they do not appear in the catalogue:

BILSON (Thomas) bp. of Winchester.
The perpetuall gouernment of Christes Church. Lond., 1593.

This is a duplicate of T. 215. The list of Tanner's gift does not give any date, so it is possible that this is the edition of 1610.

CHARLES I king of Gt. Britain.
The indictment, arraignment, tryal and judgement ... of twenty-nine regicides, the murtherers of ... king Charles the Ist. ... October 1660. Lond., 1724.

MERCATOR (Gerardus).
Historia mundi: or, Mercator's atlas. Lately enlarged by I. Hondy, Englished by W. S. Lond., 1635.

This may have been the second edition of 1637.

OUGHTON (Thomas).
Ordo judiciorum: sive, Methodus procedendi in negotiis et litibus in foro ecclesiastico-civili Britannico et Hibernico. Lond., 1728.

This is a duplicate of T. 353.

Appendix F

BOOKS WHICH TANNER RECEIVED AS GIFTS

Shelfmark	Donor	Donor's relation to book	Date, or approximate date, of gift
T. 110	J.Moore		1698
T. 247(1)	R.Wright		1698?
T. 328	R.Camell	Author	1726
T. 333	T.Parne	Editor	1719
T. 533	E.Warren	Author	1706
[Warren was also the author of T. 726, but this was not a gift]			
T. 572	P.Bedingfield	Author	1719
T. 646	P.Bedingfield	Author	1724
[Bedingfield was also the author of T. 697, but this was not a gift]			
T. 714	J.Johnson	Author	1729
T. 716(1,2)	J.Moore		
T. 744	B.Willis		1729
T. 909	J.Crooke?	Printer	1697
T. 910	J.Davis	Editor	1723
T. 917	W.Kennett	Part Author	1693
G. Pamph 1263(7)	W.Howard	Author	1733
[This is dedicated to Tanner and contains Howard's covering letter]			
A 4. 5 Jur.	W.Kennett	Editor	1700
8° S 137 Jur.	J.Hare		(1708-)
8° D 224 Linc.	R.Sare	Publisher	1705
4° Rawl. 369	T.Baker		(1702-)
8° F 100 Linc.	B. Kennett	Author	1697 [11.10.62]
8° D 99 Linc.	S. Clarke	"	1699
8° D 123 Linc.	T. Bullock	"	1728 16.10.62
8° D 25 Linc.	G. Kenwick	"	1725
MS. T. 3	H.Lloyd		1735
MS. T. 17	W.Herne		20 Jan. 1731
MS. T. 19	J.James		1728
MS. T. 100(3)	J.Rolfe		1717
MS. T. 136(4)	J.Moore		1700
MS. T. 206	T.Moore		1729
MS. T. 208	J.Rivett		1722
MS. T. 222	W.Herne		29 Mar. 1731
MS. T. 263	A.Branthwait		1722
MS. T. 291-297	Sir. R.Allin		-
MS. T. 405	M.Shepey		Sept. 1727
MS. T. 434	H.James		(1729?)
MS. T. 449	H.James		(1729?)
MS. T. 469	- Pickering		-
MS. Rawl. B 125	- Pickering		-

Appendix G

BOOKS IN THE COLLECTION WHICH TANNER MAY HAVE OBTAINED NEW

This list is entirely negative. It is based on a survey of Tanner's books which were published after 1685, and gives the shelfmarks of those books which Tanner may have obtained new and which in the vast majority of cases he probably did. However, with books published before 1695 it would be well to beware, especially if Tanner's signature is large. The early date of 1685 as a terminus a quo is based on T. 465(2) which Tanner has endorsed as being in his possession in 1686.

69(3,4)
124(3)
128(2)
132(2)
137(2,3)
160
220(5)
275(14)
279(5,6)
308
309
311
312
313
314
315
316
329
330
331
332
334
335
337
346-349
353
354-359
364
368
376
393
398
417
420
421
423
431
436(2)
448
450(1)
498
499
503(1-3)
507
530(2)
545
550
560
563
573
577
581(1,2)
584
585(1,2)
588,589
595(1,2)
596
601
615(1-5)
617
619
621
627
645
647
649
658
661
668
669
672
673
675
678
682
685
687
688
690
691
692
693
694(1,2)
697
699
700
705
706?
707
708
718
721
722
723
724

[cont. on next page]

Appendix G cont.

725
726
727
729
730
742,743
774
781
790
811-813
817
820(9,13)
823(4-6)
824(10-12)
825(10)
826(10)
827
829(4,5)
830(2-4)
831
844
848-851
852-855
861
879
908
911
924

Appendix H

VOLUMES CONTAINING MORE THAN ONE PART WHICH TANNER APPEARS TO HAVE OBTAINED AS SUCH

T. 1
2
5
9
36
56
88
95
115
119
148
174 (?)
208
218
228
236
239
248
250
266 ?
272
277
294
326
340
373
402
434
446
455 Gift?
462
504
505
517
524
553
592
622
628
686
702
716 Gift
744 Gift
745
752
764
804
819
895
916
920

Appendix I

BOOKS WITH RAWLINSON ASSOCIATIONS

This list is a revision and an enlargement of that given in B.J.Enright's doctoral thesis Richard Rawlinson: Collector, Antiquary, and Topographer. [1956] MS. D.Phil. d. 1786. Appendix B, xxxiii, lvi. Those items marked (E) appear on Dr. Enright's list. The lot numbers and sale dates are those of the Rawlinson sales.

T. no.	Markings	Lot.	Sale.
52	C & P	1970	Jan. 1728
59	"Bibl: Bodl: Ex Legat: Rich. Rawlinson LLD"		
73(1)	P	2235	Apr. 1726
(E) 161			
(E) 235(4,5)		2051	Nov. 1732
	A third item was sold in this lot. It was T. Gephyrander Consideratio nova in opusculum Archimedis de circuli dimensione (Tremoniae, 1609). The Bodleian copy (4° S 24(8) Art. Seld.) does not appear to be the one concerned.		
(E) 261(1)		1677	Nov. 1732
283		2363	Nov. 1729
(E) 300(1,2)		1805	Nov. 1732
(E) 304(3)		1545	Nov. 1732
(E) 304(4)			
(E) 343			
(E) 344			
360	Olim. 4° Rawl. 454		
(E) 403			
459		2142	Nov. 1729
		1509	Nov. 1732
	This was presumably not sold in 1729 and was re-auctioned in 1732.		
474(3)	?		
517	?		
566			
575	?		
(E) 580	C & P	375	Nov. 1732
677	C & P		
(E) 711			
880	Olim. 8° Rawl. 948		
886	Olim. 4° Rawl. 359		

A list of Tanner books in the Rawlinson collection is given in Appendix K.

Appendix J

BOOKS WITH SIMILAR PROVENANCES

This table only considers similar signatures appearing in different volumes. Where similar signatures appear on different items within one volume the book has been considered for Appendix H and has only been included here if unacceptable for that. Manuscripts of similar authorship are omitted and may be identified from the printed catalogue.

The names are not necessarily those of the people from whom Tanner obtained the item.

Printed books:

BEDINGFIELD, Philip.	See Appendix F.
CAMPE, John.	99; 135; 266(1); 825(3). Benedict Campe owned 32(2).
CHURCH, Thomas.	220(1); 822(3); 842(6); 901(1). Also owned MS. Rawl. D 976.
FLOWERDEW, Edward.	See Appendix D.
JACKSON, John.	225(2); 273(3); 427; 454(2); 638; 765; 824(8).
KENNETT, White.	See Appendix F.
KNYVETT, Edmund.	See Appendix D.
KNYVETT, Thomas.	See Appendix D.
MOORE, John.	See Appendix F.
MOORE, Thomas.	427 (see also s.n. Jackson); 756; Bib. Eng. 1690 b. 1.
PRESTON, Elizabeth.	605; 858; 859; St. Asaph 204; Also owned 8° D 220,221 Linc.
PRESTON, Frances.	377; 493; 602. Tanner's first wife owned 593.
RAWLINSON, Richard (or Thomas).	See Appendix I.

[cont. on next page]

SANCROFT, William.	317 and (?) the books of J.Jackson.
SMITH, Thomas.	275(13); 822(2,5,6); 840(5,21); 847(2,7); 883; 884?; Opp. add. 4° III 72. Also owned G. Pamph. 1523(21); 1524(17) which probably belonged to Tanner.
STANLEY, Richard.	64; 832(3).

Manuscripts:

ALLIN, Sir Richard.	See Appendix F.
CANDLER, Philip.	180; 226; 257; 324.
GIBSON, Edmund.	455,455*.
HARRINGTON, James.	402; 403; 420.
HERNE, William.	See Appendix F.
HOLLAND, Sir John,	118; 177; 239; 243; 259; 276; 321; 325; 326; 377?; 428; 431.
JAMES, Hugo.	See Appendix F.
KEMP, Sir Robert.	202; 215.
LE NEVE, Peter.	248; 249; 399.
POWLE, Stephen.	231; 253?.
RAYMOND, Burham.	156(10); 301(9).
RAYMOND, Thomas.	186; 386.
SANCROFT, William.	See Appendix N.

Appendix K

TANNER BOOKS IN THE BODLEIAN

WHICH DO NOT STAND WITH THE COLLECTION

A list of the deliberately dispersed folios is given in Appendix B.

4° Z 12(3-7) Art.

8° Z 13 Art.
8° Z 16 Art.
8° Z 17 Art.
8° Z 19 Art.
8° Z 23 Art.
8° Z 24 Art.
8° Z 28 Art.
8° Z 30 Art.
8° Z 34 Art.
8° Z 35 Art.
8° Z 36 Art.

DD 68 Art.

Auct. 1 Q 6. 6
Auct. 2 Q 3. 1
Auct. 2 Q 5. 19
Auct. 6 Q 3. 35

8° Z 61 Art. BS.

Crynes 864(2)

Douce L 588

G. Pamph. 1263(7)
G. Pamph. 1520(1,2)
G. Pamph. 1522(6)
G. Pamph. 1523(6)
G. Pamph. 1525(10)
G. Pamph. 1565(1,10,12)
G. Pamph. 2338(4) [11.10.62]

4° X 6 Jur.
4° X 9 Jur.
4° X 10 Jur.
4° X 12 Jur.
4° X 15 Jur.
4° X 16 Jur.
4° Z 70 Jur.

8° E 22 Jur.
8° S 137 Jur.

8° A 158 Linc.
8° D 216 Linc.
8° D 224 Linc.
8° D 230 Linc.
8° F 100 Linc. [no. 11.10.62]

8° D 96 Linc.
8° D 99 Linc.
8° D 117 Linc.
8° D 121, 122 Linc.
8° D 123 Linc.
8° D 124 Linc.
8° D 125 Linc
} 16.10.62

8° R 37 Med.

Mus. Bibl. II 8° 24(-32?)

Opp. add. 4° III 72
Opp. add. 4° III 74
Opp. add. 4° III 76
Opp. add. 4° III 77

4° Rawl. 369
4° Rawl. 411
4° Rawl. 502

8° Rawl. 95
8° Rawl. 169(3)
8° Rawl. 436
8° Rawl. 678

[cont. on next page]

Appendix K cont.

8° Rawl. 742,743
8° Rawl. 827

S. Seld. d. 1

8° Z 62 Art. Seld.
8° Z 63 Art. Seld.
8° Z 64-67 Art. Seld.
8° Z 68 Art. Seld.
8° Z 70 Art. Seld.
8° Z 71 Art. Seld.

8° W 14 Med. Seld.
8° W 18 Med. Seld.
8° W 19 Med. Seld.
8° W 20 Med. Seld.
8° W 22 Med. Seld.

4° C 97 Th.
4° I 11 Th.

II 20 Th.
KK 13 Th.
LL 44 Th.
MM 27 Th.

Vet. A 4 c. 211
Vet. A 4 e. 772 ?

1 b. 139 ? [ms 9.6.64]

Appendix L

CONSPECTUS OF MARGINAL NUMBERS IN TANNER VOLUMES

Margin no.	Tanner volume
1	154
	749
2	238(6)
	773(2)
3	270(9)
	715
	875
	891
4	26
	200(1)
	270(8)
	551
	736(2)
	759
	790
	797
	806
4°	Rawl. 411
5	199(5)
	225(3)
	251(4)
6	36(1)
	220(1)
	289
7	60(6)
	286
	290(2)
	760
8	758
9	172
	178(1)
	253(5)
	498
10	33(1)
	127(1)
	295
11	237(2)
	238(1)
	248(2)
	776
12	193(8)
	938
13	156
	200(5)
	401
	754(1)
	935
14	940
15	87
	130(4)
	253(7)
	275(10)
	293
	958
16	69(1)
	219(3)
	252(3)
17	25(3)
	247(1)
	291
18	49(2)
	203(5)
	750
	801
19	132(1)
	173
	225(5)
	426
	738(1)
20	234(5)
	319
	864
21	148(1)
	199(3)
	219(2)
	236(2)
22	200(2)
	231(3)
	279(1)
	738(2)
22	775
23	106
	136(2)
24	262
	304(2)
	414
	838
25	269
	290(1)
	525
	773(1)
	890
26	22(1)
	243(2)
	250
	292(4)
	839
	929
27	34(1)
	95(1)
	211(1)
	772(2)
	898
28	254(3)
	279(2)
	922
29	76(3)
	224(2)
	235(1)
	324
	511
	900
	903
30	144
	244(2)
31	119(1)
	475
	803
32	16(1)
	238(4)

Appendix L cont.

Margin no.	Tanner volume
32	799
	950
	Auct. I Q 6.6
34	15(2)
	131(2)
	209(3)
	248(1)
	290(3)
	907(1)
	8° R 37 Med.
35	46(2)
36	509
37	69(1)
	953
38	65(3)
	914
39	139
	252(1)
	389
	532
40	34(2)
	163
	203(1)
	246(6)
41	20(2)
	778(3)
42	30(1)
	200(3)
	222
	554
43	62(1)
	367
	899
44	203(3)
	925
45	146
	959
	4° X 6 Jur.
47	223
	244(1)
	519
48	142(1)
	199(4)
	571
49	71
	231(1)
	492
50	576
51	921(1)
52	104
	249
	259(1)
53	57(2)
	453(2)
54	155
	224(4)
55	130(1)
	204
	941
56	122(2)
57	63(1)
	267
58	210(8)?
59	239
60	75(1)
	734(2)
61	78
62	215(1)
63	199(1)
	480
	755
64	147(1)
	296(1)
65	24?
	179
	247(2)
66	181
	737(2)
67	153(5)
	198(1)
68	41a
69	111
	277(1)
70	113
	191
	889
	896
71	140(2)
72	737(1)
	761
73	234(4)
	390
74	182(2)
	785
75	787
76	219(1)
	901(1)
	944
77	931
78	318
	517(1)
	798
79	202(1)
80	164
	232
81	189(2)
	273(2)
	885
82	44
	217(1)
83	29
	297
	782
84	32(2)
	210(5)
	652
85	198(3)
86	114
	528?
	736(1)
87	24
	263
88	86(1)
	252(2)
89	51(3)
	264(2)
	518
91	220(8)
92	180(2)
	189(5)
93	77(1)
	734(1)
94	66(1)
	196(1)
	292(3)

Appendix L cont.

Margin no.	Tanner volume
96	94(4)
	196(2)
97	37
	907(2)
98	60(1)
	166
	224(1)
99	235(2)
100	135
	197
101	189(4)
102	74
103	19(1)
	769
104	90
105	115(1)
	563
106	48
	229(1)
108	296(2)
	631
	895(1)
109	117(3)
	960
110	296(3)
	457(1)
112	226(1)
	728
113	56(1)
	592(1)
	680
114	167(3)
	198(2)
	703
115	25(5)?
	81(2)
	422
116	167(2)
117	152
	557
	942(4)
118	643

Margin no.	Tanner volume
121	27(3)
122	46(3)
	216(2)
	570
123	112
	549
125	60(2)
	804(1)
126	133(1)
127	94(1)
	915
128	76(1)
129	153(1)
	464(3)
131	186(2)
	620(2)
132	949
134	72(4)
135	177(3)
136	117(2)
137	19(3)
	423
138	143
	434
	436(2)
	701
139	91
140	153(3)
	454(1)?
142	15(3)
144	375
145	438
146	65(1)
147	145(1)
	177(2)
148	140(1)
151	141
	923
153	171
154	610

Margin no.	Tanner volume
155	936
157	75(2)
	182(1)
159	49(3)
	76(2)
160	20(1)
	57(1)
161	60(5)
	608
162	103(2)
	567
163	60(1)
	99
165	620(1)
166	942(1)
167	920(1)
168	60(3)
	94(3)
	591
169	65(2)
	167(4)
170	117(1)
171	123
173	5(1)
	467(2)
175	4
176	3
	8° Z 30 Art.
179	82
181?	72(5)
182	8° Rawl. 95
183	133(4)
	447
	632?
185	32(1)
186	32(3)
187	182(3)
	942(5)

Appendix L cont.

Margin no.	Tanner volume
189	121
193	19(4)
194	18(2)
195	748
196	932
197	186(1)
199	247(3)
203	326(1)
205	270(7)
206	946
209	226(2)
219	255(2)
224	777
232	4° I 11 Th.
235	904
237	762
242	280
254	273(4)
262	947
264	103(1)
269	778(5)
271	463(2)
275	34(3)
	521?
279	889
285	731
288	667
289	961
298	930
302	926
313	490
316	234(1)
334	893(1)
336	957
339	247(4)
340	255(1)
342	233(2)
522?	472?

Appendix M

CONSPECTUS OF ITEMS CONTAINED IN THE TANNER MSS. WHICH HAVE BEEN PAGINATED BY ARCHBISHOP SANCROFT

Extraneous items have sometimes been inserted within numerated conjugate leaves. Larger, and apparently self-contained items are omitted.

Pagination	Volume	Item
1-4	50	18
1-8	90	13
1-34	MS. Rawl. D 853	21
1-64	160	2-9
5-34	50	17
9-16	343	27
17-48	99	20
35-40	80	8
35-52	Rawl. D 853	17-19
41-48	79	74
49-52	79	87
51-74	99	15-17
53-58	78	6
61-64	99	10
61-68	77	37
65-68	279	11
65-72	159	13-16
69-80	78	58
75-82(?)	103	2
77,78	71	45
77-88	102	9
81-84	280	10
81-108	71	44
85-88	280	6
89-92	280	12
89-96	99	29
93-96	280	26
97-100	280	74
97-128	93	7,8
101-108	280	72,73
109-112	40	30
109-152	71	33
113-116	30	150
117-124	31	149
125-128	280	33
129-132	73	215
133-158	103	3
137-140	280	15
141-144	102	6,7
145-148	74	78
153-236	Rawl. D 858	1,2
157-160	74	26
161-164	74	97
169-176	67	12
173-176	72	1
177-184	73	63
177-188	37	41,42
185-188	73	50

Appendix M cont.

Pagination	Volume	Item
189-192	74	25
189-196	99	28
193-200	99	6,7
197-202	99	31
201-208	99	33
203-210	74	32
209-212	80	67b
211[bis]-232	103	20
213-216	80	67a
217-220	99	1
225,226	155	77
229-232	57	254
233-244	73	174, 175
233-256	103	7,8
237-264	279	17
245-248	94	4
249-252	94	3
253-276	89	19
257-280	103	19
265-312	280	1
277-280	57	258
281,282	91	37
283-286	91	12
287-292	74	45
293-296	74	50
293-296	103	33
297-304	91	11
297-324	93	14
305-312	91	34,35
313-316	90	4
315-336	279	13
317-320	99	8
321-340	70	18
325-328	88	30
329-336	102	8
337-340	99	2
337-356	279	6
341-344	93	21
341-348	279	18
345-348	67	35
349-352	279	20
353-356, 359-374	88	20,22,24
357,358	73	f.150
357-368	279	14
369-372	77	4
369a-378	Rawl. D 853	23
373-386	280	38
375-378	28	6
379-382	91	14
379-382	306	7
383-386	280	ff.236, 237
383-408	306	4-6
387-390	39	103
387-394	280	21,22
391-394	280	16
395-398	80	26
395-398	280	11
395-400	306	42,43
399-408	280	29
399-410	78	67
409-412	280	27
409-412	306	71
411-414	78	71
413-416	144	60
413-418	306	13
415-418	79	52
417-424	280	71
419-422	74	74
419-422	93	22
423-426	78	64
423-426	89	33
423-430	142	13,14
427-430	72	50
427-434	78	70

Appendix M cont.

Pagination	Volume	Item
431-434	290	40
431-438	280	78
435,436	78	74
435-438	290	25
437-440	78	69
439-442	73	2
439-442	78	54
441-444	79	ff.114, 115
443-446	72	60
445-458	74	71
447-458	Rawl. D 853	7-9
451-454	73	125
455,456;447, 448;459,460 [sic in error]	74	53
459-462	91	13
463-466	72	101
463-466	73	184
463-466	79	79
467-470	76	67
467-470	78	72
471-474	73	45
471-474	76	69
471-478	280	23
475-478	73	91
475-478	76	58
477,478	76	5
479-482	79	64
479-482	290	30
479-494	78	41
483-486	73	118
483-486	76	65
487-490	76	72
491-494	73	118
491-494	76	57
495-498	76	68
495-506	280	ff.123 -128
499-502	74	75
503-510	290	19,20
505-508	76	59
507-510	144	18
509-512	76	70
511-514	74	52
511-514	280	9
513-516	76	11
515,516	74	83
515-534	91	8
517-520	76	61c
517-524	73	142
521-524	76	56
525-528	73	214
525-528	114	64
529-532	73	58
531-534	76	61a
533-536	73	213
535-538	73	206
537-540	73	71
539-542	76	47
539-558	72	86
541-556	91	4
543-546	76	6
547-550	76	61b
551,552	79	68
553-558	74	5
557-598	88	1
559-562	74	36
559-562	74	57
563-566	74	35
563-566	74	86
567-570	73	28
571-574	74	28
571-574	74	105
573-576	73	21
575-578	290	37
577-580	73	31
579,580	75	32
581-584	73	33
581-584	79	105
585-588	73	88
585-588	78	62
589-592	73	82
589-592	74	108

Appendix M cont.

Pagination	Volume	Item
593-596	73	193
593-600	91	10
597-600	72	12
599-758	102	11
601-604	73	172
601,602; 607,608	73	196
603-606	73	198
605-608	73	210
609-612	93	12
609-616	75	63
613-616	80	69
617-624	94	37
625-640	279	7
641-648	279	18

Appendix N

SANCROFT MANUSCRIPTS IN THE TANNER COLLECTION

The Sancroft manuscripts in the Bodleian fall into three groups, each of which has at one time belonged to Tanner: several volumes are to be found in the Rawlinson collection (cf. Appendix O), there is a separate Sancroft collection, and the third, and most important, group is contained in the Tanner collection. This appendix is concerned with listing those items in the third group that can be identified by examination only and not by implication from the index to the catalogue of the Tanner manuscripts.

1
2
4
7
8
9
18
26 (7,18)
27 (1,116)
28 (1,6,47,59,80,98,99, 105,148,160,161,162, 166,236)
29 (16,49,66,75,92)
30 (14,36,38,85,150,152)
31 (30,32,33,59,67)
32 (4,6,19,84,93,133, 139,141)
33 (9,16,31,35)
34 (1,33,47,61,103,118, 139,161,173,195)
35 (4,30,40,47,48,57,66,96, 97,116,139,142,155,158)
36 (12,35,42,49,67,110,116, 131,136,183)
37 (1,3,4,29,35,41,42,72, 78,93,104,116,133,148, 165,168)
38 (18,54,61,77,85,89,92, 96,106)
39 (9,13,18,26,27,29,36, 103,110,123,137b,138)
40 (2,13,15,16,39,62,89,95, 96,100)
41 (9,36,37,67)
42 (57,63,65,69,85)
43 (22,31,50)
44 (9,13,32,34,61,69,81,87, 88,92,116,120,124,128, 169)
45 (41,44,117,150,152,157, 168)
46 (34,41,73,82)
49 (43,59)
50 (2,6,7,8,17,18)
54 (1,2)
57 (233,249,254,258)
65 (26)
66 (2,92)
67 (12,32,33,35,83)
70 (18,59)
71 (33,44,45)
72 (1,12,50,60,86,101,140)
73 (2,14,20,21,26,27,28,31, 33,45,48,50,58,63,71, 73,80,82,85,88,89,91, 93,97,98,99,111,114, 118,125,134,142,172, 174,175,184,188,193, 196,198,206,210,213, 214,215)
74 (5,9,25,26,28,32,35,36, 45,50,52,53,57,65,71, 74,75,78,83,86,97,105, 108)
75 (25,32,43,63)

Appendix N cont.

76 (5,6,9,11,21-40,47,56, 57,58,59,61,65,67,68, 69,70,72)
77 (4,37,47,58)
78 (6-10,33-36,41,54,58, 62,64,67,69,70,71,72,74)
79 (1,9,12,52,64,68,74,79, 87,105,106)
80 (8,26,48,49,60,67,69)
81
83
84
85
86
87
88 (20,22,23,30)
89 (8,19,23,24,26,33,36,47, 50,51,61b)
90 (2,4,13,18,19,20,54,56)
91 (1,4,7,8,10-14,28,31,32, 34,35,37)
92 (3,27,28,33,38,40,46,57, 64,71,76,88,90,93-95)
93 (7,8,12,14,21-23)
94 (4,37)
99 (1,2,6-10,15-17,19,20, 28-33)
102 (6-9,11,12)
103 (2-4,7,8,19,20,21?,24, 29,33)
104 (15,45,50,51,65,79, 85-87,89,98,100,103, 107,112)
105 (2)
107
108
109
110
113
114 (1-5,63,64)
116
119
120
121 (3,4)
122
123 (11,12,21,24,41,43,46)

124 (1,3,5,7,9,20,23,25, 29,30,32,35,44,48, 56,66,72,75,80,87,97)
125 (1,4,7,15,20,22,23, 31,34,35,37,43,55,62)
126 (1,2,4-7,14,18-20, 40,41)
127 (8-11,14,23,25,27,29, 30,45,57,59,79,83)
128
129 [Possibly all]
130 (18,19,21,25)
131 [Possibly all]
135 (34)
136 (1)
137 (26,31,43,65)
138 (7,22,26,28,103)
140 (13,23,30,44,67,75)
141 (24,43,61)
142 (5,9,13-15,17,26-32, 36,47,53)
143 [Possibly all]
144 (7,18,30-32,60,73)
145 [Possibly all]
146 [Possibly all]
147 (3,8,60,61,63,66,71, 74,88,96,98,107)
148 (3,10,15,18,21,37, 41,42)
149 (11,26,32,45,47,48, 69,75,76,100)
150 (3,31,49)
153
154
155 (1,66,69,70,77,80,82, 88,92,93,95,99,103)
156
157 (8,12,30,36,38)
158 (2,4,7,15,17,18,20,23, 43,48,53,55)
159 (13-16,31,42,79,83) [Probably many other items]
160 [Possibly all]
161 [Possibly all]
162 [Possibly all]

Appendix N cont.

163
165
193
201
203
204
211
217 (1,6,10-12)
218 [Possibly all]
223
225
233
238
252 ?
256
262
270
271
272
273
274
275,275*
277
278
279 (3,4,6,13,14,17,18, 20,23)
280 (1,3,8-12,15,21-23,27,29, 32,34,36,38,71-74,78,80)
281 (3)
282 (3,5-8,10-12,16,18,22,23, 25,30,37)
290 (19,20,25,30,37,40,59,147)
299
300 (1,2,5,6)
301 (3,4?)
302 (9?.10?)
303 (1?,2,4,14?)
304 (8,18?,19,20?,21?)
306 (1,4-7,13,42,43,54,65,71)
307
309 ? See Summary Catalogue
310 ff.8-150
314 (32,33,51)
315
316 ff.29,59-65,86-95,103.
322
327
328
329
331
332
334
335
336
337
338 (2,63,69,71,77,92,93)
339 [Almost all]
340 [Almost all]
343 (27)
345
346
347
348
349
353
356 ?
358
359
360 ?
361 ?
362
365 ?} [If these volumes
366 ?} are Sancroft, then so are 350,351,352, 355,357,363 and 364]
368
369 ?
370
371
378
388
389
391 ? See Summary Catalogue
398
414
419
422
423
435 ? See Summary Catalogue
437
438
447 [Possibly all]
448
458 (1-7,9)

459
460 (1-14,18-33)
461 [Possibly all]
462,463
465 (1-71,72?)
466
467 (1-34,36)

Appendix O

SANCROFT MANUSCRIPTS IN THE RAWLINSON COLLECTION

This list was basically compiled by Dr. B.J.Enright and is reproduced here with his permission. I have made slight amendments.

MS. Rawl. C 922
944(1)
D 475
816
817
853(18,21)
858(1-3)
923(B 14)
1053
1104
1106
1147
1231(1-3)
1235
1240
1265
1269
1272
1280,1281
1283
1291,1292
1307
1322
1330-1332
1337
1345(13)
1346(4)
1347(7,9,10,
11,15)
1348(3)

MS. Rawl. D 1350(10,11,17)
1351(9,13,15,29)
1354 ?
1355
1361(8,11)
1365-1369
1385
1409
1438
1441
1443
1452
1501
1511
E 19
21,22
80
96
104
107
136-147
224
252
H 59
100-103
106
I 1-6

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

a: Manuscript Sources

Bodleian Library, Oxford.

Aubrey MSS.
Ballard MSS.
Rawlinson MSS.
Sancroft MSS.
Tanner MSS.
Willis MSS.
Wood MSS.
Library Records [L.P.]

MS. Add. A 179
MS. Add. A 209
MS. Add. C 64
MS. Add. D 81,81*

MS. Ashm. 1817b

MS. Autogr. c.7,8

MS. B.Litt. d. 45

MS. Bodl. 1013

MS. D.Phil. d. 1786

Dep. c. 152-176
Dep. c. 225-246

MS. Don. b. 4
MS. Don. d. 90
MS. Don. d. 127

MS. Eng. lett. c. 12
MS. Eng. lett. e. 1
MS. Eng. lett. e.30

MS. Eng. misc. b. 42
MS. Eng. misc. c. 108
MS. Eng. misc. d. 10 — MS. Eng. misc. e. 373.
MS. Eng. misc. f. 17
MS. Eng. misc. f. 66

MS. Eng. th. c. 33,34

MS. Gough Middx. 9
MS. Gough Norfolk 2-15,22,33.

MS. Lat. misc. c. 68

MS. Lister 36

MS. Oxf. dioc. papers e. 6
MS. Oxf. dioc. papers e. 22

MS. Smith 127

MS. Top. gen. c. 1-4
MS. Top. gen. c. 24,25
MS. Top. gen. e. 8-15

MS. Top. Essex c. 12

MS. Top. Lond. c. 2

MS. Top. Oxon. b. 8,9
MS. Top. Oxon. c. 413

MS. Top. Wilts. e. 1
MS. Top. Wilts. e. 4

All Souls College, Oxford.

Muniments, "Exhibitions, &c. 24, 33, 38, 43-56".

British Museum.

Additional MSS.	4276, 5831, 5841, 5845, 6185, 6190, 6209, 6261, 6262, 15932, 21906, 22934, 25103, 32556, 33393, 34652, 35114, 36651, 47842.
Egerton MSS.	2231, 2721.
Harleian MSS.	3777-3798.
Lansdowne MSS.	814, 1038.
Sloane MSS.	1039, 4039, 4042, 4047.
Stowe MSS.	749, 753, 755, 1051.

Cambridge University Library.

MS. D d. 3. 64.

Add. MS. 3470.

Christ Church, Oxford.

MS. Arch. W. Epist. 1-23.

MS. Wake 300-312.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

MS. 584-611.

Lambeth Palace.

MS. 1373

Unreferenced, but formerly St. Pauls 17 D 2 and Dalton 9.

Market Lavington

Parish registers.

National Library of Wales.

MS. 3255, 5250, 6751, 9070, 11027.

"Church in Wales; SA/Let/826".

Norwich Diocesan Registry.

Consistory Court Act Books.
Documents relating to Consistory Court.
Documents relating to disputes between Bishop and Dean and Chapter. [Box 800].
Institution books.
Bishop Tanner's Index to the Institution books. [Boxes 803-805].

Oxford University Archives.

Documents relating to the case of "Charlett v. Usher".

Principal Probate Office.

Tanner's will: P.C.C. 21 Derby.

Privately Owned.

Duke of Portland. "Collections of Dr. John Nalson". [Deposited in the Bodleian Library; Dep. c. 152-176].

Major-General C.J.G.Dalton. "Collections of Bishop Edmund Gibson". [Deposited in the Bodleian Library; Dep. c. 225-246].

St. Asaph Cathedral Library.

List of Bishop Tanner's books.

b: Printed Books

ATLEY, H. Reminiscences, a topographical account of Market Lavington. Salisbury, 1855.

ATTO, Clayton. "The Society for the encouragement of learning", The Library, 4th ser., vol.xix (1939) pp.263-288.

AUBREY, John. Aubrey's collections for Wilts. [Ed. by sir T.Phillipps]. 2 pt. [Middle Hill], 1821,38.

Brief lives. Ed. by A.Clark. 2 vols. Oxf., 1898.

Aubrey's Brief lives. Ed. by O.L.Dick. 3rd ed. Lond., 1958.

AUBREY, John. Miscellanies. Lond., 1696.

The natural history of Wiltshire. Ed. by J.Britton. Lond., 1847.

Wiltshire. The topographical collections of John Aubrey. Corrected and enlarged by J.E.Jackson. Devizes, 1862.

BALE, John. Illustrium Maioris Britanniae scriptorum. Gippeswici, 1548.

Scriptorum illustriū Maioris Brytannię ... catalogus. Basileae, 1557,59.

Index Britanniae scriptorum ... John Bale's Index of British and other writers. Ed. by R.L.Poole, with the help of M.Bateson. (Anecdota Oxoniensia. Mediaeval and modern series, 9). Oxf., 1902.

BEDDIE, James S. Libraries in the twelfth century, their catalogues and contents. Repr. from Haskins anniversary essays. Cambr., Mass., 1929.

BELOE, William. Anecdotes of literature and scarce books. 6 vols. Lond., 1807-12.

BENNETT, Gareth V. White Kennett, 1660-1728, bishop of Peterborough. Lond., 1957.

BENNETT, Henry S. English books & readers, 1475 to 1557. Cambr., 1952.

BENTHAM, James. The history and antiquities of the conventual and cathedral church of Ely. Cambr., 1771.

----- 2nd ed. Norwich, 1812.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY. Transactions. Vol. 1 et seqq. Lond., 1893 —

BIOGRAPHIA Britannica: or, The lives of the most eminent persons who have flourished in Great Britain and Ireland. [Ed. by W.Oldys]. 6 vols. [in 7]. Lond., 1747-66.

BLOMEFIELD, Francis. An essay towards a topographical history of the county of Norfolk. 5 vols. Fersfield &c., 1739-75.

----- [Another ed.] 11 vols. Lond., 1805-10.

BODLEIAN LIBRARY. Calendar of charters and rolls preserved in the Bodleian library. Ed. by W.H.Turner, H.O.Coxe. Oxf., 1878.

Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae pars quarta, codices ... Thomae Tanneri ... complectens. Confecit A.Hackman. Oxf., 1860.

A summary catalogue of western manuscripts in the Bodleian library at Oxford. 7 vols. [in 8]. Oxf., 1922-53.

Bodleian quarterly record. 8 vols. Oxf., 1914-38.

Bodleian library record. Vol. 1 et segq. Oxf., 1939 —

BRITISH MUSEUM. List of catalogues of English book sales, 1676-1900, now in the British museum. Lond., 1915.

BRITTON, John. Memoir of John Aubrey. Lond., 1845.

BROOKS, Eric St.J. Sir Hans Sloane, the great collector and his circle. Lond., 1954.

BURROWS, Montagu. Worthies of All Souls: four centuries of English history. Lond., 1874.

CAIUS, Thomas. Thomae Caii ... Vindiciae antiquitatis academiae Oxoniensis contra Joannem Caium. In lucem emisit T.Hearnius. Oxf., 1730.

CAMBRIDGE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY. Transactions. Vol. 1 et segq. Cambr., 1953 —

CAMDEN, William. Camden's Britannia. Publ. by E.Gibson. Lond., 1695.

----- 2nd ed. 2 vols. Lond., 1722.

CAMPLING, Arthur. East Anglian pedigrees. (Publications of the Harleian society, vol. 91). Lond., 1939.

CANDLER, Charles. Notes on the parish of Redenhall with Harleston. Lond., 1896.

CARR, William. University college. Lond., 1902.

CARTER, Edward H. The Norwich subscription books, a study of the subscription books of the diocese of Norwich, 1637-1800. Lond., &c., 1937.

CARTER, John. Taste & technique in book-collecting. 2nd impr. Cambr., 1949.

CATALOGI librorum manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae. [Ed. by E.Bernard]. Oxf., 1697.

A CATALOGUE of the books in the library of the city of Norwich, in the year 1706. Norwich, 1706.

A new catalogue ... 1732. Norwich, 1732.

The CHOROGRAPHY of Norfolk, an historicall and chorographicall description of Norffolck. Ed. by C.M.Hood, transcribed by M.A.Blyth. Norwich, 1938.

CICERO, Marcus T. M. Tullii Ciceronis de officiis ad Marcum f. ... ex MSS. recensuit T.Cockman. Oxf., 1695.

CLARKE, Thomas E. S. and FOXCROFT, H. C. A life of Gilbert Burnet, bishop of Salisbury. Cambr., 1907.

CLUTTON, Joseph. A true and candid relation of the good and bad effects of Joshua Ward's pill and drop. Lond., 1736.

CONCILIA Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae ... a D.Wilkins ... collecta. 4 vols. Lond., 1737.

CRASTER, sir Edmund. History of the Bodleian library, 1845-1945. Oxf., 1952.

DAVIES, William T. "A bibliography of John Bale", Oxford bibliographical society, Proceedings & papers, vol. v (1936-39) pp.201-279.

"Thomas Tanner and his Bibliotheca", The Times literary supplement, 14 Dec. 1935, p.856.

DE BEER, sir Gavin R. Sir Hans Sloane and the British museum. Lond. &c., 1953.

DIBDIN, Thomas F. Bibliomania; or, Book-madness. New ed. Lond., 1876.

DICTIONARY of national biography. Ed. by sir L.Stephen and sir S.Lee. 21 vols. [and Supplements]. Lond., 1917 —

DODSWORTH, Roger and DUGDALE, sir W. Monasticon Anglicanum, sive Pandectae coenobiorum, Benedictinorum, Cluniacensium, Cisterciensium, Carthusianorum. 3 vols. Lond., 1655-73.

DOUGLAS, David C. English scholars, 1660-1730. 2nd ed. Lond., 1951.

D'OYLY, George. The life of William Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury. 2 vols. Lond., 1821.

DUGDALE, sir William. The life, diary, and correspondence of sir William Dugdale. Ed. by W.Hamper. Lond., 1827.

The EAST Anglian; or, Notes and queries on subjects connected with ... Suffolk, Cambridge, Essex & Norfolk. Vol. 1-4; new ser., 1-13. Lowestoft &c., 1864-1909/10.

ENGLISH historical scholarship in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Papers delivered at a conference arranged by the Dugdale society. Ed. by L.Fox. Lond. &c., 1956.

The ENGLISH library before 1700. Ed. by F.Wormald and C.E.Wright. Lond., 1958.

ENRIGHT, Brian J. "Rawlinson and the chandlers", Bodleian library record, vol. iv (1952-53) pp.216-227.

EVANS, Joan. A history of the Society of antiquaries. Lond., 1956.

FARRER, Edmund. The Church heraldry of Norfolk. 3 vols. Norwich, 1887-93.

FIENNES, Celia. The journeys of Celia Fiennes. Ed. by C.Morris. Revised ed. (Cresset libr.). Lond., 1949.

The FIRST parish register of St. George of Tombland, Norwich. Transcribed by G.B.Jay, with notes by T.R.Tallack. Revised by W.Hudson. Norwich, 1891.

The FLEMINGS in Oxford. Ed. by J.R.Magrath. 3 vols. (Oxford historical society). Oxf., 1904-24.

FOSTER, Joseph. Alumni Oxonienses, the members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714 (1715-1886). 8 vols. Oxf. &c., 1887.

FULLER, Thomas. The history of the worthies of England. New ed., by J.Nichols. 2 vols. Lond., 1811.

The GENTLEMAN'S magazine: or, Monthly intelligencer. By Sylvanus Urban. Vols. 1-6. Lond., 1731-36.

GIBSON, Strickland and GIBSON, M. A. "An index to Rawlinson's collections (circa 1700-50) for a new edition of Wood's Athenae Oxonienses", Oxford bibliographical society. Proceedings & papers, vol. i (1922-26) pp.67-95.

GILBERT, Davies. The parochial history of Cornwall. 4 vols. Lond., 1838.

GILLAM, Stanley G. "Arthur Charlett's letters and manuscripts", Bodleian library record, vol. iv (1952-53) pp.105-114.

GOUGH, Richard. Anecdotes of British topography. Lond., 1768.

British topography. 2 vols. Lond., 1780.

HARDY, sir Thomas D. Descriptive catalogue of materials relating to the history of Great Britain and Ireland. Vol. 1, pt.1. (Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi scriptores). Lond., 1862.

HARRIS, Jesse W. John Bale, a study in the minor literature of the Reformation. (Illinois studies in language and literature, vol. 25, no.4). Urbana, 1940.

HAWES, Robert. The history of Framlingham. [Ed.] by R.Loder. Woodbridge, 1798.

HEARNE, Thomas. Reliquiae Hearnianae: the remains of Thomas Hearne ... being extracts from his diaries. With notes by P.Bliss. 2 vols. Oxf., 1857.

Remarks and collections of Thomas Hearne. Ed. by C.E.Doble [and others]. 11 vols. (Oxford historical society). Oxf., 1885-1918.

HICKES, George. Some discourses upon dr. Burnet and dr. Tillotson. Lond., 1695.

HISCOCK, Walter G. Henry Aldrich of Christ Church, 1648-1710. Oxf., 1960.

HISTORICAL manuscripts commission.

------ 1st report; Appendix, p.87.
------ 12th report; Appendix, Pt.9 (Beaufort, and others) p.392.
------ 15th report; Appendix, Pt.2 (Hodgkin).
------ Portland. I, IV, VI, VII.

HONE, Campbell R. The life of dr. John Radcliffe, 1652-1714. Lond., 1950.

HUDDESFORD, William. Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum ... Antonii à Wood. Oxf., 1761.

The lives of ... John Leland, Thomas Hearne and Anthony à Wood. 2 vols. Oxf., 1772.

HUNT, Richard W. "The cataloguing of Ashmolean collections of books and manuscripts", Bodleian library record, vol.iv (1952-53) pp.161-170.

"List of Phillipps manuscripts in the Bodleian library", Bodleian library record, vol. vi (1957-61) pp.348-369.

"Tanner's Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica", Bodleian library record, vol. ii (1941-49) pp.249-258.

INDEX to the Act books of the archbishops of Canterbury, 1663-1859. Compiled by E.H.W.Dunkin and ed. by C.Jenkins. Part 2. (Index library, 63). Lond., 1938.

IRWIN, Raymond. The origins of the English library. Lond., 1958.

JACOB, Ernest F. "Wilkins's Concilia and the fifteenth century", Transactions of the Royal historical society, 4th ser., vol. xv (1932) pp.91-131.

JAMES, Francis G. North country bishop, a biography of William Nicolson. (Yale historical publications, Miscellany 65). New Haven &c., 1956.

JAMES, Montague R. On the abbey of S. Edmund at Bury (Cambridge antiquarian society, 8° publications, 28). Cambr., 1895.

"The list of libraries prefixed to the catalogue of John Boston and the kindred documents", Collectanea Franciscana, 2; British society of Franciscan studies, vol. x (1922) pp.37-60.

JAYNE, Sears. Library catalogues of the English Renaissance. Berkeley &c., 1956.

JENKINS, Claude. Ecclesiastical records. (Helps for students of history, 18). Lond. &c., 1920.

JENKINS, John G. The dragon of Whaddon, being an account of the life and work of Browne Willis. High Wycombe, 1953.

KENDRICK, sir Thomas D. British antiquity. Lond., 1950.

KENNETT, White. Parochial antiquities attempted in the history of Ambrosden, Burcester, and other adjacent parts in the counties of Oxford and Bucks. Oxf., 1695.

KETTON-CREMER, Robert W. Country neighbourhood. Lond., 1951.

Norfolk assembly. Lond., 1957.

KNIGHT, Samuel. The life of dr. John Colet. Lond., 1724.

The life of Erasmus. Cambr., 1726.

KNOWLES, David. The religious houses of medieval England. Lond., 1940.

KNOWLES, David and HADCOCK, R. N. Medieval religious houses: England and Wales. Lond. &c., 1953.

KNYVETT, Thomas. The Knyvett letters, 1620-1644. Transcribed and ed. by B.Schofield. (Norfolk record society, vol.20). [Norwich], 1949.

LAWLER, John. Book auctions in England in the seventeenth century, 1676-1700. Popular ed. (Book-lover's library). Lond., 1906.

LELAND, John. The laboryouse journey & serche of Johan Leylande, for Englandes antiquities, geuen of hym as a newe yeares gyfte to kynge Henry the viij. Enlarged, by J.Bale. Lond., 1549.

Commentarii de scriptoribus Britannicis ... ex autographo edidit A.Hall. Oxf., 1709.

J.Lelandi antiquarii de rebus Britannicis collectanea ... ex autographis edidit T.Hearnius. 6 vols. Oxf., 1715.

The itinerary of John Leland the antiquary. Publ. by T.Hearne. 9 vols. Oxf., &710-12.

The itinerary of John Leland in or about the years 1535-1543. Ed. by L.T.Smith. 11 pt. Lond., 1906-10.

LE NEVE, John. Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae: or, An essay towards deducing a regular succession of all the principal dignitaries in each cathedral, collegiate church or chapel in ... England and Wales. (Lond.), 1716.

----- Corrected and continued by T.D.Hardy. 3 vols. Oxf., 1854.

LE STRANGE, Hamon. Norfolk official lists. Norwich, 1890.

LETTERS written by eminent persons in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. To which are added Hearne's journeys to Reading and Lives of eminent men, by J.Aubrey. Publ. from the originals in the Bodleian library and Ashmolean museum. [Ed. by J.Walker and P.Bliss]. 2 vols. [in 3 pt]. Lond., 1813.

LHUYD, Edward. Life and letters of Edward Lhwyd. (Early science in Oxford, by R.T.Gunther, vol. 14). Oxf., 1945.

The LIBRARY. Lond., 1899 —

LINDLEY, E. S. "A short study in Valor Ecclesiasticus", Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire archaeological society, vol. lxxvi (1957) pp.98-117.

LINNELL, Charles L. S. "Some notes on the Blomefield MSS. in the Bodleian library", Norfolk record society, Publications, vol. xii (1951) pp.65-83.

LOVEDAY, John. Diary of a tour in 1732 through parts of England, Wales, Ireland and Scotland. (Roxburghe club). Edinb., 1890.

McCUSKER, Honor. John Bale, dramatist and antiquary. Bryn Mawr, 1942.

MACRAY, William D. Annals of the Bodleian library, Oxford. 2nd ed. Oxf., 1890.

MAGRATH, John R. The Queen's college. 2 vols. Oxf., 1921.

MALLET, Charles E. A history of the University of Oxford. 3 vols. Lond., 1924-27.

MEMOIRS of a royal chaplain, 1729-1766, the correspondence of E.Pyle with S.Kerrich. Ed. by A.Hartshorne. Lond., 1905.

MILNE, Joseph G. "Oxford coin-collectors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries", Oxoniensia, vol. xiv (1949) pp.53-62.

MISCELLANEA genealogica et heraldica. Ed. by J.J.Howard. 2nd ser., vol. i (1886) pp.143-146.

MOIR, Esther A. L. "The early English antiquaries", History today, vol. viii (1958) pp.781-786.

MORTON, William. A catalogue of the books in the St. Asaph cathedral library. Lond., 1878.

MUMBY, Frank A. Publishing and bookselling. 4th ed. Lond., 1956.

MUNBY, Alan N. L. Phillipps studies. 5 nos. Cambr., 1951-60.

NALSON, John. An impartiall collection of the great affairs of State, from ... 1639 to the murther of king Charles i. 2 vols. Lond., 1682,83.

NICHOLS, John. Illustrations of the literary history of the eighteenth century. 8 vols. Lond., 1817-58.

Literary anecdotes of the eighteenth century. 9 vols. Lond., 1812-15.

NICOLSON, William. The English historical library: or, A short view and character of most of the writers now extant ... which may be serviceable to the undertakers of a general history of this kingdom. 3 pt. Lond., 1696-99.

----- 2nd ed. Lond., 1714.

----- 3rd ed. (The English, Scotch and Irish historical libraries). Lond., 1736.

Letters on various subjects ... to and from William Nicolson. Illustr. with literary and historical anecdotes by J.Nichols. 2 vols. Lond., 1809.

NORRIS, Dorothy M. A history of cataloguing methods, 1100-1850. Lond., 1939.

NOTES and queries.

----- 1st ser., vol.vi (1852) p.434.
----- 1st ser., vol.vii (1853) p.260.
----- 4th ser., vol.xi (1873) p.215.
----- 11th ser., vol.v (1912) pp.149, 238, 393, 394.

OATES, John C. T. A catalogue of the fifteenth-century printed books in the University library, Cambridge. Cambr., 1954.

ORIGINAL letters of eminent literary men of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Ed. by sir H.Ellis. (Camden society). Lond., 1843.

The PARISH registers of Lowestoft, Suffolk. Printed at the private press of F.A.Crisp, 1901.

PECK, Francis. Academia tertia Anglicana; or, The antiquarian annals of Stanford. Lond., 1727.

PEPYS, Samuel. Private correspondence and miscellaneous papers of Samuel Pepys. Ed. by J.R.Tanner. 2 vols. Lond., 1926.

Letters and the second diary of Samuel Pepys. Ed. by R.G.Howarth. Lond., 1932.

PHILIP, Ian G. "Thomas Hearne as a publisher", Bodleian library record, vol. iii (1950-51) pp.146-155.

PIGGOTT, Stuart. William Stukeley, an eighteenth-century antiquary. Oxf., 1950.

"William Camden and the Britannia", Proceedings of the British academy, vol. xxxvii (1951) pp.199-217.

PITS, John. Joannis Pitsei ... Relationum historicarum de rebus Anglicis tomus primus. Par., 1619.

PLOMER, Henry R. A dictionary of the printers and booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725. (Bibliographical society). Lond., 1922.

PLOMER, Henry R.; BUSHNELL, G. H. and DIX, E. R. McC. A dictionary of ... printers and booksellers ... 1726 to 1775. (Bibliographical society). Lond., 1932.

POWELL, Anthony. John Aubrey and his friends. 2nd impr. Lond., 1948.

POWICKE, sir Frederick M. "Sir Henry Spelman and the 'Concilia'", Proceedings of the British academy, vol. xvi (1930) pp.345-379.

RAVEN, Charles E. John Ray, naturalist. 2nd ed. Cambr., 1950.

RAWLINSON, Richard. The English topographer: or, An historical account ... of all the pieces that have been written relating to the antiquities ... of any part of England. Lond., 1720.

RECORDS of Buckinghamshire. Together with the proceedings of the Architectural and archaeological society for the county of Buckingham. Vol. 9. Aylesbury, 1909.

RICCI, Seymour de. English collectors of books & manuscripts (1530-1930) and their marks of ownership. Lond., 1960.

RIX, Samuel W. "Cursory notices of the rev. Francis Blomefield", Norfolk archaeology, vol. ii (1849) pp.201-224.

ROBERTSON, Charles G. All Souls college. Lond., 1899.

RYE, Walter. "Francis Blomefield", Norfolk antiquarian miscellany, vol. iii (1887) pp.177-184.

History of the parish of Eaton in the city of Norwich. (Rye's monographs of Norwich hamlets, 1). Norwich, [1917?].

Norfolk families. 5 pt. Norwich, 1911-13.

SALMON, Nathaniel. The lives of the English bishops from the Restauration to the Revolution. 3 pt. Lond., 1731-33.

SAUNDERS, Herbert W. A history of the Norwich grammar school. Norwich, 1932.

SAVAGE, Ernest A. "Notes on the early monastic libraries of Scotland, with an account of the Registrum librorum Angliae, and of the Catalogus scriptorum Ecclesiae of John Boston", Papers of the Edinburgh bibliographical society, vol. xiv (1926-30) pp.1-46.

SLATTER, Mary D. "The records of the Court of Arches", The journal of ecclesiastical history, vol. iv (1953) pp.139-153.

SMITH-DAMPIER, John L. East Anglian worthies. Oxf., 1949.

SPELMAN, sir Henry. Reliquiae Spelmannianae. The posthumous works of sir Henry Spelman, kt., relating to the laws and antiquities of England. [Ed. by E.Gibson]. Oxf., 1698.

The English works of sir H. Spelman. [Ed. by E.Gibson]. 2 pt. Lond., 1723.

STEEVES, Harrison R. Learned societies and English literary scholarship in Great Britain and the United States. (Columbia university studies in English and comparative literature). New York, 1913.

STRATFORD, Joseph. Wiltshire and its worthies: notes topographical and biographical. Salisbury, 1882.

STYLES, Philip. Sir Simon Archer, 1581-1662. (Dugdale society, occasional papers, 6). Oxf., 1946.

SUPPLE, William R. A history of Thorpe-next-Norwich, otherwise Thorpe Episcopi and Thorpe S. Andrew. Lond., [1918].

SYKES, Norman. Church and State in England in the xviiith century. Cambr., 1934.

Edmund Gibson, bishop of London, 1669-1748. Oxf. &c., 1926.

From Sheldon to Secker, aspects of English Church history, 1660-1768. Cambr., 1959.

William Wake, archbishop of Canterbury, 1657-1737. 2 vols. Cambr., 1957.

TANNER, Thomas. A scheme of the intended History of Wiltshire. [Oxf.?, 1694].

An account of the book, entituled, Notitia Monastica. [Oxf., 1694].

Notitia monastica; or, A short history of the religious houses in England and Wales. Oxf., 1695.

----- Publ. by J.Tanner. Lond., 1744.

----- Now repr. by J.Nasmith. Cambr., 1787.

Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica: sive, De scriptoribus, qui in Anglia, Scotia, et Hibernia ad saeculi XVII initium floruerunt ... commentarius. Praefixa est Davidis Wilkinsii praefatio. Lond., 1748.

The TANNER LETTERS, original documents and notices of Irish affairs in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Extracted by C.McNeill. (Coimisiún laímhscríbhinní na hÉireann). Dubl., 1943.

THOMAS, David R. Esgobaeth Llanelwy. The history of the diocese of St. Asaph. New ed. 3 vols. Oswestry, 1908-13.

THORESBY, Ralph. The diary of Ralph Thoresby, F.R.S. Ed. by J.Hunter. 2 vols. Lond., 1830.

Letters of eminent men addressed to Ralph Thoresby. 2 vols. Lond., 1832.

TURBERVILLE, Arthur S. A history of Welbeck abbey and its owners. 2 vols. Lond., 1938,39.

UFFENBACH, Zacharias C. von. London in 1710, from the travels of Zacharias Conrad von Uffenbach. Tr. and ed. by W.H.Quarrell and M.Mare. Lond., 1934.

Oxford in 1710. Ed. by W.H. and W.J.C.Quarrell. Oxf., 1928.

USHER, Charles. A letter to a member of the Convocation of the University of Oxford: containing the case of a late fellow elect of University-college in that University. Lond., 1699.

VENN, John and J. A. Alumni Cantabrigienses, a biographical list of all known students ... of Cambridge from the earliest times to 1900. 2 pt [in 10 vols]. Cambr., 1922-54.

The VISITATION of Norfolk ... 1664 made by sir Edward Bysshe. Ed. by A.W.H.Clarke and A.Campling. Vol. 2. (Publications of the Harleian society, vol.86). Lond., 1934.

WAKE, William. The state of the Church and clergy of England in thier councils ... from the conversion of the Saxons to the present times. Lond., 1703.

WALPOLE, Horace. A catalogue of the royal and noble authors of England. 2 vols. Strawberry Hill, 1758.

The letters of Horace Walpole. Ed. by mrs. P.Toynbee. 16 vols. Oxf., 1903-05.

WALTERS, Henry B. The English antiquaries of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Lond., 1934.

WHEELER, George W. The earliest catalogues of the Bodleian library. Oxf., 1928.

WHITEMAN, Elizabeth A. C. "Two letter books of archbishops Sheldon and Sancroft", Bodleian library record, vol. iv (1952-53) pp.209-215.

WILLIAMSON, John. Glastonbury abbey: its history and ruins. Wells, 1859.

WILLIS, Browne. An history of the mitred parliamentary abbies, and conventual cathedral churches. 2 vols. Lond., 1718,19.

A survey of the cathedrals of Lincoln, Ely, Oxford and Peterborough. Lond., 1730.

WILTON, Edward. "Bishop Tanner, his family and writings", Wiltshire archaeological and natural history magazine, vol. xiii (1872) pp.59-77.

WILTSHIRE parish registers. Marriages. Ed. by W.P.W.Phillimore and J.Sadler. Vol.i-xiv. Lond., 1905-14.

WILTSHIRE visitation pedigrees, 1623. Ed. by G.D.Squibb. (Publications of the Harleian society, vol.105/106). Lond., 1954.

WOOD, Anthony. Historia et antiquitates Universitatis Oxoniensis. Oxf., 1674.

Athenae Oxonienses; an exact history of all the writers and bishops who have had their education in the ... University of Oxford. 2 vols. Lond., 1691,92.

----- 2nd ed. 2 vols. Lond., 1721.

----- New ed. By P.Bliss. 6 vols. Lond., 1813-20.

The antient and present state of the city of Oxford. With additions by sir J.Peshall. Lond., 1773.

The history and antiquities of the colleges and halls in the University of Oxford. [Ed.] by J.Gutch. Oxf., 1786.

The history and antiquities of the University of Oxford. [Ed.] by J.Gutch. 2 vols. Oxf., 1792,97.

Survey of the antiquities of the city of Oxford. Ed. by A.Clark. 3 vols. (Oxford historical society). Oxf., 1889-99.

WOOD, Anthony. The life and times of Anthony Wood, antiquary, of Oxford, 1632-1695, described by himself. Ed. by A.Clark. 5 vols. (Oxford historical society). Oxf., 1891-1900.

WRIGHT, Cyril E. "Humfrey Wanley: Saxonist and library-keeper", Proceedings of the British academy, vol. xlvi (1960) pp.99-129.