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Abstract
Samuel Pepys's Diary was left in manuscript at his death and preserved in six volumes in the library of Magdalene College, Cambridge. It is well known as a source of detail and perspective on life in Restoration London. Less attention has been paid to the nature of Pepys's writing in the Diary and the particular way he creates himself as a character in it. The contrast with his self-presentation in other writings, such as his letters, and his NWB, for example, is remarkable. In the letters and the NWB Pepys presents himself as a confident, self-possessed, self-disciplined and consistent person. In the Diary Pepys is protean, a fluid, inconsistent self. At times he shows a boyish, immoderately enthusiastic side. There is a clear separation between the observing self who writes and an unpredictable, surprising, not entirely knowable self who acts and feels. The labile Pepys is especially obvious when he writes about episodes of corrupt behaviour. There are multiple consciousnesses perceptible in the writing: an entity which engages in corruption, another upright entity which is aware of the immoral nature of the activity, and a third which comprehends the other two. In recording his dealings with women other than his wife, Pepys again brings multiple selves into play in his writing, a desiring self which will brook no refusal with lower-class objects of lust and a timid socially aware self which fears exposure by his wife and by society in general. The special quality of Pepys's recording of subjectivity in the Diary is highlighted if it is compared to three other substantial diaries of the Restoration period, those by Bulstrode Whitelocke, John Evelyn and Roger Morrice. There are interesting moments when Whitelocke betrays emotion and reveals uncertainties, but they are rare. Evelyn is a poised, self-assured, well-educated gentleman with a strong
sense of an audience. Morrice is focused on politics and matters of religion and writes as a commentator for an imagined public. None of these three can match the extraordinary immediacy of Pepys's *Diary*, its presentation of moment-to-moment sensation, or the sense that a carefully maintained public "character" is in abeyance. It is often said that Pepys's *Diary* reveals an inner self and allows unmediated, camera-like access to his experience. This is misleading. The *Diary*, in contrast to other parts of his overall documentary legacy, functions through the absence of a unitary written self, and presents interplay between multiple shifting selves which do not necessarily have any separate existence beyond writing.
Abbreviation and note

NWB refers to Pepys's *Navy White Book*, quoted from:


Early Modern spelling and punctuation is left uncorrected when quoting from Early Modern sources.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

(a) THE DIARY

September 2\textsuperscript{nd} 1666.

We stayed till, it being darkish, we saw the fire as only one entire arch of fire from this to the other side of the bridge, and in a bow up the hill, for an arch of above a mile long. It made me weep to see it. The churches, houses, and all on fire and flaming at once, and a horrid noise the flames made, and the cracking of houses at their ruine. (Pepys, Diary 7.271-72)

The personification of the burning houses, ejaculating at their demise, highlights the powerful immediacy and passion of Samuel Pepys’s account of the Great Fire of London in his Diary. His personal recording of the tragedy is, of course, one of the best known sections of the work. Even though he did not write of this scene for almost three months after he experienced it, one can almost feel the heat of the fire after reading the sparse words again and again. The scene is set, the action horrifying, and the awesome sound of dying houses are all portrayed within three sentences. It is this temporal “happening here and now” aspect of Pepys’s Diary which makes it so different from others of the period.

The argument of this thesis is that Pepys’s Diary is like no other written in the seventeenth century: not in its style, or in its content. It differs completely from his other multitudinous documents, and from the work of three other diarists of the same era, as their study in the last chapter will show. The Diary exhibits a protean Pepys: that is to say there are multiple Pepyses, and we cannot say one is more “real” than another. This implies that it is misguided to see Samuel Pepys as a single, unchanging personality throughout the Diary. There are multiple selves within the Diary and
certainly within Pepys's documentary universe throughout the *Diary* period. Pepys was exceptional in his recording of these multiple selves in vivid written form.

In his *Diary* we are confronted with a Pepys who is often amazed at where he is and displays a remarkable naïveté in his wonder at the boundaries he can challenge. In his public and private lives, blending as they do like the shaken stones in a kaleidoscope, he changes a “self” from a grubby little lecher who is often skulking around the Thames riverside and inns seeking sexual pleasures, to a respected Navy Board Administrator who consults with the Duke of York on a regular basis, and to one who assisted in the Restoration of King Charles II. As the following thesis will show, Pepys writes himself, by choice, the protean selves of the boyish character, the convivial host, the unfaithful spouse, the avid playgoer, the puritanical penitent, the patriarchal husband, the efficient organizer of Navy Board administration, the musician, the historian of changing times, the church-goer, the singer, the corrupt official, the titular head of his family, the strict, sometimes violent employer, the fashion follower, and the “would-be” gentleman of substance. Nathaniel Hawthorne is one commentator who saw the difference between Pepys's public persona and those which appear in the *Diary*: “It seems he has no design but to appear respectable, and here he keeps a private book to prove he was not” (qtd. in Rothstein 1). The aim of the thesis is to explore and to extend the common perception, generally left undeveloped, that the Pepys of the *Diary* is highly unusual as a written persona in its diversity. Richard Ollard comments that “It is the secret of Pepys’s fascination that one never gets to the end of him. The contrasts, not to say contradictions, of his character, emotions, tastes, opinions, conduct and circumstances challenge our understanding” (17).
(b) TEXTS OF THE DIARY

Pepys made his first entry in the Diary 1 January 1660 and his last on 31 May 1669, when he feared, erroneously, that he was going blind. In total the Diary is over 3,100 pages long in the most recent full edition, and contains about 1,250,000 words (1.xli). The entries for a given day range from just twelve words to over 1800 (1.xli. n.3). The Diary was written in six stationer’s notebooks which were later bound in “lightly bound mottled calf” (1.xli, xlii). The original six volumes were probably first incorporated into Pepys's library shortly before 1677. They were apparently united for the first time in 1700, three years before his death. The catalogue of that date showed the shelfmarks of all the volumes, in unbroken sequence, superimposed over different disparate marks of an earlier date (1.lxviii).

The first printed edition of the Diary was in 1825, edited by Richard Neville, Lord Braybrooke. The task of deciphering and transcribing the Diary was taken on by a young student at Cambridge, John Smith. It took Smith three years to deliver the first transcription, after he supposedly discovered the “secret code” of the shorthand. It has been suggested that, in order to decipher the Diary, Smith compared it with Pepys’s shorthand and longhand record of the escape of King Charles II from Worcester (1.1xxvii). It seems that Smith was unaware that most of the shorthand Pepys used was that developed by John Shelton and that he could have used the college library’s copies published under the titles of Short Writing (1642) and Tachygraphy (1691) (1.1xxvii). In the latter parts of his Diary Pepys added extra letters in words to disguise them and changed the symbol of a triangle of three dots, used in his early

---

1 For the details about the various editions of the famous Diary, I have drawn on Latham and Matthews’s Vol.1 of their 1995 edition of The Diary of Samuel Pepys, and Peter David Looker’s 1996 doctoral thesis.
manuscript to indicate a full stop, into a tick (1.1xi-ii). Nevertheless, the shorthand he
used remained predominantly Shelton’s.

There was a near miss to an earlier public discovery of the Diary in 1728. Peter
Laycester (who was a friend of John Byrom the poet, and who taught his own method
of shorthand at Cambridge) wrote to his friend of finding in the Pepys Library five
volumes of “Mr. Pepys’s journal,” but pressure of time prevented him from further
investigation (Frugé 173). The existence of the Diary was next known by a member
of the public in 1812. David MacPherson, a Scottish writer who wrote about the trade
in tea, made public reference to the Diary after a friend remarked that he had seen,
amid its shorthand, the longhand words “cupp” and “tee” (1.1xxiv-lxxv).

MacPherson’s footnote explains: “Mr Pepys’s curious and valuable manuscripts are
preserved in the Pepysian library in Cambridge” (1.1xxiv.n.41). Presumably the Diary
was not chanced upon again until several years later.

The Diary has been published several times since 1825. The amount and choice of
text has depended upon the accepted moral standards of the period in which the
editions were published, and on the judgment of the editors regarding the public
appeal of the Diary as a whole.

The first editor of the Diary, Lord Braybrooke, bowdlerized -- one could even say
“mangled”-- that first edition of 1825. Smith's transcription was generally accurate,
with the caveat that he knew no Spanish, so his efforts in transcribing some of the
erotic passages were of little avail. He also omitted others which he found
“objectionable” (1.lxxix n.61). Latham considers that “If Braybrooke had printed
Smith as faithfully as Smith had transcribed Pepys, the result would have been an
excellent text” (1. lxxix). Braybrooke's omissions could have been forgiven by the
general public if the implication had not been that the edition published was of the
whole of the *Diary*, a claim which is patently untrue. Braybrooke scored through the passages he decided should be omitted, in black pencil, and then, worse, added his own words to bridge the gaps. This despite the fact that he states, of Pepys, in his preface to the original 1887 edition:

> As he was in the habit of recording the most trifling occurrences of his life, it became absolutely necessary to curtail the MS. materially, and in many instances to condense the matter; but the greatest care has been taken to preserve the original meaning, without making a single addition, excepting where, from the shorthand being defective, some alteration appeared absolutely necessary...my principal study in making the selection, however, has been to omit *nothing of public interest* [...]. (1.iii) [my emphasis]

The evidence of his black pencil is exemplified in the opening page of the first volume. Within the first few lines which Pepys uses to introduce almost ten years of his life, his stated disappointed hopes of himself becoming a father are omitted by Braybrooke because, presumably, Pepys’s reference to Elizabeth’s “terms” is indelicate. Yet this was as important to Pepys to record as was the fact that the Rump parliament was to sit again.

Braybrooke feels he has to apologise for what he sees as the diarist’s shortcomings:

> In justice to Mr Pepys’s literary reputation, the reader is forewarned that he is not to expect to find in the *Diary* accuracy of style or finished composition. He should rather consider the Work as a collection of reminiscences hastily thrown together at the end of each succeeding day, for the exclusive perusal of the Author. (iii)
One of the most obvious of Braybrooke’s omissions is his exclusion from his first edition of one of Pepys's phrases “And so to bed,” which, in that or similar form, is repeated over 400 times for all the nine and a half years of the *Diary*. Braybrooke also “added comments on Smith’s work and a few draftnotes of his own” (1.xxviii). He included only one quarter of the *Diary*, but put in 241 letters, and published the whole under the title of *Memoirs of Samuel Pepys, Esq. F.R.S., Secretary to the Admiralty in the reigns of Charles II and James II: Comprising his diary 1659 to 1669, deciphered by the Rev. John Smith, A.B. of St. John’s College, Cambridge, from the original short-hand MS. in the Pepysian Library, and a selection from his private correspondence. Edited by Richard, Lord Braybrooke*.

It must be noted, however, that Braybrooke includes Pepys’s novelistic recounting of the Great Fire in full, and almost word for word, as a comparison of his version with the Latham and Matthews’s edition shows. Strangely enough, the early Braybrooke edition in small octavo, with its tiny print which makes one peer deeply into the page, and its lack of paragraphing in each long day’s description of the fire’s havoc, evokes more drama and emotion than the Latham and Matthews version. With its large, easy to read print, and its appearance broken up by paragraphs which halt the action and give respite to the reader, and its academic explanations blocking off, in the notes, each page, the Latham and Matthews’ version loses some of the unabated consternation felt when reading the older version.

Despite Braybrooke’s devastating habit of compression by omission, a reviewer of *The Quarterly Review* thought of the first edition that

on the whole it offered no important new evidence about weighty affairs of state, but that it provided a richness of detail about the manners of its age which was unmatched, and that although inferior to Evelyn in “its tone of
sentiment and feeling”, it was superior “in variety and general amusement”.

(qtd. in 1.lxxxii)

Other reviewers were suitably impressed; only Sydney Smith thought the diary “nonsense” and Creevey thought it “almost trash” (qtd. in Diary 1.lxxxiii), but its popularity led to its being reprinted, in quarto and octavo forms, in 1828 and, with fewer letters and just two fifths of the Diary, again in the 1840s. Even so, Braybrooke did not restore the “telescoped” parts of the 1825 text and “compressed, paraphrased and bowdlerised as freely as ever” (1.lxxxiv). For example, Latham writes: “At 20 October 1663 (by misplacing an entry-date which both Pepys and Smith had placed correctly), Braybrooke conflated the events of two consecutive days, and in a footnote coped with the effect by the comment: ‘Pepys seems to have dined twice in the same day’” (1.lxxxv).

Four years before he died, Braybrooke undertook yet another edition, which he described as being “Revised and corrected” but which still passed over large passages which had previously been omitted from the editions of 1848-49 and 1854 because “they were devoid of the slightest interest” (qtd. in 1.1xxxvi).

In November 1872 “the Rev. Mynors Bright was given permission to start work on a new transcription” (1.lxxxvii). For the first time the shorthand Pepys had used was identified as that of Shelton (and not Rich’s as Braybrooke had claimed), but when Bright wrote on the title page that he had transcribed from Pepys’s “cipher” he “encouraged the long-lived fallacy that Pepys had used a system of his own invention” (1.xc). Bright used Braybrooke’s footnotes from earlier editions, thereby leaving one reviewer unimpressed (1.lxxxviii). Bright learned Shelton’s shorthand from the 1691 edition of Tachygraphy which had finally been found in the Pepys Library. Bright’s edition came out volume by volume from 1875 to1879 and included
howlers such as transcribing “my late Lord Jones” (9 February 1661) as “my late landlord Jones,” and “the Queen of Sweden” (11 April 1667), as “the Queene of Sheba.” Bright’s edition still printed only four-fifths of the Diary (1.1xxxviii).

Bell’s, the publishers, wanted to print “a full, if not absolutely complete” edition of the Diary without including any Pepys correspondence (1.xci) and, in November 1885, gave the editorship to Henry B. Wheatley, a man who knew no shorthand and had no access to the Smith manuscript. Help was sought, and there seems to have ensued a hotch-potch of random checking of Bright’s transcription by Hugh Callendar, a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Callendar later wrote several books on shorthand, and his main contribution seems to have been to transcribe the previously omitted erotic passages, and some of those entries which Bright found unimportant. Wheatley’s edition did, however, include almost the entire Diary, with the exception of some erotic and scatological passages, omissions which, as Matthews says, are “scarcely surprising in a Victorian editor” (1.xciii). Even so, some still thought Wheatley’s edition “prurient” (Looker 17). Although Wheatley’s edition was the fullest to that date, it perpetrated errors on practically every page, some “affecting the style and the very meaning of the Diary” (1.xciv). An index of sorts appeared in 1899, together with Pepsyiana, which Latham describes as “a ragbag of material” (1.cvi).

There is no doubt that the Latham and Matthews version of the Pepys Diary is the most comprehensive and definitive to date. It is the culmination of the surprisingly long gestation of a fully published Diary. Latham, with other contributors, added a companion and an index to the other nine transcribed volumes of the Diary. There are informative footnotes on every page, giving ready access to the everyday experiences of Pepys. The Companion (volume 10) includes forty-eight articles on nearly every
subject about which Pepys writes, together with an index of the many prominent people and all but forgotten acquaintances whom Pepys mentions, from kings to commoners. The transcriber and editor note every alteration or substitution that they make, and have righted the many wrongs perpetrated against the *Diary* by previous editors.

Because Pepys put in little more than full stops and the occasional bracket in his entries, various editors and transcribers over the years since the first publication of 1825 have put in their own versions of punctuation. Sometimes, however, the added punctuation gives the text a different meaning from that first intended. For example, the entry for 11 September 1664 in the original manuscript gives no punctuation save a full stop at the end of the last sentence. However, the Latham and Matthews version reads:

> This afternoon, it seems, Sir J Minnes fell sick at church; and going down the gallery stairs, fell down dead; but came to himself again and is pretty well.

(5.268)

This punctuation suggests that Sir John had died and then was subsequently revived. A version that is probably closer to the original sense could read:

> This afternoon, it seems, Sir J Minnes fell sick at church, and going down the gallery stairs, fell down dead but came to himself again, and is pretty well.

Thus the Latham and Matthews edition is not an absolute facsimile of that originally written. Latham himself explained why:

> We cannot claim that what we have printed is exactly what Pepys would have written had he composed the diary in longhand, for, apart from any mistakes of our own, his spelling varied (as most people’s did), and the abbreviated forms of the shorthand which he often used do not always give enough
information about what variant he had in mind. In fact we had to spell in modern style wherever we had no guide from the sounds represented by the shorthand and no knowledge of Pepys’s normal orthography. (“Pepys and his Editors” 110)

August Frugé, who was arranging with G. Bell and Sons the American publishing of the Diary, mentions that the two editors of this latest edition did not really get along, as they were both of different personality. Matthews was brilliant, amusing, quick-witted, quick acting. He was also impatient, much to the consternation of Latham, who was slow and methodical, and wished to control. Frugé remarks that “neither would give credit to the other” (170). Both were English born, but Matthews had acquired North American attitudes from his time as Professor of English at the University of California. Robert Latham was an Honorary Fellow and former Librarian of Magdalene College, Cambridge. Frugé had to deal with complaints from both.

Frugé has described his own visit to Bell’s offices in London in the 1960s for his first overture to obtain the rights to publish the Diary for the University of California:

The front door led not to a display room with a welcoming or snippy receptionist, as found elsewhere, but to a small shipping room where a few books were laid out on a counter and an old man was doing odd jobs. On learning that I had come to see the managing director, Mr. Glanville, the old man would telephone upstairs—they did have telephones—and Glanville would come tumbling down the back stairs on long legs and lead me up again to the dark library room where we could spread out our papers and, when my eyes had adjusted to the dim light, talk business. (167)
Frugé liked and trusted Mr. Glanville, Bell’s Managing Director, although he worried about his casual attitude about agreements. A written contract was eventually drawn up in 1970, the year before the English publication, although the thought of a new edition of the *Diary* had arisen as early as 1929 (Frugé 168).

Matthews was to prepare a complete and accurate text, a million and a quarter words of it. “He also wrote parts of the introduction that relate to the text and to the diary as literature, and did the notes that had to do with language and literature” (Frugé 170). Latham was the historian, and redid the Index. Matthews died as the last volumes of text were going through the press. Latham went on to edit three different one-volume versions of the *Diary*. He died in 1995.

(c) DIARY WRITING BEFORE PEPYS

Diary-writing in England in the seventeenth century was a relatively new art, although Peter Burke says that diaries have been found in Japan dating from the eleventh century, from China from the twelfth century, and from India in the sixteenth century, so it was not just a western phenomenon (qtd. in McKay 1). According to Matthews’s cataloguing, there were over 150 diaries listed as having been written during the seventeenth century, before Pepys began his diary in 1660, more than ninety of which were of more than ten years’ duration (xxi-xxxiv).

Matthews classifies the diaries as public, diplomatic, travel, military, astrologer’s, religious, prison, medical, war, theatre, ecclesiastical, yeoman’s, legal, country, farming, domestic, social, parliamentary, business, diarium practicum (medical), naval, university, teacher’s, civil war, and antiquarian among others. Diary writing was not so unusual an enterprise in the seventeenth century as is sometimes thought; it was starting to appear in England slowly in the sixteenth century, and was becoming increasingly popular in the seventeenth. Elaine McKay explains why:
According to David Cressy, from a literacy rate of twenty percent amongst men and five percent amongst women during the latter part of the sixteenth century, literacy grew by a further ten percent amongst men and five percent amongst women during the course of the seventeenth century. This rise was not spectacular but research carried out by historians such as Dagmar Friest, Leslie Sheperd, Margaret Spufford and Joad Raymond has highlighted England’s burgeoning literary trade with thousands of chapbooks, ballads, and, from the civil war years onwards, newsbooks. With more people equipped with the skills to write, with greater access to printed literature, and perhaps influenced by reading accounts of events and characters of the leading men of the times, keeping a personal account of one’s life may have become a popular pastime. (1)

With the growing, but still relatively low level of literacy in that period, it is surprising that at least eighteen diaries of a ten-year length have survived for five hundred years. Matthews catalogues two diaries dated 1442 and 1489. How many were written, then, which did not survive to the present day?

Elaine McKay suggests that the gradual increased interest in diary-writing, from even the fifteenth century on, was, in part, due to a country-wide networking of participants (3). She gives many examples of family interactions which criss-crossed the country, spreading interest and encouragement to write diaries:

Family ties, such as the Woodforde family from Winchester, the Newdigates from Warwickshire, the Isham family from Northamptonshire or the Winthrop family from Suffolk… all passed the tradition of diary-writing through generations. (3)
Seventy-two soldiers and sailors also wrote diaries in times of conflict in their own fashion, perhaps fearing death, and hoping for documentary immortality, or as a memento should they survive (McKay 1). There was also a growing “self-awareness” among the population, driven, to a degree, by exhortations from the pulpit to daily write down one’s sins and meditations, to keep an account of one’s spiritual well-being. William Haller said “keeping a diary of one’s sins etc. became the Puritan substitute for the confessional” (qtd. in McKay 1).

Lawrence Stone traces the upsurge in diary writing in England in the seventeenth century back to the 1620s (153). He states that “At [that] time, there developed a series of almost wholly new genres of writing, the intimately self-revelatory diary, the autobiography and the love letter” (154). The bulk of diaries were spiritually based, with the most prolific writers of diaries being Puritans (177). By the time of the Restoration, when Pepys was writing his diary, the practice was well established. Diaries on a similar scale to Pepys's by Bulstrode Whitelock, John Evelyn, and Roger Morrice survive from that period and have been printed in modern editions.

(d) PREVIOUS DISCUSSION OF THE DIARY AS WRITING

The consensus of those writing about Pepys's Diary is that Pepys's own experiences are at its heart. Lawrence Lipking says of him: “Though fully engaged in the public affairs of the day, at night, in his diaries, he contracts the world into what truly matters to him, and there the world is centred on himself” (34). Pepys’s motto, appropriated from Cicero, is “Mens cuiusque is est quisque” (“The mind of each man is the man himself” [Bédoyère, Letters 254]), and commentators often quote this in the context of his self-presentation. Ollard considers that “for Pepys, the mens, the mind, the intellect, reason was the quality that set the man above the beasts that perish and thus, implicit in the phrase if not in logic, his passport to immortality” (326-27).
Claire Tomalin concurs when she gives the title to her biography of the diarist as “The Unequalled Self.” She explains that other diaries of that era “were devoted to the spiritual life, to politics or to accounts of travel and sightseeing” and were “discreet about marital disagreements” (xxxv). Philip Hensher says that Pepys was pretty well the only writer at this time who demonstrated “such a thing as a secular, worldly way to interrogate an individual” (2). As Tomalin goes on, “What is extraordinary is that he went into areas no one else considered recording, looked at himself with as much curiosity as he looked at the exterior world, weighing himself and the world equally in the balance” (xxxv). E. Legouis and L. Cazamian put it thus:

> [. . .] the large events, the personal style, the unashamed frankness of the writing are not sufficient in themselves to account for the fascination of the book. Most important, perhaps, is that Pepys was blessed with a supremely happy temperament, and that he possessed the power of breathing life into what he wrote. He took pleasure in almost everything; each new event was the greatest ever. His Diary wins and holds us as would that of a child greedy for sensation. (692)

Although we do learn about many aspects of Pepys’s work with the Navy Board from his Diary, Stephen Coote says “It is of as much interest for what it [the Diary] does not record as for what it does. A great part of Pepys’s future career was to be given over to the titanic struggle between the English and the Dutch for commercial, and above all, maritime supremacy” (49-53). Against this is Benjamin Kohlmann's reminder that “Interpretations which stress the Diary’s textual rendering of a private self most notably neglect Pepys’s keen sense of playing an active part in the social and political changes which swept England in the middle of the seventeenth century” (1).
Critics frequently refer to the absolute openness of the *Diary*. Legouis and Cazamian's view that it shows "unashamed frankness" has already been quoted. Robert Louis Stevenson refers to the *Diary*'s "unflinching…sincerity which makes it a miracle among human books" (qtd. in Tomalin 214). Harry Berger calls it "a diary that seems to want to give everything away" (566). Robert Latham refers to Pepys's frankness as “a sort of innocence, a love of truth for truth’s sake” (Latham and Matthews 1.8). Tomalin says “So he came to render a whole society…and as he did so he forged a language--vigorous, precise, enchanting…but there is no show or pretension…” (386). This “self” Pepys writes in his *Diary* is thus generally seen as a presented self which is frank and transparent.

Francis Barker, however, challenges the idea that Pepys’s textual style is transparent. He focuses on an entry from the *Diary* dated 9 February 1668. He sees the passage as an oblique, multi-layered statement. Barker maintains that the apparently candid text, as it stands on first reading, is actually full of diversions. He disagrees with the reading of it as a transparent quotidian account of life in London in the seventeenth century (5). The *Diary* is not, he says, a clearly reported account of facts and events, textually "shorn of its ornaments … [with] an obviousness given in the image of a mind writing down mundane events according to the clear order of their unfolding” (4). He claims that Pepys's apparently simple style “works as a mask," for the seeming transparency of the *Diary* is clouded by self-censorship (1).

Barker’s argument rings true that Pepys, when writing his *Diary* entry on that Lord’s day on 9 February 1668, was hypocritically censoring himself when he says that he read the lewd *L’École des Filles* for educational reasons. At least as far as Pepys’s reason for reading is concerned, most readers would probably question the diarist’s explanation that it was for educational purposes only. Barker bases his
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argument on the series of the historical, sociological and religious changes which had all taken place before Pepys started his *Diary* in 1660. He states:

By the time that the Long Parliament abolished the Star Chamber (1637) and the other prerogative courts, a high wall of prohibition, surveillance and punishment had been built up around the printed word in whose supervision the government was prepared to invest enormous quantities of time, labour and expertise.  (44)

Although after this period there were a few years of freedom of the press when printing shops came into their own, the same Parliament, shaken by the breakdown in censorship which followed, clamped down again with constricting regulations. Total censorship of the deluge of books, journals and other documents produced during the English Revolution was challenged by Milton in his *Areopagitica*. Apart from blaspheming and seditious content, anything else, he urged, should be left to the reader’s conscience to guide him in his choice (7). Thus, “lewd” books like *L’École des Filles* were available in the shops, but not, one would expect, to be purchased by church-going citizens of Pepys’s social standing. That Pepys admits at the end of the 1668 entry that he burnt the offending item “that it might not be among my books to my shame” attests to this. Says Barker:

The state succeeds in penetrating to the very heart of the subject, or more accurately, in pre-constituting that subject as one which is already internally disciplined, censored, and thus an effective support of the emergent pattern of domination.  (47)

Barker quotes Descartes as a guide to reading Pepys:

So my intention is not to teach here the method which everyone must follow if he is to conduct his reason correctly, but only to demonstrate how I have tried
to conduct my own. Those who take responsibility for giving precepts must think themselves more knowledgeable than [sic] those to whom they give them, and, if they make a mistake, they are blameworthy. But, putting forward this essay as nothing more than an historical account, or, if you prefer, a fable in which, among certain examples one may follow, one will find also many others which it would be right not to copy, I hope it will be useful to some without being harmful to any, and that my frankness will be well received by all. (qtd. in Barker 53).

Barker maintains that Descartes’ frankness is emulated in the Pepysian text, and that the quoted passage is as much a ruse in Descartes’ case as is Pepys’s contentious journal entry for 9 February 1668 (53-4). Barker implies that Descartes well knew that in changing the “structure, style, contents and purposes of philosophy, his text underplays, disingenuously, the authority of its own project” (54). In both cases the writer’s intention is to coerce the reader into his way of thinking within the parameters of a deliberate method of discourse.

Barker says that Descartes uses an “easy, reasonable tone” throughout the famous passage from the Discourse on Method, “the text which above all legislates for the modern soul” (53), to seduce the would-be reader with “outrageous propositions concerning his body and soul” (54). This dangerous truth was that the mind and body were two separate entities; that the senses were no longer to be trusted, and that God alone could bridge the gap between body and mind. Self-possessed reason must be part of the equation. The violence of the public exposure of bodily recompense extracted from wrongdoers on the gallows was now hidden from view behind prison walls, where the minds of the incarcerated were supposed to bear the pain of remorse, as well as physically suffering the privation of prison life and separation from society.
So, Barker claims: “the Discourse rehearses, unknown to itself, that general shift from violence to ideology …as the normative component of domination, by importing censorship into the subject of discourse, the reading subject’s capacity for criticism immolated from the start” (55). However, this last claim hardly holds true for the Pepysian passage, because most critics would not believe, as has been stated, that the diarist read the lewd book for education purposes only, despite his attempt at self-censoring as Barker claims, even though we cannot argue against the fact that Pepys may have been able to cloud the issue for himself.

Barker says that the structure of the Pepys passage “conforms to R.D. Laing’s semi-theoretical diagram of a schizoid subject”:

> In both, a public persona surrounds an intermediate self (of which neither are “really” the subject’s own, just as the Diary tries to say that part of the Pepys that consumes the pleasures of the French text is not really Pepys); and within these there shelters a disembodied “inner self”: in the case of Pepys, the I that writes the text. (58)

Within this “split” the “I” is separated from the contentious thoughts which cause the division, although the struggle does not completely eliminate the warring factors from the self-possessed consciousness (Barker 58). So, although I do not agree with all Barker’s claims about the connections of elements of Pepys’s 1668 diary entry to sex, I can accept his logic as it applies to the diarist’s reading of L’École des Filles and concur that, in parts of this passage, Pepys emulates Descartes “in the rhetoric of common sense which provides in both the alibi of the evasion of censorship from without and within” (Barker 61). I explore passages where Pepys exercises self-censorship in Chapter 7, below.
Barker’s analysis of the *Diary* entry in question hinges on the Cartesian theory of dualism, that mind and body are separate entities, one immaterial and the other material. This, he says, allows Pepys to change the physicality of sexual passions dominant in this passage into something socially more acceptable; that is, that when he reads *L’École des Filles*, Pepys employs self-censorship when he writes that he embarks upon this action for educational purposes only. When Pepys refers to his reading of the “lew’d” book read “for information sake” before burning it, therefore, Pepys is practising the self-censorship, at that time, now required from the general populace. That such laws can be flouted is exposed by Christopher Hill when he shows that

an entire literary mode--pastoral--could function as a set of coded symbols by which political statements could be enunciated in a form that would allow them to evade the censorship: with sufficient manipulation of the stock conventions it could always be claimed that the poem was only about nymphs and shepherds after all. (qtd. in Barker 51)

Barker’s other arguments regarding incidents in the passage to which he attributes underlying nuances of sexuality are, however, suspect. His claim that singing means copulation in this instance is questionable, for Pepys refers so many times to singing in the rest of the *Diary* without sexual connotations.  In this part of the entry Pepys discusses the arrival of four friends who have visited him to sing from sheet music which, a little later in the text, he claims to dislike because “[he] understood not the words, and with the rests that the words are set.” Words, even when in English, can become unintelligible when broken by rests, for example, in oratorios, and in the four-part psalms Pepys so enjoyed (Willy 27), so that when Pepys says earlier in the

---

2 See the entries for 2.1.60 (1.5), 18.2.60 (1.59), and 7.10.67 (8.465).
quoted passage, while discussing singing, that Tempest “sings very well indeed” he isn’t praising his sexual prowess at all, as Barker contends. He is praising the man as a good instant-reader of sheet music, who has the ability to sing easily “anything in the world at first sight” (9.59).

Barker notes that in the same Diary entry, the interpolation of the information that Pegg Pen had been delivered of a daughter in a parenthetical aside begins, “By the way, I must remember…” and the next juxtaposition of a passing reference to smallpox victims begins “and among other things, if I have not already set it down…” This leads Barker once again to relate the incidents to sexuality because in both asides a bed is involved. Yet interest in the Diary is often stimulated by disparate jottings, which also often bear no relation to what has gone before. Mark Dawson notes that Pepys writes of a child’s death and of the Duke of York’s commendation for Pepys’s management of naval victualling in the same entry (“Histories and texts” 424).

As facsimiles of the Diary’s pages show (Tomalin Fig. 21), each page of the Diary was always neatly filled, so, quite often, useful snippets were interspersed throughout the day’s events (to keep the day’s entry even) without their necessarily always having to do with sex. However, Barker, in this instance, uses these interpolations to support his claims of Pepys’s use of double entendre. Harry Berger Jr’s criticism of Barker’s “two parsimonious strategies of snippetotomy and metonymy” has relevance here. Furthermore, Barker’s inference that Pepys wrote that particular day’s entry while under the influence of alcohol is equally misguided because of the bowdlerized text Barker used (Berger 563).

Barker claims that the “carnality of the body has been dissolved and dissipated until it can be reconstituted in writing at a distance from itself ” (57). In other words, it has become a representation, when, as Jacques Derrida says, the body has become
supplementary, “troubling the space from which it has been banished” (qtd. in Barker 63). From this, it can be deduced, comes Barker’s theory that, even through the singing session described in Pepys’s passage, the titillation of excerpts from the lewd book intrudes on Pepys’s thoughts, although it is still far-fetched to consider that in this instance, as stated, and no other in the Diary, is “singing” a synonym for something earthier. One wonders what Barker would have made of Pepys’s entry of 23 February 1669, had he read it, when Pepys, on a visit to Westminster Abbey with his family, picked up the “mummified relics of Queen Catherine de Valois” and delightedly told everyone of his joy at having kissed a queen on the mouth (9.457). Joe Roach quoted this example when he declared that Pepys in his Diary “rigorously genders the erotics of celebrity” (9).

Barker also argues that historical and socio-economic influences contributed significantly to changes in the nature of subjectivity at the time of the Restoration:

In the space of a relatively few years a new set of relations between state and citizen, body and soul, language and meaning was founded. The older sovereignty of the Elizabethan period was disassembled, and in its place was established a conjunction of novel social spaces and activities, bound together by transformed lines of ideological and physical force, among which new images of the body and its passions were a crucial, if increasingly occluded, element. (10)

Susan Bordo agrees in locating an important change in the functioning of the self in this period. She suggests that “In an important sense the separate self, conscious of itself, and of its own distinctness from a world “outside” it, is born in the Cartesian era…Descartes provides the first phenomenology of the mind, the disclosure of the deep epistemological alienation that attends the sense of mental interiority” (55).
Berger sees Pepys as exhibiting in his writing his many faces, an apt example of one trying through epistemology to make sense of both worlds. “His diary is like a time capsule containing his self-portrait safely disembodied and reincorporated in another medium, a paper investment in the future” (558).

Randy Robertson writes on the censoring of the mind throughout the *Diary* by not only the diarist himself, as I discuss, but also the populace at the time of the Reformation. Robertson talks of the unrest in the minds of the Puritans underlying the overt expression of hope and joy at Charles II’s return, and Pepys himself writes of sympathy for the dissenters throughout the Restoration period when he thinks they should censor their feelings “and not be ketch” (5.235).

Berger explains the three-fold action of self-censoring that a writer performs when creating a document. He states that, “No matter who else writers perform before, they perform in the first instance before themselves. “The *I that writes* is always an *I that reads* what it writes and monitors the act of writing” (560). When entering his version of the day’s incidents, after reading *L’École des Filles*, Pepys was not only vicariously reliving his physical reactions to the book’s contents, but in the transfer of them to mental knowledge, he was exercising the reflexive self-censorship of the I that reads what it writes to convey the written persona of the good bourgeois subject he wished to portray, despite revelations of his multitudinous marital infidelities.

Berger points out that the most valuable asset in Barker’s account is “its analysis of the convergence of the effects of the structure of writing on self-representation with the effects of changing ‘power relations’ on self-censorship and surplus meaning” (562), in other words, that same power of self-representation to which Brigitte Glaser refers when she says:
Since writers have the freedom of choice as to which details of their life they will offer for scrutiny, they also have the possibility of manipulating or directing their readers and inadvertently, themselves. From this advantage they derive some of their power. (16)

James Nielson condemns Barker’s reading from a bowdlerized text, a practice which reflects what Nielson sees as lack of philological scrupulousness in the work of many contemporary critics, and comments that Barker “spins out a gorgeously moody arabesque whose recurring themes include most pronouncedly the repression/marginalization of the (public, eroticized) body through its reinscription in the modern era as a (private, sublimated) text” (47). According to Nielson, the body of Pepys was not so much “confined, ignored, exscribed from discourse,’ as it was mangled, mutilated, and exoticized when Pepys did allow or force himself to inscribe it in his text” (49). Barker based his essay on a single day’s entry. As Berger argues: “Barker’s claims rest on a sparse data base, a small sample of texts and images that are, despite his commitment to suspicious reading, selectively and at times, tendentiously interpreted.” Berger deduces that Barker quotes from Selections from the Diaries of John Evelyn and Samuel Pepys (563). When Barker quotes Pepys as saying he “drank a mighty good store of wine” instead of “drank my good store of wine” (9.59), he infers that he has drunk alcohol to excess to “blurtingly confess” his indulgence. Latham and Matthews’s text makes it clear that the right interpretation is that he had partaken of a particularly good vintage (564).

Barker’s claim that the 1668 entry is shot through with hidden guilty sexual undertones is weakened when the later, fully transcribed version reveals Pepys’s glorious “sensual physical delight” which climaxes his reading of the French text (Turner 96). This emulates his other barely “concealed” revelations of sexual exploits
which crow their way through the whole *Diary*. Indeed, a copy of the manuscript entry for 9 February 1668 shows that the key words “*L’École des Filles*” and “decharger” are written in longhand, which stand out from the surrounding page of shorthand for anyone to see (Turner 97). James Grantham Turner further points out that Pepys’s use of an invented polyglot language to describe his sexual escapades adds colour and worldly sophistication to the text which actually foregrounds it; it does not therefore conceal it (97). As Turner argues, “[Pepys] does not deny his sex, as Barker insists, but dresses it up, with a *baguette* under its arm and a little *sombrero* on its head” (97-8).

Berger also offers a general critique of Barker's *The Tremulous Private Body*, which he says

wavers tonally between a cautionary tale and a jeremiad, the story of “our subjection”, of “what was done to us in the seventeenth century” when we became bourgeois subjects, a fate it may not be too late to “undo.” (587.n.24)

The “bourgeois subjects” to which Barker refers emanate from the founding moment of bourgeois discursivity born when modes of discourse passed “from visuality to script,” reflected in what happened in the theatre. Also pertinent was “the profound implication of the subject of writing (or of reading) [in] the machinery of censorship” (Berger 560-61). Neil Lazarus comments that Barker’s demystification of Pepysian discourse is unmistakably a critique of bourgeois ideology (432).

Barker says “Pepys’s text itself rehearses the situation it discloses as it inlays seclusion within seclusion” (7), and further that “The “I” at the centre of this inner location is placed at the heart of its own empire and very largely in terror…the *Diary* […] is thus the record of a terrible isolation” (9-10). Although most diaries, especially those particularly frank, are written in private, not many readers seem to agree with
Barker that the *Diary* was written by an author, crouched in terror, writing in “terrible” isolation. Lazarus aligns Barker’s analysis with past historical violence in England together with the scale and intensity of the political repression which swept seventeenth-century Europe: “At the heart of his work lies an unflinching awareness of the appalling violence that attended the ‘birth of modernity’” (436). Although one presumes that the dreadful statistics of hangings and other assaults upon the body Barker discovered when researching are accurate, nothing of this violence seeps through the recording of Pepys’s day of lascivious reading, boring singing, and neighbourhood gossip. The “I” central to this piece of text does not denote a character who is deeply reflective.

Barker's work was pioneering in challenging the idea that the *Diary* is a miraculously frank, open confession by a fallible Restoration Londoner. However, as commentators on Barker's chapter have pointed out, it builds a very elaborate reading of Pepys's subject position on the basis of a very idiosyncratic interpretation of one short passage, accessed in an inferior edition. In my own discussion of Pepys's subjectivity I follow Barker's lead in exploring the contradictions and unresolved ambiguities of the writing of the *Diary*, while attending more than Barker chose to do to the detailed circumstances of the creation of the *Diary*, to Pepys's other writing, and to the wider text of the *Diary* itself.

Dawson provides another important perspective on the *Diary* as writing. He argues that the *Diary* should be seen in its position as but one of a number of account books kept by Pepys. “Although the diary itself will always reign supreme, it was ringed by other texts which helped give it substance.” The *Diary* did not “stand alone” in a “discursive void”: 
The text which we know as Pepys’s diary was not created on a daily basis with a “single stroke” of the pen. The diary text was typically created in the following manner. First, when applicable, Pepys kept various *aides memoire* of a day’s events, many of which he had not authored himself. Second, at an average interval of two to four days, relying on these memorabilia and his memory, Pepys jotted down notes in a manner closely resembling the keeping of a register or ledger. A central column noted key events and these were linked, by dashes and brackets, to corresponding indices of time past and money spent written in the left- and right-hand columns or margins. Third, Pepys then wrote, from these by-books or collected papers, in one of the six volumes now constituting the Cambridge text *and*, more often than not, also into one or more of the other texts mentioned above. It is difficult to over emphasise the implications of this complex and particular process of record-keeping. From a single “master” text were created several new texts, but all shared a mutual textual pedigree. (416-17)

Dawson says “the diary is essentially a narrative of social accounting by a middling man on the make” and he goes on to list the many accounting terms which Pepys uses throughout the diary (422).

Most notable in Dawson’s article is his argument that most critical efforts when approaching Pepys seem to begin with the man, attempting to analyse him (including the assignment of motive) from a single text. Dawson maintains that such analyses should be reversed: “begin with Pepys’s text, establish the diary’s primary discursive context, and only then make tentative observations about the author.” He claims that Pepys’ writing of his misdemeanours in his *Diary* is not a form of self-discipline, as
many contend, but rather that it is the vows he made in the *Diary* that constitute his attempts to reform himself, and Dawson quotes Pepys (410):  

And so walked to St. Dunstans, where, it being not 7 a-clock yet, the doors were not open; and so I went and walked an hour in the Temple garden, reading my vows; which it is a great content to me to see how I am a changed man, in all respects for the better, since I took them – which the God of Heaven continue to me and make me thankful for. (3.167)  

He buys a box especially for the financial remunerations for his “sins” and records its use whenever he breaks the vows regarding his failures (3.230).  

Dawson states that Pepys’s mobility in the text “actually informs the whole text at the most fundamental level,” but he considers the text as a social diary because “it is irresolvably recursive in nature” in that the text of the *Diary* in its writing and rewriting relies upon reading other texts. “This multiple auditing leads, in turn, to the constant creation and recreation of a future oriented textual ethos separate from the “I” that held the pen that wrote the diary or made the fist which had blackened Elizabeth’s face” (431).  

Miriam Nandi is another writer who focuses on the *Diary* as writing rather than as a revelation of Pepys the man. She discusses Pepys's work as a forerunner in the genesis of the novel by probing the boundaries “between the diary and the novel and the structural affinities and commonalities between the two genres” (60) and this subject is discussed in this dissertation in Chapter 7. However I do not agree with her opinion that Pepys’s *Diary* is written “matter-of-factly” or that the text has “a rough, unfinished quality” (63). Dawson’s description, above, of the genesis of the *Diary* refutes this. Nandi’s study is hampered by being limited to the selections from the *Diary* in *The Illustrated Pepys*. 
Stuart Sherman focuses on the way Pepys presents time in the writing of his text. He suggests that “Within the diary, the language of sight colludes with the structures of time to forestall a totalizing discipline.” For instance an exclamation like “Lord, to see [this or that]” … “by its grammatical incompleteness, its absence of predication, offers a syntactic analogue for the watch-measured walk to Greenwich: both experiment and exclamation register the data but relinquish a measure of control” (105). Sherman also points out that as Pepys walked with his watch to Greenwich on business, feeling pleasure, he was “appropriating public time for private use” (105). The pleasure came from using a new watch which showed minutes, and so “enhanced chronometric autonomy many times over.” It allowed Pepys “in a convergence of precision (however illusory) with privacy that produces new data” which was not about the mechanism, nor even about what the time was, “but about the idiosyncratic motion of the solitary self through space and time” (87-88). Sherman explains:

Huygens’s clocks actually implemented new rules of engagement with passing time in order to measure the minutes: Pepys devised similar rules to track the days, as (on the available evidence) no one writing English had done before. The minute and the second hand purport to tell time not intermittently (as did the hour bell and the hour hand) but continuously, to provide a running tally. No English diary before Pepys moves literally day by day over the entire course of the document. Earlier diarists wrote more sporadically, for several reasons grounded in several textual traditions (35).

Sherman sees that “The day in Pepys’s narrative, like the minute on Huygen’s clocks is not just the index of measurement; it is the unit of innovation” (35-6).

Sherman (5), Stagl (2), Stevenson (3), and Tomalin (207) make reference to Pepys's “boyishness” which is expressed in the enthusiasm in his writing in the Diary
and which resembles the self-centredness of a child. Legouis and Cazamian have already been quoted as describing Pepys as a "child greedy for sensation." Other critics, such as Glaser, suggest that Pepys evolves as a moral being in the course of the Diary. She suggests that “in the act of giving a textual shape to his thoughts and feelings, Pepys may well have pursued the unacknowledged objective of reconciling the warring sides within himself and thus comes to terms with his nature” (210). Richard J. Ollard says “To have written the Diary clearly sets him apart from the ordinary run of humanity which it reflects and judges with such piercing discernment. Most men can brace themselves to the shock of self-knowledge provided that they can look away again quickly. Moral and intellectual courage of a high order is required for the sustained, relentless, clinical examination of the private world of thoughts and emotions as well as the half public one of actions and words” (19). Brooke Allen says, of the Diary, that Pepys had no autobiographical model to study (14), but Martin H. Stein says that “His skill in perceiving and evaluating reality must have been highly developed and closely related to his capacity to observe, discriminate, and record the workings of his own mind” (90).

There has been little attempt to place the Diary in the context of other diaries of the time. Guy de la Bédoyère briefly remarks on the difference he finds evident in the comparison of the diaries of Pepys and John Evelyn. Pepys in his, he concludes, has “vitality and lucidity [which] serve to diminish the rest of his life, whereas the “sterile portrait” of Evelyn in his “has remained in Pepys’s shadow ever since 1825” (Particular Friends 12).

Matthews writes seventeen pages of discussion and information on Pepys’s Diary as literature. These pages cover the care taken in the composition, which has been generally covered in this thesis by Dawson, but is given in more precise detail by
Matthews. The article discusses possible motives for the writing of the Diary, and how the writing has the sense of the “living moment,” both of which have been considered in this thesis also as “immediacy.” Matthews says of Pepys, “In his own bailiwick, and at his best, he is as much a non-pariel as are Chaucer and Shakespeare” (Latham and Matthews 1.cxiii).

(e) PEPYS’S DOCUMENTARY LEGACY

Those readers who are aware of Samuel Pepys’s Diary are often unaware that that illustrious work is not the only documentary inheritance he left. In fact, such evidence is diverse enough to be tabled in four sections: firstly, the Diary itself; secondly, The Navy White Book (NWB); thirdly, letters, office records and papers; and lastly the Catalogue he prepared of his extensive library bequeathed to Magdalene College, Cambridge, after his death, which occurred in 1703.

The NWB is a major element of Pepys’s documentary creation. It began life as a private office journal, Pepys’s own copy of daily naval affairs. It was published in 1995 and augments the Diary in many ways, as it is filled with much more detailed information about the workings of the ports and docks and shipping. It is also what I term Pepys’s “Insurance Book,” as it details many contretemps between Pepys and his superiors, which Pepys faithfully reports for himself when problems regarding contentious words with the senior members of the Board transpire. These conversations he records, sometimes word for word, in his meticulously documentative fashion. When there was incompetence among his colleagues of the Navy Board, and fraudulent undertakings by dockyard employees and cheating suppliers, Pepys removed himself from possible later suspicion by keeping records of instances he personally witnessed and experienced.
Pepys was a curious man, with a great thirst for knowledge, and so, with every new item of practical or theoretical interest he learned in the course of his duties, whether it was the sturdiness of materials for the ships’ sails, or the consistency of tar for the ropes, or unveiling tricks of suppliers claiming payment for “slops” (clothes) of seamen long dead, he often made notes on the subject in the NWB. He also entered lists such as a victualler’s allowance per man of alcohol and food (105), and tables comparing prices charged and those which could have been obtained more cheaply (106). It can be said that Pepys’s writing in the NWB adopts an educational style and commercial tone, providing an illuminating comparison with the Diary.

The remainder of the NWB is given over to Pepys’s answers to the criticisms of the financial mismanagement in the war made against the Navy Board by the Brooke House Commissioners. His recorded systematic answers to the accusations won him approbation from Charles II which showed, as Latham and Matthews note, “that the King had no doubt who was his best spokesman on affairs of the Navy” (1.x).

The NWB covers the period between 1664 and 1672, which includes the war with the Dutch in 1665-7 (NWB x). Pepys’s documentation here has proved invaluable to historians, as official records related to this conflict are scattered and incomplete (x). Pepys used his recordings in the NWB to enable him to become, later, the greatest authority on naval administration that England had ever produced.

Many of Pepys’s letters, or their copies, are still extant. J.R. Tanner edited a selection of Pepys’s correspondence from the period 1679-1703 which was published in 1926, followed by another book containing letters of the period 1662-79 which was published in 1929. This contained letters from Pepys’s letterbook which were of historical or biographical interest, of official and semi-official character, and some private family letters. However, not all were included, Tanner admitting to having
omitted many letters of a routine character. R.G. Howarth published letters from many sources in 1932 which covered the period 1655-1703. Edwin Chappell in 1933 transcribed and edited business letters and Helen Truesdell Heath published more private letters in 1955. Guy de la Bédoyère published in 1997 and 2005 books of letters which had been published before, but which also included 30 that were being published for the first time. This chapter gives an overview of the known whereabouts of the greater numbers.

The National Maritime Museum’s Library in Greenwich contains Pepys’s original letterbook, detailing, mostly in Pepys’s own longhand writing and some shorthand, copies of letters from the 1660s, primarily concerning official business, which he obviously regarded as confidential. After 1673, when he moved to the Admiralty “it became more of a record of private and semi-official matters” (Latham and Matthews 10.90). The book contains 940 letters, one third of which have been published in 1929 by J.R. Tanner, and in 1933 by E. Chappell (10.91).³

Pepys also left masses of manuscripts, papers and letters dealing with his official (and family) business, to posterity. They are not, unfortunately, in one place, as is his library, and a few are scattered as far afield as the USA. Most of them, though, remain in three other repositories other than in the Pepys Library at Magdalene College, Cambridge.

Eighty volumes of Pepys’s papers were bequeathed by the antiquary Richard Rawlinson to the Bodleian Library at Oxford where they are still extant. It is thought that the papers were put on the open market about 1747 when the Jackson family vacated the Clapham property (Latham and Matthews 10.90). Rawlinson acquired

³ A later edition, *The Letters of Samuel Pepys*, by Guy de la Bédoyère, which included letters never before published, was available April 2006.
them then, and had the loose papers bound. The volumes include accounts and letters from the diary period, and Pepys’s later Tangiers diary, and a large number of papers relating to the history of the Navy. Rawlinson included this Pepysian documentation when he bequeathed his other vast collections to the Bodleian in 1755 (10.90).

The Public Record Office in Kew, London, holds “the most voluminous single source of information about Pepys’s work in the ’60s” (10.91). Many of his office books and papers have been lost since 1688, but even so, the large volume of papers, mainly letters addressed to the Office, “are easy to consult since summaries, with indexes, have been published in the Calenders of State Papers Domestic—a shelf-full of large and well-organized volumes of which Pepys himself would have approved. To some extent the diary and Pepys’s related papers fill in the gaps they leave” (10.91). A further collection of Pepys’s papers held by his nephew and heir, John Jackson, passed into the hands of his descendants, the Pepys Cockerells, and were sold in 1931 into private possession, where they still remain (10. 91).

Another most impressive example of Pepys’s documentation is his thirty-five year in-the-making Catalogue of the contents of his library, now in Magdalene College, Cambridge. A walk round this library, with books symmetrically arranged according to size, numbered from 1 to 3000, encased in twelve beautifully carved seventeenth century presses, gives another insight into Pepys the collector and documenter. He started his catalogue on 17 December 1666, and finished with the help of his wife Elizabeth and his brother John. The first part was tabulated numerically and the second alphabetically, but neither was sectioned by subject. There are several copies of the Catalogue still extant. The original no longer exists. These copies contain not only records of his book collections, but give details of the large numbers of ballads he acquired, together with prints, drawings, music, maps, calligraphy, medieval and
modern manuscripts, and book bindings. Edward Ladborough in his article “The Sanctum of Sam Pepys” discusses the collections surrounding the Diary in The Pepys Library at Cambridge, proving “his insatiable curiosity, and the fact that everything was grist to his mill” (13).

At that stage Pepys had only enough books to fill two bookcases, so the first catalogue was finished by February 1667. In less than four years Pepys himself, or others at his request, produced three catalogues, none of which now survives (7.xii-xiii). Pepys continually replaced books with later editions so this meant many changes in documentation along the way. When the scope of Pepys’s collection and cataloguing are taken into account it is possible to realize how much documentation was required to keep track of every piece. The substantial 1700 catalogue (with additions made by John Jackson) quoted from here, is divided into seven categories:

I. Printed Books 3000 in number
II. Broadside Ballads 1740 in number.
IV. Music, Maps, and Calligraphy. 1000’s in albums.
VI. Bindings. Standard and Fine.

The reference for the Catalogue is tabled under Supella Literare Samuelis Pepys Vol.1.

It is important to realize that Pepys also had other working documents, for instance, those cataloguing his shorthand books, as well as catalogues of his Navy interests, hydrography and navigation. These were bound and probably completed by
Jackson and placed in the library after Pepys died. Just as an example of Pepys’s meticulousness, here is part of a collection which bears the long title:

A Catalogue & Alphabet to my books of Geography and Hydrography containing mapps, charts and other descriptions, in taille-douce, of countries, cities & townes, seas, coasts, harbours, & other places, domestick and forrein; resting in my library at its adjustment Midsummer 1693; and from thence by additions carry’d on to Midsummer 1695. And from thence by further additions to the completing of the library. (Catalogue 7.xiii)

This catalogue list in no way explains the enormity of the task in documenting its contents. It was a process which occupied Pepys in his retirement until shortly before he died.

From all the above it can be seen that the Diary alone is only a fragment of Pepys’s documentary legacy. As Harry Berger states, “Samuel Pepys was a creature of documentary culture and desire” (559). He invested a great deal of his energy in writing and collecting, designed to create a documentary self that would survive the ravages of failing memory and even mortality, and a remarkable portion of this self survives to the present. The Diary is but one element of Pepys’s documentary remains and an atypical one at that. To understand it one must understand its textuality, and the textual universe of which it is part.

(f) OUTLINE OF THE THESIS

The focus of this thesis is on the contrasting and unreconciled versions of Pepys which emerge from the Diary, especially in relation to the other documentation of his life which he created. Only in the Diary writing can we find, in the adult Pepys, traces of “the boy left behind.” This aspect is the subject of Chapter 2. Pepys's boyish enthusiasm bubbles up, time and again, when he imparts his delight with something or
somebody as “the best” of its kind that he has ever encountered. Chapter 3 explores the question of immediacy in Pepys's Diary, examining it as “kinetic specificity,” as Stuart Sherman terms it. The use of time as a measurement of distance is discussed in its relationship to the significance of how Pepys’s choice of words, itemizing his daily travels of urban space, are “akin to the effect that Joyce claimed to pursue in his narrative of Bloom’s single day” (67). Immediacy is manipulated into being by grammatical dexterity. The open potentiality of Jetzeit or “now time” signifies time waiting to be filled, and the emotions of Pepys’s protean faces, like quicksilver, oblige. Pepys is judgemental, instantly. In this chapter examples are given whereby the recorded ad hoc judgements, of persons especially, are sometimes proved by other documentation to be misleading.

Chapter 4 compares the two different Pepyses that are presented by the Diary and the NWB. The first shows his weakness in his indecisiveness, his broken vows, his immaturity, and his moral turpitude. In the second journal Pepys is the indefatigable, competent, forceful father of the professional Navy of the Restoration. In Chapter 5 I consider the style of Pepys's letters and the personality of the writer which they create. All these letters were sober in tone, even the family ones, with none of the merriment, or joy of living which the Diary text affords the reader. This chapter gives examples which show that in his letters, as in the NWB, Pepys presents himself as a man of strength and ambition, sure of his position on the public stage, with none of the insecurities we find in the Pepys of the Diary.

Chapter 6 discusses the double consciousness under which corruption is both revealed and denied in the Diary. Corruption in the seventeenth century was illegal but often condoned. Pepys writes that he rejoices in the “gifts” for himself and his wife for inside favours he received in the course of his daily work. Pepys tends to
keep an account of such receipts, but censors their illegality although honouring their existence. His sexual bribes are the cake in the bread and butter of his day. They are something to be enjoyed, written about for further titillation, but of no great consequence in the historical and business world where his probity can be maintained regardless.

In Chapter 7 I discuss the way in which Pepys writes about his contacts with lower-class women in the *Diary*. The erotic macaronic language he employs in the recounting dresses up the experiences. All those women, mostly married, are there, in his eyes, on an equal footing, that is, to be used. Only when his desires centre on a young woman of a somewhat higher social standing, who comes within his orbit of opportunity, does this daily balance of work and sexual play go awry. I argue that his recording of this affair is in a narrative rather than diurnal style.

Chapter 8 discusses three other seventeenth-century diaries to help locate the special characteristics of Pepys's *Diary*. The work of all three other contemporary diarists of the seventeenth century lack the intimate detail provided by Pepys, the protean faces which his writing exhibits, the immediacy of his writing, his merriment, and the special qualities of his use of language. John Evelyn’s diary records the life of a man of greater wealth and social standing than Pepys, a man of greater academic knowledge, a more experienced traveller and a man of much deeper piety. That of Bulstrode Whitelocke is perhaps not so well known, but it gives a close feel to the politics of the day, especially when he writes about Cromwell. Whitelocke was an Ambassador to Sweden, much against his will, and a great family man who writes in detail of his life with the three women he married and the seventeen children he fathered, with none of Pepys's uncertainties and fluctuations of identity. *The Diary of Roger Morrice* covers a later period in the century than that of Pepys, and centres on
James II and the fear of Catholicism taking precedence in Protestant England. This also serves as a finished and consolidated record of public affairs, rather than offering the moment-by-moment fluidity of Pepys’s *Diary*. 
CHAPTER 2
THE BOY LEFT BEHIND

There is nothing childlike in the Pepys we find in the text of the NWB and his public and private letters. While, through the Diary, the mature Pepys also mostly holds sway, there are also many occasions when Pepys’s immature behaviour allows us to see “the boy left behind.” This unresolved facet of Pepys's inner self provides a good instance of the protean Pepys of the Diary, which has not been sufficiently acknowledged in previous discussion of Pepys's work.

There are times, from the earliest entries to the later, when Pepys acknowledges himself that he is acting and feeling like a child. Pepys, always aware of his public image, seems anxious about his ongoing immaturity when he says in his Diary entry of 13 May 1665:

So home, and late at my office. But Lord, to see how much of my old folly and childishness hangs upon me still, that I cannot forbear carrying my watch in my hand in the coach⁴ all this afternoon, and seeing what a-clock it is 100 times. (6.101)

In documentation other than the Diary, both business and private, Pepys deliberately projects maturity and authority, both attributes for the position of responsibility he has, and a position he is always hoping to improve. Socially he likes to display himself as a man of consequence, and only in the text of the Diary does Pepys allow the reader to see this “boy left behind.”

But, who is the reader? We know that in the first instance it is Pepys himself, but it must be asked, “which Pepys is it?” In the above quotation there appear to be two Pepyses, of which the surprised Pepys is aware. One, is the mature Pepys, jealous of his public face, almost exhibiting fear in his wish to project the image of maturity his

⁴ This was probably a public vehicle, for Pepys did not own his own coach until 1688.
position demands, and two, the boyish Pepys, whose enthusiasm and wonderment at owning this new horologic masterpiece leads him to the overt behaviour in a public vehicle one would expect of a boy with a new toy. In fact, his boyishness often predominates the mature Pepys in the *Diary* when he exhibits his enthusiasm about almost everything new:

Sir W. Pen and I stayed to do business, and afterward together to White-hall, where I went to my Lord and found him in bed not well. And saw in his chamber his picture, very well done; and am with child till I get it copyed out, which I hope to do when he is gone to sea. (1.262)

Here again, he is hiding his boyishly exuberant enthusiasm, not wishing this to be evident to “my Lord”, by vowing to wait until he was out of the way.

Excitement of the physical type in children -- for example, running, skipping, screaming, hitting, jumping up and down--all denote a heightened emotion which, as an immature being, allows them to release and, at the same time, to communicate their feelings. Adults communicate their excitement with their voice, their eyes, and with maybe some not too extravagant gesture. Or they may, like Pepys, write of their childishly excited reactions with an overt use of superlatives and denigrations, which mark this exuberance of style as akin to a child’s physical enthusiasm. Although he may be describing a play he has seen, a book he has bought, a painting he has acquired, a meal he has eaten, Pepys attributes to it the zenith of its kind by describing it as the best in the world, the best he had ever seen, the best he had ever eaten, and so on. There are multitudinous examples of this, among which are:

18 May 1660. There is a sea-fight the best cut in Marble, with the Smoake the best expressed that ever I saw in my life. (1.145-6)

9 April 1661. Mr.Allen and two daughters of his, both very tall and the
youngest very handsome, so much as that I could not forbear to love her exceedingly - having, among other things, the best hand that ever I saw. (2.68)

9 May 1662. Thence to see an Italian puppet play that is within the rayles there, which is very pretty, the best that ever I saw, and great resort of gallants. (3.80)

20 April 1663. So to my office the remaining part of the morning, till towards noon, and then I went to Mr. Grants; there saw his prints which he showed me, and endeed are the best collection of any things almost that ever I saw, there being the prints of most of the greatest houses, churches and antiquitys in Italy and France, and brave cutts. (4.106)

2 August 1664. Thence to the King’s play-house and there saw Bartholomew fayre, which doth still please me and is, as it is acted, the best comedy in the world I believe. (5.230)

There are dozens of other examples all through the Diary where he uses ‘best’ superlatively. Conversely he uses ‘worst’ to describe disparate objects, subjects and occasions in like manner. For instance:

24 August 1660. My father came in and Dr T. Pepys, who talked with me in French a great while about looking out of a place for him. But I find him a weak man and speaks the worst French that ever I heard of one that hath been so long beyond sea. (1.230)

10 April 1661. Here we had, for my sake, two fiddles, the one a bass viall; on which he that played, played well some Lyra lessons, but both together made
the worst musique that ever I heard.  (2.71)

1 March 1662. Then my wife and I by coach, first to see my little picture that is a-drawing, and thence to the Opera and there saw Romeo and Julett, the first time it was ever acted. But it is the play of itself the worst that ever I heard in my life, and the worst acted that ever I saw these people do; and I am resolved to go no more to see the first time of acting, for they were all of them out more or less.  (3.39)

28 Feb 1664. Both before and after sermon I was most impatiently troubled at the Quire, the worst that ever I heard.  (5.67)

In contrast, Pepys’s NWB entries and letters exhibit a marked sobriety, but also an excessive level of detail, as if the incidents were being given as evidence to a judge in a court-room, so explicitly are they written:

But as to our former subject, Mr Gibson does tell me of another discouragement to seamen which never yet occurred to me but seems very considerable – viz. that whereas in all merchants’ service if a seaman deserts the ship at the beginning or during the voyage he indeed forfeits his wages, but if it be at the end after the ship is come into port, he forfeits no more than the master’s charge in hiring another to do his work in the delivery of the ship. Our practice in the King’s service is such, that if after a ship is come into port, lying there without anything to do but in expectation of being paid off, and this after being abroad a year; if, I say, at this time a seaman either for health, business, visiting of his family, or, it may be, pleasure, shall not attend on board, though there be nothing for him to do, nay and the King be profited by his absence in the saving of his victuals and might also save his wages during
his absence, yet this will not suffice, but that the seaman shall forfeit all his wages past. Which (for instance) is the present case of one Thomas Haggon now petitioning the Board, who coming as a volunteer to serve Capt. Scott and served him as a midshipman fourteen months in the *Victory Prise* and therein continued a week after her coming in to be laid up, then with his captain’s leave went on shore to visit his friends and happening to marry in the interval, which was five weeks before the ship’s being paid, and in that time being missed at his musters, he was denied his whole pay for the voyage and is still so now the ship has been paid off above ten months, and Capt. Scott himself not only certifying the truth of the premises but at this day soliciting for him as for a very able and deserving seaman, and who by his coming in as a volunteer and serving as a midshipman cannot be reasonably judged a runaway. Which practice of the Navy seems very well worth considering; and the rather for that at the same time I do remember that the absences of seamen have been punished by defalcation of wages only for the time they have been absent, though absent for six weeks, without forfeiting any more. Which latter practice condemns the former, and while both are continued bewrays unsettledness in our methods. *Vide* what was done at the King’s coming in to the 65 ships then lying long in expectation of being paid off, when, as I remember, leave was published to the men to visit their friends with the forfeiture only of their victuals.  

(232-33)

He does not record that he condemns the treatment of the seamen as the “worst” he has seen, or that Captain Scott considers Thomas Haggon the “best” sort of midshipman he could have serving him, which contrasts with Pepys’s constant use in the *Diary* of two repetitious superlatives. It is as if, in the *Diary*, Pepys has only two
immature definitions, “good” or “bad,” and the words “best” and “worst” are the optimum choices such as a child would use to create excitement for attention, because on the occasions when Pepys uses these two words of hyperbole, it is apparent that it is unlikely that he has really experienced the best and worst of the situations he is describing. These words are used so often that they could be routine value-centred expressions just as “up” and “so to bed” are temporal ones in that they are chronological markers signifying the beginning and the end of the day. The practice of his describing incidents as the “best” and the “worst” could well be considered as a child-like regression to emotional exaggeration. De la Bédoyère suggests that this practice of repetition was only for speed, but then why not use “good” or “bad”, why use the superlative?

Another of Pepys’s traits in the Diary indicative of “boyishness” is excessive curiosity. The Pepys of the Diary has this in abundance, as he acknowledges 30 September 1661 when the feuding French and the Spanish come to pay respects to Charles II. Pepys is dashing round London hoping to get a glimpse of each country’s coaches and retinue:

But I, as I am in all things curious, presently got to the waterside and there took oares to Westminster-palace, thinking to have seen them come in thither with all the coaches; but they being come and returned, I run after them with my boy after me, through all the dirt and streets full of people; till at last at the mews I saw the Spanish coach go, with 50 drawne swords at least to guard it and our soldiers shouting for joy [...]. (2.188)

---

5 De la Bédoyère asserts this in a talk, yet to be published, to the members of The Samuel Pepys Club, May 2010.
Again with boyish enthusiasm, he describes, in his superlative fashion a present of a scotoscope he is given, as “a curious curiosity” (5.240). In June 1666 he is still enthusing youthfully when visiting the lodging of W. Hewer, “After supper into his chamber, which is mighty fine, with pictures and everything else very curious – which pleased me exceedingly” (7.152).

Pepys’s library collection is evidence of his curiosity in itself, the three thousand books covering myriad subjects, many of which Pepys studied. Justin Stagl states that curiosity can be defined as:

- the urge to explore unknown situations:… Ethologists and psychologists seem to agree that curiosity is a directed activity involving locomotion and the senses; has something to do with new or unknown situations; is closely connected with play; and leads to indirect, long-range advantages in the form of learning. (2)

When Pepys was, at first, an inexperienced member of the Navy Board, the Diary Pepys tells us how, with boyish enthusiasm, he threw himself into learning everything he possibly could about the King’s ships and how to keep them supplied and maintained. He did a great deal of travelling, mostly by boat, sometimes by coach, sometimes on horseback, and sometimes by foot to The Royal Exchange, hurrying between all the shipyards and docks and to the Navy Board offices and Charles II’s court. Pepys could sometimes appear immaturely overexuberant in his passion to learn, and he was just as enthusiastically curious to see and hear about all sorts of social gossip and exotic activities as he was to gain the knowledge he needed to send him up the ladder of success. Tomalin points out Pepys’s curiosity is so squarely centred on himself as a character, that he rarely gives us, as John Evelyn does, a
formal character portrait of his friends and acquaintances. Like a self-centred teenager, “everyone else revolved round him in his place at the centre of the universe” (88).

There is one instance, at least, when he really cannot understand anyone not being curious. On 30 April 1663 he arrived home midday for dinner to find his father and W. Stankes there and he writes:

But Lord, what a stir Stankes makes with his being crowded in the streets and wearied in walking in London, and would not be woo’d by my wife and Ashwell to go to a play nor to White-hall or to see the Lyons, though he was carried in a coach. I never could have thought there had been upon earth a man so little curious in the world as he is. (4.118)

Pepys’s opinion of the dismal Stankes contrasts with Richard Ollard’s perception of Pepys’s youth in the Diary, when he writes “spiritually and mentally his arteries never hardened” (17).

When we meet Pepys first in the Diary, his foot is on the bottom rung of the ladder, anxious to know who was to rule England: Monck, Parliament, or Charles II. He did not know where his clerkship would lead him, but his hopes, hearing Montagu’s promise, were high. With the adventurousness of youth, Pepys would start his day on his travels around London, often having no knowledge in the morning where his travels would take him, who he would meet at The Exchange, Westminster, the office, or with whom he would converse, King or commoner, where or what he would eat or with whom, and what news he would gather. With the headlong impetuosity of youth he seemed never to have nothing to do. If there was a space of time he would fill it. Pepys recorded time with his actions (as explained in Chapter three). These actions were necessary for him to forge ahead until he was in control. When he was later threatened with prison and disgrace he fought furiously to clear his
name, which he did. He was full of hope, which so often abounds in youth; and this sentiment he expresses in the *Diary* 729 times.

During his first impecunious years as a clerk, hope was for financial security as he accounted for his monetary balance every last day of the month, watching with boyish glee as the amount increased, and tabling it in his *Diary* from the end of May 1662 when the credit balance was 530 pounds. At the end of August 1665 he is still expressing his joy:

> So home: and all day, till very late at night, setting my Tanger and private accounts in order, which I did in both – and in the latter, to my great joy do find myself yet in the much best condition that ever I was in – finding myself worth 2180l and odd, besides plate and goods which I value at 250l more […].

(6.207)

As his wealth rapidly increased, the recording of the monthly balances disappeared, and boyish delight at seeing it on paper was either not prudent or outgrown. An almost lifelong hope of youth is expressed on 2 March 1662 when the impecunious Pepys writes in his *Diary*, “talking long with my wife about our frugall life for the time to come, proposing to her what I could and would do if I were worth 2000l; that is, be a Knight and keep my coach…” (D.3.40). When he started the *Diary* he had 25 pounds, when he ended it he had 10,000 pounds (Tomalin 87). The coach came in 1688 when he was worth 8000 pounds; the knighthood never (3.30. n.1).

Pepys also exhibits a childlike simplicity on many occasions. This enabled him to bring himself down to the level of children of whom he writes fondly, such as when he visits Mrs. Jem and her children and other children of his friends. He also appears at first childishly simple when his Uncle Wight begins to pay overt bodily attention to Elizabeth. Even when his wife alerts him that when Uncle Wight visits her, knowing
he will find Elizabeth alone, he is physically insinuating, Pepys shrugs off her misgivings:

And anon comes my uncle Wight and my aunt with their Cozen Mary and Robert, and by chance my Uncle Tho. Pepys [...]. They being gone, my wife did tell me how my Uncle did this day accost her alone and spoke of his hopings she was with child; and kissing her earnestly, told her he should be very glad of it; and from all circumstances, methinks he doth seem to have some intention of good to us, which I shall endeavour to continue more than ever I did yet. (5.14)

Three days later Uncle Wight turns up to play cards with Elizabeth who was again alone:

And is mighty inquisitive to know whether she is with child or no – which makes me wonder what his meaning is; and after all my thoughts, I cannot think, unless it be in order to the making his Will, that he might know how to do by me. (5.16)

A week later Pepys records:

After supper, home; and my wife tells me mighty stories of my uncles fond and kind discourses to her today, which makes me confident that he hath thoughts of kindness for us, he repeating his desire for her to be with child – for it cannot enter into my head that he should have any unworthy thoughts concerning her. (5.24)

The following month there is another visit. Pepys writes:

So back and after setting there a good while – we home; and going, my wife told me how my uncle, when he had her alone, did tell her that he did love her as well as ever he did, though he did not find it convenient to show it publicly
for reasons on both sides; seeming to mean, as well to prevent my jealousy as
his wife’s. But I am apt to think that he doth mean us well, and to give us
something if he should die without children. (5.55)

After yet after another visit from Uncle Wight, his machinations are revealed 11 May
1664 when he openly proposes to Elizabeth that he father her a child. Pepys writes,
“He commended her body and discoursed that for all he knew the thing was lawful”
(5.145). Even so, though Pepys at last realizes his uncle’s fondness for Elizabeth is
lust, he still decides to say nothing “till I have thought better of it” (5.146). Obviously
he was not mature enough to handle the situation.

Pepys throughout the *Diary* is ever on the lookout for financial gain. During the
incidents of Uncle Wight’s attempts on Elizabeth’s virtue Pepys has boyishly shown
his lack of worldliness in this situation in primarily believing that the attentions of his
uncle to his wife must be one of intending financial benevolence, as he was a close
family member with no children of his own.

For all Pepys’s dalliances he was still ignorant about homosexuality until he was
thirty years old:

But blessed be to God, I do not to this day know what is the meaning of this
sin, nor which is the agent nor which the patient. (4.210)

Here, as Tomalin states, “we are hearing the voice of the puritan boy” (207). This is a
surprising admission from Pepys considering that he had attended Cambridge
University where his education would have been broadened. Evidence for the
University’s gay past can be found from as early as 1619, in a memorial in Christ's
College Chapel (Sherlock 151).

Pepys’s childlike ingenuousness is highlighted when he loves to hear, from
travellers especially, their stories of foreign lands; and from sea-faring men, tales of
their exploits; or gossipy stories of happenings at court, stories of things he has not witnessed himself, but which excite him enough to record them in his *Diary* to make them live again in a document.

In spite of his own lack of embarrassment in tabling his, and his household’s several excremental accidents (3.57 and 4.155-56), his mature frankness deserts him when he cannot carry off with aplomb finding Lady Jem in his dining room:

> I perceive by my dear Lady's blushing that in my dining-room she was doing something upon the pott; which I also was ashamed of and so fell to some discourse, but without pleasure […] (5.129)

Stuart Sherman also refers to Pepys’s ‘childlike astonishment’ when he points out how often the diarist prefaces wondrous encounters with ‘But Lord to see this!’… Or ‘Lord to see that!’ (5).

Mostly, boys enjoy the rough and tumble of sport, and often mature into following or taking part in physical games. We do not read in the *Diary* that Pepys ever indulges in competitive sport, but he does very much indulge in a solo private sport with the seeking out, the challenge, the victory he hopes will ensue from his chasing women for sexual gratification. This is acknowledged also to be a pursuit followed by mature men, but Tomalin paints for us a rather immature figure of a Pepys who is often pathetically unsuccessful in his endeavours, for the truth is, she says, “he had not much sexual confidence” (207) as he admits 1 April 1667, even though he has recorded dalliances for several years:

> […] walked (fine weather) to Deptford and there did business and so back again; walked, and pleased with a jolie femme that I saw going and coming in the way, which yo could aver sido contented para aver stayed with if yo could
have ganar acquaintance con ella; but at such times as those I am at a great loss, having not confidence, ni alguno ready wit. (8.141)
The sport was, for him, the searching out, during his many business journeys on foot by day, possibilities of short trysts with the lower-class women he could browbeat or cajole into acquiescence. This random sex for Pepys was a physical need just as he needed food, like a hungry boy who has yet to experience the joys of a discerning palate and eats because his body demands it.

Although he fantasizes about making love to women on a higher social plane, even to the King’s mistress, he dare not approach them. Pepys knows that he lacks maturity in wit and sophistication and fears rejection. He also fears for his reputation. Successfully gaining some sexual gratification sometimes seems of less importance than his success in obtaining it. The chase, the challenge, is more titillating and desirable. He can record the outcome as a prize he had attained, when writing up his Diary, like a boy winning a ribbon for coming first in a running race at school. Once he had recorded what he did, or was done to him, it was referred to no more. The chase was finished. Over the years, Pepys had different servant women in his household who were there whenever he desired, but the sport of going out to hunt for it fulfilled a boyish enjoyment of a physical rough and tumble.

The boyishness of Pepys contrasts with the paternalistically authoritative attitude he adopts with his parents and members of his family, although they contribute to this by their dependency. His mother is not mentioned a great deal (Pepys would not have been proud of her former washerwoman employment), and his father could not have been much of a role model for the boy. Pepys was away at school in Brampton in his early years, until he came back to London when aged about fourteen to go to St. Paul’s School. His exceptional ability saw him awarded a scholarship to Cambridge
when he was seventeen (Tomalin 37). Later, and before he became a clerk in 1660, he lived in the Montagu ménage, when, despite his youth, he was trusted by General Montagu to take over the responsibility of caring for this relative’s wife and children and other family members and visitors, and of keeping the General informed on all matters, political and private, while he served at sea.

Living in the large country residence of General Montagu at Huntingdon, meeting the wealthy and aristocratic friends and acquaintances of his employer, obviously gave Pepys a taste of what it would be like to live such a privileged life, one which he states that he aspires to in the Diary (3.39-40), which often gives rise to his complaints against Elizabeth for bad housekeeping (1.308) and inappropriate dressing (3.110).

At this stage he is acutely aware that he has a distinct lack of the backing necessary to be accepted in such social circles. He has no family money, no family prestige, and not even a close rapport with his parents, who, in any case, were unable to offer guidance for the social standing he wished to achieve. Pepys was already more educated than his family, and the gulf must have become more obvious as time went on.

Nevertheless, now a clerk to General Montagu at twenty-seven, Pepys, this poor tailor’s son, found himself travelling with the General to Holland to pick up the soon to be restored Charles II. This meant that the exuberance of youth had to be cloaked in his newfound public persona of responsibility, so that only in the Diary could he let the observations and actions of the boy left behind jump out onto the pages for him to commune with, as he embodied him in documentation which survives to this day.

However, Pepys’s boyishness never comes to a crisis, or causes any outward personal or business problems. It is a Pepys self which is represented only in the
Diary, and which contrasts sharply with the sober, mature Pepys extant in the NWB and in his letters. It is a persistent element in the text of the Diary, a source of some anxiety to Pepys himself, and one aspect of the protean Pepys which the Diary reveals.
CHAPTER 3
TEMPORALITY AND IMMEDIACY

In his Diary writing Pepys is not trying to forge a distinct self over a period of time. We see multiple selves in this work. Other diarists of the seventeenth century had not presented themselves in this way. Other diarists recorded different events, but portrayed themselves as one consistent character. Pepys does this in his letters, and in the NWB, but not in his Diary. Yet these different Pepyses run in a concurrent time frame.

The immediacy of Pepys’s Diary gives us a portal into glimpses of lived time (Sherman 34). Kairos (a point in time filled with significance), is surrounded by the chronos of passing time, wherein Pepys exhibits his protean faces. It could be asked if the multiple selves of the Diary to which Pepys introduces us make up a single Pepys. The answer is “no”. The Diary Pepys is not introspective in a narrative sense. He is not the hero of his own story. Pepys is not producing himself as a consistent fictional character of emotive depth. He states his emotions throughout the text, “I was vexed”, “I was merry”, and never spends time delving into long psychological explanations. One could argue that it is this that gives the Diary its disjointed immediacy.

Stuart Sherman terms this immediacy “kinetic specificity”, which he considers is “akin to the effect that Joyce claimed to pursue in his narrative of Bloom’s single day” (67). By this he means the way Pepys itemizes his daily traversals of urban space. He says the reader becomes aware of “a sense of many motions closely mapped” (67). Indeed one sees this in Pepys’s obsession with his newly acquired watch. As discussed in the previous chapter, the boyish face his writing sometimes affords us is shown in his immediately apparent glee in the watch’s ownership, as he records in the Diary on 13 May 1665. His fascination, written again into the Diary four months later, is then enhanced by the practicality of being able to calculate the
time the journey took from one place to another. Rather than being measured by actions, or roughly by hours, his travels were now able to be calibrated in a minutely serial form, although Sherman states that:

In the 1660’s, Huygensian chronometry and Pepysian narrative… were not wholly new in conception: Galileo had thought of the pendulum, and clocks had borne minute hands before Huygens’s innovation [but the balancing spring giving detailed timing was not innovated before 1675]…(35)

Pepys was now able to measure distance not by miles but by time:

Up, and walked to Greenwich, taking pleasure to walk with my minute wach in my hand, by which I am now come to see the distances of my way from Woolwich to Greenwich. And do find myself to come within two minutes constantly to the same place at the end of each quarter of an hour. (6.221-22)

The items Pepys documents in the day’s recording are often subjectively discrete, yet over each diurnal period they form one confined repository. There is very little continuity of content (the dancing master episodes [Chap.7], the Deb Willett affair [Chap.7], the plague [Chap.3], and the Great Fire [Chap.1] excluded), but the days make up a serial time-set on the calendrical grid. Thus, Pepys’s fascination with his watch relates to his day’s journeyings and their eventual (temporal) transformation into the written word. The result is that space becomes time.

Sherman characterizes Pepys’s writing strategy in the *Diary* as an attempt to “realize the fullness” of clock time. He writes that the division of the *Diary* into uniform durations is a marker of Pepys’s need to fill them. As he states:

The uniform durations, provisionally blank, are seen by the diarist both to require filling (by experience in life, by inscription on the page) and also to facilitate it. The days function as isochronic containers [occupying equal time]
that in the uniformity, specificity, and seriality of their temporal dimensions make it possible to reckon fullness and hence to ‘realize’ it: to embody it palpably on the page. The date makes fullness necessary and makes it possible. Pepys’s *Diary* figures homogenous time as full rather than empty by a strategy of double containment: a plenum of narrative within each day, and a plenum of narrated days within the calendar. Measure defines narrative obligation; the fulfilment of the obligation produces temporal fullness in text. Each event recounted within the diary occupies a space ‘in the fullness of time’ so constructed and contained. (34-5).

However, while Sherman is correct in regards to the “serial quality” of the *Diary*, he makes too much of the concept of homogeneity. While Pepys does “serially” fill in time in the *Diary* -- in effect, transforming *kairos* into *chronos*— time is not homogenous within the entries themselves. Pepys “plays around” with time, inasmuch as some events are given greater or lesser significance. Their temporal presentation is either lengthened or shortened. Those events that are significant to Pepys are dwelt on in great detail with the result that time “slows,” while other events he mentions in passing (often of great social or historical import) are “speeded up.” The curious thing is that there is little rhyme or reason for what Pepys deems to be significant and thus worthy of being “slowed”. The different, and disjointed, temporalities within each entry point us towards Pepys’s multiple selves. Homogenous time, as Sherman would have it, leads to a homogenous self, but this is not what is occurring within the *Diary* entries.

Pepys uses *Diary* time to record “doing,” not so much “thinking.” The various emotions Pepys writes into the *Diary* do not fit together. When he visits women for dalliance he expresses no emotion at all; he just states what he does, allowed or not.
He will describe a meal, and then state his enjoyment or otherwise, but nothing more. If he sees a play, or hears a sermon, he records whether he liked it or not, maybe whether he liked the actors or the ministers, but that is all. There is no long discussion. For the most part he appears as a surface Pepys. There are exceptions, however, when he writes of his perceptions of beauty.

All the protean selves Pepys writes in the *Diary* have different senses of immediacy, because they exist in the time of *kairos* and *chronos*. The significant moment, and the prosaic time of chronicity, merge into a life that projects forward to the image of a gentleman walking beside his coach. Yet the immediacy linked to *kairos*, generated by the writing of these selves, seems to authenticate the truth of each self at that moment in time. Does the ability to move fluidly between different selves undermine the authenticity of each self, which seems to be guaranteed by immediacy?

It does seem that the reader of the *Diary* accepts and connects with the selves Pepys writes as they appear. Immediacy is “now” time when a person acts before thought, and that is what Pepys appears to do so often in each diurnal period. This has affinities with Walter Benjamin’s notion of *Jetzeit* or *now-time* which signifies the open potentiality of the present moment (time waiting to be filled), as opposed to the narrative-like constructions of the future and the past (qtd. in Sherman, 34). This reveals the (unwitting) sophistication of Pepys’s *Diary* entries; we feel we are in the immediate present with him as he is relating them, yet, they are carefully worked over and revised pieces of writing. Of course, the open potentiality of *Jetzeit* also points us towards the openness, in the *Diary*, of Pepys’s protean selves.

He goes here, he goes there. If the person he seeks is absent he goes somewhere else. He often goes looking for things to happen or fishing for people to see. That is
what he writes. But there are two sides to this element which spark immediacy. One is the craft of the author as he works this up, and the second the work the reader does in exploring the mysteries represented by this body of writing. By exploring it one can see a lot of different dimensions; for example, how writing operates between writer and reader, and the way multiple selves can be communicated through writing.

As stated in Chapter 1, several critics of the past have had the common view that the *Diary* is “transparent” in its writing, and that its major use is as a reference for the social history of the seventeenth century, but my proposition is that this work is much more complicated.

The aggregate of Pepys’s wealth marked down at the end of every month in his impecunious years is analogous to the words he writes in the *Diary*, for each day’s accounting of his actions is building up the solid body of self which *he* will allow to be whole when he walks beside his coach “like every other gentleman” (9.557). The temporality of the *Diary* is measured by the lineal growth of Pepys both financially and by the accumulation of words in the entries. Each pound earned, or accumulated otherwise, is added and documented in the *Diary* month by month, in the early years, and more sporadically over time as his position improves. Pepys appears to write diurnally, each day’s recordings represented separately, yet incrementally, when he does his monthly tally.

There is the self he sees while he is writing, the multiplicity of selves he exposes to the reader over time in his writing, and the end point in time when he envisages himself as a wealthy and influential gentleman. The words he is writing down are like his counting of his money. Both are materialistic. Both lead, in time, to his objective of wealth and power as a “gentleman.” Pepys sees the movement in time towards this end when he chooses to write in the *Diary* the exact twenty-four hour period in which
he received a letter addressed to ‘Samuel Pepys Esqr’ (1.96-7). An Esquire was rated even higher than a gentleman (1. 97 n.1). This is an acknowledged, and documented, stepping stone on his early journey of upward mobility. He publicly emerged from being “Mr. Pepys”, to “Samuel Pepys, Esquire,” in the eyes of the watching world the following summer when he became Clerk of the Acts. One can think of Pepys’s “self” here as the “self as social words.”

To Pepys, high social standing and the power of wealth are embodied in the future when he will not only own the symbolic coach, but, more importantly, also be seen to be the owner of a coach, as the following quotation, very near the end of the Diary, 19 May 1669 exemplifies:

> With my coach to St. James, and there, finding the Duke of York gone to muster his men in Hyde-park, I alone with my boy thither; and there saw more, walking out of my coach as other gentlemen did […] (9.557)

Thus language, particularly social language, plays a performative role in the Diary entries.

A style of writing with literary immediacy (an effect of language and imagination as William Matthews says in the introduction to Pepys’s Diary [1.cv]), is one of the facets of the Diary’s distinctiveness, as it verbally clicks from one incident to another, like photographic snapshots, as its immediacy temporally constructs the present. Pepys jumbles people, food, places, music, meetings, work into an unplanned twenty-four hour period, filling up time as he fills each page of his journal. As Sherman expresses it “Pepys endeavours throughout to foster the textual illusion of temporal continuity; it is a critical (though tacit) stipulation of his narrative contract” (34). Perhaps Sherman is not quite accurate in using the term “narrative” here, for narrative implies a story in which a character is transformed in some way, and although in the
Diary Pepys becomes more experienced, he is not “transformed.” The disconnectedness of the prose mirrors the multiplicity of the protean faces of Pepys that it exposes.

There is plenty of evidence that Pepys rewrote and revised parts of the Diary entries from rough notes (for example, different coloured inks used, sentences squashed in small spaces, and the unentered notes bound into the last volume of the Diary). Matthews tells us:

Pepys seems to have treated the re-writing as an opportunity for imaginative re-entry into the recent past represented by his rough notes, and also for making all those changes that contribute to immediacy in the literary sense--the selection and combination of details, the effects of conversation, the injection of judgement words, the retention of some details that were reported while he was in the very act of writing the rough notes and the addition of others that occurred while he wrote the fair form. (cvi)

Taking Matthews’s points in order, while expanding on his claims, there are indeed many examples which support his contentions regarding the diarist’s use of text which contribute to an effect of immediacy.

Pepys writes, supposedly daily, of trivialities, and family tragedies, which he juxtaposes with his work and historically important events, alongside his attempts to enjoy sexual gratification with women. In one day’s entry we see the face of the profligate Pepys, the sober, hardworking officer of the Naval Board, the social, gossipy Pepys, the historian Pepys, and the compassionate neighbour. All these are contained in one day’s entry on June 18th 1667 where he writes, in part:

Up, and did this morning dally with Nell and touch her […]. To the office, and there all the morning. Peg Penn came to see me, and I was glad of it; and did
resolve to have tried her this afternoon [...]. Dined at home, W. Hewer with me; and then to the office and to my Lady Penn’s, and did find occasion for Peg to go home with me to my chamber [...] and I lost my hope. So to the office; and by and by word was brought me that Commissioner Pett is brought to the Tower and there laid up close prisoner [...]. (8.276)

Pepys then describes his fear of meeting the same fate as the Commissioner, and prepares his defence. He goes on:

Great news tonight of the blowing up of one of the Duch greatest ships while a council-of-war was on board; the latter part, I doubt, is not so, it not being confirmed since; but the former, that they had a ship blown up, is said to be true. This evening comes Sir G. Carteret to the office to talk of business at Sir W. Batten’s; where all to be undone for want of money, there being none to pay the Chest at their public pay the 24th of this month, which will make us a scorn to the world. (8.277)

Pepys then tells us of Sir G. Carteret’s long conversation about finances, his hopes of relinquishing his naval post with profit, then interrupts it with:

My Lady Jem goes down to Hinchingbrooke to lie down—because of the troubles of the times here.

Then he follows this immediately with:

He [Sir G. Carteret] tells me he is not sure that the King of France will not annoy us this year […] He tells me now the great Question is, whether a Parliament or no Parliament; and says the Parliament itself cannot be thought able at present to raise money, and therefore it will be to no purpose to call one.

And he finishes, confrontingly, with “I hear this day poor Michell’s child is dead”
In this one entry Pepys has briefly recounted each incident for the day and given his, and others’ impressions of life around them, with such clarity, brevity, and diversity, that the whole day’s entry seems to be crowded with interesting people, in one spectroscopic view bound together in the immediacy of time and space.

Much of the *Diary* follows a similar pattern, with the exception, as stated, of his novelistic accounts of the Plague, the Great Fire, and the trauma surrounding Deb Willet.

Pepys embellishes information with conversational expressions of piety. For example, he frequently starts a sentence with “But Lord…” and this sentence can herald a sad statement, a statement of affront, an amusing happening, or an expression of wonder, but the use of such an example of personal interjection gives the impression of the writer immediately speaking to the reader just as, originally, the expression was used to invoke the Lord’s attention to whatever affected the speaker, so strongly, as to call upon His instantaneous attention. However, in the *Diary*’s examples, the invocation is to alert the reader to the writer’s response to a particular situation.

Unlike “But Lord”, Pepys’s constant references to “God,” although he was not a devoutly religious man, and attended church more as a social convention (and to gaze upon pretty women), also contribute to the conversational tone of the *Diary*. He praises God, he pleads with God, he vows before God, he acknowledges God’s intervention for his good fortune in money and position, and all are made in the immediacy of the moment as the circumstances arise as he communes with himself and his Maker as he writes. This, though, is the quasi-religious Pepys whose
Protestant faith has to be seen to be practised, especially as an accusation of Popery could lead to a detention in the Tower.

As a conversational expression, it is clear that Pepys is using such entries as “Blessed be God” as an expression of gratitude (or maybe ‘insurance’) (1.1). Similarly he blesses God when he writes, “and I find him [Montagu] to be above 80l in my debt” (1.269); for his [Pepys] having “a great deal of good Household stuffe” (1.279); and that “I could diligently fallow my business” (3.244). He blesses God throughout the Diary even near to its end on 22 March 1669 when he blesses God for Coventry’s return home after he had been imprisoned in the Tower (9.493). Interestingly, he has replaced the word “thank” with “bless” on this occasion, so, to him, there was a difference.

William Matthews, in his introduction to the Diary, includes the opinion that the Diary’s style “is close to ordinary speech, although it is more economical” (1.civ). It is the feeling that Pepys is often speaking conversationally, in phatic communication in terms of Pepys’s relationship with the reader, or God, while reporting confronting or other emotional situations, which supports the immediacy claim.

As well as adopting some of the characteristic locutions of conversation, Pepys also gained an effect of immediacy by referring to sources in conversation for that which he reports. Much of Pepys’s knowledge of his social and historical world is gained (apart from his many books) from his daily conversational encounters. He recounts not only information gained from his own communicative experiences, but also those of his colleagues who, in turn, divulge the contents of conversations they have had with various other contacts. There are instances which give the impression that Pepys writes these up as if they were freshly garnered that day. They all add up to diverse information, which swells the “daily” entries of the journal into motley
situations and venues which create a sensation of present happening, where we see the many selves of Pepys which he exposes to the reader if not to his communicants. This is also the face of the acquisitive Pepys who gathers knowledge, in the same way that he traverses London, as stated, to gather to himself his experiences of the day with which to embellish his Diary. The relatively long entry of June 4th 1664 exemplifies this:

Up and to St. James’s by coach (after a good deal of talk before I went forth with J. Noble, who tells me that he will secure us against Cave – that though he knows and can prove it, yet nobody else can prove it to be Tom’s child – that the bond was made by one Hudson, a scrivener next to the Fountain tavern in the old Bailey [...] and there up to the Duke and was with him, giving him an account how matters go [...]. [my emphasis] (5.167)

Pepys then tells how he advised the Duke of the necessity to “Presse” seamen to man the ships, after which he says:

This morning Captain Ferrer came to the office to tell me that my Lord hath given him a promise of Young’s place in the Wardrobe; and hearing that I pretend a promise to it, he comes to ask my consent; which I denied him, and told him my Lord may do what he please with his promise to me, but my father’s condition is not so as that I should let it go if my [Lord] will stand to his word. And so I sent him going, myself being troubled a little at it.

After office I with Mr. Coventry by water to St. James, and dined with him and had excellent discourse from him. [my emphasis]

Then Pepys meets Lord Fitzharding, goes home to supper and bed. At the end of the same day’s entry he adds a record of Mr. Coventry’s earlier conversation:
Mr. Coventry, *discoursing this noon* about Sir W Batten (what a sad fellow he is), *told me* how the King *told him* the other day how Sir W. Batten, being in the ship with him and Prince Rupert when they expected to fight with Warwicke, did walk up and down sweating, with a napkin under his throat to dry up his sweat. And that Prince Rupert, being a most Jealous man, and particularly of Batten, doth walk up and down, *swearing bloodily* to the King that Batten had a mind to betray them today, and that the napkin was a signall; “But by God!” *says he*, “if things go ill, the first thing I will do is to shoot him.” [my emphasis] (5.168-69)

Pepys in the *Diary* is a very judgemental character, and he writes us many examples of his own, sometimes unabashedly unkind, judgements of people with whom he comes in contact every day. Temporally, the judgement he passes arrests the subject in the status he affords them in the present: for example they *are* brave, they *are* untrustworthy, they *are* pretty. By ‘fixing’ them in such a fashion in his writing, Pepys positions individuals consistently in a way that he never does with himself. While his “self ” is fluid and multiple, others are characterized like inert objects. Judgementally, his love of beauty makes him unrelenting in his derogatory descriptions of homely-looking women:

[…] And she would not let him come to bed to her, out of jealousy of him and a ugly wench that lived there lately -- the most ill-favoured slut that ever I saw in my life (2.90).

[…] and at noon by Coach by invitacion to my Uncle Fenners, where I find his new wife, a pitiful, old, ugly, illbread woman in a hatt, a midwife (3.16).
They have a kinswoman they call daughter in the house, a short, ugly, red-haired slut that plays upon the virginalls and sings, but after such a country manner, I was weary of it but yet could not but commend it (4.242).

Sermons also are judged almost on a weekly basis in the early years of the Diary; indeed he applauds the preacher on the very first day in his journal entry of January 1st 1660 when he writes of hearing “a very good sermon” (1.3). What he comments on are not the words of holy guidance and support, but, quite often, the preacher’s delivery of the eulogy. In the following few months the sermons are judged as “eloquent” (1.25), “lazy poor” (1.26) [Pepys attended church twice that day], “excellent” (1.32), “good honest” (1.42), and “very gallant” (1.91). Pepys offers judgement on sermons all through the years of the Diary, but it is noticeable that by the last few months of the journal’s entries in 1669, he not only does not always use judgement words, he does not always appear to attend church, possibly due to the problem with his eyes. Nevertheless, he still records that the preacher subjected him to “a dull sermon” on both 25 April 1669 (9.533) and 9 May 1669 (9.548). We are always brought temporally into the present when he discusses sermons, because the Sunday entries in the journal are almost inevitably prefaced with “Lords day,” so, unlike other “daily” entries, we often know immediately that we shall, mentally, go with him to church, and we anticipate his judgement not only of the sermon, but often, too, of the preacher.

Pepys did not only say that he had met certain people, he would often use a judgemental adjective to describe them. This gives substance to the person, and brought them to the forefront of the text, so that we see them immediately through the eyes of the diarist as he was seeing them in his mind as he wrote. For example, the
entry of July 9th 1662 relates, “and then came Mr Mills the Minister […] but he is a
cunning fellow” (Pepys was not enamoured of the members of the cloth [3. n.2.135]),
and we read one of his many heartfelt expressions of disgust against Sir. W. Penn –
“who I hate with all my heart for his base, treacherous tricks […]” (3.132).
Conversely, he waxes eloquent on the features of “pretty women” in general, and
Lady Castlemaine in particular, as discussed in Chapter 7.

Using judgement words as he discourses on incidents personally experienced or
reported upon in his daily life, Pepys portrays his immediate conception of the morals
and personalities of others in a forthright manner. However, probably because of a
lack of all the facts, his repetitions when recounting another’s experience of incidents
discussed do not always allow a fair judgement of the person concerned, as the two
instances following show. This, though, emphasises the immediacy of the reporting
because he has not had time, personally, to verify the assertions. In the latter part of
his entry of June 4th 1664, Pepys is reporting a discussion with Mr. Coventry on the
question of bravery:

He discoursed largely and bravely to me concerning the different sort of
valours, the active and passive valour. For the latter, he brought as an instance
Generall Blacke, who in the defending of Taunton and Lime for the
Parliament did through his stubborn sort of valour defend it the most
*opiniastrement* [obstinately] that ever any man did anything – and yet never
was the man that ever made any attaque by land or sea, but rather avoyded it
on all, even fair occasions. (5.169)

Although it is Mr. Coventry’s judgement he is repeating, nevertheless, as Pepys does
not refute his superior’s conceptions, it should probably be taken that he is willing to
agree with what he says. Although admitting that he is talking about past events,
Coventry’s judgements however are being given by Pepys in the moment, and we accept them as such. Pepys always thought highly of Mr. Coventry:

Thence to St. James's to Mr. Coventry and there stayed talking privately with him an hour in his chamber of the business of our office, and find him to admiration good and industrious, and I think my most true friend in all things that are fair. He tells me freely his mind of every man and in everything.

(3. 197)

The editor’s note, however, refutes the judgement Pepys relates, made by Coventry, when it points out that “Blake was capable of making attacks – as he did in taking Taunton, or, at sea, in his bold actions at Porto Farina in 1655 and Santa Cruz in 1657” (5.169.n.3).

Similarly, Pepys says that Coventry is reported as saying that although Prince Rupert is said to have “personal courage,” he is judged for his mishandling of the defence of Bristol:

[…] no man did ever anything worse, he wanting the patience and seasoned head to consult and advise for defence and to bear with the evils of a siege.

(5.170)

Yet again we have an editor’s note that this was an unfair judgement, when Prince Rupert was “deprived by the King of his command, but he was in fact without the means of defence” (5.170.n.1), yet in Pepys’s revelation these uncontested judgemental impressions present us with an immediate conception, and contemporary context, of the two men concerned, as weak and ineffectual in their positions. Pepys often added an ad hoc opinion to what were, in fact, carefully crafted judgements. For example, Pepys had been recommended a boy who was to join his household. His entry of August 7th 1664 tells of arrangements for them to meet. Pepys appears to add
an *ad hoc* opinion of the lad, after the introduction, which it is credible had been written as he was writing the hiring of him into his day’s rough notes:

[…] and at Chappell I there met Mr. Blaygrave, who gives a report of the boy; and he showed me him and I spoke to him, *and the boy seems a good willing boy to come to me, and I hope will do well*. I am to speak to Mr. Townsend to hasten his clothes for him, and then he is to come. [my emphasis] (5.234)

As explained earlier in this chapter, most of Pepys’s rough notes were written on pieces of paper carried with him for that purpose on his daily, and longer travels, to be entered later into his *NWB*, another note book (which has been lost), and other accounts books. Notes were also taken then for later inclusion in the *Diary*. Sometimes descriptive passages appear to be added, brought suddenly to mind, while he is in the act of copying from his rough notes into the *Diary*. These are often flagged by his changing the tense in which he is writing, from the recent past to that of the present. One example of this appears in his entry of September 21st 1665. Pepys was visiting Nonsuch House, which had been a royal palace begun by Henry VIII and completed by the 12th Earl of Arundel (d.1580). In Pepys’s time it was being used by the Receipt of the Exchequer (Finance Department [6.188.n.1] which was moved there during the plague. Of this visit Pepys writes:

But not seeing how to help it, I did walk up and down with Mr. Ward to see the house […], and there drink and set up my horses, and also bespoke a dinner. And while that is dressing, went with Spicer and walked up and down the house and park; and a fine place it hath heretofore been, and a fine prospect about the house - *a great walk of a Elme and a Walnutt set one after another in order – and all the house on the outside filled with figures of story, and good painting of Rubens or Holben’s doing. And one great thing is that*
most of the house is covered, I mean the posts and quarters in the walls,

covered with Lead and gilded. [my emphasis]

Then he changes again from present description, to past action:

I walked into the ruined garden, and there found a plain little girl, kinswoman

of Mr. Falconbrige […]. (6.235)

The property is here, now, before us, as it is summarily instanced in Pepys’s mind in

the temporal present as he writes; the trees, gilded walls and paintings solidified for us

also in a few brief and concise lines of text.

Similarly, on 1 February 1664, he relates:

In my way home I light and to the Coffee-house, where I heard Lieutenant

Collonell Baron tell very good stories of his travels over the high hills in Asia

above the Cloudes. (5.34)

Pepys immediately goes on, changing to the present tense:

How clear the heaven is above them. How thick, like a mist, the way is

through the cloud, that wets like a sponge one’s clothes. The ground above the

clouds all dry and parched, nothing in the world growing, it being only a dry

earth. Yet not so hot above as below the clouds. The stars at night most

delicate bright and a fine clear blue sky. But cannot see the earth at any time

through the clouds, but the clouds look like a world below you. (5.34)

In this quasi-poetic outpouring, he writes as if he is the person at that moment

experiencing the scene he is describing. He changes back to the past tense as we read

that he went home to supper, and then did business “about Creed” (5.34).

Another grammatical change heralds a graphic description of action in an unusual

story, encountered in the entry of 30 October 1662. Mr. Wade told how John

Barkstead, a goldsmith of the Strand, when Lieutenant of the Tower 1652-60, was
supposed to have hidden a treasure of gold, silver and jewels worth 7000 pounds therein. He was executed before he could retrieve it (3.241.n.1). Pepys and others were to dig for the treasure and to share the spoils. The Diary entry traces Pepys’s actions for the day, from the dark of morning, through the arrangements for the excavation, to when he went to the Tower with accomplices and guides to “set upon” the job in hand. Then Pepys writes, changing from the past to the present tense, “So our guide demands a candle, and down into the cellars he goes […]” (3.242) and it is then we go down with them all, as eager as they, to see what eventuates. It is all rather farcical, as they dig until eight o’clock that night to no avail. Pepys writes this in a serious, straight manner which belies its humorous appeal for modern readers. The rest of the very long, novelistic, entry for that day is all in the past tense, and has less of the sense of immediacy and excitement which had been engendered by the present tense demand of a light, which was to lead them to find the expected treasure.

Stylistic features which suggest immediacy are some of the many aspects of the texts which demonstrate the quicksilver personality of the exuberant author. Indeed his first word written for the day is very often “Up.” There are very many instances in the Diary where Pepys uses this short word to announce that he has left his bed, and it is usually followed immediately by an action. On 27 September 1663 he writes, “Then up and got me ready”, which gives a sense of immediacy as if we are there helping him dress (4.318). The use of this “up” word is one of the many textual tools Pepys uses to portray immediacy in action. This unexplained, unadorned, even abrupt word to start a day’s entry rivals “and so to bed” for its repeated use. For example, in September 1665 he starts the first paragraph with “up” no less than nineteen times in thirty days. However, significantly, Pepys often adds incidents after the formal ending

---

6’Several attempts have been made since Pepys time (e.g. in 1958) to find it’ (D.3.241.n.1).
of the day which he thought important enough to include, or, as often happened, were necessary to fill the page.

In order to achieve a sense of immediacy, Pepys deliberately creates the impression that the journal is written diurnally. He makes little, if any, reference to past entries, and there are many instances where he repeats a whole situation sometimes a day or so after the original entry, sometimes longer, as if the incident had not been previously mentioned. For example, on 12 March 1665 Pepys writes that he discoursed “with my Lady about Sir G. Carteret’s son, of whom she hath some thoughts for a husband for my Lady Jem...,” and on 24 March he mentions it again as if it was the first time he had heard of the proposition. As he achieves a sense of immediacy by not referring to past entries, he does on occasions write about things he has already experienced as though he was experiencing them for the first time. For instance, he admits in the *Diary* itself that he wrote the entries for the Great Fire some months after the event, yet (with one exception) we read his entries as daily information.

Thus, as he gives the impression of living and reporting day by day, so we live with him on a daily basis too, only discovering with him, supposedly, what the morrow may bring, as explained earlier. And every day we are rushed along, in that sense of immediacy, with breathtaking mobility on Pepys’ part as he journeys all over London (a great deal on foot in the early days of his career), visiting socially, and on errands for General Montagu, his employer. Indeed, he often manages both with great dexterity, slotting in a music session here, a play there, taking off for a sexual dalliance when the urge overtakes him; all the while visiting members of the Navy

---

7 ‘I now saw my little goldsmith Stokes receiving some friend’s goods, whose house itself was burned the day after” (my emphasis). *Diary*, September 2nd 1666.

8 Memorandum, *Diary* October 11th, 1666.
Board, the docks, the victuallers, the seamen, the Duke of York, even the King, as his career progresses. As previously stated, Pepys constantly made and broke vows of many descriptions, yet he almost never omitted a day’s written entry into his Diary, even though it was penned days, and sometimes weeks, after the events. This act of self-discipline shows us a face of Pepys which is missing from that of the Pepys who, in a fury, tore up his wife’s love-letters. He threw those on the bedroom fire to burn (yet was at great pains to save his Diary from the Great Fire of London). Elizabeth’s letters, proffered at a time of complaint to her husband of her unhappiness in their marriage, were to remind Pepys of a time that was, when she was happy. This confrontation in the now Pepys could have seen as a threat to his power over her; his cruel act of consigning the written declarations of his love to the flames was to regain it. This furious face of Pepys differed from that of the cautious Pepys, who was telling himself that the time he spent reading a lascivious book was for the purpose of gaining knowledge. He had also consigned L’École des filles to the flames. Conflagration extinguishes time as well as substance. The letters and the book were no longer extant.

Pepys’s writing in the Diary plays a double role. It is a material “thing” that gives body to the “now”, but it is also a place where he can manipulate “time;” to speed it up or slow it down for emotional effect as exemplified in the “treasure hunt” described earlier.

In contrast to the many entries in the Diary where the writing suggests the immediacy of time, there are sections of the Diary where Pepys’s eulogies on beauty slow down time. His descriptions elongate time. Exemplifying his admission in the Diary that “music and women I cannot but give way to, whatever my business is” (7.69-70), Pepys visits the theatre with his wife and Deb Willett and we read:
[...] but that which did please me beyond anything in the whole world was
the wind-musique when the Angell comes down, which is so sweet that it
ravished me; and endeed, in a word, did wrap up my soul so that it made me
really sick, just as I have formerly been when in love with my wife; that
neither then, nor all the evening going home and at home, I was able to think
of anything, but remained all night transported, so as I could not believe that
ever any music hath that real command over the soul of a man as this did upon
me [...]. (9.94)
The words “nor all the evening”; “going home”; “at home”, “remained all night”
lengthen the occasion for Pepys as he writes, and for us, as we read of his rapture.

Other similar occasions of the writing slowing down time occur, as above, when
Pepys describes an early morning scene of a wondrous display of ships in the harbour,
and when he, with apparent enjoyment, relates tales told to him of wondrous scenes
by travellers.

The Diary, because of its genre, purports to explore mostly the present, and it is
true that Pepys does not often refer a great deal to times past. When he does, time
slows down in the telling, because the past becomes fixed, a moment of stasis for
Pepys, although, paradoxically, it sometimes reads like the present. For example his
recording of his walk to Aristotle’s Well while at Cambridge when he slaked his thirst
with so much water that he voided yet another stone (Tomalin 42).

Pepys also uses “time” as a tool of moralistic control. This is strong evidence of
his basic puritan face which appears, and disappears, in many written forms in the
Diary. He makes vows to resist the lure of certain practices, but often only for a
specific time. After the set period of his self-imposed resistance to self-indulgence is
over he rejoices that he can gratify himself once more. So Pepys quantifies “remorse”
by “time” and not infinity. Even this doesn’t last. The arbitrary temporal limits he sets mark a time of (unconvincing) observance.

He makes at least fifteen vows against drinking, but excuses himself from breaking seven of them before his set period of abstinence ended (11.299). He makes sixteen vows to resist going to the theatre, and talks himself out of back-sliding (4.126), after resolving not to go to a theatre “till Easter, if not Whitsuntide next, excepting plays at Court” (4.8). But he took his wife and maid to see The Humorous Lieutenant and juggles time, with a little accountancy, to ease his conscience:

> Thence to my brother’s. and there took up my wife and Ashwell to the Theatre Royall, being the second day of its being opened […]. And though my oath against going to plays doth not oblige me against this house, because it was not then in being, yet believing that at that time my meaning was against all public houses, I am resolved to deny myself the liberty of two plays at Court which are in arrear to me for the months of March and Aprill; which will more then countervail this excess. (4.128)

He also makes, and breaks, vows against idleness, extravagance, not to be alone with Betty Lane for more than quarter of an hour, and to “laisser aller les femmes” for one month (11.299). The significant point is that if he expresses remorse (it is usually for upsetting his wife), it lasts only a short time, for such feelings are washed away in the crowded space that was seventeenth-century London. It is a space that marks a fluid conception of time, one that Pepys manipulates to suit himself through his writing.

Pepys breaks his time-embracing vows, yet, as stated, he never breaks his vow to make entries for each day for over nine years, even if they were not actually written on a daily basis. To Pepys, the power of the written word, and his obeisance to it, is stronger than all the other sins of excess he grappled with over time.
As he imaginatively re-enters his recent past to bring it to the present for himself as he writes (and for us as we read), through his artistic textual dexterity he exhibits for us, on a daily basis, the protean faces which make up the incomparable Pepys of the *Diary*. These are incomparable with the Pepys of the sombre faces of probity elicited from his other prolific documentation.
CHAPTER 4
COMPARING THE DIARY AND THE NAVY WHITE BOOK

The Pepys of the *NWB* is a different character from the Pepys of the *Diary*. Different personalities emerge through the two sets of writings. The differences go beyond those one might expect between a work record and a personal diary. One Pepys is a mature, efficient man; the other Pepys, in the *Diary*, is full of private doubts, weaknesses, and unending curiosity, often showing the emotions and self-awareness of a teenage boy. In the *Diary* we are presented with plural “Pepyses” responding or reacting to different events, people, and circumstances. Pepys would seem to have no interest in deliberately creating different selves – after all, the *Diary* shows him in a process of creating a public persona of success and importance, and trying to unite disparate elements through the writing of the *Diary* itself – but strikingly different versions of himself emerge as if it is beyond his control to unify a coherent self caught in the dynamic movement of life through his writing.

In the *NWB* the sombre, business-like prose of the entries delineates the hard-working, responsible, extremely efficient father of the professional Navy of the Restoration, the man who, it was said, had “put wooden walls around Britain” (Cavendish 60). He is indefatigable, competent and forceful in his official endeavours, which are often reduced in the *Diary* to the single phrase “at the office.” There is no sign in the *NWB* Pepys of the “boy left behind.” In the *NWB* Pepys betrays no doubts about his own maturity. The *NWB*, which is full of complaints about the inefficiency of the employees, and the fraudulent tricks of the suppliers in the way they go about the King’s business under the Navy Board, just details the facts which, although stated succinctly, have none of the *Diary*’s immature extravagance of expression. For example, the *NWB* has the following entry:

*Febr. 23. 1664[5]. King’s officers chosen by the merchant in cases against*
the King. Being to receive from the owners of the Eagle, a merchant to be hired into the King’s service, the names of two persons at Portsmouth (where the ship now is) is to join with two on our behalf in the value of the said ship and apparel, in case she should be sunk or taken by an enemy – they chose Capt. Tinker our master attendant and Mr Eastwood our purveyor, the very men which I for my part had in my thoughts to propound to the Board to have appointed in behalf of the King, as the most proper officers the King hath about him. (111)

It could be suggested that if this passage were written in the same vein as in the Diary it would probably read “They were the best men for the job I could ever propose” instead of referring to Capt. Tinker and Mr. Eastwood as being, in Pepys’s NWB opinion, “the most proper officers the King hath about him.”

It would be expected that the NWB, as a document compiled as part of office procedure, would deal with matters official in a relevant style. Yet there are differences from the Diary which go beyond this difference of mode. As stated, Pepys’s character comes through in the NWB as mature, markedly masculine, very sure of himself, calculating, almost always untroubled by conscience, generally dour, and explicitly critical of those around him. This Pepys is a systematic recorder of useful and technical information. His will and his duty to the King are in harmony.

In the NWB Pepys shows strength of character, for example, when he refuses to pass bills for payment which he thinks are not honest (65-6). He deplores the lack of book-keeping which results in the King’s financial loss (17). There are many instances in the NWB where Pepys records that he stopped payment on bills already passed by his superiors Sir W. Batten and Sir J. Mennes, standing tall against their anger (65-6). On other occasions bills are presented which he will not pass for
payment until ratified by these senior members, who sometimes refuse because they know that they are fraudulent. They do not want to be implicated, although they have been complicit in their production. For example, on 28 June 1664, Pepys writes in the *NWB* that after two years “comes Mr Lever’s account to be signed as Purser-General for the fleet that went with My Lord to the Straits” (65). Sir John Mennes signed it for payment and Sir William Batten also. When the account came before the Board, Mr. Coventry raised some questions. The Comptroller (Mennes) said he had looked over Lever’s oath of authenticity and several certificates in Spain, and so signed the bill for payment. Before Pepys would ratify it, he stated that he would do this only by adding that he was doing so “upon the [written] confidence of Sir J. Mennes having had examined it thoroughly.” Mennes refused to sanction this proviso and said he wanted his signature removed from the bill. Mr. Coventry, Pepys’s superior, approved of Pepys and backed him up, saying that in that case the bill would be removed also (65-6).

Pepys was suspicious of Mennes's and Lever’s whole involvement in the matter. For eighteen months Lever had been asked for proof of the expenses (for which he had made claim six months before that) and he had produced few certificates to authenticate his claim. However, now he was said to be bringing “sufficient vouchers for everything, and all clear, and he a man who had not been worth a groat,” yet claimed to have been at a loss of £300 in this employment, and claimed the King was indebted to him for £500 or £600. When Pepys asked Mennes for the accounts for which he had signed, none was forthcoming. Pepys had Mennes, Batten and Coventry sign the bill and sent it on, out of his hands, to Mr. Turner “to deliver to the Comptroller what he please with the bill” (*NWB* 66).
Pepys then fills another whole page in the *NWB* (66-7) which details the involvement of Lewes, Mennes, Batten and his clerk Wilson in this and many other illicit practices, as revealed to him the same night, after the Board meeting, by Mr. Prince the purser, who knew their exploits and their reputations well. Pepys presents himself, as a junior member of the Navy Board, showing courage in standing up to his superiors.

On 15 December 1663 in the *NWB* Pepys expresses himself strongly, but eloquently, when indignant at the unfair denigration of another superior. Instead of documenting that Sir William Warren had been treated in the "worst" way as he would probably have done in the *Diary*, Pepys records:

> There happened this day at the office, present my Lord Berkely, Sir J. Mennes, Sir W. Batten, W.Coventry, Sir W. Penn, and myself, a great dispute about the signing of Sir W. W[arren]’s bill for his masts delivered at Chatham and certified to answer in all points the terms of the contract, and also what to do with other goods which came along with them. He was most shamefully used by Sir W. Batten, and Sir W. Warren’s condescensions [concessions, without implications of patronage (NWB 438)] were so great that my Lord Berkely did say he never heard so many reasonable answers and agreements in any man in his life […]  

The rest of the three-page entry may be condensed as follows:

> Batten complains that the masts supplied by Warren were too short and one worm-eaten and that, as a consequence, they (the Navy) are now overloaded with small masts. Warren denies his accusations and Pepys supports him. Wood had originally wanted the whole order at a higher price than Warren’s. Wood then approached Batten and Mennes to offer his masts at the same price as Warren’s. This
proviso Batten and Mennes were now denying, untruthfully, as Pepys knew. There was much verbal to-ing and fro-ing until Mennes humilitatingly dismisses Pepys, telling him to draw up the contract as he pleases and to take the minutes. Pepys writes, “which did vex me to the guts” (11). Pepys says he will try a trick to prove he is right.

The next day Pepys performs an Iago-like ruse to gain a confession from Wood regarding the argument about masts. He sets up Captain David Lambert to stand within earshot as he questions Wood, who, unaware of the nearby Lambert, confirms Pepys’s evidence. Pepys did then “seem” (as he says) to offer him a contract to present more masts now. Pepys bids Lambert to remember the confession. Pepys follows this with a small smug paragraph (humour being a rare thing in the NWB), imagining the quandary facing Batten when Wood goes to him to offer more masts. Either Batten will have to contradict himself or take Wood’s masts which will lie on his hands (11-12).

Another display of Pepys’s authority in the NWB is apparent in the entry for 26 March 1664. Mr. Shish (master shipwright) came to Pepys with a complaint that the carpenter and others, although on an order of the Duke’s to start work at 5.30 a.m., would not work until the clock struck six. When they did work it was lazily, and “whereas he hath heretofore sheathed a ship of 400 tons in a day, now they have been eight days sheathing a vessel of 120 tons, and knows not yet when he shall have done it” (45).

Pepys asked to be given the names of those concerned. Shish would not do so. He gave him two names but would not name warrant officers. Pepys records:

I again desired him: he said he could not. I bid him again; he told me he would step aside and do it. I would not be contented with that, but bid him think of
the names and set them down; he told me he could not think of them presently, he was so disturbed. So W. Hewer reached a call-book and there read the names of all to him. Then he began to say that some of them were very willing to work, but that others would not let them. And yet by and by that they all hung together. This made me mad, and thereupon I told him that he did counterfeit this complaint if he did not tell us the names of some that did really deserve complaint, or else he had so carried himself that he durst not complain by name. At last I forced him to tell me, man by man, one after another… [My emphasis] (45)

This episode shows a determined man quite calculatingly bullying an employee until he gets the information he seeks.

Pepys reports another show of strength in the NWB when, on 7 September 1668, he confronts a superior member of the Board, Sir. W. Penn, who has wrongly passed payment for claims presented by several pursers of Sir John Harman’s fleet which had been lately in the West Indies (137). Mr. Hayter (Pepys’s clerk) also alerts Pepys to the fact that the people of New England had given presents of provisions for relief of the fleet, who were suffering distress for want of them. However, it appears that the pursers of the ships receiving the provisions had now put in claims to be recompensed by the King for these, although they had been given as a gift to His Majesty. Penn had passed the spurious claims for payment (138).

When Pepys brought the matter up with Sir William Penn before the Board, Penn denied all knowledge of the gift, saying that therefore he could not “confront the pursers” in this regard. Pepys records the following:

I told him that not only had I heard the King and the Duke speak of it, but that Sir John Harman also had by discourse acquainted the Board heretofore with
it, which Lord Brouncker recollected also. But Sir Wm Penn continuing in his
total ignorance of it, I propounded that Sir J. Harman might be presently writ
to about it, which was done, and this 7 of 9ber [sic] Sir Wm Penn brought Sir
John Harman to the Board, telling us that Sir J. Harman had delivered in an
account six months since of the victuals by him distributed to the several
pursers of his fleet in the West Indies. Upon which, I gently reminding Sir
Wm Penn of his disowning the other night his having ever heard of these
proceedings, he presently answered me with some concernment that the
account was delivered to him only as an account of provisions bought by Sir
John Harman. To which I replying that I could not believe but that there was
some mistake in that, forasmuch as Sir John Harman could not be thought to
bring that to account as bought which cost him nothing. Sir William Penn
hastily answered that the account was delivered to him as of provisions only
bought. But Sir John Harman presently stopped him, saying that he did deliver
it distinctly in his account what was bought and what presented. Which having
awakened Sir Wm Penn in this matter so as to put him upon doing the King
right in it, I suffered the discourse to fall, urging it no farther to the
unnecessary offence either of Sir Wm Penn or Sir J. Harman. But am
thoroughly satisfied that to this hour the King had not been secured by Sir
Wm Penn in having any fruits of the present, though I have no suspicion of its
being designed to be brought into account as so much bought. (NWB 137-8).

It is interesting that the Pepys of 1668 “suffered the discourse to fall” in order not to
give offence to Penn after he had roundly pinned him to the board. This was not a hot-
headed “vexation to the guts” explosion as recorded four years earlier in the NWB on
December 15 1663 (11). Instead, in this situation, Pepys shows the maturity of self-
control, without the need to gloat even to himself. No sign of the “boy left behind”
here, as in the Diary.

Nor, in the NWB, does Pepys shrink from defying Batten and Penn when he
considers that he has some superior knowledge (probably gained from his tailor
father) of the better breadths and widths of the material suitable for sailmaking. The
written detail of the encounter Pepys records points up the difference in entries on the
same subject between that entered in the Diary and its importance in the NWB.

The complete entry on 31 March 31 1664 in the NWB, with the heading
"Comparing the breadths of Hollands duck and West Country canvas and their
different pennyworths. Sailmakers profit by the narrowness of the canvas," goes into
detail, taking nine paragraphs to record that Pepys personally measures the width of
canvases, and has long discussions on the value of canvas versus duck for the making
of sails, and whether it is more advantageous financially to take a narrower width
which would need seams. The argument against the latter was, that when sails were
damaged, through war or storm, they inevitably tore along the seam made weaker by
the lines of holes for the stitching. They then needed a four inch broad strip up and
down to cover and strengthen the seam. Sir W. Batten and Sir William Penn
disagreed, saying more seams meant stronger sails. However, Mr. Lewen the
sailmaker agreed with Pepys saying that the width of the sails as they now were
would be satisfactorily held in strength by the bolt-ropes. There were many more
arguments about how many number of threads to the inch were sufficient for the
reliability of the material for the sails, and whether to take notice of the Dutch whose
widths were 31 inches, in duck, with no seams. Multiplied by the number of ships
which needed sails, this was a big issue, both practically and financially, and Pepys,
as always, fought hard and long in discussions and claimed, as always, primary loyalty to the King (NWB 27-29).

By comparison, in the Diary entry for the same day, Pepys mentions going through accounts in his office, walking home with Creed, finding Luellin at home with whom he had dinner, returning to the office “[his] head mightily crowded with business” and taking his wife to his father’s house. He then went to an alehouse where he met his father’s tailor, then went home with his wife, working on his own accounts, going to bed with his head full of business. The only mention in the Diary of the long discussions on sailcloth is “Then with Creed to Deptford, where I did a great deal of business, of Canvas and other things with great content” (5.106). There are similar results gained when comparing other entries in the NWB on the subject of the sails on May 27, 28, June 22, July 22 1664, with those entries of the same days entered into his Diary, where only the Diary entry of May 27 barely mentions the subject so greatly argued over that day. In the NWB Pepys pursues extended, complex detail on matters of business; the Diary Pepys is often dilettante, assembling heterogenous, piquant odds and ends of knowledge in short sentences, juxtaposed with instant judgements on face value (literally) of anyone from politicians, street women, and ladies of quality, to the clergy.

In the NWB Pepys exhibits a face of determination and resolute strength in the King’s interest before his superiors. By contrast the Pepys of the Diary constantly makes vows (at least ninety), all of which he is too weak to keep. He promises himself to negate his proclivity to overindulge himself in drinking, theatre-going, idleness, extravagance, and, more positively, he vows to rise early, to allow Elizabeth dancing lessons, to say family prayers twice a week, not to be alone with Betty Lane for more
than quarter of an hour, and to "laisser les femmes” for one month. The contents of his poorbox attest to his backsliding:

Now, as my mind was but very ill-satisfied with these two plays themselfs, so was I in the midst of them sad to think of my spending so much money and venturing upon the breach of my vowe; which I find myself sorry for, I bless God, though my nature could well be contented to fallow that pleasure still. But I did make payment of my forfeiture presently, though I hope to save it back again by forebearing two plays at Court for this one at the Theatre, or else to forbear that to the Theatre which I am to have at Easter (4.56-57).9

Always the book-keeper, he is attempting to balance his breaching of vows with equalizing sacrifices. It is amusing that he writes of his hopes of regaining the forfeit to the poor box by not going to the theatre when he is allowed. Such incidents of bargaining with himself, as in this instance, would not find their like in the NWB.

As mentioned, the Pepys presented in the NWB is essentially a champion of probity among those serving the King; however, he does record, at length, one conspiracy of his own which we would now regard as dishonest. I deal with this episode at length in Chapter 6. This is a guarded account which exposes his going to great pains to cover himself should the occasion of question arise. Pepys takes two pages to document eight paragraphs covering himself, if this arrangement should come to light.

The Pepys of the Diary gives us much more of a complex attitude to his own corrupt dealings. There are times when he is averse to accepting bribes – occasionally because the offer is too small, but also because he doesn’t want to incur an obligation.

9 Other references to the breaking of vows and resulting forfeitures are at 2.200, 3.230, 294, 4.164, 7.401, and 8.45 (See the index entry, 11.299).
The *Diary* Pepys has a curious double standard of “honesty” which relates back to his sense of loyalty to the King. Privately, he takes “presents,” which in his eyes does nothing to dishonour his criterion of fidelity to the crown, but, as discussed in Chapter 6, when naval employees put in bills for payment (from the King’s purse) which are dishonest, he publicly documents it in his *NWB* and brings it to the notice of his superiors, well knowing that they too are involved in the deception.

There are times when a fear of exposure of his own dealings leads him to feel at least “disturbed” although his many vows do not often extend to refusal of bribes.

Some of his profits were, as Lord Montagu intimated, officially sanctioned, but many were not, especially when he was dealing with the choice of suppliers. As Christopher Hill points out:

> The Pepys of the Diary essays complicated equivocations [which] enabled him to deny accepting bribes. This is indeed the homage that vice plays to virtue – or the post restoration civil servant to the standards set during the interregnum. (267)

The result is that Pepys unintentionally writes himself into a character with many faces in the *Diary*, which marks a contrast between that character, and the character of the man with one consistent face which he presents in the *NWB*. This is slightly odd considering that the writing in both texts is imbued with a strong sense of self-centredness which influences not only his presentation of himself and his actions but also his presentation of others. In the *NWB* he draws one-dimensional characters of others. He documents his colleagues by their shortcomings in all fields relating to their work with the Navy Board. We see old men, and men his own age, and others probably in between, as flat cutouts of incompetence and fraud. Some of these are written into a little more depth with their inclusion in social activities in the *Diary*, but
Pepys’s word pictures of some of his colleagues and superiors offer a limited, evidently prejudiced view of these personalities. Often he leaves out compensating information. He biases their characterizations by omission. Claire Tomalin tells us of the fine reputations of Batten and Penn who were “naval commanders of long service with distinguished fighting records…Penn had taken Jamaica for the English, and Batten, a man of sixty, had been surveyor of the navy under Charles I and knew everything there was to know about the naval yards where ships were built” (123-24). Pepys continually complains about both these officers and often had heated arguments with them. His complaints against them often mirrored his own profitable and suspect dealings which, with the one exception (that of Captain Taylor), are not documented in the NWB at all.

In the Diary, however, Pepys’s spotlight is turned upon himself and mostly his personal experiences. Batten and Penn do still receive mention about their incompetence (something which Pepys rarely admits to in himself) but his about-face regarding his own doubtful arrangements, and the spoils he receives in cash and kind, are recorded for only himself to see. So, by confessing these actions in a documented puritanical penitence, does he expect forgiveness for his “sins,” or is he keeping an account book of his promised “help” and expected rewards, so that he doesn’t slip up and convict himself?

Pepys in the Diary enters many records of money and kind, including sexual favours, he accepts, for “helping” merchants, sea Captains, and others. For example:

26.6.60. Mr. Throgmorton [...] 5 pieces of gold for to do him a small piece of service about a convoy to Bilbo, which I did. (1.185)
8.12.63. […] did discourse with Captain Taylor, and I think I shall safely get 20l by his ships freight at present, besides what it may be I may get hereafter. (4.408)

3.4.63. Thence going out of White-hall, I met Captain Grove, who did give me a letter directed to myself from himself; I discerned money to be in it and took it, knowing, as I found it to be, the proceed of the place I have got him, to have the taking up of vessels for Tanger. But I did not open it till I came home to my office; and there I broke it open, not looking into it till all the money was out, that I might say I saw no money in the paper if ever I should be Questioned about it. (4.93)

In the last passage Pepys is evidently trying to convince himself that he is not dishonest. Many examples from the Diary prove otherwise. On February 2, 1664, for instance, Pepys receives a pair of gloves for his wife from Sir William Warren, inside which were 40 pieces of gold, a fact which the secretive Pepys kept to himself, deliberately not telling his wife "for fear of making her think me to be in a better condition or in a better way of getting money then yet I am" (5.35). On April, 19, 1664, Pepys consults Captain Taylor to see how he (Pepys) could make money by letting him have the Elias to transport his masts (5.127). On 27 May of the same year Pepys receives £20 from Taylor for expediting his payment for masts (5.158). Then on 2 August Warren suggests Pepys help him regarding contracts for masts and promises him £100. Pepys demurs at this time. But by 14 September that same year, he surprisingly writes of asking Warren for a loan of £100 which is a very artful way of reminding Warren of his earlier promise. Two days later Warren hands Pepys the
money as a “gift” and, says Pepys, “…he himself expressly taking care that nobody might see this business done…” (5.271).

On 24 May 1664 Pepys documents in the NWB a conversation he had with Hempson concerning Sir J. Minnes who accuses Sir W. Batten of demanding, and receiving, 20 pounds a time for the passing of his accounts. Pepys makes no accusation or commendation on receipt of this knowledge, but simply records it, with an interesting little gossipy side snippet (unusual in the NWB) that when it was paid to Comptrollers and Surveyors in the past, Lady Castlemaine (the King’s mistress) had demanded it for pin money (14).10

The Diary creates a mixed, jumbled Pepysian day as it records a conglomeration of domestic, entertainment, work-related, personal, office-based, intimate, health assessment and financial incidents, to name a few. By contrast, the NWB is almost wholly devoted to the interests of the Navy Board, and Pepys’s placing on record contentious issues with superiors, suppliers, and dockyard employees. He also enters into this book his education into the technical principles of the workings of the naval shipyards and the anomalies encountered when victualling the ships’ crews. In fact, it could be considered as another kind of diary, for this is not the workaday memoranda, recorded by office staff, of the Board’s obligations and contracts, as is that in the unpublished, but still extant, Conclusions and Memorandums Occasional journal, and other office books, then in use, none of which has survived (qtd. in Diary 10.91).

Pepys himself wrote the entries in the NWB, Jan. 5 1663/4 to July 25 1664, but, soon after the Second Dutch War, he wrote his brief notes on loose sheets which were later copied into the journal by his chief clerk, Richard Gibson. Gibson again made

---

10 This conversation also recorded in the Diary (5.140-41). Pepys had a long and unusual interest in Lady Castlemaine (see Chapter 7) which we see here even infiltrates the sober NWB.
entries straight into the *NWB* after January 1667 but presumably at Pepys’s dictation (*NWB* xviii). As stated in Chapter 3, Pepys himself wrote the whole *Diary* in shorthand (but, for clarity and speed, writing names and places in longhand) using notes he jotted down during the day, whether he was at home or travelling. He appears to have made small additions, sometimes, as he made his entries into the notebooks of the *Diary* itself; these he later had bound in leather.

Although the *NWB* has not been considered the “secret” work in the way that the *Diary* is usually understood to be, its often damning observations of people like Batten and Mennes would lead one to think that, at the time, it was not available for general inspection, especially as Gibson appears to be the only other penman (xviii.n 5) besides Hewer (232, 236-7, 251-3) and Hayter (256-60). The *NWB* was not written chronologically, as the supposedly diurnal *Diary* is set out, but was organised by topic with identifying headings.

Pepys started the *NWB* in 1664 as his personal record of the Board’s debates and transactions, and to show how each member of the Board had discharged his responsibilities. It was also designed to be a means of defence against criticism11 as he states in his entry of 15 December 1663:

> It is fit for me to remember against a time of inquiry what I have to say as to the profit which I have made of Capt. Taylor’s bills for his ship hired by us to Tanger, which is this […] (6)

Yet it is interesting to note from the foregoing how different is Pepys’s treatment of his own corrupt activity in the *Diary*, in comparison to the puritanical outcries against the transgressors of the King in the *NWB*. The Pepys of the *NWB*, imposing many unpopular precedents in book-keeping on staff and port workers, as well as enforcing

---

11 Pepys had been ‘vexed’ by Sir W. Batten’s interference in his work (*Diary* 5.115-16).
written justification of their actions from his Board superiors, storekeepers and suppliers alike, must have made many resentful enemies. The humour we find and the light-heartedness he displays in the *Diary* play no part in the *NWB*.

The *Diary* Pepys is caught between boyhood and adulthood as discussed in Chapter 2. In his immaturity he anxiously questions himself, and with the passing years he has a conscience which is evident to the reader if not always acknowledged by Pepys himself. He is always jovial and popular with his social associates (he speaks of being “merry” with them 776 times), and is a constant collector of information, revelling in acquiring books, prints, maps and all sorts of knowledge, especially from The Royal Society from where much information regarding research in the sciences and anatomy emanated at that time. The light-hearted ethos of the *Diary* is a far cry from the verbal tone of strength the text of the *NWB* exhibits. The *NWB* suggests order. The *Diary* in its immediacy is more riotous and fragmentary. This reveals a conflict between the image of an ordered public man and the disordered, potentially chaotic private life, in word and deed, that subtends it.

In the *NWB* Pepys’s entries are orderly although, as stated, these are not always presented chronologically. He has control. In the *Diary*, on the other hand, daily events happen to him and then he responds by putting them into a kind of paratactic textual existence.

The *NWB* is the product of the naval world Pepys inhabits, whereas the *Diary*, with exuberance and immediacy, hurls us from one of his worlds to many another, sometimes several in the one day. For example, there is his domestic world of Elizabeth and her companion and house staff, from which he travels to his office world, branching out to the political world of the Exchange, Whitehall, and the Court. He talks often of his parents, his brothers, and his other family members, sometimes
with irritation and sometimes concern. These do not appear in the *NWB*. There is his musical world which interrupts his Navy Board activities, and often follows on to the world of the theatre where he sometimes sees three plays in one day. There is his eating world where food and talk are reported in great detail, and then he is often back in his office into his documentary world, writing letters and journal entries until well into the morning of the next day. One of his favourite worlds he reports on at length in the *Diary* is that of the Royal Society, the knowledge from which sends him into superlative descriptions of strange operations. There is the world where he seems to be overwhelmingly interested in the workings of his body, and the clothes he covers it with, and, most of all, there is the importance to him of his public appearance in the social and business worlds, his outward public "self."

The protean self of Pepys's *Diary* is thus thrown into contrast by the singular, disciplined, coherent self of the *NWB*. The latter provides a more conventional view of the self as a fully formed consistent character, a public entity which exists to be registered by others, "a kind of legible interiority, something inside an individual, and yet potentially subject to scrutiny, to reading" (Blank 265). The *Diary* Pepys is altogether more surprising and hard to account for. One possible analogue is in the new conception of the self explored by Pepys's contemporaries Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) and John Locke (1632-1704). Hobbes “provided a radically new and to many shockingly materialistic account of individual and social life, prompted by both scientific and political revolution, and his ideas had wide currency” (Seigel, *Idea* 88). Hobbes's idea of the self is “bodily” (Seigel, "Forum" 334). Locke was the first to define the self through a continuity of consciousness. Contrary to pre-existing Cartesian philosophy, he maintained that we are born without innate ideas, and that
knowledge is instead determined only by experience derived from sense perception (Seigel, *Idea* 88).

The “self” evident in Pepys's *Diary* is governed less by any constant identity, or any guiding moral character, than by moment-to-moment reactions to experience. In this it resembles closely the Lockean self as depicted by Locke's opponents. “A good many of his contemporaries saw in his emphasis on experience and his rejection of innate ideas a formidable threat to personal stability, and even a grave danger to morality and religious belief” (Seigel, *Idea* 89). In a letter Locke himself remarks, “Tis our passions and bruitish part that dispose of our thoughts and actions, we are all Centaurs and tis the beast that carries us” (qtd. in *Idea* 91). Seigel frames the popular reaction thus: “How could people be responsible for their actions if the whole content of their mind was dependent on experience and thus susceptible to its shifting winds and currents?” (89). The young third Earl of Shaftesbury, a one-time pupil of Locke, wrote in his diary of what Seigel paraphrases as the “ill effects of seeking to develop himself along Lockean lines”:

> Thou hast engag’d, still sallied out, and lived abroad, still prostituted thy self and committed thy Mind to Chance & the next comer, so as to be treated at pleasure by everyone, to receive impressions from everything, and Machine-like to be mov’d & wrought upon, wound up, & govern’d exteriuorly, as if there were nothing that rul’d within, or had the least control. (qtd. in Seigel, *Idea* 90)

Seigel makes it clear that this is an extension of just one aspect of Locke's view of the self, and misses an important aspect of it:

> Locke’s empiricism was not a one-sided account of the mind as the product of circumstances and conditions, since it went along with an
unquestioned conviction that humans were active users of reason […]. Locke
still recognised the power of passion, custom, and interest, but he saw reason
as able to stand up to them, enough at least to provide a measure of moral
freedom and responsibility” (Idea 88, 92).

In his Diary, Pepys is a Lockean self in the specific sense developed by
Shaftesbury, driven by immediate inner drives and external influences, whereas in his
NWB and his letters (discussed in Chapter 5) he is consistent and much more aware of
a self as registered by others.

Pepys does not mention Locke in the Diary, and Locke's Treatise Concerning
Human Understanding was not published until 1690, so any connections between
Pepys's manner of presenting himself and Locke's views can only be a matter of a
shared era and environment. Seigel writes:

The reasons that made Britain the site for new departures in thinking about the
self in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are not far to seek.
[…]. Many individuals were finding new opportunities for innovation and
personal advance in the growing commercial economy whose domestic and
foreign markets […] opened up paths for individual initiatives […]. British
politics posed new questions about the status of individuals too, first because
England was in the seventeenth century what France would become at the end
of the eighteenth, the home of revolution. The collapse of the British
monarchy in the Civil War of the 1640’s and the religious disunity that
contributed so much to it brought to the fore questions about the foundations
of social life and the basis of political obligation whose answers could still be
taken for granted elsewhere, and the struggle between the restored Stuart kings
and Parliament that culminated with questioning alive. (Idea 87)
These questions go beyond the scope of this thesis. Here we can only note the effects of the vast historical changes Seigel lists, and of Pepys's own local circumstances, on his presentation of himself in his writings.

The contrasts within this set of writings are remarkable. The NWB offers a mature, efficient, successful public man, while the Diary shows different personas full of private doubts, weaknesses, and unending curiosity, often joyfully exposed with the exuberant vocabulary of a teenage boy. The disordered juxtapositioning of different worlds, jostling between work and play, laid out in the Diary, where the happenings of whole days are sometimes represented by only half a page of writing, and the reporting of single incidents is sometimes spread over three pages, produce faces of Pepys which contradict the flat persona who is found in the NWB. If only the Pepys character of the NWB had been available to posterity, much would have remained unknown: his love of music and the theatre, his voracious and detailed eating habits, his love of beauty and his stinging hatred of all things ugly, his endless curiosity which bordered on the omnivorous for fascinating details in myriad subjects, his polyglot entries of his endless forays for sexual dalliances, his intense interest in his bodily health, his acquisitive nature, his often boyish exuberance, and most of all his wonderful conviviality. The NWB, on the other hand, reminds us of an obdurate Pepys, a man of will, which was no doubt at least as important to his own sense of self, and presumably much closer to the Pepys which appeared in the office and even in his own household.
Apart from news-sheets and word of mouth to inform the public, the letter was the primary *modus operandi* to issue orders, instructions, and to pass information in the business world of the seventeenth century, and the Navy Board constituted the largest business in England at that time. Guy de la Bédoyère confirms the letter’s importance in that era:

In the seventeenth century letters had more significance than they do now.

They were the normal medium not only for the exchange of private and public news between friends and family members, but also the manner in which much military, political and state business was conducted. *(Letters 5)*

Samuel Pepys was a prolific letter-writer. He had to be. His position with the Navy board entailed control of a vast, scattered network. Pepys was responsible for ordering and arranging the providing of the timber, rope, canvas, tar, iron, etc., and all that was necessary for the building of new ships and the maintenance of others. Later he was to be in charge of ordering victuals and slops (clothing of seamen), all these commodities to be supplied to service the requirements of docks at Greenwich, Woolwich, Deptford, Chatham, Harwich and Portsmouth. Most of the published business letters of Pepys are addressed to his superiors, colleagues, or docks staff whose job it was to deal first-hand with suppliers.

Pepys wrote over a thousand letters which survive as originals, or as copies. Several hundred have been printed in modern editions. The majority relate to Pepys’s overall running of the varied commercial undertakings of the Navy Board. There are also many private letters he wrote to his family and friends, originals or copies of which are still extant, but those covering the period 1660-1669 have not been, as yet, well represented in print.
In making an analysis of Pepysian letters, one is able to do so only with the letters published so far, remembering that there are hundreds more which have not been published. These are known to be kept in many places such as Cambridge University, Oxford University, The Public Records Office (Kew), in private hands in the UK, and in the United States of America. However, there are still many unaccounted for, so there is no comprehensive listing of all letters.

In Braybrooke’s 1825 edition of the Diary, and in John Smith’s 1841 transcription of what he called Pepys’s Second (Tangier) Diary, a selection of letters was included, but unfortunately, as De la Bédoyère points out, “neither Smith nor Braybrooke had much interest in generating authoritative texts and adjusted them as they saw fit” (Letters 7). In 1926 J.R. Tanner edited a selection of Pepys correspondence from 1679-1703, and in 1929 he edited a selection from the 1662-79 journal Pepys referred to as "My Letter Book." Of the latter, Tanner says that he, as editor, has omitted “a good many letters of a routine character,” but claims to have made his choice of letters to be included in this volume on the basis that ”everything of historical or biographical importance has been included ” (xix). Some of these letters were official, some written more intimately, which Tanner considers semi-official, and some were of a purely familial or private nature (vii).

The only collection of letters “drawn from all available sources, and covering all aspects of his life” was published by R.G. Howarth in 1932. The 350 letters therein are not all written by Pepys. Many are those written to Pepys. These date from 11 March 1655, to Pepys’s last letter in the volume, to Sir George Rooke, dated April, 1703. The last two touching letters, in an appendix, are from John Jackson to Pepys’s long-time friend, John Evelyn, advising him of the death of Pepys at Clapham on 28 May 1703 (Bédoyère, Letters 7). Pepys wrote many letters wholly or partly in
shorthand, and Edwin Chappell in 1933 transcribed and edited 56 of these for publication, plus one letter as an appendix, all of which were official letters of the Navy Board.

In Tanner’s 1929 edition of Pepys’s letters there are almost no private letters from the Diary years 1660-1669; in Chappell’s 1933 edition there is none; in Helen Truesdell Heath’s there are three, and in de la Bédoyère’s in 2006 there are but sixteen, fifteen of them written to his employer Lord Montagu regarding the Lord’s family matters before 1660. In Howarth’s 1932 edition of Pepys’s letters, of the 350 examples, there are only 31 printed which date before June 1669, and of those, seventeen are dated pre-1660. To gain a full impression of Pepys as a letter-writer, there are therefore not enough letters in the 1660-1669 period alone, so I draw on a wider time-span here, while being mindful of the fact that, as Howarth states, “the Pepys of 1689 is not our Pepys of 1669” (vii).

There is one collection of personal letters, published by Heath in 1955, showing a caring, but not effusive, Pepys. Heath states that her collection points up the continuing family relationships as a unifying principle of her collection, “to return us to the man of family pride, personal ambition, and meticulous responsibility” (viii) and to offset the bulk of the previous letters printed by former editors, which relate so much to his public life (vii). She prints 188 letters of which 114 are written by Pepys. Heath also includes a précis of 137 letters and omitted papers as an index at the end of the volume to “shed light on, or corroborate details in, some of the letters and papers printed in this volume” (231).

The most recent volumes of letters of Pepys’s correspondence are those published by Guy de la Bédoyère in 1997 and 2005. He includes 260 letters to and from Pepys, dating from 11 March 1656 to 5 June 1703. They are sourced from the collections
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mentioned above, with the exception of six which are reproduced from the three books on Pepys by Arthur Bryant published in 1942 to 1943, and thirty other letters which, before this, had remained unpublished.

In this chapter I shall concentrate mainly on those letters written by Pepys between 1660-1669. The exception will be the private letters of the Heath volume. As stated, there are so few dated between 1660-1669 in print, but the many which follow expose a different Pepys from the Pepys of the business letters, so to complete the picture of Pepys as a letter-writer they are included here.

The first thing that strikes the reader of the Pepys letters, whether private or public, is that here are the missives of a sober man. There is no sign of levity, not even when he writes to his siblings. Yet throughout the period of this study he is still a young person, aged between twenty-seven and thirty-six years. This sobriety characterizes all the letters.

The business letters up to the end of May 1669 show us an ambitious Pepys. Not only does he suggest to Lord Brouncker the improvisation of a newly designated position to increase the efficiency of the running of the Navy Board, but, 19 October 1665, he proves his ambition by suggesting that he, himself, should be the one chosen to fill the post of Surveyor-General of the Victualling (Chappell 70-72), a position, which he duly obtained 27 October 1665 (Bédoyère, Letters 273).

In other letters he is also a self-promoting Pepys. For example, in an earlier letter he sends to his superior William Coventry, 20 May 1665 he writes:

And not to be silent in my own bad case, where (without arrogance) my pains exceed any of my neighbours, and for all that shall not want as great a share of blame upon any miscarriage, I can safely say that were or could the imperfections of this Office in the dispatch of ships, etc., be greater than they
are, or had the hire of my labour been 10,000 [l] per annum, I could not be
possessed of a more hearty intentness in the early and late pursuance of my
duty herein than I have been hitherto, and would you have it demonstrated,
take it then in your own merry mathematics. I have heard no music but on
Sunday these six months [...]. (Bédoyère, *Letters* 37-38).

The strong desire to always be thought of as having the highest probity is also
apparent in remonstrative letters to a friend and colleague. Pepys would distance
himself from the actions of anyone, no matter how close, which could cast a shadow
on his public reputation. For example, his friend Anthony Deane had conspired with
Browne in making untrue accusations against a colleague named Wheeler. In his letter
to Deane, dated 8 March 1666, Pepys says, "I will not dissemble with you because I
love you. I am wholly dissatisfied in your proceedings about Mr Browne and Mr
Wheeler.” He goes on further:

But upon my word, I have not spared to tell the Board my opinion about this
business, as you will shortly see by a letter we have wrote to Commissioner
Taylor. Wherein I have been very free concerning you, and shall be more so if
ever I meet with the like occasion [...]. You know this hath formerly been my
manner dealing with others, therefore cannot wonder upon the like case to find
me the same man to you [...]. (qtd. in Bédoyère, *Letters* 52-53)

Nevertheless, in the letter dated 5 May 1666 he does accept a book from Deane,
justifying his acceptance of it while reiterating his high moral stance:

The book, which you send me as a present, I do at your desire accept of and
give you my thanks for, and the rather for that I am sure you know me so well
as not to think I can be tempted by that or anything else to let fall my
dissatisfaction, when taken upon such grounds as I declared in my late letter I
had done that concerning you. I am sorry to find what I then feared prove so true, that now that league contracted so suddenly with a newcomer, to the dishonouring of the Commissioner and disordering of the yard, is broken, and you left (how justly I know not) to be the subject on which all the miscarriages of the place is laid by them both. (qtd. in Bédoyère, Letters 54)

In the letters he writes himself into a strictly honourable character, repeatedly rehearsing a version of himself as upright and honest. He is writing a certain kind of Pepys into documentary existence, so much so that his self-recommendation could almost be considered as grandstanding, especially when he is sounding so self-righteous, as he does in this oft-repeated quotation taken from a letter written to Sir William Coventry 25 August 1665. After announcing that he will stay in London during the plague, he writes, “You, Sir, took your turn at the sword; I must not therefore grudge to take mine at the pestilence” (44). It is as if Pepys is seeking a wider audience, in hopes that the letter’s recipient would broadcast his courageous stand, so enhancing Pepys’s public image even more. Letters and manuscripts in those days were often shared, as Gary Schneider explains:

Since early modern epistolarity must be considered beyond the dyadic model of single sender and single recipient, another mode of definition needs to be posited. Harold Love’s paradigm of the “scribal community” serves as a useful and accurate model on which to base the systems of early modern epistolary circulation. Such communities employed the handwritten text in acquiring and transmitting information, and in bonding groups of like-minded individuals into a community, sect, or political faction, with the exchange of texts in manuscript serving to nourish a shared set of values and to enrich personal allegiances. (23)
Lois Potter tells us that the mode of delivery did not always constitute complete privacy: “The interception and opening of private correspondence was the most obvious example of secrecy becoming public” (39).

On the other hand, Pepys attempted to make sure some of his business letters were not made public by writing to the Duke of York himself with complaints. In November 1666, Pepys confidently, but sombrely, wrote an extremely long letter to the Duke stating exactly where the Navy Board stood financially:

We are yet once more constrained to become troublesome to your Royal Highness upon that subject on which we have, by your Royal Highness’s favour, been so often suffered to importune you, namely, the want of money, and the effects of that want, under which his Majesty’s service under our care hath long been sinking […] we find ourselves wholly unfurnished of any other way of acquitting ourselves under this difficulty than by a timely and continued declaration of it and its effects to your Royal Highness […].

Pepys then gives details of the amounts promised and the terrible shortfall of that received, and goes on,

What then must the condition of his Majesty’s stores, and the credit of this Office, or its capacity either of building the new ships designed or refitting the old for the service of the next year, although your Royal Highness cannot but already collect in general, yet that you may see how far this lack of money hath diffused itself by its ill effects through every part of the naval service […] (Tanner 146-54)

There was no money for provisions; when they ordered new anchors the suppliers refused, stating that those already delivered had still not been paid for. No credit was given, money had to be upfront and was not forthcoming. Ships were coming in from
overseas with supplies, and going out again without unloading as there was no money with which to pay for the goods therein. Commissioner Taylor had reported in a late letter to Pepys that many men “are observed by him daily to spend their dinner-times walking like ghosts in the yard at Harwich for want of knowing whither to go to find credit for food” (Bédoyère, Letters 65).

Pepys does not acknowledge any contradiction in lamenting the terrible circumstances in which lack of pay often places the seamen, as well as the dockworkers, and his accepting bribes and other favours of financial gain. De la Bédoyère tells us that on 7 October 1665 Pepys had to listen to the “lamentable moans of the poor seamen that lie starving in the streets for lack of money. This distressed him, especially when the seamen heaped abuse on him and other naval officials, but he saw no connection with his own profiteering, perhaps because the problem was so established” (48).

Yet Pepys was worried when he and Sandwich had prematurely accepted prize goods from two captured Dutch East Indiamen. Pepys, however, made sure he protected his outward show of honesty by obtaining letters from the Earl of Sandwich, dated 1 October 1665 exonerating him:

These are to certify all whom it may concern that Mr Samuel Pepys hath bought of some of the flag-officers of his Majesties’s fleet several parcels of spices, silks and other goods taken out of the two East India prizes by Order, which goods he is fully authorized to dispose of as he shall think fit, he paying His Majesty’s Customs due thereupon. And all His Majesty’s Officers of the Customs and Prizes are hereby required to suffer the said Mr Pepys quietly to enjoy and dispose of the said goods accordingly. Witness my hand the day and year above-said. SANDWICH. (Bédoyère, Letters 48)
The Earl was on board the *Prince-Royal*, and he himself was punished for not observing the King’s protocol in this instance, and was sent abroad as punishment. In Pepys’s defence, accepting emoluments, “donations of gratitude,” and other benefits did appear to be a custom of the times. When he first entered the employ of the Navy Board, Montagu promises Pepys, “We must have a little patience and we will rise together” (1.167). Pepys soon found that one didn’t consider the salary so much, as the opportunity of supplementing this to a large degree by using his position to grant favours to those who requested them (*Diary* 4.368). Although this was commonplace, it was still not strictly honest, and Pepys, the upright man in his letters, often fell into this deception.

As stated, Pepys was vehement too, in his claims in all his writings, that he always first acted in the King’s interest. If his practice of accepting bribes and favours caused no loss to the King, this, he obviously felt, justified its existence, because he, himself, is constantly complaining in the *Diary* about the shortcomings of different members working for the Navy Board, who, when handling money, did so against the interests of the King, especially when they were in league with cheating suppliers.

Although detrimental to the King only by inference, an example of criminal mismanagement, which angered Pepys into expressing his disgust in a letter, is that of Sir William Batten’s deliberate mishandling of the finances of the Chatham Chest. This was a charity set up from compulsory contributions of seamen against their need, when sick or abjectly poor. From its inception it was notoriously mismanaged, its funds often raided for other uses (*Diary* 10.59-60). It was misappropriated by those in charge and caused outrage in Pepys when blatantly sabotaged by Sir William Batten to whom the management of the Chest had been entrusted as a voluntary, unpaid position. When an account by Lady Batten was presented after his death, Pepys sent a
letter to the Governors of the Chest the following letter in his public writing mode, dated 6 February 1668, decrying the demand:

Next, we think ourselves obliged to take notice of two particulars demanded in the account which we can by no means think reasonable in the demanders nor justifiable for us to allow, namely the 6d per pound demanded by the paymaster amounting to 112 [pounds], and 500 [pounds] by Sir W. Batten himself in consideration of his pains. We are sorry this seeming ill office was left to us to do after the death of Sir W. Batten, but you well knowing what endeavours were used by us in his lifetime to the obtaining a state of this account, and how he to the time of his death did avoid the giving of the same, we doubt not but we shall be held excusable by all the world in our not making these exceptions sooner. We shall not disagree to the allowing Sir William Batten whatever charges shall appear to have been occasioned to him by this work, and therefore we accept not against the other allowance demanded by him on that score; but this reward of 500 [pounds] to himself, we do again declare ourselves totally unsatisfied therewith, it being a work taken upon him with profession during his whole life of doing it in charity for the Chest, without any the least intimation in all his discourses of anything of profit expected by him for the same; wherefore unless you can inform us in anything (not appearing to us) for the rendering this demand reasonable, we desire that both it and the 112 [pounds], to the paymaster may be expunged, or left to the Lord High Admiral to determine in. (qtd. in Tanner 188-89)

Because of Pepys’s own meticulous book-keeping, and that standard he insisted from all his colleagues and workers, not only is Batten’s fraud deemed unpardonable, but Pepys is obviously irritated at his lack of accountancy. When Pepys has been
demanding good book-keeping from the dockworkers, he could not accept such sloth from a superior.

However much this Pepys volubly protects his public reputation on paper, he also, in one instance, disguises his financial gain by omission. In his letter to the Earl of Sandwich dated 29 September 1668 he is welcoming the safe arrival of the Earl back at Portsmouth, and he mentions that the Earl’s two sons had let him know that their father was without funds but that they were in no position to help. Pepys undertakes to supply 500 pounds, the first instalment of 200 pounds he encloses with the letter, to enable the Earl to get to London. Pepys gives notice of granting a loan to the Earl, but not the fact that he intends charging his mentor 6% interest. He does not put into a written document his lack of magnanimity for the man who had started him on his upwardly mobile path. Claire Tomalin points out Pepys’s intention of profiting from this “help,” referencing a Rawlinson manuscript dated 15 June 1670: “he made a note that he was charging 6 per cent on the 100 pound he had lent Lady Sandwich two years earlier, and the same on the 500 pounds lent to Lord Sandwich; he did not consider waiving his interest” (293). The loan in Pepys’s era symbolizes the economic networks existing at that time in friendship. It was a question of business and it resonates with issues of class. For instance, his benevolence to Balty and his family is treated differently (see below this chapter).

Neither does Pepys always show benevolence towards his colleagues. He writes a letter which shows that he is prepared to be frank to the point of callousness. He wants Sir John Mennes out of the way. His letter to Lord Brounker dated 11th March 1669 leaves no doubt that he is willing to help in expediting his dismissal. He says, in part:
The truth is, my Lord, the ill success of my so many endeavours with his Royal Highness, Mr. Wren, and Sir John Mennes himself (to some of which your Lordship hath been both privy and assisting) of getting him without prejudice eased of an office wherein his infirmities render his continuance unsafe to his Majesty as well as burdensome to the Board, makes me more willing by my advice and help to supply the want of his removal by making his stay as little to be repented as I can.  (qtd. in Tanner 225)

By 11 March 1669 Pepys was so confident in his position that he appeared to consider that he was subservient to none but the King and the Duke of York. The thinly-veiled sarcasm with which he feels he can open the following letter to Lord Brouncker makes this apparent:

Though the thanks I received from all but your Lordship for my late endeavours of helping the Board to a right knowledge of the posture wherein they stand in relation to their discharge before the Commissioners of Accounts, were such as might well put an end to the care I have so long unprofitably undergone on the behalf of others; yet so much is his Majesty’s service and the joint honour of the Board interested in our giving satisfaction to the said Commissioners, that I cannot think any care too much that may conduce towards it, and therefore have adventured in the enclosed to give Sir John Mennes occasion of being farther displeased with me.  (Bédoyère, Letters 75)

After the closure of his Diary less than three weeks later, it is mostly his letters which allow us to watch Pepys’s characterisation of himself through the persona he exhibits to all the letters’ recipients (Bédoyère, Letters 76). As he writes, he monitors the expressions he uses, and the contents, obviously aware of to whom he is writing and
the impression he wants them to receive. Never once do we read a letter of apology to an inferior, and he is quick and emotional in defence when he or his department receive criticism from above. He presents himself as a man who is unafraid to show that he has the courage of his convictions, even to Lord Brouncker.

Pepys maintains a persona of unrelenting efficiency in his business letters through the 1660s. As examples, there are these letters to his lifelong friend, one of those superiors he most admired, Mr. Coventry, dated 18th and 22nd November 1664:

The enclosed will tell you the proceedings of Sir W. Penn who is well in the Downes after much ill weather.

I wish as things are your quantity of deals had been greater though the price be high, the uncertainty of Sir. W. Warren’s and the greater charge of sending supplies from hence making it much to be wished.

I will take care to have a supply of Ironworke put on board a small vessel tomorrow, though I cannot force it into the thoughts of others that anything of the great demand needed to be thought of till this fleet be dispatched away which they say has been supplied long ago with everything demanded hence, which (upon calling for the papers today to examine) I find quite otherwise. I make it not my purpose to charge my letters always with reflections on others and I hope you do believe me herein, but the care taken of the safety of the King’s service (which you ought to know) cannot be told truly without it[…].

I am Sir

Your most affectionate and humble servant

S.P.  (Chappell 3-4)

An even longer letter written to Mr. Coventry four days later (26 November 1664) covers such topics as Pepys’s inability to provide chain plate, blocks and oars. Port-
hinges have already been shipped; ironwork has been held up because suppliers complained of low prices. Pepys offered to rescind their contract, and they immediately supplied the required goods. Supply of flags was discussed; seamen at first complained of the smell of tobacco stalks used as wadding for the guns, which was Pepys’s suggestion (but they later changed their minds when they found the fumes enjoyable). The sailmaker was to answer the next day on the supply of boltropes. There is report of a discussion about the ropemakers working overnight, and a tart expression on Pepys’s part hoping that Christopher Pett should hereby learn the use of speaking the truth. There is a paragraph regarding Pepys’s views on whether authority would be diminished if Commissioners were not given this title. There follows a discussion on the provision of knees. Knees were pieces of timber naturally bent which were used in shipbuilding. In the same letter he regrets overcharging by suppliers and asks Coventry if he would agree that a Clerk of the Cheque is needed at Harwich. The person suggested for the position had lately brought in an estimate of 5500 pounds for the building of a ship which had previously been worked out to be at a cost of 2200 pounds. Anchors for Woolwich are not yet made; no cables have been dispatched, and the provision of rope from hemp is causing problems. All this information, in the one letter, is itemised succinctly, with no wastage of words or circumlocution of subject. Every now and again Pepys slips in a little sentence pointing up his diligence (Chappell 11-13).

His letters to Sandwich as the years go by lose the familiarity obvious in those of the earlier years, when Pepys was acting as a personal secretary regarding the affairs of Sandwich’s family while his superior was at sea. The Chappell letter dated 3 December 1664 is almost fawning. There had been no fight when Sandwich encountered at sea the Dutch enemy because the latter hurried away to the safe haven
in port. Pepys, however, tried to make the incident look like a victory when he wrote to his lordship:

May it please your Lordshipp,

I do congratulate your Lordshipp with your return to Portsmouth so much like a victory, your enemy fleeing, but could be glad to apprehend more reason than I yet do of the inference the World generally draws from it, to the questioning the courage or capacity of the Dutch to have stood you […].

(Chappell 20)

Some of his letters, which appear sincere, also promote him as a caring Pepys, such as when he is stating the plight of destitute seamen referred to above, and similarly, in the letter, sent 4 September 1665, which described the sad plight of those suffering from the plague to Lady Elizabeth Carteret, who was far from the scenes (although, even then, he cannot resist a little self-praise):

Dear Madam,

Your Ladyship will not (I hope) imagine I expected to be provoked by letters from you to think of the duty I ought and should long have paid your Ladyship by mine had it been fit for me (during my indispensable attendance alone in the city) to have ventured the affrighting you with anything from thence. But now that by the dispatch of the fleet I am at liberty to retire wholly to Woolwich, where I have been purging my inkerhorn and papers these six days […].

The absence of the Court and emptiness of the city takes away all occasion of news, save only such melancholy stories as would rather sadden than find your Ladyship any divertissement in the hearing; I having stayed in the city till above 7400 died in one week, and of them above 6000 of the plague, and
little noise heard day or night but tolling of bells; till I could walk Lombard Street, and not meet twenty persons from one end to the other, and not fifty upon the exchange; till whole families (ten and twelve together) have been swept away; till my very physician (Dr Burnet), who undertook to secure me against any infection (having survived the month of his own being shut up) died himself of the plague: till the nights, (though much lengthened) are grown too short to conceal the burials of those that died the day before, people being thereby constrained to borrow daylight for that service. Lastly, till I could find neither meat nor drink safe, the butcheries being everywhere visited, my brewer’s house shut up, and my baker, with his whole family, dead of the plague.  
(Bédoyère, Letters 45)

Despite, also, the responsibility of his increasingly important position with the Navy Board, later family letters allow us to see, for the most part, a patient and compassionate Pepys who gives those close to him caring attention, despite his time-consuming workload.

Indeed, the whole Pepys family, which extended to in-laws and distant relatives, appear from the letters to be a drain on Pepys throughout his life, not one of them appearing able to be responsible for their own upkeep, with the exception of John Jackson, his favourite nephew. Although we read of five nephews in the letters, the two daughters of Balty, Pepys’s brother-in-law, are never mentioned. This is probably because the girls do not appear to have been schooled and therefore were not assisted in education by Pepys, as were their brothers. It is interesting that, as in the business letters, where Pepys likes to be recognised for his benevolence, in his private letters he frequently reminds his family of his efforts in their interests, and of other examples of his generosity. Nevertheless, as seen in the case of Balty’s efforts on his behalf in
France when Pepys was accused of treachery, he also recognises the reverse, not forgetting to acknowledge favours executed on his behalf (Heath 119). Life seems to be one big balance-sheet for Pepys.

In his private letters Pepys is particularly solicitous towards his parents, especially John Pepys Snr, although in a letter addressed to his father, he himself takes on a paternal persona as he gives him a lecture on keeping peace in the home, and in being financially prudent, albeit couched in caring phrases of concern:

[…] I would by this oblige my mother and you to the study of thrift and quietnesse, that I may heare noe more of those differences, which to my great griefe I have of late understood doe often arise betweene you […]. And I must needs further say, that considering you live rent free, that 50l a yeare will bee thought a good competence. Especially if all ways of thrift bee studied, as I hope will all of you thinke it necessary from hence forward to doe. And by the way lett mee tell you, that if I understand any thing of thrift, it cannot bee any good husbandry to such a family as yours to keepe either hoggs, poultry, sheepe, cowes, (or horses more then one) there being meete of all sorts, milke, butter, eggs fowle and every thing elce to bee had cheaper and I am sure with more quiet at the market, if not at your doore, then for you to keepe them besides the danger of theyr dying or being stolne […]. (Heath 2-3)

Never a man to leave a job undone, especially involving book-keeping, Pepys goes to some trouble to further list, in meticulous detail, fifteen properties attached to Brampton, their individual rents, their expenses, leaving the obvious balance of fifty pounds clearly accounted for, so that his parents have a good and positive start in their new life in the country. Pepys’s father, who makes many demands on this successful
son, nonetheless must have given Pepys food for thought when, in showing concern for the younger man in that he has “an ulser groeing in [his] kidnes”, the old man goes on, after urging him to see a doctor, “to beg a blessing from the lord that your life may be preserved, for what a sad condishun shuld your poor old father and mother be in if the lord shuld tak you before us” (Heath 13).

There do not appear to have been any letters to Pepys’s wife Elizabeth which have survived, although there were surely many, for example when she was at Brampton and Pepys was in London (Diary 1.128). Pepys admits, one day, to tearing up and burning most of his love-letters written to her, which she obviously cherished, including one letter she read to him which detailed her unhappiness in their marriage. Pepys was incensed. Here again Pepys’s main worry was the threat to his public reputation should the letter become public (Diary 4.9-10).

Despite the fact that he was not overly fond of his plain and bad-tempered sister Pall (Paulina), Pepys still gets her a husband, John Jackson, and writes to her caringly. Jackson died September 1680 and the letter from John Turner to Pepys deals with Pepys’s handling of Pall’s financial affairs. He is still involved in this as shown in his letter to her dated 29 April 1682. Upon her death Pepys takes over the complete care of her two sons, Samuel and John. Samuel became a wastrel and a thief and married against Pepys’s wishes, so he was disinherited. Pepys had a close association with his nephew John all his life, and this favourite nephew looked after Pepys’s interests before and after the diarist died in 1703.

By far the largest group of correspondence Helen Truesdell Heath records is that between Pepys and Balthasar (Balty) St. Michel, and many of these letters she chose were to be published, in 1955, for the first time. Of the 188 letters chosen, 104 are between Pepys and Balty, together with eight letters between Pepys and Ester (Balty’s
wife), and two from their child Samuel, who was Pepys’s godson. Of the letters between Pepys and Balty, the greater number refer to Balty’s efforts to find witnesses in France who would disprove the accusations of Colonel John Scott that Pepys and Anthony Deane had treasonously sold maps of the English coastline to the French.

Reading the letters on this concern consecutively, one feels the great sense of urgency besetting Pepys as he sends instructions every few days, repeating them letter after letter, lest they become lost or unheeded. Each letter sent and received is referred to by date, so that any missing could be re-sent. Pepys insists that Balty approaches those willing to help with the greatest care, reiterating that he should recompense them only for their barest expenses, fearful he could also be accused of bribing witnesses (Heath 120). This was a Pepys fighting for his life; treason was punishable by death.

In the sometimes extremely long letters to Balty, he invariably began with the courtesies of private letter-writing typical of the day, not always found in his business letters. For instance that of July 17 1679:

Brother Balty,

Since mine of the 14th I have received yours of the 12th Instant, for which I give you my very kindest thankes, it giving me a very full account of your Care and diligence in my affair, as also of the great instances you meet with of the Friendship and Civility Of Mr Trenchepain and Mr Pelletier to the later of whom having lately wrote, I give you now a line or 2 to the same purpose to the former in acknowledgement of his great favours, and pray make both the one and the other understood how sensible I am of them, and particularly of the last good Office which I find done me in theirs and your Conference with Le Picard and Mr De La Valossiere and the Attestation, which you have sent
me thereof under their hands and the hands of the 2 Publick notaries […]

(Heath 75)

Over the years Balty made many financial and other demands on Pepys, as later letters show, and Pepys was not always too civil in later correspondence to Balty as a consequence. However, Pepys chooses his words very carefully to obtain Balty’s co-operation when he is desperate that Balty obtain the required letters, or statements, from those residing in France, which could offer positive evidence in his defence. The almost deferential tone he uses then contrasts with the reprovingly moralistic tone of the letters he sends to Balty’s wife, Ester, later, complaining of their improvidence, when he, Pepys, is the giver and Balty and his family, the takers.

It appears from Ester’s very long letter of 28 August 1681, begging for financial help, that Mr. Hewer has promised to supply money to Ester and her five children on her husband’s behalf while he is away on Navy Board business. This was to be set against his salary. The allowance has proved insufficient. Pepys’s censuring letter in answer, written a month later, avowing not to discuss the matter more, and obviously questioning the woman’s frugality, differs very much in tone from those caring letters written to his own blood relatives, and the likes of Lady Jemima Montagu and Lady Carteret. Ester’s immediate answer sounds desperate as she itemises dozens of household expenses to explain her impecuniousness. Pepys’s long letter of 1 October 1681 again states that he will not discuss her predicament any further. Here he is not afraid to sound sanctimonious and unfeeling when he replies, in part:

What then you have to trust to from me and Mr H is what I told you in my last namely after the rate of 20s per week and no more this being as much as I and my wife had for several years to spend and lived so as never to be ashamed of our manner of living though we had house rent and tax to pay which you have
not and this in London too and yet [safe] from ruin on that score. The truth
and surety of which do appear in the daily account she kept of every issuing of
her family expense even to a bunch of carrot and a ball of whiteing which I
have under her own hand to show you at this day. Therefore do not expect that
any profession of frugality can be of satisfaction to me but what appears in an
account… (Heath 188)

When Ester said she couldn’t afford to live longer at Brampton, Pepys ends the letter
by telling her that she was quite welcome to come back to London and try living there
on 20s. per week (Heath 189).

Most of the letters Pepys has earlier written to Balty himself end with ‘Your most
affectionate Brother’ or similar, until, nearing the end of the correspondence (and
after Ester’s tart letters to Pepys), the endings become, ‘Your &c, S.P.’ when Pepys
has finally told Balty that he can support him and his family no longer. Pepys became
obviously completely disenchanted with both of them. The return of his kidney stone
and its accompanying pain exacerbating his annoyance:

December 11th 1686.

Brother St Michel,

I cannot but thank you (though in few words) for your kind enquiry after my
health by yours of the 7th instant. It was not without very much ground, that in
one of my late letters of generall advice to you, I cautioned you against
depending upon any support much longer from mee, I then feeling what I now
cannot hide, I mean, that paine which I at this day labour-under (night and
day) from a new Stone lodged in my Kidnys and an ulcer attending it, with a
generall decay of my Stomack and Strength, that cannot bee played with long,
nor am I solicitous that it should.
This satisfaction I have as to your owne particular that I have discharged my part of friendship and care towards you and your Family, as farre as I have been, or could ever hope to bee able, were I to live 20 yeares longer in the Navy; and to such a degree, as will with good Conduct, enable you both to provide well for your family and at the same time doe your King and Country good service. Wherein I pray God to bless you soe, as that you may neither by any neglect or miscarriage fayle in the latter, nor by any improvidence (which I must declare to you I am most doubtfull of and in paine for) live to lament your neglect of my repeted admonitions to you touching the latter. This I say to you, as if I were never to trouble either you or myselfe about it more, and pray think of it as such […] (Heath 205).

Despite Balty’s sycophantic letters to Pepys (of which there are many in Heath’s selection), he did appear, from their correspondence, to work assiduously to gain evidence for Pepys in France. One cannot be sure, from available printed letters, what led to Balty’s fall from Pepys’s grace, but the finality of Pepys’s missives to Balty and the ‘Adieu’, a cold letter-ending mirroring one sent to his wife Ester by Pepys 1 October 1681 (Heath188-89) exhibits Pepys’s state of mind. Nevertheless, Pepys’s family loyalty did persist to the end, because one of his last letters, dated a few weeks before he died, shows a compassionate Pepys interceding with the Navy once more on behalf of the wretched Balty (Howarth 373).

Heath reproduces only one letter addressed to Pepys’s long-time friend and colleague, William Hewer, in whose house Pepys was to end his days. It is a long letter, not circumspectly pressuring like those he sends to Balty in France, but warm, the personal inclusions about Hewer’s family blending in with Pepys’s family matters concerning Paulina’s financial problems left by her husband. Hewer appears to be as
much personally involved with these problems as is Pepys. This letter is the most companionable in the book in that, unlike his business letters, and even his private letters, this letter gives the impression that Pepys is writing, chattily, without self-censorship, as if face to face with his friend. For example, he begins one paragraph with “I wonder I have noe answer to my late Letter to Sir Nicholas Pedly,” rather than beginning with his usual habit of stating a fact. He ends with, “I commit you to God’s Protection, Yours most affectionately and thankfully, S.P ” (Heath 172).

Heath remarks that Pepys’s letters are a bridge for personal contact (xxxiv). However, this sits oddly with her remark that Pepys is an actor more than a spectator in his letters. The first suggestion implies sincerity, the second the opposite. If one is acting then one isn’t being oneself. It is true that there is no raillery or light-heartedness in the letters; they all “deal” with something. Pepys always wrote a letter for a reason, not to just commune, but to communicate. Problems and directions are all analysed and presented in a simple manner.

To sum up the impression one receives of the man who is Pepys after reading the available letters, we must admit that his attitude is consistent throughout, just as he is in writings other than the Diary entries. He is business-like, self-satisfied, even self-righteous, and authoritative in his self-control. He is always, in his business letters, in character in whatever position he aspires to, never letting his guard down, always pre-occupied with creating a persona which is respectable, strictly honest, and, foremost, the King’s man. In his personal and familial letters he is much the same, pointing out their shortcomings, advising them to be frugal, and authoritative should they stand against him. Nevertheless, he looks after the family’s interests, ends his letters to them affectionately, and accepts his responsibilities throughout the whole of his eventful lifetime.
In all his letters Pepys writes with an obvious purpose. In none of them does he admit any doubt or hesitation. In many of them he could be said to be pontificating. They are a careful presentation of Pepys the sober public man.
Bribery, and therefore corruption, was alive and well in the mid-seventeenth century when Pepys was part of governmental officialdom. Bribery was not publicly condoned but it was accepted, and notwithstanding that Pepys attacked all and sundry for their corruption from the Court down, he admits in the Diary to hoping “to get something” out of a situation or deal over twenty times (and there must have been many times such a hope was not recorded), every now and again telling himself in the Diary that it was not against the King’s interests. Nevertheless, there are times when a fear of exposure of his dealings leads him to feel at least disturbed, although his many vows do not often extend to the refusal of bribes. Such emoluments he refers to as gifts for his efforts on the donors’ behalf.

It must be acknowledged that corruption as we know it today may not have the same legal framework as it did in the seventeenth century, but it is surprisingly akin to similar ethics and practices extant over three hundred years ago (Gilman and Lewis 517-24). It is an important subject because the public Pepys is so supposedly upright and honest, but in the Diary he presents a private face that reveals entanglement in the corrupt practices that often exist in the public worlds of business and politics. When he started the Diary he had 25 pounds; when it finished (less than ten years later) he had 10,000 pounds. As he was employed by the Navy during the whole of this time, and makes no mention of being a gambler, this fact alone speaks for itself, fulfilling the prediction made by “My Lord” that “it was not the salary of any place that did make a man rich, but the opportunities of getting money while he is in the place” (Diary 1.223). Some of his profits were, as Lord Montagu intimated, officially sanctioned, but many were not, especially when Pepys was dealing with the choice of suppliers. In this he was following in a long tradition of corruption by governmental
officers and employees in positions of power, going back to the thirteenth century (Peck 6).

In the reign of Edward I (1272-1307) statutes were in place which proscribed a variety of corrupt practices (Peck 5). These were part of the legal system relative to feudal obligations, such as sheriffs taking gifts for consenting to the concealing of felonies committed in their bailiwicks; who have received the king’s command to pay his debts, and have taken from the creditors a certain portion for paying them the remainder, and nevertheless have caused the whole to be allowed to themselves in the Exchequer or elsewhere. (6)

Patronage ruled in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, with the sale of offices paramount. “Officers opposed increases in wages for lower-class workmen because it would overthrow the sales of offices. Sir John Trevor and his wife discouraged the proponent because they received kickbacks from boatswains, pursers and cooks” (Peck 116). In an attempt to counteract the sales of offices, bills against this practice were brought in, in 1621, 1625, 1626, and 1628 (Peck 9). This shows how little they were effective then, and later, which Povey’s incident, mentioned in the Diary (see below, this Chapter) confirms.

With the increasing success of the English navy in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, additional funding and administrative support at home were forthcoming. With the expansion of the navy came incentives for corruption, as the diversion of resources from the Crown to its lower ranking officials (who were not usually gentry) led to navy bribes being given to gain lucrative contracts, to obtain office, or to divert supplies. A master gunner in the early seventeenth century sold the remainder of the ship’s stores when the vessel returned from the sea. He claimed “it
was customary” (Peck 116). Not only were the lower officers engaged in corruption. “Procurement and the letting of contracts was shaped by personal interests of officials who often had close relationships with suppliers or often were the contractor” (Peck 109).

In the time of the Jacobean navy, the Controller of the Navy “took an oath to execute his office directly to his Majesty’s best advantage, and no way particular to his own profit by his Majesty’s loss” (Peck 108). This was the loophole taken then, and by Pepys later, to grant permission to themselves to profit on the side, as long as it did not lead to the king’s loss. That it may have been a financial loss to a relevant supplier appears to be of no consequence. From 1618-1628 the commission “reduced corruption for the first five years but ran into trouble when the war came in 1625 […] then […] the administrative machinery proved ineffective in dealing with longstanding problems of provisioning and victualling […] war and taxation in the 1620’s and 1630’s made administrative waste in the navy highly visible” (Peck 132). A study of Parliamentary documents of the seventeenth century records examples of bribery and corruption and the administered punishment. Even though the period examined (1695) is later than that of the Diary, it is still within the time of Pepys’s interest in the Navy Board. In the East India Company, bribes as high as 10,000 pounds were in contention (Peck 39). Such was the position when Pepys took over the job of Clerk of the Acts in 1660. As stated, bribery and corruption were practised but not legally condoned.

From then Pepys sets out with great zealousness to institute administrative efficiency in his Navy Board office, and in the dockyards, but the lure of money to be made by the corruption which had become acceptable in the business world was too
hard to resist. Pepys’s puritan upbringing vies with his secular desire to become a wealthy, public person of repute.

As we have seen in Chapter 4, Pepys goes to great lengths to present himself publicly as a man of probity, exemplified when he writes to his friend Anthony Deane, a supposedly reputable shipwright, whom Pepys helped in a not too savoury incident regarding a ship design. Friendship did not stop Pepys writing Deane a letter of reproof, 10 March 1666 over an incident which may have reflected badly on Pepys’s reputation:

> What it was that first occasioned my singling you out for my friendship you well know, and so long as the same virtues of diligence and good husbandry remain, I will not fail to continue the good offices I ever did you, but truly when they shall be questioned, I shall not dare to be your advocate. (qtd. in Bédoyère, Letters 54)

Although Pepys exposes his own shortcomings in all the protean faces he exhibits of himself, to himself, in the *Diary*, by contrast, in the *NWB*, he comes across as a seeker after knowledge who wishes to learn everything possible to improve his position. As touched on in Chapter 4, it should be noted that included in the *NWB* also are *The Brooke House Papers* which are Pepys’s record of his answers to the Brooke House Commissioners, who sent to the Navy Board eighteen critical “Observations” they required to be elucidated, about proceedings in the “management of his Majesty’s naval affairs entrusted to you (the Navy Board) during the late war” (*NWB* 271).

Mennes, Brouncker, and Penn submitted their individual replies. Pepys’s answers are described by Robert Latham as “being for the most part convincing”, and “In his defence of his own conduct the most interesting feature is his claim to ‘integrity’ [although] there is no denying that like most of his colleagues in the Navy office […]
he accepted gifts in money and in kind from naval contractors, in ‘compensation’ for the low rate of his salary’” (NWB xxxiv).

Pepys is certainly not consistent in his attitude to corruption. He makes note of the conversation with Hempson, clerk of the survey at Chatham, in the 27 Jan 1663/4 entry in the NWB, that Comm. Pett “makes sometimes four, five, or six labourers work to the removing of his dung and other such works” (19). Pepys, however, profits similarly by using the services of the Navy dockyard carpenters who made the first two of his presses, which are, to this day, still in the Pepys Library at Cambridge (Diary 10.94).

In the NWB when he finds merchants, dockworkers and colleagues cheating the King in various monetary ways, he documents his sadness that the King is treated so, for he constantly reiterates that his profits do not detract from the King’s. However, when he records that lesser employees such as seamen, workmen and their wives profit by helping themselves to offcuts of timber, or used tar-barrels, or a ship’s provisions and the like, he still records the facts but with no words of judgement. They are all good references, though, in case he needs the knowledge to protect his own interests.

The shortcomings of his superiors and co-workers are also told to him by workmen and colleagues -- in other words, second-hand, but they are still recorded. From these, and his own input, he has by him his own “insurance” reference book. It is almost as if Pepys perceives, and writes, the corrupt acts of others because he is repressing acknowledgement of his own corruption.

An example of this “insurance” can be found in the NWB which is recorded on 24 May 1664 when Pepys documents a conversation he had with Hempson (Clerk of the Survey) concerning Board member Sir John Mennes [Minnes], who accuses Sir
William Batten of demanding from suppliers, and receiving, twenty pounds a time for
the passing of their accounts. The difference with this “sideline” is that it is a public
procedure. Pepys makes no accusation or commendation on receipt of this knowledge,
but simply records it, with an interesting little gossipy side snippet (unusual in the
NWB) that when it was paid to Comptrollers and Surveyors in the past, Lady
Castlemaine (the King’s mistress) had demanded it for pin money (14).

It is necessary to return to the Diary here as a lead-in to one of the most obvious
cases of corruption which is clearly recorded by Pepys himself. In the then secret
Diary Pepys’s spotlight is turned upon himself, openly recording in its privacy his
doubtful arrangements. The spoils he receives in cash and kind, albeit that he is
constantly denying to himself that he takes bribes, he writes as being only gifts in
gratitude for services rendered. So, by confessing these secret acquisitions (which are
not secrets to the donors of course), he could be writing a puritanical confession, or,
more likely, he is keeping an account book of his promised “help” and expected
rewards, so that he doesn’t slip up and incriminate himself. He goes to some lengths
to circumvent discovery of his received bribes.

In the Diary Pepys enters many records of money and kind received from
merchants, sea Captains, and employees’ wives. The graft Pepys perpetrates with
Captain Taylor has been discussed in Chapter 4. The following quotation from the
Diary, shows Pepys fearful of exposure:

Captain Taylor came to me about his bill for freight; and besides that I find
him contented that I have the 30l I got, he doth offer to give me 6l to take the
getting of the bill paid upon me; which I am ready to do, but I am loath to
have it said that I ever did it. (4.414)
Those *Diary* entries do not tell the full story, for, as with most other entries in the *Diary* referring to his own hopes and misdemeanours, the references are short, and so differ very much from the prolixity of his lengthy, sometimes almost verbatim accounts of his colleagues’ corrupt acts in the *NWB*. The Captain Taylor episode points up Pepys’s battle between his desire for financial gain, his sense of morality, and his fear of exposure. He writes himself a defence should this episode threaten his public reputation.

What does become apparent upon reading of this incident in the *NWB*, dated 15 December 1663, is the fact that not only is Pepys getting something for himself, but he also deliberately misleads and secretly cheats the officer. He is being doubly corrupt:

> It is fit for me to remember against a time of inquiry what I have to say as to the profit which I have made of Capt. Taylor’s bills for his ship hired by us to Tanger, which is this. He at first had received 92l.18s.04d. by way of imprest, or money paid in advance, upon his freight. The services being done there was the other two thirds due to him, which together is 278l.15s.00d. Then for demurrage, so many days according to the rate that we did use to count others, and cutting half of it, it came to 73l.17s.00, which together is 352l.12s.00d., which is the whole of the bill made out to him. But I thinking that this was too much for him to go away with, beyond whatever he expected for demurrage, I did cast about how to get something of it; and so having told him upon the Change that I had got him 43l.17s., he was mighty thankful to me for it. (*NWB* 6-7)

---

12 Pepys was reserving half for himself (*NWB*.7. n.1).
Apart from his wish to profit from this deal, the last sentence exhibits the sense of power Pepys has in his position. It would be demeaning for him to make less than the supplier. He ekes out a little more:

[...] only, I told him that he must abate 8l. 9s. for short deliveries of goods, which I did do against a day of inquiry, and this 8l. 9s. I cast [it as it is] in the margin:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>116 lbs.</td>
<td>9s. per lb.</td>
<td>1l. 9s. 0d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bread</td>
<td>1000 at 12s.</td>
<td>per cwt</td>
<td>6l. 0s. 0d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 deals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1l. 0s. 0d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>8l. 9s. 0d.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And he was most ready to agree to it, giving me many thanks. (NWB 7)

In this last sentence Pepys seems almost gleeful, and proud of his manipulation, and then gets in deeper:

Seeing this go fair, well I delayed for three or four days, telling him that I would endeavour to get this granted and confirmed for him by the Commissioners of Tanger, and that I had no way to satisfy myself but by getting something the more added, either to his bill or to somebody’s else under another head. (7)

Once again he is showing that his is the power to do this. He is skilled at playing such games and this is why he prospers. He binds the supplier with him in the corruption as he records further conversation, telling Capt. Taylor:

if he would consent to it and keep it secret, he would do me a courtesy. He told me with all his heart, he would, and that he would secure me against all inquiry from his partners hereafter (and by name I did inquire whether Mr
Wood was one of them: he told me no, but that Sir W Warren was, of which I was glad.

Wood was a timber merchant Pepys mistrusted, with good reason, as he supplied inferior masts and was guilty of other “tricks.” Warren was respected more by Pepys for his fair dealing [NWB 114-15]). Pepys continues:

So we parted, and a while after I came and told him that I had got his bill signed as I told him, with an addition for myself under the name of demurrage, of 30l., to which he did fully consent. That is to say, that out of the 352l. 12s. I should have 30l. upon that score and 8l. 9s. abatement for short provisions. Then he began to treat with me about my buying of his bill – to pay him at my own time between this and Candlemas. He would give me 5l. I would not buy his bill, but if he would give me out of the 221l. 4s. 8d. the 6l. odd money, and leave himself 215l. clear, upon condition I got him the money paid before Christmas, I would endeavour what I could. He consents.

Pepys again seeks to benefit from his position of power for even such a relatively small profit of around 6 pounds. by allowing Taylor’s bill to take precedence over others in the queue of suppliers waiting for payment. Pepys writes on:

So the next day I got the Treasurer to sign it and this day, being the 16\textsuperscript{th} day of December 1663, he did go himself to the Treasury Office, without anything with me along with him (only last night, by other business I did go thither and spoke to Mr Fen\textsuperscript{13}) and received his money, that is, the whole bill of 352l. 12s. only abating his former imprest of 92l. 18s. 0d. – and 3l. and the odd money of the sum remaining for their poundage. And so there remained to him 256l. out

\textsuperscript{13} Mr Fen was the paymaster. Pepys was leaving nothing to chance. He was checking that the payment would be made the following day.
of which he did come to me and brought me 43l. 13s. 00d. – that is to say, 30l. for my part of the demurrage and 8l. 9s. for the abatement for short provisions, which I must take care to reckon myself debtor to the Committee of Tanger in and lay by the money to that purpose, and 5l. 4s. more for my pains in getting the money thus paid him. (NWB 6-8).

The above was the accountant and the manipulator writing to himself, for himself at that stage (of course this account would be damaging if published), so that all was clearly documented for him to be reminded of later as a record of what actually occurred. However, it is interesting that he follows on from this point (where he is still addressing himself, but changing the direction of audience to a possibly later one of accusers) in the following manner:

Upon the whole, I am principally to remember these points –

That the bill is all writ with my own hand, and was done at the importunity of the man in the absence of Mr Hater, who was then at Portsmouth at the pay of Sir J. Lawson’s fleet there, and nobody else here could do it. But, however, I did keep it till they did come home and got the Comptroller’s hand to it, and would have had Sir W. Batten’s too but that Sir J. Mennes had set his hand so near the other that he hath not let room for Sir W. Batten to set his hand between his and W. Coventry.

1. That Capt. Taylor hath not been observed to pay me any money, he bringing it in a handkercher to my office, which nobody observed, and left it with me so. And that he had not any word from me under my hand, or anything whereby he can evidence the payment of any money to me [see points 3 and 5 below].
3. That if hereafter he should play the knave (for I have not herein done the King the least wrong, nor the man, for he is well satisfied with having the 43l. for his demurrage and the whole 73l. is not a farthing more than we have all along paid others in proportion), I may, I say, hereafter either put him to prove his payment or say that it is true I did receive money of him, but it was 8l. 9s. for the Committee of Tanger.

Temporality, as well as financial and moral questions, arise here as Pepys is looking to the future (where he envisages calling Taylor a liar if necessary). He writes in the present, anticipating happenings (which may or may not eventuate) in time to come. He further justifies himself, to himself, by implicating two colleagues:

4. That if I be demanded why I did not mention it in the bill of 8l. 9s. – I had [no] reason so to do, it being so much delivered short to the wrong of my Lord Peterborough, who hath offered to me (by Mr Povey) the gathering of what is due to him upon short deliveries; and what I account for the rest, I do purpose to [do] it for this.

Pepys is a very visual man, as the whole of his *Diary* concedes and records, and the following excerpt from the *NWB* shows how he tells himself that his use of this sense takes precedence over his morality even while it could not be condoned in his credulity:

5. That none of the Treasurer’s people can have the least doubt of my being concerned herein, he [Taylor] himself, going for the money, and receiving it all and giving his hand for it. Nor did I take anything under his hand for what was coming to me when I did give him up the bill.

6. I must remember that he had, besides all this, given me a while since a silver plate, to gain my help in business, so that I have got of him herein a
piece of plate of about 4l. and 35l. 42 clear, besides 8l. 9s. upon account for Tanger against I am called to give it. However, I will keep myself ready to expect it.

7. He cannot say that he did pay me any particular sum, for he did not tell it. But only, in the morning he brought me 40l. in his handkerchief and I took it without telling it, laying it by me; and at night he came and paid me the rest (3l. 13s.) wrapped up in a paper, without telling it at all.

8. That he did take of me the particulars of the provisions: how the 8l. 9s. did arise, as I have set it in the margin of the other side; but that he left it behind him, and so hath nothing to show of particulars, only in a bit of paper he did take the sum of 8l. 9s. as the sum that was abated out of the whole upon the account. But now I think of it, I am not very certain of this last head, for I think he did take the particulars of the provisions in two several papers at several times. (8-9)

All the above shows Pepys premeditating corruption, whilst deceiving Capt. Taylor, who, as stated, he is quite prepared to call a liar to his face should this incident be uncovered. This answers the question of why Pepys allows others through such dealings to be in a position of power over him if they decide to resort to blackmail. He will call them liars. The items above show his intended defence, which proves that he thinks he might need one. He could quite truthfully say, if confronted, that he did not see the money which changed hands hidden in the handkerchief “at that time,” and therefore claim that Taylor, and anyone else under similar circumstances who might be telling the truth, is not.

Pepys negates his fraudulent activity by resorting to a purely literal description to cloak his immorality. He might convince any accuser, but he could not convince
“himself” as his Machiavellian efforts to cover all exigencies prove. He knew he would retrieve the money from the handkerchief sooner or later. He has the plans, in the above incident, for extricating himself, if called to account, but they are hardly foolproof, as he is not sure, according to the last paragraph, whether Taylor did take away with him “the piece of paper” he will claim the man left behind. His intention to shift the guilt to another if found out heightens his willingness to be corrupt to ensure his self-preservation. This may exonerate him with others, but not himself. He knows the truth. His own words expose his manipulating greed, while he writes another face of complete integrity in his public documents and letters. The face of the Pepys in this instance in the *NWB* is one of careful planning to manipulate himself out of a charge of corruption should it be made public.

The other face of seeking to obtain bribes in this Captain Taylor incident can be clearly seen in his brief, but telling, writings in the *Diary* (so different from the lengthy reports, as shown, in the *NWB*), where he writes that he first “discoursed of something about freight of a ship, the *William and Mary*, that may bring me a little money” on 21 February 1663 (4.52-3). He writes only one sentence again on this subject in the *Diary* on 15 December 1663 but says “whereby I may get something justly” (4.422).

That Pepys considered that his admissions of moral misbehaviour were safely secreted in the *Diary* can be judged, as mentioned, against the almost complete exclusion of such personal incidents, except the one above, from the guarded, but not entirely secretive, *NWB*. It should be pointed out that this one exception is entered in the first few pages of the *NWB* and its like never repeated, as if the first inclusion was an error of judgement on Pepys’s part.
A similar example of using the literal truth of words to falsify a situation occurs in the *Diary* (dated 3 April 1663). In attempting to persuade himself that he is not culpable, Pepys is not only preparing a defence, but trying to salve a nagging bad conscience:

> Thence going out of Whitehall, I met Captain Grove, who did give me a letter directed to myself from himself; I discerned money to be in it and took it, knowing as I found it to be. The proceed of the place I have got him to have the taking up of vessels for Tanger. But I did not open it till I came home to my office; and there I broke it open, not looking into it till all the money was out, that I might say that I saw no money in the paper if ever I should be Questioned\(^{14}\) [sic] about it. (4.93)

The following year Pepys is still writing excuses for himself for his corruption. We cannot know his true motivation, but it seems a reasonable inference that his making vows against drink, theatre-going, idleness, extravagance, and visiting women, are all aimed at making his everyday life less turbulent, because they detract from his work, possibly inhibiting his rise to prosperity and gentility, rather than that he genuinely fears offending the Almighty. He does slide the profit from some of his suspect “deals” into gifts from God in his writings, but his profits are grist to his mill of avarice. A case in point occurred when Luellin approached Pepys on 12 December 1663 on behalf of his master who had surplus goods he wanted Pepys to sell. Pepys writes of the encounter in his *Diary*:

---

\(^{14}\) The capital letter beginning the word ‘Questioned’ is an interesting psychological slip, it could be contended. There is no reason, grammatically, why this word should be written so, but its use here promotes the suggestion that Pepys’s Machiavellianism subconsciously makes a literal escape onto the paper.
Then he begin [sic] to tell me that Mr. Deering had been with him to desire him to speak to me that if I would get him off with those goods upon his hands, he would give me 50 pence. And further, that if I would stand his friend, to help him to the benefit of his patent as the King’s merchant, he could spare me 200 l. per annum out of his profits. I was glad to hear both of these; but answered him no further then that as I would not by anything be bribed to be unjust in my dealings, so I was not so squeamish as not to take people’s acknowledgement where I have the good fortune by my pains to do them good and just offices. (4.415)

The last sentence shows a glimmer of conscience, for he is attempting to prove to himself that he is morally good, even philanthropic, in his desire to help his fellow man. In case they misunderstand him, though, he lets it be known that he anticipates the offered remuneration:

And so I would not come to be at an agreement with him, but I would labour to do him this service, and to expect his consideration thereof afterward, as he thought fit. So I expect to hear more of it.

I did make very much of Luellin, in hopes to have some good by this business; And after he was gone, I to my office doing business; and in the evening received some money from Mr. Moore and so went and settled accounts in my books between him and me; I do hope at Christmas not only to find myself as rich or more than ever I was yet, but also my accounts in less compass, fewer reckonings, either of debts or moneys due to me, then ever I have for some years. And endeed do so the goodness of God bringing me from better to a better expectation and hopes of doing well. [My emphasis] (4.415-16)
It is interesting that in this entry, as in many others, Pepys salves his conscience by ‘purifying’ his deals in intimating that God had engineered it. That Deering made the bill of exchange out in the name of Luellin to convert to the gold to be passed on to Pepys points to the deal being underhanded (5.1). The lure of 50 pieces of gold is too much for Pepys to refuse, and in the following *Diary* entry of 5 January 1664 we see him writing his justification for his avariciousness while maintaining his honour:

He being gone, then Luellin did give me the 50 pound from Mr. Deering which he doth give me for my pains in his business and which I may hereafter take for him—though there is not the least word or deed I have yet been guilty of in his behalf but what I am sure hath been to the King’s advantage and the profit of the service, nor ever will I. And for this money *I never did condition with him or expected a farthing at the time when I did do him the service*. Nor have given any receipt for it, it being brought me by Luellin. Nor do purpose to give him any thanks for it—but will, wherein I can, faithfully endeavour to see him have the privilege of his Patent as the King’s merchant. [My emphasis] (5. 5-6)

Pepys’s 1 January 1664 entry states that the money was paid in the name of Luellin, and the mere mention that he has given him no receipt, not even thanks in acknowledgement of the money’s changing hands, shows that Pepys is not being above board in this dealing. Indeed his recording of it is an acknowledgement of no acknowledgement. He documents a non-happening, then justifies it by documenting a proposed happening which may easily not happen either. His writing here crosses several temporal zones as he tries to legitimize the deal by laying it to the King’s advantage, which opens up the ironic ambiguity of the gap Pepys exploits between being “literal” and the deception of “lying”.

---

Barry 136
Pepys’s writings do not show him as being deliberately humorous, and it is often when he is being deadly serious that the situation he describes elicits laughter from the imaginative reader. In this case it is with his inclusion of the domestic deceit he uses in the following bit of corruption:

Thence to the Change again, and thence off to the Sun taverne with Sir W Warren and with him discoursed long and had good advice and hints from him; and among [other] things, he did give me a pair of gloves for my wife, wrapped up in paper; which I would not open, feeling it hard, but did tell him my wife should thank him, and so went on in discourse. When I came home, Lord, in what pain I was to get my wife out of the room without bidding her go, that I might see what these gloves were; and by and by, she being gone, it proves a pair of white gloves for her and 40 pieces in good gold: which did so cheer my heart that I could eat no victuals almost for dinner for joy to think how God doth bless us every day more and more – and more yet I hope he will upon the encrease of my duty and endeavours. I was at great loss what to do, whether tell my wife of it or no; which I could hardly forbear, but yet I did and will think of it first before I do, for fear of making her think me to be in a better condition or in a better way of getting money then yet I am. (5.35)

His face of pride vies with his acquisitive visage. Pepys is dying to share with his wife his cleverness in profiting from such a good deal, but afraid she might wish to relieve him of some of it, and worse, for him, that she might even be more demanding of his assets in the future. To Pepys, saving money is a means to power, and the wherewithal to buy the trappings of the gentleman he so wishes to become.

The following episode points up how much Pepys’s mind dwells on the making of extra money from his position. He keeps this avenue of remuneration somewhere in
the forefront of his workaday world for almost six weeks before extracting the spoils.

On 2 August 1664 he writes:

At the office all the morning. At noon dined, and then to the Change and there walked two hours or more with Sir W. Warren – who after much discourse in general of Sir W. Batten’s dealings, he fell to talk how everybody must live by their places; and that he was willing, if I desired it, that I should go shares with him in anything that he deals in. He told me again and again too, that he confesses himself my debtor 100l, for my service and friendship to him in his present great contract of masts, and that between this and Christmas he shall be in stock and will pay it me. (5.229-30)

Pepys demurs at this time. But by 14 September that same year, as noted in Chapter 4, he surprisingly writes of asking Warren for a loan of 100l which is a very artful way of reminding Warren of his earlier promise. Two days later Warren hands Pepys the money as a “gift” and, says Pepys, “he himself expressly taking care that nobody might see this business done […]” (5.271). Warren, in so doing, realised that he, too, was taking part in an incident of corruption, and Pepys tables his secretive action. With this sleight of hand approach, Warren is either just being careful or suffering from conscience too. This deal had involved the sale of thousands of masts by Warren to the Navy, and had attracted a great deal of animosity from another supplier (Woods) with whom Pepys dealt only under duress, in time of need, because of the inferiority of his timbers. Pepys and Warren were later to be accused in the parliamentary enquiry of 1669 of the offence attributed to Batten and Wood (4.201).

There are at least twenty-three more examples in the Diary of Pepys receiving money for favours, and around forty-four for gifts in kind, including much silver plate, gifts for Elizabeth, also various foods and wine, jewellery, and household
implements, about which, despite his claiming that he does no wrong, he is secretive.¹⁵ In his entry of 12 December 1663, he is fearful of being exposed as being involved in even more “double-dealing”:

At noon went home; and there I find that one Abrahall, who strikes in for the serving of the King with Ship-chandlery [sic] ware, hath sent my wife a Japan gowne; which pleases her very well and me also, it coming very opportune – but I know not how to carry myself to him, I being already obliged so far to Mrs Russell – so that I am in both their pays. (4.415)

Pepys records three days earlier that Mrs. Russell had given Elizabeth an alabaster figurine of St George, ostensibly hoping to supply the same order of tallow for which Abrahall was vying. Pepys’s integrity did not stretch to refusing at least one of these bribes, however. Pepys’s conscience causes him concern the next day when Mrs. Russell lost out on the deal, and Pepys once again pretends that a bribe is not a bribe:

So hard it is for a man not to be warped against his duty and maister’s interest that receives any bribe or present, though not as a bribe, from anybody else.

(4.409)

Even so, Pepys makes no mention later of returning either one of the “presents”.

On a much larger scale Pepys again uses the King’s property for free when he had the prize ship *The Maybolt* fitted out before taking possession of it (8.503-04). He also profits by trading in calico (5.289.n.4.) and coal (5.575-76), this, despite, as a

---

¹⁵ Pepys accepts money as bribe: 1.85; 1.273.n.1; 4.93, 408, 414, 423; 5.1, 35, 127, 158.n.3, 229-30, 270, 271; 6.55, 70, 85, 100, 98, 274, 280, 245.n.3; 251, 328, 7.8, 25, 85, 89-90, 244, 118; 8.44, 250; 102, 372, 548; 9.81-2. Other gifts: 1.320, 4.39, 41, 120, 150, 182, 220, 290, 293, 361, 368; 4.405, 409, 415; 5.32, 35, 45, 51, 52, 62, 72, 88, 152, 216, 218, 225920, 234, 259 n 1, 316-17, 6.57, 83, 100, 190-1, 338, 7.90, 91, 364, 405, 409, 413, 415, 416, 420, 7.175, 351, 407; 8.19; 9.405. (See the *Diary* index, 11.55.)
principal officer of the Board, being forbidden to trade in naval stores (5.289. n.4). The fear of exposure in this led him to stoop to downright fraud, when he removed his own name from an account book to be delivered to Parliament in which this calico deal was documented, and inserted Mr. Tooker’s (7.295.n.1).

There are occasions when Pepys refuses bribes, or writes of refusing them. It is interesting that this occurs when another more senior member of the Board is involved. For example, on 13 June 1663 Pepys writes:

And he and I parted, and I to the office and there had a difference with Sir W. Batten about Mr. Bowyers tarr; which I am resolved to cross, though he sent me last night, as a bribe, a barrel of sturgeon; which it may be I shall send back, for I will not have the King abused so abominably in the price of what we buy by Sir W. Batten’s corruption and underhand dealing. (4.181-82)

This is hypocritical of Pepys. He excuses his acceptance of gifts for smoothing the passage of suppliers through the obtaining of contracts and payment of their bills by constantly reiterating that he does so in the King’s interest, for these ‘presents’ are above what the King, via the Navy Board, should receive on the deals. These are bribes for doing the work for which he is paid by the King to do anyway, so in effect, he is again corrupt in being paid twice over.

A refusal of another type of bribe could have changed the pages of history. When it was mooted that Pepys was to be given the position of Clerk of the Acts he was offered 500 pounds by Mr. Watts to refuse the offer. Remembering Lord Montagu’s words about the profits of high office, Pepys refused the bribe (1.185) and ultimately became the respected naval advisor to the King himself and his brother the Duke of York.
For different reasons, another offer of a bribe was refused by Pepys, this time because it was too small, but he nevertheless makes it clear that the offer should still stand:

So home to dinner – where I find Captain Murford, who did put 3l in my hands for a friendship I have done him; but I would not take it, but bid him keep it till he hath enough to buy my wife a necklace.   (1.273)

Having looked at some of the inclusions of corruptions in the *Diary*, we should note one glaring exclusion. Pepys does not admit to his flagrantly dishonest maltreatment of Mr. Povey, the former Treasurer for Tangiers. This is despite the fact that Mr. Povey helped procure his membership of the Royal Society, and performed other kindly deeds for him over the years.

On February 16\(^{th}\) 1665 Pepys writes of Povey in his Diary:

But Lord, to see what a degree of contempt, nay, scorn, Mr. Povy, through his prodigious folly, hath brought himself in his accounts, that if he be not a man of a great interest, he will be kicked out of his employment for a fool – is very strange; and that most deservedly that ever man was. (6.37)

Povey did indeed have all the accounts in a turmoil (but in his defence, he also filled many other positions), and not being able to bring the books to a satisfactory accounting, he decided to resign as Treasurer of Tangiers. On March 17\(^{th}\) 1665, he approached Pepys to suggest that, with his backing, and the promise that Pepys would agree that he (Povey) would receive half the profits that the position afforded, he could take over as Treasurer. In other words he would “sell” his place to Pepys for a division of the profits.

Pepys records talking over this suggestion with Mr. Coventry who urges him to take the post as he would then mingle with important superiors. Pepys agrees, but
there is another contender for the post (6.59-60). However, with Povey’s backing he is
given the position. Other members of the Board then decided that perhaps the position
should not be handed over until Povey first reconciled all the accounts. Pepys now
wanted the post more than ever, and finally the finances and the accounts were passed
to him as the new Treasurer of Tangiers.

There are at least two occasions in the *Diary* where Pepys refers to making the
contract with Povey regarding his agreement to split the profits with him:

- At my office all the afternoon, drawing up my agreement with Mr. Povy, for
  me to sign to him tomorrow morning. (6.67)
- Up betimes to Mr. Povy’s, and there did sign and seal my agreement with him
  about my place of being Treasurer for Tanger, - it being, the greatest part of it,
  drawn out of a draught of his own drawing up; only, I have added something
  here and there in favour of myself. (6.68).

According to Latham and Matthews (10.344) and Bryant (iii.167-8) Pepys reneged on
the deal. Claire Tomalin gives more details. In less than one year in the Tangiers
position, Pepys had made one thousand pounds. When Povey wrote asking for his
share Pepys said he had obtained nothing. Nine years later Povey wrote to Pepys
complaining again. And on 23 February 1674 Pepys put him off once more. After
more correspondence Pepys replies to Povey in a tone of injured innocence and
magisterial dignity:

- Pray therefore let us have no more of this sort of correspondence between us,
  for I am one too stubborn ever knowingly to endure being imposed upon, so
  shall I with much less willingness be ever provoked to violate the known
  simplicity of my dealings, especially with one from whom I have always
  owned my having received such civilities as may challenge and shall meet
with all expressions of gratitude on this side admitting of a manifest wrong.

(qtd. in Tomalin 146)

As Tomalin notes, “The ornate prose in which he chooses to tell his lies makes an interesting contrast to the concise language of the Diary” (146). When Povey persists in his claim Pepys again uses language to corrupt the truth by telling Povey that he has never asked Sir Denis Gauden, the chief victualler for Tangiers, “for anything.” Povey said he had never asked Mr. Gauden for anything either because Gauden gave without being asked. Pepys’s Diary entry dated 30 December 1665 confirms this:

At noon home to dinner, and all the afternoon to my accounts again; and there find myself, to my great joy, a great deal worth above 4000£, for which the Lord be praised—and is principally occasioned by my getting 500£ of Cocke for my profit in his bargains of prize goods, and from Mr Gawden’s making me a present of 500£ more when I paid him 8000£ for Tangier. (6.341)

The original agreements on Tangiers between Pepys and Povey are still extant (6.68 n.2), as are letters from Povey asking for the money, to no avail, even from Will Hewer who subsequently took over the Tangiers job (Bryant Saviour of the Navy 167).

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the buying of a place, which Pepys had virtually agreed to do with Povey in the beginning, was still definitely against the law at this time. Whether Pepys did not recompense Povey because of this, or whether he used that law as an excuse not to pay him is not made clear.

“Corruption” may be defined as the condition of a person who is “perverted from uprightness and fidelity in the discharge of duty” (OED). This usually refers to an incumbent of a public or professional position who uses their official capacity for private benefit. In Pepys’s case, such a description is very pertinent when he obtains
sexual gratification from these lower-class women in exchange for his using his influence to engineer the employment of their husbands. This exchange on the women’s part is sometimes offered or given freely. There are numerous occasions, at least twenty (11.79), when the young Mrs. Daniel, seeking a place for her Naval Officer husband, meets with Pepys and allows, indeed, surely expects, the intimate touchings she mostly condones, even when heavily pregnant (6.336). She repulses similar overtures from Lord Rutherford (6.274). She has no need to bribe him.

Pepys’s relationship with Mrs. Bagwell starts out differently. She, too, comes with her husband to ask for a favour, but by appearing “a modest woman” as Pepys first describes her, she plays Pepys like an angler tussling with a fish as he writes serially about what becomes an extended affair, even after he achieves his first intention. This relationship is discussed in detail in Chapter 7.

Pepys never admits to being corrupt, although he often writes his intention to be even more so. As stated, he documents his decision to incriminate others should this become necessary to protect his other written faces of honesty, integrity, and service to the King, which he foregrounds so constantly in the NWB, and his thousands of business and private letters.

It would be tempting to regard this contrast as simply hypocrisy, following the familiar pattern of an outward appearance of virtue concealing what are in fact vicious practices. In this formulation the corrupt Pepys would be the authentic one, and the upright Pepys simply a mask. Accounts of the Diary, much the best-known among the documentary sources originating from Pepys, have tended to take this view, rejoicing that the creation and survival of the Diary provides - uniquely - a window into the inner reality of a seventeenth-century figure. Yet this is an over-simplification. We know from historical record that Pepys was a highly successful and disciplined civil
servant, and can be credited with the organisational underpinnings of one of the
greatest navies of his era. The sober Pepys of the letters is at least as coherent, and as
plausible, as the exuberant, morally questionable, divided and insecure Pepys of the
Diary. The Pepys of the NWB, from another private if not entirely secretive set of
writings, shows us that Pepys can be aggressive, even vindictive, emphatically
excluding any admission of doubt or uncertainty. This self-documentation leaves a
protean multiplicity of lives in the record, but this multiplicity cannot be overcome by
attempting to merge both Pepys’s public and private writings of himself. Pepys lives
on different planes.

His avowed desire early in the Diary to join his superiors and “become a
gentleman with a coach” leads him to set out in whatever way he is able, to make the
money to buy his way to gentility. This sets up a complexity which foregrounds a
psychological dilemma for him. His financial desires battle with his puritanical
upbringing. He cannot always marry the two, so two of his faces separately exist at
the one time. As we have seen, he “confesses” in the Diary to his ill-gotten financial
profit on a deal, then he denies it is a bribe. He documents how he received it in a
clandestine manner, next using the manipulation of semantics to disguise the bribe’s
presence at all.

The seamier side of Pepys’s private life he documents practically all through the
Diary, making a tie between sex and business when he coerces women as part of his
public-business power, using them as a commodity. This reveals a gap between his
conscious knowledge that he is doing wrong and his implicit acknowledgement that
he is still doing it. So, on the surface, in these entries, Pepys disguises his darker face
even from himself. Yet we know he was also compelled to enter that darker face in
the ledger of his Diary, to write it out as perhaps no-one had ever done before him.
CHAPTER 7
WOMEN

In this chapter the presentation of women and sex in the *Diary* will be examined in regard to the question of the protean quality of the Pepys who is presented in the *Diary*. These are important subjects in regard to the study of Pepys for it is around these issues that one can most clearly perceive the different "faces" he assumes in his writing. Sex is particularly relevant in an investigation of Pepys’s presentation of himself in the *Diary* because, following the work of Michel Foucault, “sex” has become one of the prime discourses in signifying selfhood. Foucault remarks (in a way that is particularly applicable to the case of Pepys) on the link between sex as “discursive fact” and the “channels of power.” He writes:

> My main concern will be to locate the forms of power, the channels it takes, and the discourses it permeates in order to reach the most tenuous and individual modes of behaviour, the paths that give it access to the rare or scarcely perceivable forms of desire, how it penetrates and controls everyday pleasure—all this entailing effects that may be those of refusal, blockage, and invalidation, but also incitement and intensification: in short, the “polymorphous techniques of power.” (11)

In regard to Pepys one can clearly see the link between sex and power, in terms of both social and sexual relationships, and his authority as writer of the *Diary*. The point is, though, that the "self" Pepys writes are "selves" and that his writing about women and sex reveals an instability around which other "faces" circle.

There is no single narrative style or form Pepys uses to present lower-class women in the *Diary*, with the exception of Pepys’s recording of his exploits with Mrs. Bagwell. Often he will merely mention a dalliance in the middle of an account of his day-to-day activities as if it had no more importance to him than consuming a meal.
The paratactic style of writing about his sexual liaisons gives the impression of them being merely one among a number of loosely connected events. In terms of Pepys’s reasons for writing about them, they take on the form of a personal record or tabulation of his forays.

Conversely, when Pepys is writing about his wife, Deb, and Mrs. Bagwell, he assumes a more "serialized" style that tends to follow a plot line (though there are also significant differences between the style and form of these "narratives" as well, as will be discussed below). It is important to remember that as a writer Pepys is assuming a position within the discursive field of his time, and so cannot escape the influences of other modes of presenting women and sex. Although plays and pornographic novels, and the discourse of libertinism, are not written up in the Diary in any great detail, as are Pepys’s dalliances, such writings were freely available for those who sought them out, and it is known from some of his journal entries that Pepys did acquire and read pornographic literature. James Grantham Turner writes, on this subject:

England did not develop in isolation, and though future chapters concentrate on London, I will here, if only briefly, cite parallels from Continental Renaissance sources that anticipated or influenced Stuart culture.

“Pornographic texts” […] circulated widely in England, especially the two notorious dialogues that Pepys mentions in his diary, the French Escole des filles and the Italian work attributed to Aretino, La puttana errante – the "Wandering" or "Errant Whore." (3)

Although Pepys writes of his sexual encounters with intimate enthusiasm, Claire Tomalin, in her novelistic biography of Pepys, writes Pepys as an incompetent, rather shallow “failure” in his extra-marital sex exploits (207), although, he at most times expresses his enjoyment after such episodes, and over the period of the Diary there
were dozens and dozens of them. The incident to which she specifically refers involves his lack of confidence in accosting a pretty girl he saw walking towards him in the street who engendered in him the fear that he would be unsuccessful if he accosted her, because he was not adept at witty conversation (8.141). She did not appear to be one of the lower-class women from whom he usually took his sexual favours -- he would need no ready wit to seduce those doxies -- but this young woman’s class of female he was never confident in approaching.

Pepys’s relationship with women and his writing about sex are crucial in understanding the instability of his “self” as it is manifested in the *Diary*. In the main, Pepys presents women in his *Diary* writing, in terms of lust, sex and power, but female family members are also considered in light of the power relations between men and women. He exhibits the face of power when writing family letters to or about women, for example those regarding his sister Pall, and more so in those he writes directly to his brother-in-law, Balty’s, wife Ester. His face of power is obvious in his *NWB* and in business correspondence, but the written faces of lust and sex are prominent only in the entries in his *Diary*. These are faces of himself he chooses to write, albeit primarily for his eyes alone, for barely any man in the seventeenth century actually wrote of such less than desirable actions other than aristocratic libertines such as Rochester, Sir Charles Sedley and William Wycherly (Stone 340).

Pepys’s blood kinship with his mother and sister Paulina (Pall), and his marital kinship with Balty’s wife Ester, virtually precludes them from being characters included in this chapter on Pepys’s “women,” which deals mostly with his sexual relationships. In the *Diary* Pepys writes his relationship with his mother as someone about whom he does care, but he accepts his father’s criticisms of her as being

---

16 See Chapter 5, above.
complaining and difficult to live with. When Pepys writes that he hears of her severe illness 20 March 1667 “he made no attempt to visit her; instead, like Proust with his grandmother, he contented himself with dreaming of her” (Tomalin 163). When he hears of her death a few days later he weeps and is sad. His relationship with his sister is not a closely affectionate one. He writes that his sister Pall is “ill-natured” (1.290), old and ugly (8.471) but he always looks after her interests, finding her a husband and handling her financial affairs. He agreed that she should be part of his household at one stage before her marriage, but insisted she would only have the position as a servant and not as a member of his immediate family. This situation did not last. Pepys’s relationship with Ester, wife of Elizabeth’s brother Balty, was even less harmonious. His letters to her (see Chapter 5) attest to this.

There are entries relating to only two women in the *Diary* which exhibit a face of Pepys which shows emotional warmth as well as physical desire. These two emotions are apparent in his narratives involving his wife’s young companion, Deb Willet, and in those numerous entries when writing of his life with his wife, Elizabeth, with whom he first fell in love.

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, marriages, among the middle and upper classes at least, were not generally made by two people in love. “Poor greenheads”, wrote Daniel Rogers in 1642 of those who did, “when a year or two had passed and they had skimmed the cream of their marriage, they would soon envy the good fortune of those whose union was built on stronger foundations” (qtd. in Fraser 31). The stronger foundations alluded to were money or land for men, and perhaps a good societal position for the women. Men often provided a title or a good family name, and the woman generally bolstered the success of the union by bringing with her a substantial dowry of money or property (Stone 38). This, upon marriage, became the
property of the husband, as *The Lawes Resolutions* decreed: “That which the husband hath is his own” and “That which the wife hath is the husband’s” (qtd. in Fraser 13). *The Lawes Resolutions* were “an exposition of the law concerning the female sex printed in 1632, but thought to have been written by two lawyers at the end of the sixteenth century” (Fraser 13). Marrying for love “received a hearty condemnation… by most societies in the history of the world” (Fraser 31). Samuel Pepys was “a greenhead,” for he married a fifteen-year-old girl, Elizabeth St. Michel, who had neither position nor dowry. She was the daughter of Alexander St. Michel, a French protestant, who, it was said, fought under Cromwell in Ireland where he met Elizabeth’s mother, Dorothea, who claimed kinship with the Earls of Cumberland (10.374). Pepys’s treatment of his wife, which he graphically describes in his journal entries, vacillates between love in the bedroom and fireworks in the kitchen, although, on at least two occasions, very violent confrontations also erupted in their sleeping quarters.

Elizabeth Pepys appears in the first paragraph of the *Diary* thus: “My wife, after the absence of her terms for seven weeks, gave me hopes of her being with child, but on the last day of the year she hath them again” (1.1). For the length of the *Diary* (altogether 3,908 times) Elizabeth is referred to in no other way but “my wife.”

Claire Tomalin says that Elizabeth, in comparison with her husband, “is a fainter, simpler figure, and voiceless since none of her letters survive” (214). Some critics, like Robert Louis Stevenson, denigrate Elizabeth by calling her “vulgar” (qtd. in Tomalin 214), and Tomalin argues that “twentieth-century feminist attempts to give her a voice have been unconvincing” (214). This is simplistic. It is true that no writing of hers survives in Pepys’s papers or elsewhere, and almost no direct speech of hers is quoted in the *Diary*, yet she is an indirect, but persuasive presence there, and Pepys
evidently defines himself to some degree in relation to her. Her voice is spectral in that it is there even though it appears, at first, as if it is missing, but she is as much written up as his omnipresent closing phrase “and so to bed." She is acknowledged constantly in the *Diary* entries, and there are some sequences where her views and responses are treated very seriously indeed, as we shall see.

Pepys’s entries do prove that Elizabeth is wilful and headstrong (with good reason sometimes), and not just the suppliant helpmate that wives in those days were meant to be. Women were expected to obey their husbands in all things in that era, as Lawrence Stone reports:

> Of greatest impact, in the sense that it must have reached the widest audience, over the longest period of time, was the Homily on Marriage which was . . . ordered by the Crown to [be] read in church every Sunday from 1562 onwards. It left the audience in no doubt about the inferior status, rights and character of a wife: "the woman is a weak creature not endued with like strength and constancy of mind" . . . The ideal woman in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was weak, submissive, charitable, virtuous and modest [...] she was silent in church and in the home, and at all times submissive to men. (138)

Elizabeth often openly defies her husband, and Pepys is afraid that her attitude in the house before servants, and her failure to respect his father will make him lose public and familial face (4.212). Pepys also writes of his complaints, as the years go by, about her lack of ability to run the house, her handling of the servants, and their cooking, especially when she does not provide a good table for visitors whom he wishes to impress (5.291).
Pepys records the terrible scene where she writes him a letter telling him of her unhappiness in her marriage; she is lonely, he doesn’t love her. Furious at her temerity in criticizing him for neglecting her, and fearful if this became public that it would damage his image, he tears up her cherished love letters he wrote her when she was "happy," and consigns all but one to the fire (4.9-10). She is threatening Pepys’s patriarchal dominance here, a situation which Pepys writes of finding troublesome on other occasions, as shall be seen primarily in the Pembleton episode. Pepys does not show himself in a good light in the scene above; his face of threatened power gives way to one betraying unnecessary cruelty to Elizabeth.

In the upper and moneyed classes the wife was expected to control the children and maids, provided this was with the concurrence of the husband. Pepys did not father a child, possibly because of the effects of surgery he underwent in 1658 for the removal of a stone in his bladder (Tomalin 55), so matters concerning household servants became the only domain over which Elizabeth was allowed to exercise control.

However, balancing the troubled times in their marriage, Pepys also writes of his happiness with time spent with his wife, and he shows concern for her maladies and distresses, and the love that he feels does come through the Diary entries (despite his extramarital lustful dalliances). For example he notes that “In the evening our discourse turned to great content and love” (4.183), and, after several years of marriage, on 5 March 1667 he writes:

But Lord, to see to what a poor content any acquaintance among these people, or the people of the world as they nowadays go, is worth; for my part, I and my wife will keep to one another and let the world go hang—for there is nothing but falseness in it. (8.97)
Conversely, however, as in the letter scene above, Pepys reacts violently when Elizabeth tries to assert herself beyond her place in the gender dynamics of that society. When he criticizes her handling of the servants, she gives him “some cross answer” (5. 349). For this he gives her a black eye. Pepys admits, on that occasion, that he has to make excuses to others why she does not accompany him on visits for several days thereafter. He would not want it known that he had beaten his wife. He would lose respect in the public arena and sully his public persona, that of the face of an upright and moral man. Although he tells the \textit{Diary} that he is sorry for his violent act, it comes across, in his entry, that he is more fearful of the loss of his public face as an honourable man, than that his wife is in pain or in distress, when he writes on 25 December 1664:

\begin{quote}
Up (my wife’s eye being ill still of the blow I did in a passion give her on Monday last) to church alone—where Mr. Mills, a good sermon. To dinner at home, where very pleasant with my wife and family. After dinner, I to Sir W. Batten’s and there received so much good usage (as I have of late done) from him and my Lady, obliging me and my wife, according to promise, to come and dine with them tomorrow with our neighbours, that I was in pain all the day, and night too after, to know how to order the business of my wife’s not going […]. \end{quote} \hspace{1cm} (5.356)

Nevertheless he shares many happy outings with her, and companionable discussions for their future. Pepys enjoys teaching her music (7.111) arithmetic (4.402) and astronomy (4.43). She appears an apt pupil, and he delights in her prowess at painting (7.232) and singing (8.171), but Pepys makes several entries which betray a relative lack of sexual intimacy in his marriage. He sometimes records that he has not lain with his wife for months. Elizabeth suffered from an abscess in her private parts, also
recurring menstrual pain, which often precluded copulation. For example, 2 August 1660 Pepys writes:

    When I came home, I find my wife not very well of her old pain in the lip of her chose [genitalia], which she had when we were first married. (1.213)

And a few days later on 6 August 1660 he admits to being "not a little impatient" to find his wife still “being ill in pain a-bed” (1.216). However, he is in a brighter mood two days later: "We lay there all night very pleasantly and at ease, I taking my pleasure with my wife in the morning, being the first time after her being eased of her pain" (1.217).

This recurring physical problem was offset by Pepys’s pride in the attractiveness of his wife. Throughout the Diary Pepys describes various women by their appearance in that they are “pretty,” or “ugly sluts,” and he is obviously proud as he writes of Elizabeth’s good looks when they are out together in public, especially when she outshines the wives of his superiors, or in this case, Princess Henrietta, in beauty and dress: "But my wife, standing near her with two or three black paches on and well dressed, did seem to me much handsomer then she" (1.299). In public, she is thus an asset to his social standing (he takes, as it were, her beauty as a positive reflection of himself), even if, in private, she sometimes fell short in his estimation of what a wife should be. When he later has to choose between a young female object of desire and his marriage, there is no contest, even though he writes of his struggles to have both. His public face of rationality and self-interest, then, triumphs over that of private lust.

However, when Elizabeth decides that she wishes to take dancing lessons from Mr. Pembleton, a dancing master, for a month, both Pepys’s public character and his private reaction to the lessons lead to a change in the style of his writing when he recounts the incidents. The narration of the Elizabeth and Mr. Pembleton episode is in
an ongoing, serialised style, rather than the diurnal style which Pepys mostly
otherwise uses, with two more exceptions. Over the two months of lessons, and
beyond, he records the emotional turbulence engendered by the relationship between
his wife and the dancing master in a narrative style rarely apparent when recording his
often daily dalliances. Unlike the face of confidence Pepys displays in his business
dealings, the feeling of insecurity caused by his own “folly” in acceding to his wife’s
request for dancing instruction shows us a face of anguished jealousy, and dismay at
losing control both of himself and his wife, and, worst of all, the possibility of losing
face in the social world if he were to be cuckolded.

On 25 April 1663 Elizabeth started having lessons from Mr. Pembleton, and on 4
May 1663 Pepys, considering that dancing could be a social asset, allows himself to
be cajoled into taking lessons also. He proudly records his own progress every few
days until, almost three weeks later, he writes that he is “a little angry with my wife
for minding nothing now but the dancing-maister, having him come twice a day,
which is a folly” (4.133). Three days later Pepys becomes inordinately jealous of this
“black” (dark-haired) man, and his entry for that day shows the emotional turbulence
foreign to the strong and efficient “man of business”:

And by coach to St. James’s and there told Mr. Coventry what I had done
with my Lord, with great satisfaction; and so, well pleased, home – where I
find it almost night and my wife and the Dancing Maister alone above, not
dancing but walking. Now, so deadly full of jealousy I am, that my heart and
head did so cast about and fret, that I could not do any business possibly, but
went out to my office: and anon late home again, and ready to chide at
everything; and then suddenly to bed and could hardly sleep, yet durst not say
anything; but was forced to say that I had bad news from the Duke
concerning Tom Hater, as an excuse to my wife – who by my folly hath too much opportunity given her with that man; who is a pretty neat black man, but married. But it is a deadly folly and plague that I bring upon myself to be so jealous; and by giving myself such an occasion, more then my wife desired, of giving her another month’s dancing – which however shall be ended as soon as I can possibly. <But I am ashamed to think what a course I did take by lying to see whether my wife did wear drawers today as she used to do, and other things to raise my suspicion of her; but I found no true cause of doing it.>\(^{17}\) (4.140).

Pepys even writes, the next day, that his own conduct should prevent his criticizing Elizabeth when “upon a small temptation I could be false to her” (4.140).

Nevertheless, Pepys then writes himself into an obsessed, clown-faced figure over the next few weeks, one who listens at keyholes, rifles Elizabeth’s underwear drawer, and sneaks upstairs to see if the beds have been disturbed while he was at the office, and his wife and Mr. Pembleton were alone in the house (4.158).

He admits that his great fear is losing control over her, and he tries to prevent having to admit his jealousy to her for just this reason. He not only is losing control over Elizabeth, but his own spiralling emotions are leading him to spill his fears onto the pages of his journal:

[…] and Pembleton being there again, we fell to dance a country dance or two, and so to supper and bed. But being at supper, my wife did say something that caused me to oppose her in; she used the word “Devil”, which vexed me; and among other things, I said I would not have her to use that word, upon which she took me up most scornfully; which before Ashwell

\(^{17}\) The editors note that the last sentence is crammed in as an afterthought (4.150).
and the rest of the world, I know not nowadays how to check as I would
heretofore, for less then that would have made me strike her. So that I fear,
without great discretion, I shall go near to lose too my command over her
[…]. (4.150)

By 27 May 1663 Pepys was so overwrought that at 3 a.m. he woke Elizabeth and
taxed her with his jealous thoughts. She tearfully denied any wrongdoing and Pepys
appeared mollified (4.158). But he records nineteen more days of feelings of
uncontrollable jealousy when Pembleton is on the scene, even until April 1665
(11.214). Some of those entries do give rise to the thought that Elizabeth may have
been seeking retaliation, as he had feared, because several times she insisted upon
going to church dressed in her best clothes when she knew Pembleton would be there,
even though she had neglected going to church on many occasions, and Pembleton
turned up at the Pepys’s home several times to dance with Elizabeth, presumably at
her invitation, long after the lessons finished. Over twenty times more Pepys carries
on the jealous entries, but he and Elizabeth have by that time returned to the status
quo, and there is relative peace between them. 18

Up, and my wife and I to church; where it is strange to see how by use and
seeing Pembleton come with his wife thither to church, I begin now to make
no great matter of it, which before was so terrible to me. (4.347)

Although they shared a volatile relationship, Pepys writes of missing his wife when
they are apart (1.317), even though he often uses her absence to go in search of purely
sexual pursuits.

18 Two years later Mr Pembleton is written in the text several times as Mr Pendleton, if it is indeed Mr
Pembleton. Latham and Matthews evidently believe that this is indeed the one-time dancing master,
judging by their index entry “PEMBLETON (Pendleton)” (11.208).
Overall, Elizabeth is written as an underlying threat to Pepys’s control. As John H. O’Neil points out when discussing the Mr. Pembleton episodes, “To some degree, the very word master may be responsible for Pepys’s unease” (91). She is also a threat to the stability of his emotions in this narrative, as he writhes in uncontrollable jealousy.

Pepys, in his voice, may be said to create Elizabeth. Although he appears to silence her voice with his own, she resists, as an implied fictional character, splitting the authority of his word. In this sense Elizabeth’s voice in the *Diary* becomes a "partner" in dialogue with Pepys’s own voice. The best example of this is in the sections in the *Diary* about Deb Willet, discussed below, which reveal a dialogic interplay of voices (based on gender, class, and the distinction between the public and private worlds). Despite Pepys’s habit of never quoting her verbatim, except when he writes of her calling him a “prick-louse” (4.121), we hear Elizabeth’s emotions of rebelliousness, complaint, kindness, enjoyment and raging anger, the latter when she is finally aware of his infidelity.

Pepys starts to write of his wayward exploits (catalogued in meticulous detail) as he pursues young women who take his eye just over two years into the *Diary*. These were not discussed, as far as we know, with anyone else (except perforce, much later, with William Hewer in the Deb episode). These entries are written by Pepys for himself, perhaps as a record, or for lascivious enjoyment, but the act of writing, because of its erotic nature appears to become a quasi-sexual performance and not the act of reading. Pepys obviously wanted to tell someone of these exploits, but the *Diary* entries do not disclose anyone he would choose to tell, so he released the sexual incidents into his supposedly diurnal writings.

Most of Pepys’s entries about his dalliances are written in a polyglot, or macaronic, language of English, French, Spanish, Italian and Latin with a little Greek
here and there. Arthur Bryant refers to this linguistic composition as “peculiar jargon” (*The Man in the Making* 313), while William Matthews refers to Pepys’s *lingua franca* (1.xi). The reasons suggested for using it are also varied: his childhood puritan background, his shame, his desire for secrecy (1.cix-cx), although, as Matthews writes, “his presentation of this record of his moral deviations is clinical rather than moral or erotic; much of it reads like material for a scientific report on sexual behaviour in the human male” (1.cx). Although concurring with Matthews on this last statement, I am still of the opinion that Pepys’s motive for cataloguing his dalliances so, was one of lasciviousness. When he writes of his “pleasure” after the events, he is referring to physical gratification, albeit, in his case, temporary. Remembering Harry Berger. Jr’s proposal that when putting words on a page, “No matter who else writers perform before, they perform in the first instance before themselves. The *I* that writes is always an *I* that reads what it writes and monitors the act of writing” (560), the polyglot entries which Pepys makes allow him to live erotically the memories of his sexual pursuits.

Having said that, the question arises, why did he begin to use this macaronic language at that particular time in his *Diary* when he had made, earlier, perhaps an even more prurient entry in plain English? Although Pepys later describes the illicit sexual interludes which he seeks out in this polyglot language, they do not rival, in prurience, the earlier incidents before Pembleton which he has written in lurid English. For example on 18 July 1663 he writes:

> By and by Mrs. Lane comes; and my bands [neckbands] not being done, she and I parted and met at the Crowne in the palace-yard, where we eat (a chicken I sent for) and drank and were mighty merry, and I had my full liberty of towsing her and doing what I would but the last thing of all; for I felt as
much as I would and made her feel my thing also, and put the end of it to her breast and by and by to her very belly—of which I am heartily ashamed. But I do resolve never to do more so. (4.234)

This example is more sexually explicit than some of the other entries he makes which are supposedly secreted in the idiolect he has concocted, a literary habit which he then adopts when writing up the sexual exploits until 30 May 1667. After that date, until the end of the Diary, he unaccountably changes the style of writing of his sexual incidents to one “where he garbles the shorthand passages of this kind by inserting extra letters, especially r, l, m or n” (8.244). It can be presumed that the dalliances thus documented, begin to live, for Pepys, a more exotic life on the page. As James Grantham Turner argues, “[Pepys] does not deny his sex, as Barker insists, but dresses it up, with a baguette under its arm and a little sombrero on its head” (97-8).

Whether Pepys’s wild imaginings of Elizabeth’s possible infidelity fired his own passions the more can only be conjectured. Did the possibility of Elizabeth straying from the matrimonial fold with the dancing master, thus putatively making him a cuckold, necessitate his written proof of his own sexual mastery when he chose to exercise it? And did his rise in his career give him more opportunity, or a more powerful “right” to extract or expect, from lower-class women, the sexual gratification which he entered as multilingual titillation? The following sequence, based on the “assignations with women” heading in the index in the Latham and Matthews’s edition of the Diary, seems to imply that this could be so:

In 1664 he wrote of 7 such assignations.

In 1665 he wrote of 23.

In 1666 he wrote of 28.

In 1667 he wrote of 62
In 1668 he wrote of 79. (11. 155)

In the index Robert Latham uses the terms "amorous passages," but there is no warmth of love expressed in these dalliances, just physical lust. To term them "lecherous passages" would have seemed more accurate.

From Pepys’s point of view, his power over women has two sides: his career advancement gives him the opportunity to exercise such power with its enjoyment of physical pleasure, but, also, this leaves him having to admit that desire is a threat to rationality, and therefore, control. He gives in to desire, as he records the Diary, many times, when he admits that he cannot resist a pretty face. He cannot resist mammary glands either, which he uses for erotic sensations, as he does in his placement of women’s hands on his body. Even “big-bellied” [pregnant] women do not escape his sexual interest if they can provide him with “pleasure” (5.242). One could argue here that Pepys turns women into body parts, “part objects,” that he fetishizes, rather than thinking of them in terms of being a whole woman. This again emphasizes Pepys’s attempts to control.

Pepys records sexual encounters with at least twenty different women in the course of the Diary’s writing (Tomalin 209). That Elizabeth was completely unaware of his philanderings is unlikely, given that she insists that he gives written proof that he will not see Mrs. Knipp, an actress, and others more (9.339). However, these women she has met socially, and so are known to her. Of Pepys’s long association with a lower-class woman like “Bagwell’s wife” it is believable that she knows nothing. Bagwell’s wife is one of a long line of women who are treated as mere sex objects by Pepys. By constantly referring to the woman as “Bagwell’s wife” -- he never gives her any other name -- Pepys writes her out of any relationship other than a sexual one. Bagwell’s wife is mentioned at least twenty-four times in the Diary. As
stated, Elizabeth is always given the personal “my wife.” Although he uses her, Pepys always regards Bagwell’s wife as Bagwell’s property.

When very few dalliances appear in the earliest years of the *Diary*, 1660-1662, it is to be questioned whether this was because there were none, or because he did not, for whatever reason, decide to record them. Betty Lane (later Mrs. Betty Martin, a linen-draper’s wife) appears to have been a contact of Pepys before he started to write the *Diary*. He writes on 12 August 1660 that he took her to his house in Axe Yard, and “was exceeding free in dallying with her, and she not unfree to take it” (1.220).

This is not explicit. It could mean anything -- from groping to something more physically intimate -- but it shows that some such scene had been enacted. His association with this woman is carried on and off throughout the whole of the *Diary*, but not in narrative form. She appears to be a woman of dubious morals although not a prostitute; a friend of the family as well as Pepys’s doxy (9.297), but she does not always make herself available, and Pepys several times expresses his low opinion of her, but theirs does seem to be a long, if spasmodic, relationship. However, it is not in the same category as other women he uses, for he also enjoys her company socially. There is an occasion, too, when Betty Martin insists (her husband being away) that she is with child, and that the child is Pepys’s. She finds out soon after that she is not pregnant. Pepys is relieved. Despite his having no legitimate progeny, it is obvious that Pepys does not wish to have a child with such a low-class woman. This would not sit well with his public image. He says, after the conversation, “it doth trouble me not a little. Thence, not pleased, away to White-hall . . .” (8.318). Pepys never writes of such an occasion happening with the many other women (mostly married) with whom he dallies. Not that a paternity issue would apply to the prostitutes who seem to
fascinate him, because he is too health-conscious to risk catching a sexually transmitted disease.

Just three days after the Pembleton bed-checking fiasco he admitted to (4.158), he is returning home from his day’s wanderings (it was a holiday) and writes:

And so home and in my way did take two turns forward and backward through the Fleete alley to see a couple of pretty whores that stood off the doors there; and God forgive me, I could scarce stay myself from going into their houses with them, so apt is my nature to evil [...]. (4.164)

Pepys’s recording of his visits to bawdy-houses in Fleet Alley exposes a prevarication not obvious in his public writings. For example, 11 July 1664 he rides partway with Elizabeth on her annual journey to the country, and later, on 23 July 1664, he visits Fleet Alley and considers going into the house with “a pretty wench,” a prostitute, and writes, “but what by sense of honour and conscience, I would not go in” (5.219).

However, later that same day, he meets Mrs. Lane, “had his pleasure of her twice” and, after half an hour with her, went straight back to Fleet Alley and into the bawdy-house with the pretty woman he had seen earlier in the day. He does not write that he is lured in to the brothel by sex, but by the prettiness of the prostitute on show. He evinces no pretence of honour or conscience this time, but he decides not to “meddle” with her, “for fear of her not being wholesome” (5.219). Yet, as a businessman, is he naïve when he records surprise when the prostitute rejects his attention when he, fearing contamination, tells her he has no money (5.219-20)? It is interesting that he never writes details of a sexual act in which he takes part in a brothel. His inability to resist sexual temptations again and again, despite his writing earlier “And so through fleete alley, God forgive me, out of an itch to look upon the sluts there; against which, when I saw them, my stomach turned” (4.301), shows a weak face of the diarist which
is not commensurate with that of his upstanding and strong public persona in his other
documentation.

In the *Diary* Pepys openly admits that he cannot resist pretty women, even when they are in church (8.389). If the sermon is boring he fills in his time watching them. He even writes of “pleasuring himself” after looking at them. This solitary act is a link with his solitary act of writing. Also in the solitary act of “pleasuring himself” he exercises a fantasy power, having full imaginative control over the image of the woman. This act also mirrors his relationship with these women he uses; the “pleasure” is only for him, for he never writes of being considerate of them. Both the masturbation and the ex-marital sexual fumblings are purely physical, without emotional warmth.

Pepys does not appear to have had much success in sexual escapades in those earlier years, during which he writes that he had a mind to his maid while Elizabeth was away, but feared the girl might tell her mistress, so he desisted (3.152). He appeared not to be restricted in this manner later on in the *Diary*, as subsequent entries show. In diurnal style he records physical assaults on at least two of his wife’s companions, Mary Mercer (7.104) and Jane Birch (9.307). He used the power of his position as their employer to effect these “pleasures” as the opportunities presented themselves.

The faces of power and sexual lust are brought to the surface in the drawn-out relationship with “Bagwell’s wife”, which never exists beyond the confines of the working-class environment which the woman inhabits. Here the style of writing changes to that of serialisation. The documenting of it is ongoing, and needs high points along the way to sustain interest in the content, and a conclusion. A study of the meetings between Bagwell’s wife and Pepys does show high points. There are
over sixty entries mentioning her, the early ones leading gradually to her succumbing to the desired copulation, later ones showing a gradual loss of interest in the relationship, and its dénouement. The serialisation of the Bagwell saga continues for over two years, unlike Pepys’s occasional forays with shop girls and the like, which were ad hoc occasions recorded in his diurnal style.

When William Bagwell, a ship’s carpenter, visits Pepys’s office with his wife on July 9th 1663, Pepys first records that Bagwell’s wife is a “pretty woman”, and that he will manufacture some occasion for her to come to his office (presumably alone), at a later date:

Sir W. Batten and I sot [sic] a little this afternoon at the office; and then I by water to Deptford and there mustered the yard, purposely (God forgive me) to find out Bagwell, a carpenter whose wife is a pretty woman, that I might have some occasion of knowing him and forcing her to come to the office again […]. (4.222)

On July 17th he meets the pair, by chance, in the street, and they invite him into their modest house. Pepys notes that he believes Mrs. Bagwell to be “a virtuous, modest woman” (4.234). On 7 August, while he is conversing with an employee in the yard at Deptford, he states that he is “waylaid” by Mr. and Mrs. Bagwell, and that the husband asks for his help in getting him onto a better ship. Pepys then writes “which I shall pretend to be willing to do for them” [my emphasis] (4.266). In one word Pepys records his face of manipulation. This scene manifests the unspoken social codes that acted as a sort of commerce in this society. Bagwell, having noticed Pepys’s admiration for his wife, appears to act as a kind of bawd in this situation. This is an example of a woman as a commodity. The fact that Pepys was not moved to exert himself to accede to their request straightaway points to some doubts, on his part,
about the possibilities of success with her, especially when Pepys’s first impression of her is that of “a virtuous woman.” In the ongoing saga the whole situation appears to be based on a sexual and economic *quid pro quo* between Pepys and the Bagwells.

Six months later, 27 February 1664, Bagwell’s wife appeared in his office, this time alone, again asking the favour that he get her husband onto another ship. Pepys has his first physical contact by just stroking her under the chin (5.65). After three months when she is not mentioned at all in the *Diary*, Pepys writes again that she appears in his office, and although he thinks her “modest” (and, because of the time elapsed between recording visits, one surmises that he has not been considering her as much of a prospect for his sexual endeavours), he says he will do something for Bagwell “for I think he is a man that deserves very well” (5.162). Considering the long-lasting physical relationship that ensues between him and Bagwell’s wife, it must be questioned here whether Pepys, in stating the reason for his intention to help Bagwell altruistically, was lying to himself or lying to the *Diary*, because it was some time before he actually acceded to the Bagwells’ request. It doesn’t appear from the *Diary* that bedding Bagwell’s wife was a priority at that time.

In the next *Diary* entry in the Bagwell story, almost four months later (6 Sept 1664), Pepys writes that he waited in his office for Bagwell’s wife to come “that I might have talked with her” (5.263). This implies that meanwhile there had been some earlier communication regarding this intended visit, but it does not appear in the journal. Bagwell’s wife did not come. The next day she did arrive, but others came in so there was no conversation. It was 3 October, almost a month later, when Pepys mentions that she again came to the office and that he records that he kissed her for the first time, obviously to see how it would be received. This was a high point in the recording of the relationship in the *Diary*, with Pepys now wondering how far he
would be allowed to go. She rebuked him, but, as Pepys says, “I do not see but she takes it well enough,” which was sufficient for him to be encouraged, next time, to move further (5.287).

On 20 October he records that Bagwell’s wife came again to his office where he caressed her, and he states “and find her every day more and more coming, with good words and promise of getting her husband a place, which I will do” (5.301-02). It can be noted here that Pepys was first asked to help Bagwell to a better ship fourteen months earlier, but the carpenter’s wife had given nothing in return, and Pepys rarely did any favours without expecting compensation in money or kind. He was "balancing the books," so to speak. He would not do anything to further her request without her supplying him with some sexual gratification, and she would not allow this unless she was sure he would do as he had promised.

However, soon after, on November 3rd, he met Bagwell’s wife on appointment when she followed him to an alehouse where, alone (in a private room), they drank and ate together. Pepys caressed her and “made an offer”, which she refused, at which he surprisingly writes, “which I was glad to see and shall value her the better for it – and I hope never tempt her to any evil more” (5.313). Pepys has to think that she is virtuous, for this gives the pursuit more relish, and also bolsters his masculinity. Pepys enjoys resistance, as future exploits will show. He is exhibiting the ironics of desire. He writes more than once in the Diary of his disgust if a woman is too "easy" (7.284). He is not then able to exert his power.

His supposedly pious hope that he would save Bagwell’s wife from sin lasted but twelve days, because on November 15th 1664 she followed him (presumably at his instruction) to the ale-house again (obviously Pepys does not wish to be seen with her in the street) where Pepys says he caressed her:
and many hard looks and sithes [sic] the poor wretch did give me, and I think verily was troubled at what I did but, at last, after many protestings, by degrees I did arrive at what I would, with great pleasure. (5.322)

This is another high point in the serialisation. He has obtained sexual release but not with, what he later terms, “the big thing.” The gradually increasing success of his physical demands is due only to the power Pepys exercises over her in his capacity as a member of the Navy Board, when he persists despite her protestations. Irony is exposed in the very next sentence he writes, after the above, wherein he tells how he took coach to Whitehall, “where, and everywhere else, I thank God, I find myself growing in repute” (5.322). Pepys wears many faces that day. Or perhaps his recent sexual conquest affirms his masculine ego which relates to the other “public” aspects of his life.

After a few more visits to his office where nothing occurred, Mrs. Bagwell arrives there again on January 23rd 1665, from where they go to a tavern and he has “his pleasure” of her all the afternoon. After all his lengthy chasing of this unwilling woman, who was for her own interests playing him at his own game, he then writes, “but strange, to see how a woman, notwithstanding her greatest pretences of love a son mari [for her husband] and religion, may be vaincue [overcome]” (6.20). Pepys cannot conceive that Mrs. Bagwell, in sacrificing herself for her husband’s benefit, proves her love. Nevertheless, finally, on February 20th 1665, Pepys writes the long-sought-after letter in favour of Bagwell, 19 and arranges to visit Bagwell’s wife at her home that afternoon.

19 There is a copy of a further letter sent to Sir William Coventry on Bagwell’s behalf dated 23rd December 1665 in J.R.Tanner’s book Further Correspondence of Samuel Pepys (91), a letter which apparently proved unsuccessful.
20.2.65. Thence to the office and there found Bagwells wife, whom I directed to go home and I would do her business; which was to write a letter to my Lord Sandwich for her husband’s advance into a better ship as there should be occasion—which I did; and bye and bye did go down by water to Deptford-yard […] and it being dark, did privately entrer en la maison de la femme de Bagwell [in the house of Bagwell's wife], and there I had sa compagnie [her company], though with a great deal of difficulty; néanmoins, enfin je avais ma volenté d’elle [nevertheless, in the end I had my will with her]. (6.39-40)

Afterwards he writes, “with a great deal of difficulty,” and with enough force to strain his finger, he forces her to his will and gets his side of the bargain (6.40). This is a further high point in the serialisation.

However, by 8 August 1665 the dynamics of their relationship appear to have changed as Pepys records:

And after dinner Bagwell’s wife waited at the door, and went with me to my office, en lequel jo haze to do which I had a corason a hazer con ella [in which I managed to do that which I had a desire to do with her]. (6.186)

Significantly, here, there was no talk of the woman making any resistance, nor did he mention, as he did so often when he had to physically overcome the woman, that he gained pleasure from the incident. So often, when writing of the sexual encounter, the resistance of the woman and the recorded pleasure of Pepys went hand in hand.

It is worth noting that, for all Pepys’s taking care that his dalliances are secret, just four days after the last encounter, he writes of meeting Bagwell’s father, who is also known to Pepys, and says “old Bagwell walked a little way with me and would have me in to his daughter’s; and there, he being gone dehors [outside], ego had my volunte de su hija” [I had my will with his daughter]. However, not only the father
knew of Pepys’s sexual dalliances with his daughter-in-law, so did the woman’s mother, as Pepys notes on 22 August 1665, after mentioning a business dinner with Mr. Andrews:

we parted, and I to the King’s yard, walked up and down, and by and by out at the back gate and there saw the Bagwells wifes [sic], mother and daughter, and went to them; and went into the daughter’s house without the mother and faciebam la cosa que ego tenebam a mind to con ella [did the thing I had a mind to with her]. (6.201)

There again there is no recording of the woman’s resistance or of Pepys’s pleasure.

After November 8th 1665 there is no mention of Bagwell’s wife until April 11th 1666. Pepys writes that the woman came to his office “after being long at Portsmouth.” By May 16th 1666 he had “an itching desire” to see Bagwell’s wife. When this proved unsuccessful he writes that he was glad, “only, I observe the folly of my mind, that cannot refrain from pleasure at a season, above all others in my life, requisite for me to show my utmost care in” (7.126). Pepys frequently acknowledges his lack of self-control in matters of pleasure, and especially so at this time of the plague, and when he was desperately worried at the lack of funds necessary for his efficient provision of supplies for the fleet. He also is acknowledging his weakness of character.

Despite his good intentions, Pepys tries again to see Bagwell’s wife on 13 June 1666 where he “did as he would”20 which, for the first time, he wrote in garbled English and not a polyglot version (7.166). The implications of this may be that the

20 Note that in the text he crossed out "could" and replaced it with "would." The replacement presents him as stronger and more forceful.
erotic attraction has palled. However, in time, Pepys again visits Bagwell’s wife on and off during her husband’s absences at sea (absences which Pepys plans).

September 10th 1666 shows a further marked change in the relationship. Pepys calls at the Bagwell house, but she did not “ouvrir la porta como yo did expect” [open the door as I did expect] (7.284). He saw her the next day, however, “and agreed upon tomorrow.” On the morrow, though, he visits Betty Martin in the morning “and there did tout ce que je voudrais avec [all that I would wish with] her,” yet found occasion to return in the dark to Bagwell and there, “nudo in lecto con ella [naked in bed with her] did do all that I desired; but though I did intend para aver demorado con ella toda la [for to have stayed with her all the] night, yet when I had done ce que je voudrai [that which I would wish], I did hate both ella and la cosa [her and the thing’], and taking occasion from the uncertainty of su marido’s [her husband’s] return esta noche [this night], did me lever [leave]” (7.285). He had never used the term “hate” in relation to such issues before. There is no written explanation for this outburst of sudden hatred for the woman, or of his disgust for the former physical pleasure. The excitement of the chase appeared no longer there because she offered no resistance.

Nevertheless, one month later, on October 23rd 1666, he unexpectedly met Mrs. Bagwell in a field, but they just talked. November 1st he took Mrs. Bagwell into his office and “did what I would with her,” which was not written in polyglot (7.351). Once again, no talk of pleasure, but he writes that that same night he went home to talk with his wife “with whom I have much comfort.” The word “comfort” here portrays a warmth of emotion missing from his writings of his extramarital sexual pleasures. It appears obvious that, to Pepys, his marriage and his extramarital dalliances were parts of two different worlds, neither of which impinged in any way on the other, provided, of course that he physically kept them apart. However, 22
November 1666 saw Bagwell’s wife back in the office, a fact which appears, in the *Diary*, in the prosaic wording of a bureaucrat, in bland English once more, “I did what I would” (7.380).

On 1 February 1667 Pepys records having a tempestuously sexual time with Bagwell’s wife after which “su marido [her husband] came in, and there, without any notice taken by him, we discoursed of our business of getting him the new ship building by Mr. Deane, which I shall do for him” (8.39). After March 4th 1667, entries in 1668 on January 6th, 15th, May 29th show that Pepys’s attempts to get Bagwell’s wife alone proved fruitless until, on 2 June for the first time in fifteen months, suddenly again written in polyglot language Pepys “facero la grande cosa [did the big thing] upon the bed” for the last time mentioned in the *Diary* (9.221). He writes of just seeing her March 4th and 29th 1669, and talked to her in a public place on April 15th, the day he takes an unfortunate, ejected Deb Willet to an alehouse (9.521).

Three former biographers of Pepys have written about Pepys and Bagwell’s wife. It is interesting to observe their differing attitudes to Pepys’s writings regarding his treatment of the carpenter’s wife. Arthur Bryant in his book *The Man in the Making*, published in 1943, appears to be almost poetically excusing Pepys for his weakness. He makes reference to the relationship on ten pages of his work, often just relating Pepys’s text, but sometimes offering an opinion. In this instance he speaks of incidents of Pepys’s rare self-control regarding sexual opportunities: “For deep at heart Pepys was a Puritan, and man can still be one thing and love another” (207). Similarly, when Bagwell’s wife refuses Pepys, which supposedly earns Bryant’s praise, Bryant writes, “So strangely are the threads of good and evil interwoven in human hearts” (233). Thirdly, after Pepys has had a day out in Hampstead with Mary,
the girl from the “Harp and Ball” Bryant notes, “nor did it keep his entranced feet from seeking the house of Mrs Bagwell” (258).

No such whimsicality comes from Richard Ollard. He considers Pepys’s purposeful mustering of men at the yard for the sole purpose of giving occasion for the “pretty woman” (Bagwell’s wife) to come to his office on 7 July 1663 (4.222) “a fairly cold-blooded opening” to the affair (98). Indeed, Ollard is largely critical of Pepys’s “relationship” with the Bagwells. When, on 1 May 1664, quoting the passage where Pepys avows to “do her husband a courtesy for I think he is a man that deserves very well,” Ollard points out “But early in October Bagwell’s professional merits were still unrecognised” (99).

After Pepys praises Bagwell’s wife for her refusing his sexual “offer” 3 November, and then seduces her twelve days later against her will, Ollard writes, “he seduced her in the same unromantic surroundings [a drinking house] to her evident distress and his great pleasure” (100). Then later, 20 December that year, he was invited to their humble home, ate dinner with them, and after sending the husband out on an errand, forced himself on Bagwell’s wife once more. Ollard quotes Pepys’s self-centred account of that evening, saying, “And so, both trust and hospitality betrayed, he took leave and walked home” (100). Ollard sums up his impression of the way Pepys writes of his sexual use of Bagwell’s wife in the following manner: “Smugness geared the slipway of routine: routine led to boredom: boredom to distaste: and distaste to active repulsion” (100). Although, Ollard says, Pepys did continue to watch over Bagwell’s career with a “headmasterly sententiousness” (101), this did not stop Pepys from later (2 January 1687) writing to Bagwell (who was importuning him for help once more), telling him to keep his wife away, “in a firm,
perhaps rather too magisterial letter, explaining that Mrs. Bagwell’s constant visits to the office would in no way promote the end in view” (101).

Claire Tomalin’s biography on Pepys (published 2002) looks at Pepys’s account of his treatment of Bagwell’s wife from a feminist viewpoint. She mentions her on eight pages of her almost five hundred-page book, *Samuel Pepys: the Unequalled Self*. Of the long-running sexual relationship of Pepys and Mrs. Bagwell she writes:

> The story is a shameful one of a woman used by two bullies: her husband, hoping for promotion, and Pepys who was to arrange it. Pepys did not present it in quite those terms, but it is clearly how it was. He shows it was furtive and squalid, and he even makes us see the funny side of his own behaviour, but it can’t have been funny, or fun, for Mrs Bagwell. (169)

I have to disagree with her. With Pepys’s reputation among the yard’s workers, more than one of whom had brought his daughter to Pepys’s office to secure a favour (6.202), Bagwell’s wife would have known what would ultimately be expected of her. She made many visits to the office virtually asking Pepys to improve her lifestyle by obtaining a promotion for her husband. Granted she may have been at first reluctant to accept his advances, but later in the relationship Pepys writes that she is more than willing to take part, which is probably one of the reasons that he began to lose interest in her. The pleasure of the chase had long been absent: her acquisition was no longer of importance. Here Pepys lets us see, among his protean faces, that of his boyishness again when he acts like a child bored with a toy.

When writing of his long association with Mrs. Bagwell, Pepys, irrespective of his intimate physical relationship with her, places her always at a social distance and, as stated, unerringly refers to her as "Bagwell’s wife." Thus, despite his use of her, she is acknowledged by him to be the property of the carpenter who owed him a favour. No
such debt exists between the two parties when Pepys, in his Diary, writes himself a fantasy relationship with a woman at the other end of the social spectrum. Pepys’s wielding of power, of putting himself in control, extends beyond the boundary of reality when he wields, in a dream, power and control over no less a person than the King’s mistress, Lady Castlemaine (6.191). He also states, on but one occasion, that he went to bed one night to use waking thoughts to enjoy himself with the Queen (4.232).

In reality Pepys would know his preferred outcome with such women was impossible, and he acknowledges this many times, when his desires centre on beautiful ladies, or pretty women of his own, or of a higher social class, who he comes across in his daily business travels, at Court, or on walks in the park. This is where he exercises rationality, where lack of it would destroy his public face of gentility. Joseph Roach writes that “in the moral shadow of its most concupiscent court, what Pepys witnessed was the appropriation of the religious aura of celebrity by an erotic one” (3). He writes of the ladies of the court appearing in paintings in the early modern period as religious subjects for the artwork. Even Pepys’s wife, Elizabeth, poses for a portrait as “St. Catherine, the sacred bride of Christ” (5). Roach likens the background of the spiked wheel on which the saint was martyred, to Elizabeth’s suffering of hurt inflicted on her by Pepys during their marriage (5). Pepys also had a painting of Lady Castlemaine hanging in his house.

Morton Rosenbaum suggests that, although Pepys earlier admired Lady Castlemaine’s beauty when he saw her, his interest in her deepened when he learned that she was the King's mistress (430-31). He wrote that everyone knew that the elevation of the husband of Barbara Palmer (as she then was) to the Earl of Castlemaine was “tied up on the males got on the body of this wife” by the King.
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(2.229). I suggest that, although he knows to the contrary socially, Pepys then puts her, imaginatively, on the same level as the women he uses for sex, for, as he writes 16 July 1662, he pities her for her reputation when she leaves her husband, “though I know well enough that she is a whore” (3.139). Bringing her down to such a level makes her available to him, sexually, if only in a dream, when on 15 August 1665 he describes the experience:

> which was, that I had my Lady Castlemayne in my armes and was admitted to use all the dalliance I desired with her […] But that since it was a dream and that I took so much real pleasure in it, what a happy thing it would be, if when we are in our graves (as Shakespeere resembles it), we could dream, and dream but such dreams as this 21—that then we should not need to be so fearful of death as we are this plague-time. (6.191)

(It is revealing that the diarist, even in death, would consider thoughts of sex the optimum pleasure while lying in a coffin). It is interesting to note that in the positive dream he took real pleasure in his success with Lady Castlemaine, with no mention of having to use coercion, which, as noted, seemed a requisite for his pleasure with lower-class women.

Thereafter, having wielded his power over the King’s mistress in his psyche, cuckolding the monarch, yet with no hope of having her in reality, his references to her are often derogatory:

> There the King was, but I was sorry to see my Lady Castlemaine; for the mourning forcing all the ladies to go in black, with their hair plain, and without any spots, I find her to be a much more ordinary woman then ever I durst

---

21 The reference is to *Hamlet* III.i.93, as noted by Latham and Matthews, 2.64-5.
thought she was; and endeed is not so pretty as Mrs. Stewart—whom I saw there also.  (7.106)

Lady Castlemaine is mentioned in the *Diary* over 170 times (11.200-1).\(^{22}\) Indeed, one might say that she is the physical embodiment of different aspects of Pepys’s desires. In the later years, most of Pepys’s comments regarding Lady Castlemaine come from reports and gossip he receives from many associated with the Court, criticising her power over the King sexually, politically, monetarily and socially. She was seen as not only a danger to the court, but a danger to the country. As John H. O’Neil notes, Pepys links politics and sexual matters in a conversation with Sir Thomas Crew:

> I sat talking with him all the afternoon, from one discourse to another. The most was upon the unhappy posture of things at this time; that the King doth mind nothing but pleasures and hates the very sight or thoughts of business. That my Lady Castlemayne rules him; who he says hath all the tricks of Aretin that are to be practised to give pleasure […]  (4.136-7)

John H. O’Neil says that “Pepys’s use of the word *posture* for the condition of affairs of state is a kind of unconscious pun […] [where] Pepys unconsciously links the “tricks of Aretin” practiced by Barbara Palmer, countess of Castlemaine, with the “posture” of state affairs” (92). Lawrence Stone says of the monarch, “Charles’s failure to address himself to business, his inversion of the proper order of brain and body—these acts constitute an abdication of the high place to which patriarchy had assigned him” (110). E. Pearlman says that one of the reasons that Lady Castlemaine so enthralled Pepys “was that she was both elevated and debased” (52). He also argues that “Lady Castlemaine embodied the vices that Pepys wanted to embrace but often forced himself to avoid” (50). But Pepys, like the king, did not avoid them

---

\(^{22}\) Based on a search of the electronic version of the *Diary*. 
either. He, again like the king, in the war of will and pleasure allowed pleasure to win. But this engendered in Pepys a fear that this loss of control meant loss of power (O’Neil 93).

This mistress of the King seems to have generated in Pepys a fascination for hearing and seeing everything she does, whether he is glutting himself with looking at her, or becoming excited to see her underwear hanging on the line (3.87). He records the banal fact that she steals a patch from the face of a nearby woman to cover a pimple on her own, that she demands an enormous share of the money received from Parliament by the King, and that she insists that her bastard children are publicly acknowledged by him:

He tells me that the King and my Lady Castlemayne are quite broke off and she is gone away, and is with child and swears the King shall own it; and she will have it christened in the Chapel at White-hall as, and owned for the King's as other Kings have done; or she will bring it into White-hall gallery and dash the brains of it out before the King's face.23 (8.355)

Indeed, so great is her influence at Court that, as James Grantham Turner suggests, when Pepys reports the debacle of the Dutch burning the British fleet in the Medway in 1667, that Pepys “weaves even closer this association of political catastrophe, aristocratic riot, and sexual transgression”:

The linkage between royal adultery and the collapse of the coastal defences even filtered upwards into official discourse, when the king’s own chaplain made the same point in a thunderous and outspoken sermon. (168)

23 Lady Castlemaine may well have been recalling here the scene where Lady Macbeth seeks to browbeat her husband, using the image of the violent murdering of a baby to enforce her will (Macbeth 1.7.54-9).
Pepys writes graphically of reports of the burning of the ships in the Medway, yet on 21 June 1667 tells how

Sir H. Cholmly came to me this day, and tells me the Court is as mad as ever and that the night the Duch burned our ships, the King did sup with my Lady Castlemayne at the Duchess of Monmouth, and there were all mad in hunting of a poor moth. (8.282)

Pepys, not being there, cannot write himself of happenings at court, but he chooses to write derogatory reports, made by others, of the King and Lady Castlemaine.

Nevertheless, acknowledging Lady Castlemaine’s power at court, it is amazing that Pepys, in his mind, and through his writings, appears to create a fantasy triangular relationship with the King, himself, and the most prominent of Charles II’s mistresses, in what René Girard calls “triangular desire” (17). Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick also quotes Girard, stating that in such a relationship, one man desires the woman because she is first the object of the other man’s desire (21). The King is the ultimate source of power. Pepys, being power-hungry, in effect desires her through the King’s eyes. When the King later becomes interested in Mrs. Stewart, Pepys also writes, upon seeing her in the park with the Royal couple and other ladies of the court, along with a disgruntled and neglected Lady Castlemaine:

But above all, Mrs. Steward in this dresse, with her hat cocked and a red plume, with her sweet eye, little Roman nose, and excellent Taille, is now the greatest beauty I ever saw I think in my life; and if ever woman can, doth exceed my Lady Castlemayne [...]. (4.230)

Sedgwick suggests that such a triangle often means that the homosocial relationship between the two men in the triangle can be stronger than the desire of either of them for the woman involved (21). Of course this sexual triangle is only a fantasy which
Pepys fosters. In terms of waking reality, he has some relationship with Charles II in his position with the Navy Board, and none at all with Lady Castlemaine.

The Court’s libertinism can go far to enlighten us about Pepys’s attitude to – and presentation of – women in the Diary. For Jane Barker, writing during the reign of James II, changes in literature which altered gender-relations with their “Interest and Loose [sic] gallantry” wreaked “havoc on the social fabric” of the seventeenth century, and created a “Deluge of Libertinism which has overflow’d the Age” (qtd. in Turner ix).

An apt literary description of the Libertine appears in John Milton’s Paradise Lost which Turner quotes (164):

_Belial_ came at last, than whom a Spirit more lewd
Fell not from Heaven, or more gross to love
Vice for itself…
In Courts and Palaces he also Reigns
And in luxurious Cities, where the noise
Of riot ascends above their loftiest Tow’rs,
And injury and outrage: And when Night
Darkens the Streets, then wander forth the Sons
Of _Belial_, flown with insolence and wine. (1.490-502)

Pepys writes of one such example of Milton’s fallen angel’s “Sons” in his Diary on 23 October 1668:

This day Pierce doth tell me, among other news, the late frolic and Debauchery of Sir Ch. Sidly and Buckhurst, running up and down all the night with their arses bare through the streets […]. (9.335)
Barely any man in the seventeenth century actually wrote publicly of his less
desirable actions, other than aristocratic libertines such as Rochester, Sedley and
Wycherley, who expressed their dissolute mores in witty verse, prose, and plays, and
also in their actions. (In fact, according to Stone, “only twelve autobiographies were
written before 1660, only one of which was of a personal type” and presumably that
was not pornographic [155]). Jeremy W. Webster makes the point that libertines
“were public performers of private pursuits […] These extroverts were a law unto
themselves, yet with their prose, poetry and plays, they wrote into existence a social
acceptance, though supposedly clandestine, of a culture of profligacy frowned upon
by the puritans” (2- 3).

The most important personage of the realm exhibited libertine practices.
Charles II publicly flaunted his mistresses and his illegitimate offspring, and, like the
libertines, set the standard for sexual freedom which spread throughout the upper
classes after the 1660 Restoration. Turner writes, “The loose and all-too-visual
behaviour of Charles’s entourage – recorded and furtively emulated by Pepys—
opened up a conceptual channel between zones of licence widely separated by social
status” (165). Samuel Pepys, despite his yearnings to be considered “a gentleman”,
was not of the aristocratic socio-economic set. However, after a short time, despite his
puritan upbringing, he allowed himself the same sexual freedom as the Court, albeit
with lower-class women, while roundly denouncing the King’s, and his retinue’s,
priapism when he writes, “In fine, I find that there is nothing almost but bawdry at
Court from top to bottom…” (4.1). Such behaviour, from “the royal palace turned
brothel” (Turner 165), later provided fodder for many street pamphlets which spread
the King’s, and his followers' libertinism, across town and country for all to read, or
to be read to (2). The earthy multiple faces of the protean Pepys were written to
remain unseen in his *Diary*, but unlike Pepys, libertines were writers for the public who wrote their sexuality for notoriety. James Turner suggests that “libertinism was not so much a philosophy as a set of performances, and its defining properties are better understood as theatrical props than as precise attributes” (Turner qtd. in Webster 2).

It could be argued that Pepys regards the women with whom he dallies, as "props" for the performances he replays for himself when he writes in his *Diary* his evaluation of his sexual dalliances. Like the libertines in their plays when they analysed, interpreted and evaluated their own riotous behaviour for stage and literary performances by way of the characters they created, Pepys, as the accountant he was, also evaluated his, and the women’s, performances during his sexual forays. For instance, he states whether or not they were receptive to his advances, how far each time they allowed him to go, whether the experience of the dalliance was successful, pleasurable, or less than satisfying. Always, it should be noted, he is the centre of interest himself.

Although protesting against the debauched actions emanating from the seat of power in the land, Pepys portrays his interest in the erotic when he admits that he keeps a book of Rochester’s earlier poems locked in his desk drawer, and writes of having read earlier a “lewd book” for “information sake” only, as discussed in Chapter 1 (9.59). When he writes, secretly, about his own sexual proclivities in a baldly explicit fashion, his *Diary*’s documenting of them lacks the sophistication of the Wits, although it is acknowledged that the playwrights wrote to entertain the public.

The Wits are sometimes given to expressing sexual actions in terms of extended metaphors, such as “china” and “cards” in Wycherley’s *The Country Wife*, where
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Lady Fidget triumphantly holds her piece of china, the symbol of her sexual gratification from Horner, and Squeamish begs for some too. Horner says, “Upon my honour, I have none left now” (4.3.187). And again, silly Sir Jasper, under the impression that Horner is impotent, begs Horner to “Pray come and dine with me, and play cards with my wife after dinner – you are fit for women at that game yet, ha, ha!”

In contrast, Pepys’s documentations of his sexual encounters, once translated from the shorthand and the polyglot language, are baldly confronting in Pepys’s use of his anatomical idiolect. Also, whereas Sedgwick says that “cuckoldry is the main social engine of the aristocratic society depicted” in *The Country Wife* (49), this is not the intention with Pepys when he uses women. His only interest in the husbands of these women is that they are conspicuous by their absence – even “deliberate absences” such as those engineered by Bagwell himself. The libertines seek public recognition when they indulge in their sexually overt practices, so that they may impress their peers. Not so Pepys. The last thing Pepys seeks is public recognition of his dalliances by anyone, nor does he exhibit a desire to impress his peers. He desires anonymity to protect his public image. In fact, Pepys often invents the necessity to visit places, connected with his work, in the hope that his absence from his office is as unobtrusive as possible, so that he may scour the area for possible providers of physical pleasures (6.20). Nevertheless, the promiscuity of Pepys, in his written descriptions, like the propounded indiscrimination of the libertines, lacks the warmth of human emotion. However, the greatest emotional upset Pepys records in his *Diary*, and his most potentially dangerous action for the continuance of his marriage, emanated from inside his own home.

Following on from the petering out of his relationship with Mrs. Bagwell which ended on Pepys’s terms, the advent of Deb Willet onto the stage of Pepys’s
relationships with women totally alters his face as controller of his dalliances. A far
cry from the face he shows the Navy Board world -- one of strength, honesty and
efficiency-- his weak vacillations between making and breaking vows to himself, to
Elizabeth and to God, regarding his relationship with Deb, show us the face of a man
who is out of control when he allows his sexual, and in this case, also his emotional
urges, to hold sway. When writing about the final days of the Deb debacle, he does
not even seem to know himself. As John H. O’Neil notes, the war between will and
desire is one of the things a diary does best. Other accounts, written in hindsight,
smooth out the uncertainties and changes of mind, but a diary gives the felt reality of
the moment, including an entry recording a passionate, unbreakable resolve never to
do something, sincerely believed, which is followed by an entry recording that the
person then did exactly what they were never going to do again. Pepys, several times,
during the aftermath of his exposure concerning Deb, fervently tells Elizabeth that he
will see the girl no more, and vows to himself that he will never seek her out again,
but, almost immediately, he lies to his wife about his whereabouts during the
following days when he has been trying to make contact with her. As John O’Neil
comments, “Ultimately it is power over himself that Pepys most fears losing, and it is
with himself that the strongest battle of wills takes place” (94). Pepys writes:

> God forgive me, I do still see that my nature is not to be quite conquered, but
> will esteem pleasure above all things; though, yet in the middle of it, it hath
> reluctance after my business, which is neglected by my falling to my
> pleasure. However, music and women I cannot but give way to, whatever my
> business is. (7.69-70)

This is especially true of Pepys in the Deb Willet saga. In the following entry Pepys
already writes that he anticipates a battle of wills regarding his feelings for the girl.
O’Neil likens Pepys’s later “battle” with that of Charles II whose “inversion of the proper order of brain and body” where his weakness for sex with lower-class women is concerned, and his patriarchal position as head and ruler of his country are at odds (93). One could lose his marriage, and the other his country.

Pepys first mentions Deb Willet in the Diary on 24 September 1667, sight unseen, as a prospective “woman”, a “companion” for Elizabeth. She was just seventeen, a young girl straight from school (8.451.n.2). His introduction to “the pretty girl” as he refers to her, is written up by him three days later:

While I was busy at the office, my wife sends for me to come to home, and what was it but to see the pretty girl which she is taking to wait upon her; and though she seems not altogether so great a beauty as she had before told me, yet endeed she is mighty pretty; and so pretty, that I find I shall be too much pleased with it, and therefore could be contented as to my judgement, though not to my passion, that she might not come, lest I may be found too much minding her, to the discontent of my wife. She is to come next week. She seems by her discourse to be grave beyond her bigness and age, and exceeding well-bred as to her deportment, having been a scholar in a school at Bow these seven or eight year [...]. (8.451)

Obviously, Pepys’s future intentions in regard to Deb are made clear by the conflict between his “judgement” and his “passion”. This conflict is one that will be exacerbated by time and is one that throws the order of Pepys’s private world into a complete state of disarray. Later that same day he records:

[…] and so with pleasure discoursing with my wife of our Journy shortly to Brampton, and of this little girle, which endeed runs in my head and pleases me mightily, though I dare not own it: and so to supper and to bed. (8.453-4)
The next morning he reports that he has not slept well during the night, his thoughts "full of this pretty little girl that is coming to live with us, which pleases me mightily" (8.454). Gradually, Pepys’s text reveals, perhaps more than he realizes, how the social spaces he allows Deb to inhabit fluctuate according to his own assessment of her domestic, or social position at the time of writing.

In his *Diary* Pepys refers to her only as “the girl” in the first weeks of her “living-in,” placing her squarely in the domestic and social position of an employee. On 15 October 1667, barely two weeks after her arrival in the Pepys household, Elizabeth makes complaints against her companion, and Pepys writes that “she is already jealous of my kindness to the girl” and fears that she will not stay long as a consequence (7.481). He seems unperturbed at this stage, and "the girl" is only mentioned as accompanying Elizabeth and himself everywhere to plays and social engagements until, after a few months, a difference in a closer physical relationship occurs when Pepys writes on 15 November next "I got the girl to comb my head and then to bed—my eyes bad” (8.531).

On 22 December 1667, Elizabeth is confined to bed with a toothache, and Pepys reports that “Willet” came to him on an errand from his wife, and for the first time he “did give her a little kiss, she being a very pretty-humoured girl, and so one that I do love mightily” (8.585). The word “love” here Pepys uses many times in the *Diary*, referring to both males and females, and, according to the context, he is merely expressing a fondness. However, given Pepys’s leaning towards “prettiness” there is some cause for suspicion that “just fondness” is not paramount in his thoughts.

Pepys continues to refer to “the girl” throughout December, but by 10 January 1668 she is referred to as “Deb” (which contrasts with his use of “my wife” and “Bagwell’s wife”), and the next day he writes, “and so by the fireside to have my head..."
combed, as I do now often do, by Deb, whom I love should be fiddling about me…” (9.20). She was “Deb” thereafter in every entry throughout the first three months of 1668, presumably “combing his head” every night as well as helping him undress, and to aid his attiring in the mornings.

Pepys took occasion to make his first “open” move on the girl’s virtue when she was crying at her task of putting him to bed, after her mistress’s anger at the girl’s inefficient attempt to write a list. He writes 31 March 1668 “but going to bed she undressed me, and there I did give her good advice and beso la, ella [and kissed her, she] weeping still; and I did take her, the first time in my life, sobra mi genu [upon my knee] and did poner mi mano sub her jupes and tocar her thigh, which did hazer me [and did put my hand under her skirts and touched her thigh which did pleasure me]; and so did no more, but besando-la [kissed her], went to my bed” (9.143) The incident of his putting his hand under her skirts and touching her thigh set the precedent for the master-servant power Pepys would now seek to invoke. This is the face of Pepys the opportunist and the manipulator. And the next morning was not too soon to exercise that power again. He writes:

Up and dress myself; and called, as I use, Deb to brush and dress me and there I did again as I did the last night con mi mano [with my hand] , but would have tocado su [touched her] thing; but ella endeavoured to prevent me con much modesty by putting her hand there about, which I was well pleased with and would not do too much, and so con great kindness dismissed la [her]; and I to my office, where busy till noon, and then out to bespeak some things against my wife’s going into the country tomorrow. (9.144)

Possibly Pepys dismissed the girl “with great kindness” knowing his wife and Willet would be away in the morning and he would be free to pursue others. His being
“well pleased” with her defence added excitement to the prospect of her return after the holiday. He could wait. Predictably, during the absence of Elizabeth and the “two maids” (as Pepys refers to Jane and Deb [9.147]) at Brampton, his country house, Pepys does visit several of his willing lower-class women for sexual dalliances. He makes the journey to Brampton himself on 24 May 1668 to see his wife, enjoys her favours, and leaves after two days with a bare mention of “Willet.” It is as if “Deb’s” absence from the Diary is related to the available sexual resources Pepys has to hand. Pepys returns twelve days or so later and takes his domestic family of wife and two maids and, goes with friends to the West of England. Deb is rarely called by name when they are en famille in public, but when they return home again she is written up in the entries of the Diary by her first name.

This pattern is followed all through June and July with no references to Pepys accosting Deb until August 6th when he writes “this day yo [I] did first with my hand tocar la cosa de [touch the thing of] our Deb in the coach –ella [she] being troubled at it—but yet did give way to it.” In this one sentence Pepys’s writing reveals his sexual pleasure, Deb’s resistance to his advances, and her reluctant capitulation. Four days later while Elizabeth was in the same room reading a book, Pepys is "touching" Deb while she combed his head. By the 18th he makes Deb touch him intimately while he is lying in bed. Every entry now, all through August and in September until 13th of October, she is referred to as Deb, and on that day Pepys writes that while she combed his head he “had the pleasure para touch the cosa of her [of being able to touch her thing] and all about, with a little opposition” (9.328).

It has to be recorded that all these entries, in relation to Deb, were but a few short paragraphs amongst those seething with political and regal matters, as well as Pepys’s entries describing plays he had seen and the food he had eaten, and the plethora of
 incidental meetings and happenings which filled his days. Although Pepys’s fixation with Deb was important to him, it is obvious that it takes less space in the Diary than the business and political problems troubling Pepys at the time. The significance of this emotional drama, though, is, that, although the Deb incidents are in that "other" world of domesticity which he, Elizabeth and Deb inhabit, a breakup of his marriage in his private world would have impacted on his public world, and on Pepys’s jealously guarded reputation.

Control in Pepys’s marital world changes on 25 October 1668 while Deb is combing Pepys’s head in his bedroom, and Elizabeth catches Pepys with his hands under her skirts. Elizabeth is struck mute. This high point of the Deb episode manifests in Pepys a fear of devastating loss in both his private and public worlds. In writing up the incident Pepys immediately distances himself from Deb. She becomes textually “the girl” instantaneously:

"Lord’s Day. Up, and discoursing with my wife about our house and many new things we are doing of; and so to church I, and there find Jack Fen come, and his wife, a pretty black [dark-haired] woman; I never saw her before, nor took notice of her now. So home and to dinner; and after dinner, all the afternoon got my wife and boy to read to me. And at night W Batelier comes and sups with us; and after supper, to have my head combed by Deb, which occasioned the greatest sorrow to me that ever I knew in this world; for my wife, coming up suddenly, did find me embracing the girl con my hand sub su coats; [with my hand under her skirts] and endeed, I was with my main [hand] in her cunny. I was at a wonderful loss upon it, and the girl also; and I endeavoured to put it off, but my wife was struck mute and grew angry, and as her voice came to her, grew quite out of order; and I do say little, but to bed;
and my wife said little also, but could not sleep all night; but about 2 in the morning waked me and cried, and fell to tell me as a great secret that she was a Roman Catholique and had received the Holy Sacrament; which troubled me but I took no notice of it, but she went on from one thing to another, till at last it appeared plainly her trouble was at what she saw; but yet I did not know how much she saw and therefore said nothing to her. (9.337)

Pepys in this paragraph appears to care little for the feelings of Elizabeth or Deb. Of greater import is Pepys’s writing of Elizabeth’s threat to put their very lives in jeopardy by admitting to be a papist, “which troubled me but I took no notice of it” (9.338). This could be read that Pepys “appeared” to take no notice of it, to defuse its importance, for important it was. Such an accusation of being a papist later in Pepys’s career landed him in the Tower. Elizabeth is already taking the upper hand now.

That Pepys refers to Deb as “the girl”, mid-paragraph, whether or not he realises it, denotes that he is immediately distancing himself from her, while he exhibits that demoting the companion Deb to “the girl” also validates his “right,” as the head of the household, to expect sexual favours from his lower-class female domestic staff. Pepys records such familiarities in his Diary which involve Mercer (7.104) and Jane (5.268). However, Deb was not lower-class, she was educated, and still only then an eighteen-year-old virgin who had been treated as one of the close family, going to plays, visiting, and shopping; Pepys and Elizabeth even visited her well-respected family on their travels (9.235).

As Pepys writes up the dynamics of the triangular relationship between himself, his wife and Deb in the next few days, the Diary entries reveal a transformation in his approach to the situation. It almost begins to feel that he is standing back, watching his, and the two women’s performances, like characters in one of the plays he so often
frequents. He writes “I do say little” when Elizabeth rants during the night, divorcing himself from her anger, not knowing exactly how much she saw, circumspectly waiting for her to become calmer, and appeasing her with promises of love “till at last she seemed to be at ease again” (9.338).

Pepys continues his version of what followed in a narrative genre, day by day moving the telling on, which, with its immediacy, leaves the reader awaiting the consequences. He writes that he went off to Whitehall in the morning, “but with my mind mightily troubled for the poor girl, whom I fear I have undone by this, my [wife] telling me that she would turn her out of door” (9.338). His words here show concern for Deb which is not paralleled with how he treats his "other" women.

His machinations in the home, at this time, mirror those he is embroiled in with his work with the Navy Board. The same day, following on from the above, he writes of a discussion with Lord Sandwich:

He told me my Lady Carteret’s trouble about my writing of that letter of the Duke of York’s lately to the office; which I did not own, but declared to be of no injury to G. Carteret, and that I would write a letter to him to satisfy him therein. But this I am in pain how to do without doing myself wrong, and the end I had, of preparing a justification to myself hereafter, when the faults of the Navy come to be found out. (9.338-9)

This entry reveals Pepys’s propensity for always looking after his own interests. In his work, and through his letter writing, he must keep up his public image of an honest and open man, while, in his writing to himself, he acknowledges that Elizabeth now has power over him to prove otherwise. This was a definite threat. He acknowledges to himself that he would have to sacrifice Deb (9.344).
So when Elizabeth again wakes him at midnight with accusations that she saw him hug and kiss the girl, he relies on semantics again, “quite truthfully” he writes, owning to the former but not the latter, yet leaving out the more incriminating act. (His lying by omission here is redolent of his justifying his action of accepting bribery by literally not “looking” at the money he takes from an envelope, so that he could, if discovered, just as "truthfully" say he had not seen it.)  

Pepys does not lie; he just avoids the truth. However, in the first instance, whereas he was misleading Elizabeth with his omission, and in the second he was escaping possible censure by persons unknown, yet on each occasion he was not fooling himself. In the *Diary* he was being literally true, the better to obscure his misdemeanours.

So, of the incident which had caused all the trouble, up to this moment Pepys has admitted to just a hug and “there was no harm in it.” The next night there is a repeat performance of Elizabeth’s rantings on another score while Pepys writes “but [I] was forced to be silent about the girl, which I have no mind to part with, but much less that the poor girl should be undone by my folly” (340). This caring thought confirms that Pepys’s interest in Deb is not merely physical. Nevertheless, he is biding his time, once more still hoping to be able to keep Deb in his employ.

Peace between Pepys and Elizabeth having seemed to be restored, more or less, by 9 November 1668, Pepys, to keep things on an even keel, with another dramatic gesture, writes that he “flung” a little note to Deb warning her to deny that he had ever kissed her. She reads it and flings it back in passing, as he asked. But trouble was brewing. The next day Elizabeth had obtained a confession from the girl, who told absolutely all. Pepys writes that Elizabeth “kept raving till past midnight, that made me cry and weep heartily all the while for her […] and at last, with new vows, and

---

24 See Chapter 6, above.
perticularly [sic] that I would myself bid the girl be gone and show my dislike to her -
- which I shall endeavour to perform, but with much trouble” (9.357).

Thus, it seems, there is soon to be an end to the episode of Deb Willet, for on 13
November 1668 Pepys writes that Elizabeth had told him that “Deb had been abroad
today, and is come home and says she hath got a place to go to, so as she will be gone
tomorrow morning.” Deb was now no longer a servant, and how his mind is running
on, despite his vows, is exposed when he writes “This troubled me; and the truth is, I
have a great mind for to have the maidenhead of this girl, which I should not doubt to
have if yo could get time para be con her [if I could get time for to be with her]—but
she will be gone and I know not whither” (9.361-62). The war between will and
pleasure is at its height. This passage emphasizes how, for all the signs of emotional
turmoil in the writing, and his vows of fidelity to his wife, Pepys regards his conquest
of Deb’s body, and the pleasure he expects to accrue from it, as all-important. But a
subtle power change occurs between Pepys and Deb here. Pepys no longer could
evoke the role of her master, and she, being soon out in the world, having what he
wanted, weakens his control and strengthens hers as she moves out of his orbit. And
she is not the only woman with more power. After Deb has left Pepys says:

And so all quiet, and I to the office with my heart sad, and find that I cannot
forget the girl, and vexed I know not where to look for her – and more
troubled to see how my wife is by this means likely for ever to have her hand
over me, that I shall forever be a slave to her; […]. (9.363)
Pepys goes on that he fears it will be “a little time before I shall be able to wear Deb
out of my mind […] for my thoughts of this girl, which hang after her” (9.363).

The very next day, he understands from his wife’s discourse that Deb is in the
vicinity of Whetstones-park. This is strange that Elizabeth lets this slip. Or does she?
She would not allow Deb in the same room with him before the girl’s departure (9.353). Why give him details of her whereabouts once she has gone? Possibly she is testing him, because she also lets it be known that Deb is staying with “a kind of poor broken fellow” named Dr Allbon. Pepys hears he has gone to Fleet-street (9.365).

Despite all his vows never to see Deb again Pepys is out of control now. The next day, 18 November 1668, he tracks her down (despite telling his wife that morning that he would not look for her). What follows, given the dramatic structure of events, sounds, more than ever, like the machinations of a farce:

So I could not be commanded by my reason, but I must go this very night; and so by coach, it being now dark, I to her, close by my tailor’s; and there she came into the coach to me, and yo did besar her and tocar her thing, but ella [I did kiss her and touch her thing, but she] was against it and laboured with much earnestness, such as I believed to be real; and yet at last yo did make her tener mi cosa in her mano [take my thing in her hand], while mi mano was sobra her pectus [my hand was under her breast], and so did hazer [gain relief] with grand delight. I did nevertheless give her the best counsel I could, to have a care of her honour and to fear God and suffer no man para haver to do con her [for to have to do with her] – as yo have done – which she promised. Yo did give her 20s and directions para laisser [for leaving] sealed in paper at any time the name of the place of her being, at Herringman’s my bookseller in the Change – by which I might go para her […]. And so home, and there told my wife a fair tale, God knows, how I spent the whole day; with which the poor wretch was satisfied, or at least seemed so; and so to supper and to bed, she having been mighty busy all day in getting of her house in
order against tomorrow, to hang up our new hangings and furnishing our best chamber.  (9.366-67)

This entry reveals significant, and conflicting, faces of Pepys. First we see the “dark” sexually-driven Pepys who pressures Deb to perform sexual acts. Then Pepys, the man of property, makes Deb swear that she will not allow another man to do with her what she has suffered him to do. Finally, there is Pepys, the deceitful husband, but here a note of ambiguity creeps in. One finds this ambiguity in the phrase “poor wretch” which simultaneously suggests both pity and contempt for his outraged wife.

Pepys was not sure he was pulling the wool over Elizabeth’s eyes when he writes that "she seemed" satisfied, but that Elizabeth was cleverer than he, at this stage, was shortly to be proved. Pepys’s naïveté, a distant echo of the appearances of the face of "the boy left behind" in the *Diary*, emerges. There is only one other reference to Pepys physically “running” anywhere in the whole of the *Diary* (5.355), so when Pepys writes the next morning that his “heart is full of joy to think in what a safe condition all my matters now stand between my wife and Deb and me; and at noon running [my emphasis] upstairs to see the upholsterers,” his elation is almost palpable, and farcical. Then he writes “I find my wife sitting sad in the dining-room” (9.367). She is in a rage. She knows of his visit to Deb the day before. This confirms the idea that Elizabeth’s “letting slip” Deb’s probable whereabouts, but three days earlier, was deliberate. She set the trap, and in his complete lack of control, he had played into her hands.

He writes that he endured her threats, vows and curses the whole afternoon. She would slit the girl’s nose, she would leave him, and the worst threat of all to this paragon of public virtue, she would make all the world know of his shame. The choice was easy for Pepys. The face of public honour was more important to him than
his desire to bed Deb. He agreed to his wife’s demand that he never goes out alone, but goes either with Hewer or herself. Pepys writes that he “By the grace of God resolved never to do her wrong more” (9.368).

If he thought that that was the last he would hear of the Deb episode from Elizabeth he was mistaken. Three months later on 12 January 1669 Pepys records:

This evening I observed my wife mighty dull; and I myself was not mighty fond, because of some hard words she did give me at noon, out of a jealousy at my being abroad this morning; when, God knows, it was upon the business of the office unexpectedly; but I to bed, not thinking but she would come after me; but waking by and by out of a slumber, which I usually fall into presently after my coming into the bed, I found she did not prepare to come to bed, but got fresh candles and more wood for her fire, it being mighty cold too. At this being troubled, I after a while prayed her to come to bed, all my people being gone to bed; so after an hour or two, she silent, and I now and then praying her to come to bed, she fell out into a fury, that I was a rogue and false to her; but yet I could perceive that she was to seek what to say; only, she invented, I believe, a business that I was seen in a hackney-coach with the glasses up with Deb, but could not tell the time, nor was sure I was he. I did, as I might truly, deny it, and was mightily troubled; but all would not serve. At last, about one a-clock, she came to my side of the bed and drow my curtaine open, and with the tongs, red hot at the ends, made as if she did design to pinch me with them; at which in dismay I rose up, and with a few words she laid them down and did by little and little, very sillily, let all the discourse fall; and about 2, but with much seeming difficulty, came to bed and there lay well all night [...] (9.413)
Notwithstanding Elizabeth’s threatened violence, Pepys still sought Deb out and took the long way round on his travels, hoping to see her, which he reports that he did, three weeks before the Diary ended, when he asked her to let him know where she resided (9.518). On 19 April he “walked from 10 o’clock to past 12, expecting to meet Deb” (9.526) who failed to arrive. Later that same day he met Doll Lane and, despite his disappointment at missing Deb, had a sexual encounter with her. But in the very last entry, 31 May 1669, he rather plaintively states that there is unlikely to be anything of a risqué nature to write in a future journal\(^\text{25}\) (which he had intended would be kept by an amanuensis), “now my amours to Deb are past” (9.565).

Surprisingly, over 330 years later, Kate Loveman, while researching letters in the Bodleian Library at Oxford University, proved this belief untrue. By chance, Loveman came across documentation which proves that Pepys, after the Diary ended, did, indeed, have some sort of relationship with Deb, whether just friendly or otherwise, in subsequent years. Deb Willet married a church minister, Jeremiah Wells, the year after Pepys’s Diary ended. When, at one stage, Wells needed Pepys’s help in obtaining an ecclesiastical position, on land, Pepys arranged a position as a navy chaplain for him on a ship. Loveman states:

\[\ldots\] it was quite possible that he assisted Deb out of sheer benevolence. However, his wife had died in November 1669, Deb was living in tantalizing proximity, and Pepys knew her to be without her husband \[\ldots\]. (897)

Considering that Pepys had made access to Betty Lane and Bagwell’s wife an easy ploy by finding their husbands positions on ships, Pepys may still have been demanding of Deb. However, as Loveman writes, Wells became a member, “albeit a

\(^{25}\) He never wrote another diary like this one.
peripheral one,” of Pepys’s intellectual circle (899), and something of a friend, so maybe Pepys’s help to the Wells family was altruistic by this stage. Nevertheless, I disagree with Loveman’s suggestion that for Deb the affair between her and Pepys “was not a deeply unpleasant experience” (901). Pepys at no time writes that she welcomes his sexual advances, quite the opposite in fact. On April 1st she “endeavoured to prevent [him] with much modesty by putting her hand there about” when he tried to touch her intimately (9.144), again she was “troubled” when he repeated such an act in a coach full of people including his wife (9.274). There were further similar occasions about which he expresses his pleasure, but he never claims that Deb shows the same gratification. She is still an inexperienced young girl who may not have had to cope with these situations before, having come straight from school to Pepys’s employment (Tomalin 269).

When one considers that Pepys always wanted to keep his public face above dishonour, his help to Wells and Deb may have been more circumspect than altruistic. However, whichever of Pepys’s motives were true, his further relationship with Deb was fairly short-lived, for Deb died, when twenty-seven years old, in March 1678. Her husband, after remarrying, died in August 1679 (Loveman 893-901).

Elizabeth had also died prematurely, at the age of 29 years, of an illness contracted while she and Pepys were fulfilling a long-held wish of Elizabeth’s to revisit France, especially Paris. She had lived there when a child with her mother, before her father gathered the family up and fled to England (Tomalin 57). For this holiday Pepys had been granted three to four months’ leave with the hope that the break would improve his sight. The tour, however, started in Holland so that Pepys could visit the shipyards there. After spending some time enjoying Paris, they visited Rouen and Brussels on their return journey, but it was while they were on their way
home that Elizabeth was taken ill. She arrived at Seething Lane on 20 October 1669 and died of a fever 10 November 1669 (Tomalin 281-3).

Later, Pepys spent many years in a co-habiting relationship with Mary Skinner, after she first entered his employ as his housekeeper. Whether, thereafter, he lived in a monogamous relationship with her, or whether he continued to pursue casual sexual interests elsewhere throughout the following years, we shall never know, for nowhere but in his Diary did Pepys lay bare the intimacies of his sexual proclivities.

When Pepys is textually defining his relationships with women in the Diary, he exhibits protean faces including a face of patriarchy and of cruelty when writing of Elizabeth; one of fear that she could expose him in public; one face of power in the class structure, and one of weakness in his necessity to sexually use lower-class women; and a face of confusion between will and desire because of his emotional dependence on Deb Willet. Whether such faces were "the societical norm" in that era or not, the fact that Pepys documented them in his Diary raises the question, why, when these protean faces present a far cry from the face of high morality he exhibits in the public writings of his position as an important member of the Navy Board?

He writes of his intentions and his successes in sexual gratification in varying degrees of detail, almost like keeping his account books in the office. One of the answers could be that his sense of power is ratified by the lengths of intimacy he is allowed, or forces, on the women who owe him favours. In other words, how far he was allowed to go, especially against their will, was a measure of his physical strength as well as of his social authority. There is one occasion where he records that although he was using her physically, the fact that the woman allowed him to do anything willingly caused him to feel cheated enough to make a Diary entry about it. He writes 28 February 1666 piously, “I perceive she is come to be very bad and offers anything”
She appeared to have the power in this situation, giving so freely in her enjoyment, that she was the dominant one, but she exceeded her social position. Or more to the point, Pepys needed to overcome the resistance of women to gain optimum sexual pleasure. One could argue that it is Pepys’s puritanism – inculcated since childhood – that sets up the barriers which generate his desire to overcome them. The greater the resistance offered to his advances, the greater the desire, and therefore, the greater the pleasure when fulfilled.

It has been said that his recordings of his dalliances could be a form of confession. Stone says “He was unable to indulge in hedonistic adventures of sexual seduction without a twinge of guilt or remorse. He recorded what he regarded as his failings as an aid to his reformation” (350). On the other hand, writing about the thrill of the chase and of his physical pleasure obviously gives him a sense of triumph, especially as he has no children to prove his virility, and his use of polyglot foreign languages in his descriptions give the incidents, in retrospect, an added sense of eroticism which fuels his sexuality.

However, this view seems too simplistic. It is both more complex and accurate to say that the confessional does co-exist within the entries on sex in the Diary, as does the pleasure. It is too easy to read some of the entries as hypocritical, yet often the paradoxes involved seem devoid of hypocrisy. Like an actor wearing a mask, Pepys often assumes the face that is appropriate to the situation. For example, after having a “tempestually sexual time” with Mrs. Bagwell in her bedroom, he immediately assumes his business face when her husband arrives home (as mentioned above). This sounds more volitional than the process really is. For sex and desire are the forces that undermine the fixity of these masks, and reveal a chaos that threatens Pepys’s world. Indeed, one might say that sexual desire in the Diary is a mask that assumes Pepys
himself. The *Diary* could be viewed as a mask that is constructed to order the chaos and the paradoxes that are manifested in particular *Diary* entries, but the chaos and paradoxes remain visible nevertheless.
CHAPTER 8
COMPARISON OF THE PEPYS DIARY WITH THREE OTHER DIARIES OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

(a) Preamble

This chapter discusses three notable diaries of the seventeenth century, by Bulstrode Whitelocke, John Evelyn and Roger Morrice, and compares them with the *Diary* of Samuel Pepys. To my knowledge, no-one before has attempted an extended comparison between Pepys’s *Diary* and three diaries by his contemporaries. The comparison allows us to see where the Samuel Pepys of his *Diary* is placed in the seventeenth century, not only politically and publicly, but more importantly for this thesis, in the private world in which he writes his many selves, a world which differs greatly from those in the diaries written by the three other prominent men of his era. This will show that Pepys’s *Diary* differs considerably from the other three in its style and content, and indeed from any other diary known from the seventeenth century up to the present day. By looking closely at these other diaries, each of them very substantial, and each a rival to Pepys's in recording the experience of a significant citizen of the era with connections to important public events, I aim to provide a context for the diary which is the main subject of this thesis. None of them provides the immediacy of Pepys's *Diary*, with its sense of time fragmented into discrete days, for example, and all three are essentially written from a single coherent subject position, quite unlike the layered and disparate strands of consciousness we find in Pepys. In their diaries Whitelocke, Evelyn and Morrice each assume a stable place in their society and each presents a relatively uncomplicated sense of himself. There are also occasional points of contact with some of the peculiar features of Pepys's *Diary*, as I explore in detail below.
The four diaries cover different time spans. Pepys’s runs from 1660 to 1669, ending when he is still a comparatively young man. Whitelocke began with recording his own birth in 1605 and then, partly in hindsight, made short entries about his boyhood (47). His entries covered the rest of his life, almost to the day he died in 1675. Evelyn’s first entry is for 1631 and his last, on 3 February 1706, was simply the recording of the subjects of the two chapel services he had attended that day. He died two weeks later in his 86th year. Morrice’s first entry is for 1677. He continued making entries until April 1691, when he stopped, satisfied with the advent of the Protestant William and Mary II on the English throne, quelling his fear that the country would be ruled by Catholicism.

None of the four diaries was published in its author’s lifetime. As we have seen, Pepys’s survives as six bound volumes within the library that he left to Magdalene College, Cambridge in his will (Pepys Diary lxxi). Whitelocke’s original diary is extant in two manuscript volumes, of which the first was abridged from a much more extensive set of records he called “The Annales of his Life and Labours remembered for his Children” (Spalding. Whitelocke’s Diary 31). This diary is owned by the Marquess of Bute. The second manuscript gives us the only record of Whitelocke’s life (Spalding. Whitelocke’s Diary 31). Evelyn’s diary survives in three bound volumes and a collection of loose sheets, in the possession of his descendant Mr. John Evelyn of Wotton (De Beer, Diary 1: 44). The last of the diaries, that of Roger Morrice, consists of three volumes of manuscripts, described as “very frail,” which are still in the library of Dr. Williams of Gordon Square, London (Goldie, Morrice’s Entring Book 1: xiv).
(b) THE DIARY OF SIR BULSTRODE WHITELOCKE.

The *Diary* of Sir Bulstrode Whitelock (1605-75) did not come to light until around 1820, when the manuscripts were found in a library at Luton Hoo in Bedfordshire. In the 1850s other works of Whitelocke were published, but it was not until June 1873 that The Camden Society was given permission by the owner, Lord Bute, to publish the manuscripts of the Whitelocke diary, provided “indelicate” health references were omitted. These were mostly in reference to “the bloody water” caused by stones, and scatological entries (32). However, at that time The Camden Society considered that such a publication was too ambitious and costly a project (34). The *Diary* was finally edited by Ruth Spalding for The British Academy, and published in 1990.

Whitelocke was a prominent lawyer and parliamentarian. He was born in 1605, and so lived through the English Revolution and the beheading of Charles I. He was closely involved with Cromwell (not always amicably), and with Charles II, and he held very high positions before and during the Interregnum.

Whitelocke was a prolific writer. This is evident from the five pages of references to his documentation in Spalding’s *Contemporaries of Bulstrode Whitelocke* under “Principal Manuscript Sources with notes” (xviii-xxiii) and a further two pages titled “Bulstrode Whitelocke’s Published Work, including Speeches” (xxiv-xxv). His voluminous manuscripts, letters, and other documentation are held in the British Library, Longleat, Cambridge University Library, the Bodleian, and in private hands (Spalding xviii-xxii).

Whitelocke’s *Diary* starts out as a memoir, as it begins at his birth on 6 August 1605. From then on until the end of the *Diary* he headed each birthday month of August as the beginning of each new year. The *Diary* covers the intervening years until 1675, although he did not begin to write it until 1663. Whitelocke did not refer to
his work as a diary, although his later entries were made under specific dates so that
the publisher named it as such. Whitelocke referred to it as a “history” and a “private
history” (qtd. in Worden 3). He stated that his “history” was written for the edification
of the remaining children of the seventeen he fathered from the three women he
married, Rebecca, Frances and Mary (88). Whitelocke, in undertaking this work, was
also staking a claim for a place in history, for, as Blair Worden points out, although
Whitelocke wrote *The Annals of his Life dedicated to his Children* (from which work
the *Diary* is taken) for his immediate family, the fact that Whitelocke warns them that
they would “probably […] hear your father censured” for its contents “suggests that
he must have envisaged a wider readership” (Worden 9). Originally, the *Annals* were
written in the first person and filled five large volumes, with two more covering his
time spent as an ambassador in Sweden. They are made up of autobiographical
sections interspersed with a history of his times and with entries on religious,
political, historical, legal, social and domestic subjects.

The *Diary* is written in the third person, which is an unusual style for a diarist to
use, especially when the *Annals* had been written in the first person (Spalding, *The
Improbable Puritan* 11). It is possible that whereas, as Whitelocke says, the *Annals*
were written for his children, and writing in the first person suggests intimacy, when
he wrote up the *Diary* from the *Annals* in the third person in the objective rather than
a subjective style, he was envisioning a wider and future readership. Whether or not
writing in an objective style is supposed to give the impression that his statements are
the “truth,” or to give a sense of his impartiality (27), it is a rather curious way to
write a supposedly personal journal, for this style distances the author from his
writing. I say “supposedly personal” because Whitelocke, originally, trying to sort out
the masses of writings, documentations, treaties, letters and the like which he had
produced on myriad subjects, from which he wrote up his *Annals*, intended that, from them, he would produce two volumes. One was to consist of his “public history,” and the other, the *Diary*, was to be his “private history” (Spalding. Whitelocke *Diary* 544) and Spalding says “this concentrates mainly on direct experience, except for some months before and after the Restoration” (31). Instead, both volumes blurred into both categories. Worden says, “thus the boundary between the two documents […] proved at best flimsy and at worst invisible” (5).

When writing the *Diary*, Whitelocke realised that he would be unable to fit all the external matter he had put into the *Annals* into his two *Diary* journals. Even so, historians have criticized his inclusion of newspaper reports, hinting that he passed them off as eye-witness accounts, but in the *Annals* he had already stated frankly that he used them to fill gaps in his knowledge (Spalding, *The Improbable Puritan* 13). However, Spalding maintains that “except for some months before and after the Restoration, the diary concentrates mainly on direct experience” (31). Worden also suggests that it is possible that Spalding was wrong in believing that Whitelocke wrote the *Annals* first, circa 1663, followed by the *Diary*. The entries in the *Diary*, he maintains, were probably written concurrently with those in the *Annals*:

In both works he would “insert” material from the papers before him at the appropriate points and on the appropriate dates (see, e.g., *Diary*, 1 January 1646, 28 July 1646). Occasional cross-references in the *Diary* to the *Annals* – to what he calls his “larger booke of *Annales*” or his “larger volumes” (pp.118, 238, 248, 270, 271, 279, 283, 288, 289) – indicate that he composed the *Annals* (or each portion of the *Annals*) first, and then wrote the “*Diary*” (or each corresponding portion of it) with the *Annals* beside him. (25-6)
From this point of view it can be appreciated that the Whitelocke’s diary’s methodology is more studied and structured than spontaneously reflective.

Whitelocke’s father was Sir James Whitelocke, a judge, and both his parents were “of antient Gentry” (Spalding, Whitelocke Diary 43). Whitelocke, writing of his earliest years, relates his interest in books and the keen gaining of knowledge from as young as his ninth year:

He was so much addicted to his book, that often coming home att nights, he gott by his mothers connivance a little hole under a payre of stayres in his father’s house in Fleetstreet & made it his study, & when his schoolfellows were att play he would be in his study when he was att home, by which industry & advantage of his time, he gott before his fellowes in learning, & much pleased his parents, & his tyrannicall schoolmaster, who was very cruel to him. (45)

Whitelocke writes his boyhood with brevity, perhaps relying on his memory. He describes an accident in his tenth year when he was kicked in the face by a horse which “cutt his upper lippe asunder, & greatly endaungered his life” (45). At fifteen years he was sent to Oxford University, and in his seventeenth year, he met with an accident which left him lame and in pain, and Whitelocke’s report of the aftermath and treatment of this injury heralds the start of much longer diary entries, though still in yearly reviews. Whitelocke did not return to Oxford after his accident, but instead toured England learning from lawyers on his journey.

Whitelocke’s Diary covers seventy years of English history from 1605, documenting a most turbulent period, and Spalding rightly says that until the Diary reaches August 1644 “a layer of knowledge is spread over it” (28), referring to the fact that Whitelocke’s entries, although being written about 1663, are taken from
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documentation that Whitelocke had written previously. The items Whitelocke selects for entry do not follow a set pattern of inclusive detail. For example, when covering his twentieth year he again writes sparingly (in seven lines) first of his study of the law and attaining his degree of barrister, and his study of music. However, where his reputation is concerned, just as when his emotions are involved, in either the public or private areas of his life, he tends to write in greater detail, as he did when writing of his early escapade in trying to cross the River Wye. He makes an entry in the Diary describing this occasion which is twice as long as that describing his legal studies. It explains how, against the advice of his groom, he attempts to get himself, his groom, and a horse to the other side of the river, in a small boat, this with the help of a woman using only a short “Scoupe” or paddle, which could not reach river bottom. The horse “began to flounce, & his two hinder legges were over the side of the boate in the River, his forelegges still within the boate, & so he lay, the boate expected every minute to sinke.” Whitelocke, seeing the danger, writes that he told the groom to remove the horse’s saddle and to push the animal into the river, but the groom was so “amazed with fear” that he was incompetent. Whitelocke removed the saddle himself and the horse got itself back into the boat, which, nearly filled with water, just reached the safety of the bank before disaster could ensue (52). Whitelocke’s description of this episode, which he chose to include in the Diary, exhibits himself, as a young man, in a heroic light. Therefore, from this early written personal encounter it can be seen that Whitelocke’s intention to make the first volume of the Diary a public one soon falters. There are just a few stories like this in the Diary. They make for an odd combination of subjective, personal content and ostensibly third person reporting. Whitelocke is foregrounding the resourceful and upright man of political integrity, and the courageous soldier and ambassador he saw himself as
having become. Whitelocke prefers to show himself in his writing in a favourable light, always placing on record praise or approbation from those he considers important. It is interesting that Whitelocke neglected to mention that in this same year (1625) Charles I came to the throne (52.n.2).

In the year following the river incident Whitelocke writes that, under his father’s patronage, he had moved into legal and political circles, having entered “the best school of Christendom, the Parlement of England […] & by this he gained much knowledge & experience in the publique affayres” (53-54). Amongst the responsibility of public duties and his legal position, Whitelocke juxtaposes his first venture into matrimony, with Rebecca Bennet, when he was twenty-two years old, and the disaster which was the first night of his “expecting marriage joys.” These hopes were dashed when his bride became hysterical and experienced “her fits of her former distemper, which were so violent that her Bridegrome was fain to leave her bedde to call for helpe for her, thus she continued all night,” after which “his comforts vanished & he mett with sharp grievfe, his joyes were turned into anguish and perplexity, butt he looked up to Him who orders all things” (61). He constantly writes that he looks to God for help in adversity, whatever the field, and he gains comfort from his motto “Whatever happens is best – if I make it so” (61.n.2). Ruth Spalding says that this philosophy was to colour his outlook, and even his political judgement, in the years to come (The Improbable Puritan 40). His first marriage, nevertheless, after the unfortunate beginning, is written of as proceeding happily (The Improbable Puritan 41), but was soon a disappointment, his wife early showing symptoms of mental problems. She died in 1634, while he was in France, leaving a son, James (The Improbable Puritan 42).
Whitelocke writes movingly in his *Diary* and elsewhere about the romantic courting of his second wife, Frances Willoughby, whom he evidently deeply loved, and her agonising death 16 May 1649. On 27 April of that year Whitelocke wrote that he came home to find Frances unwell. From then on, the entries for the month of May tell how her health rapidly deteriorated, doctors clashing over her treatment. They even “lay’d slitt pidgeons to the soales of her feet, butt she found no ease” (237). He writes of the significance of his misery by describing on 15 May how he lay weeping most of the night in the next room listening to the “grones” of his wife. He writes piteously of his wife’s dying prayers for him and the children. He finishes the day’s entry with “Whitelocke had a cold kisse of his wife which he warmed with his tears” (238). She died the following day. On the 16th he writes:

> The saddest day of Whitelockes life when his deare wife dyed, then whom never wife was a truer comfort & helper then she was. Her birth, her beauty, her disposition, her wisdom, her cheerfulness, her entire affection to her husband, he cannot now relate for tears, they are in plenty exprest in his larger booke, so are her orders of housekeeping, of breeding her children, of governing her family, & her incomparable love of her husband & desire to please him, who can say no more of this subject […] (238)

It is strange that, when so obviously distraught, he still writes in the third person. He goes on to say, also, that several times he saw “a perfect apparition” of his wife standing by his bed whereby “he was nothing frighted butt delighted with it […] but she spake nothing to him, only looked cheerfully uppon him” (238-39). Whitelocke’s writing of this great loss in his life provides a contrast with his basic and business-like reports on government affairs, and belies Thomas Carlyle’s description of
Whitelocke’s writing in the “castrated” *Memorials*, as “dry as dust” (qtd. in Worden 2).

Ruth Spalding writes a different description of these days, attributing different words to Whitelocke without making reference to her source. She claims that he wrote, “in minute detail, eight large pages of recollections of this enchanting creature” which do not appear in the *Diary* (*The Improbable Puritan* 118). This possibly was because Whitelocke had run out of space in the smaller volume. However, Spalding’s pages of Reference Notes at the end of her book (270-300) give a month by month indexation of notes, many of which have been seconded from Whitelocke’s “Memorials” and “Annals” and various other manuscripts attributed to the author. Possibly the eight pages to which she refers are among this material.

After Frances’s death Whitelocke was left with ten children. He then married Mary Carleton, a childless but wealthy widow, who treated her ten stepchildren as her own, and subsequently Whitelocke and Mary added their own children to the brood (*The Improbable Puritan* 67). Whitelocke’s recording of Mary’s contribution to the marriage, especially when he is to be sent, against his will, to Sweden, and her support when he fears for his life, at the Restoration of Charles II, figures at length in the *Diary*. However, it is noticeable that Mary is rarely mentioned in the last few years of the *Diary* before Bulstrode’s death. There are frequent entries mentioning family problems and sadness in the same years, but no tender care recorded from his wife, even in the last weeks before he died, and not even shortly before his last day, despite, over the previous weeks, almost daily entries that he was “very ill” of “bloody water,” these often several times a day. On 31 December 1674 there is what may be a defining sentence: “Whitelocke and his wife very Solitary” (834).
In the *Diary* Whitelocke’s constant juxtapositioning of family affairs against those of the important public servant he was allows the reader to comprehend the culture of the domestic highs and lows in the family life of one who held important government and legal positions in that era. Whitelocke writes about himself as a considerate and loving husband and father with no mention, in the *Diary*, of any interest in anyone outside his family (although he writes of Queen Christina’s flirtatious conversations with him when he visits Sweden but this, too, like his self-presentation as a good family man, could be mere self-aggrandizement).

Whitelocke’s diary entries recording his political career show that he found it difficult, even dangerous, to adhere to his father’s early advice “not to join any party or faction whatsoever, but to vote on each resolution according to his conscience” (7). Indeed, as often as he could circumspectly do, he kept to that ideal of freedom of conscience for most of his life, as exemplified in his writing of himself, “and when called on to act against Archbishop Laud, and, later, against Charles I, he refused in the first case, giving his reasons in the House, and in the second case disappeared into the country with Sir Thomas Widdrington.” Spalding says “his political taste was for a middle way, if possible a peaceful way” (*Diary* 8). However, later supportive dealings regarding rebel Phanatics (ejected Puritans) among whom he lived were an exception (647).

On 30 January 1649 Whitelocke writes in his *Diary*, “Whitelocke went not to the house. Butt stayed all day at home, troubled att the death of the King this day, & praying to God to keep his judgements from us” (229). Although he could have written more at length in another manuscript, as was his practice, it is significant that he chose to record the event so non-committally in his *Diary*, and with such brevity. Conversely, when both sides of the House decided that Whitelocke, as one of the most
successful lawyers in the land, should be one of the Commissioners of the Great Seal, one of the highest legal positions in the country, Whitelocke writes at some length of his opposition to taking that responsibility (which would mean extra work, and time away from his large family, and would result, as it did, ultimately, in less remuneration). His colleagues warned him, though, that if he did not concur, he would most likely be sent to the Tower because he would be holding the Houses in contempt. So he did, in the end, accept (Diary 211).

His father’s advice about allying himself with factions was especially difficult to adhere to when Bulstrode was confronted with Oliver Cromwell. Whitelocke writes in guarded tones of his relationship with Cromwell, which he records before and during the ensuing years of the Protectorship. As stated, Whitelocke consistently mentions when he is given the warm affirmation of others he meets, either publicly or privately, but this habit reaches a different dimension when it is applied to his relationship with Cromwell. As it appears in the Diary, Cromwell’s approbation is linked to Whitelocke’s security. There are many occasions where he writes of Cromwell’s goodwill towards him. For example: On 12 May 1646 “Whitelocke made his mind known to Cromwell with whom he was very intimate” (186). In May 1647 Cromwell was “well disposed towards Whitelocke,” supporting him when he objected to being sent to Ireland (193). After Cromwell returned from “crushing Ireland” in June 1650 Whiteclocke claims that he “received Whitelocke with all kindness & familiarity” (258). There are more such examples in the same vein. Whitelocke writes of entertaining Cromwell to dinner in his home, of playing bowls with Cromwell, of being consulted by Cromwell (211). Indeed, Spalding says that “Whitelocke’s claim that Cromwell enjoyed his company and treated him with great respect was probably
accurate” (Improbable Puritan131), that is until Cromwell asks Whitelocke the fateful question, “What if a man should take upon him to be King?” (Whitelocke 281).

There follows a highly significant episode, recorded at length in the Diary as verbatim dialogue, but with both of the speakers still written in the third person. Whitelocke, ever the conscientious lawyer, lays before Cromwell valid reasons against such an action. Cromwell then asks him what should be done. Again Whitelocke gives a “frank” opinion, that the legal King should be restored but with limitations, “& in such a way as yourselfe shall judge safe, & of highest honour to you & your children as ever any subject had.” Whitelocke continues, “With this Cromwell brake off […] seeming by his Countenance and carryage, not to be pleased” (282).

This is an instance where Whitelocke’s “guardedness” in his writing up his relationship with Cromwell is apparent, for his use of the word “seeming” lightens Cromwell’s obvious vexation, more so than if he had plainly said that Cromwell was angry. Whitelocke goes on:

Only Whitelocke found Cromwells carriage towards him, from this time altered, & his advising with Whitelocke not so frequent nor intimate as before, & it was not long after that Cromwell found an occasion by an honourable imployment to send Whitelocke out of the way (as [Cromwell’s] own daughter Lady Claypoole affirmed), that Whitelocke might be no obstacle or impediment to Cromwells ambitious designs, as may appear afterwards.26

(282)

On 6 April 1653 Whitelocke describes how he tries to dissuade Cromwell from dissolving Parliament, suggesting to him that the members of Parliament and the Army officers “dissolve themselves by an Act and allow them to elect & provide for

---

Here is an example of Whitelocke's “looking forward” in his writing.
future Parlements,” but he states that others were against him. The members of Parliament went ahead with proposals of their own. Whitelocke writes that when Cromwell heard this he called on the Army to accompany him, even into the Lobby before the [Parliament] House (285). Whitelocke recalls:

“furiously” [Cromwell] bid the Speaker to leave his chayre, told the house that they had sate long enough unlesse they had done more good, that some of them were whore Masters, looking then to Mr Martyn & Sir Peter Wentworth, that others of them were drunkards, & some of them were corrupt, unjust & scandalous to the profession of the Gospell, that it was not fitt they should sitt as a Parlement any longer & desired them to goe away. The Speaker not stirring from his seat, Collonell Harrison who sate neer him, rose and tooke him by the arme to remove him from his seat, & then the Speaker left the chayre.

Some of the members stood up & offered to speak, butt Cromwell would suffer none to speake butt himselfe. Which he did with so much arrogance in him, and disdaine to his fellow members & Masters, that some of his privadoes were ashamed att it, but he & his party would have it so, & among the parlement men, many of whom wore swords, & would sometimes bragge high, not one offered to draw his sword against Cromwell or to make the least resistance, butt tamely departed. He bid one of his soldiers take away that fooles bable, the Mace, & stayed to see all the members gone out of the house, & he the last, & then caused the doores of the house to be locked & shutt up.

[My emphasis] (286)

This is one of the rare moments that Whitelocke lets down his guard and openly portrays Cromwell in a poor light in the Diary. Spalding says that Whitelocke’s
account of the scene is “compressed, impressionistic and probably less accurate than some other eye-witnesses.” She continues:

Others recalled that Cromwell sat silent taking stock of the situation and then started speaking, at first calmly; Whitelocke’s account left this out and went straight to the fury with which Cromwell ordered the Speaker to leave his chair. (Improbable Puritan 135)

Passion of a different kind touches Whitelocke personally, when on 23 August 1653 he hears by letter from London of the proposition that he is to go to Sweden as an Ambassador to arrange a treaty. Whitelocke writes “with which newes Whitelocke was surprised & his wife and friends much troubled” (289). On 2 September 1653 Whitelocke receives a letter by messenger from Cromwell himself offering him the post. Whitelocke records that he went to Cromwell and used every argument he could muster against his going to Sweden: his age (he was forty-eight), his child’s imminent birth, the rest of his large family, but Cromwell repeatedly overrides his objections (291). How this troubles Whitelocke can be seen in manuscript 4902 from which were later transcribed -- in two volumes, with the title A Journal of the Swedish Embassy -- his conversations with Cromwell and Gilbert Pickering regarding this hiatus. These conversations are written in the first of the two journals as dialogue (13-17).

Blair Worden warns of the necessity to be “alert to the retrospective component of the work” when interpreting the dialogue regarding this problem for Whitelocke (25), and Spalding states, correctly, that “The Diary version is much condensed” (291.n.1). Whitelocke writes that his friends were for and against his going, and he writes that his wife “was full of tears & trouble” (291).

When Whitelocke says he would think the offer over, Cromwell drops his façade of geniality and “entreats him to reply with an acceptance in a few days.” Whitelocke
again “asks for release from the appointment.” Cromwell becomes intimidatory, and his colleagues urge Whitelocke to accept, as a refusal means that he could be in danger. Whitelocke writes that after he has most reluctantly accepted the position, Cromwell “was exceedingly well pleased” (291).

From his acceptance of the Ambassadorship on 13 September 1653 until sailing 6 November 1653 Whitelocke describes preparations for his departure, and on 26 October, with perhaps an eye to history, he records in the *Diary* his retinue for the voyage, from chaplains, physicians, the Gentleman of the Horse, Officers, servants, Trumpeters, to laundrywomen, 100 persons in all (296). This record suggests again that the *Diary* was for future readers, other than his children.

Thereafter, in a shortened version for the *Diary*, in comparison with the original two volumes, as Spalding has pointed out (28), Whitelocke vividly describes many problems on the high seas before his fleet reaches Sweden, and he records, after landing, finding it irksome suffering setbacks trying to obtain an audience with the absent young Queen Christina. He describes the life in the Swedish court and mentions courtiers who are antagonistic towards him, for they fear his influence on the young royal, who later states her affection for him (402). The elderly statesman Oxenstertia is the exception. Whitelocke writes that this gentleman treats him with respect and affection during his prolonged stay in his country. Once again it is important to Whitelocke to record the respect he is given.

There are many delays in Whitelocke’s attempts to get the Queen to sign the treaty between England and Sweden for England’s free use of Swedish waters, and when Whitelocke receives the news there on 13 January 1654 that Cromwell in mid-December had assumed the title of Lord Protector, he writes how dismay on two counts overcomes him: firstly, because he “saw the Protectorate as illegal and as a
threat to the Commonwealth” (Spalding 171), and secondly because he received the news from a Swedish source. (This, however, does not stop Whitelocke from calling him “His Highness” after the event [472]). This change of power also caused more delay to the signing of the treaty. Whitelocke often writes of chafing at the inaction and his wish to be home with his family. Finally he achieves his intention and the treaty is signed.

Whitelocke was away from November 1653 to June 1654, and his writing on this subject is one of the most interesting sections in the Diary, as it describes the frustrations he encountered to obtain the signing of the treaty, and the social dexterity needed when dealing with the court of a foreign country. The writing is vivid in its portrayal of his unusual experiences there which introduce the reader to a more “human” authorship than that found in many other areas of his diary. Spalding refers to these writings as “the most readable” of his works (36). Whitelocke probably did write the descriptive manuscripts of this period in a narrative style as the incidents actually happened, and was sometimes writing verbatim (if edited), from these copies, which later became the Swedish Embassy section of the Diary.

Whitelocke’s writing of this journey into a different culture enlivens the Diary, which benefits from its being written with a feeling of immediacy which is lacking from his multitudinous one or two line impersonal entries in the rest of the diary. For instance, Whitelocke is describing his visit to Queen Christina 23 December 1653:

Two Senators came presently after dinner in 2 of the Queen’s rich Coaches to conduct Whitelocke to his audience. Whitelockes liveries were of Grey Cloth, & buffe doublets laced with guards of blew velvets between edges of gould and silver, his pages more rich & their cloakes lined with plush. In the great Court of the Castle was a guard of 100 musketiers, Whitelocke alighted att the
foot of the staires where he was received by Grave Gabriell Oxenstierne with
his silver staffe testifying his Office of Steward of the Queens house, & many
officers and gentlemen with him, who complemented Whitelocke in French,
bid him welcome to the Court, & offered his Service, which Whitelocke
answerd [...]. (315)

The description of the meeting is written in detail over two full pages of text. Indeed
his writing of this whole ambassadorial sojourn reads as an ongoing narrative as he
waits to attain his objective. The Swedish entries cover a wedding, over which the
Queen presides, and they describe Whitelocke’s various travels around the country,
including a visit to a Market place where “he saw one executed for murder, the
Executioner with a sword cutt off his head att one blow”(347). He also relates in some
detail his meeting of other Swedish and foreign dignitaries, most of which is covered
in his two separate journals. When relating conversations which involved Queen
Christina, he writes them in dialogic form. Whitelocke records that the young Queen
Christina invites him to what he describes as a private audience which “lasted above
two hours, none being present butt the Queen & Whitelocke” (318). As their meetings
increased Whitelocke writes that the Queen expressed her affection for him, and later
“when he excused his long stay with her, she told him she delighted in his company,
& would not lett him goe” (324). Other than the Queen, Whitelocke mentions little of
women in Sweden, except when he writes of the Queen’s requesting him to show the
ladies of the court the custom of salutation in England [“the salutation of the lip not
being in these countries allowed” (357.n.3)]. Whitelocke describes his compliance in
a “legal” style: “which after some defence their [the court ladies'] lippes &
Whitelocke’s obeyed” (357).
His presumption can be amusing. He writes of having an audience with the Prince, who succeeded to the Swedish throne after the abdication of Queen Christina. “Whitelocke advised the Prince to the reformation of those abuses & sins reigning among this people, when he should be King, & as that which God would expect from him & also for liberty of Conscience, & the Prince seemed well pleased with it” (366).

Finally, on 20 May 1654, his mission accomplished, Whitelocke gives himself yet another of the pats on the back which pepper the Diary:

Whitelocke, leaving no debts nor ill name behind him, his business through the goodness of God successfully concluded, & all his ceremonies ended & all his people in good health, they began their desired journey homeward this morning… (367)

On the journey back, weathering storms, many times dramatically detailed, he finally describes his triumphant return to England on 30 June 1654. He writes warmly of his homecoming, and, soon after his arrival, of Cromwell’s greeting him “with great demonstration of affection” and endless questions pertaining to Sweden’s royalty, religion, trade, and Whitelocke’s hardships and health (388).

In August 1654, his fiftieth year, Whitelocke writes that he “began to decline in his health and strength, & likewise in his fortune, as to worldly things” (393). For the whole month he again resorts to reporting everyday affairs, in brief, and, also, to utilising one of his little quirks. When reporting a good deed of his to another which was unappreciated, he interpolates, “which was afterwards forgotten” (394, 397). In the following months public and private entries are juxtaposed, and a letter in French delivered to him from the Queen of Sweden is recorded wherein she awards him a Knighthood of Amarante (402). Whitelocke writes of losing his position as
Commissioner of the Seal on a matter of conscience regarding Cromwell’s changing of the law, which limited the jurisdiction of the Chancery (404). This was not a law made by Parliament but by Cromwell who did not have that power, so Whitelocke, as a lawyer, could not, and would not, agree (408). However, the Ordinance was passed. Whitelocke writes on 18 June 1655 that he “accounted himselfe to none butt God who he hoped was not displeased with it [his action]” (409). The Ordinance lapsed in February 1658 (408.n.1).

It was 3 September 1658 when Cromwell became ill. Whitelocke writes a short paragraph proclaiming his death, ending baldly with “some were of the opinion that he was poisoned” (496). He added no other comment. Richard Cromwell, now in his father’s position, restores Whitelocke to his former holding of the Keeper of the Great Seal of England. Whitelocke, who previously wrote of his unwillingness to accept such a position, now writes that he considers its endowment as “the providence of God” (506).

In August 1659 Whitelocke writes of civil war, recording various uprisings in several parts of the country. Major-General John Lambert, M.P., marched forth 6 August. “Parliament approved officers and gave commissions” 15 August (527). Whitelocke, now a soldier, gives constant reports from various parts of the country but never expresses an opinion on the fighting. These reports are interspersed with bald news of family births, and deaths, which are announced in the same manner:

27. Letters from Lambert of the surrender of Chirke Castle.

The examination of Sir George Booth taken at Heselrigge & Vane, referred to the Councell of State.

Letters from his son James, of his wifes miscarrying of Twins. (529)

And again, after the cessation of hostilities Whitelocke writes 7 October 1659:
Order for thankes to the Citty for their entertainement.

Several addresses to the Parlement.

Letters from publicke Ministers.

About 12 o’clocke att night, Whitelocke’s son Stephen was borne att his lodgings in Scotland yard in Whitehall. (534)

Brief statements, such as the above, are just that, whereas the editor’s note (535. n.1) makes the comment that Whitelocke’s description of Major Arthur Evelyn’s meeting with Lambert, a week later, is so written that he implies that the Major and his troope “tamely submitted” to the lone Lambert:

Evelyn, who commanded the life guards of the Parlement, marching forth with his Troupe, to doe his service, was mett by Lambert att Scotland yard gate, & Lambert commanded Evelyn to dismount, who thought it safest to obey, & though Lambert were on foot, & none with him, yet Evelyn in the head of his troupe dismounted att his command, & his troope also obeyed Lambert. (535)

But, as Spalding points out, “the Major could hardly be expected to disobey a man who, until the previous day, had been Lieutenant General and who, not two months earlier, as saviour of the nation, had been voted a jewel worth 1000 [pounds] by a grateful Parliament” (535.n.2). Whitelocke achieves the implied derogatory implication by painting the picture with “& though Lambert were on foot, & none with him, yet Evelyn in the head of his troupe dismounted att his command” without actually adding an adverse comment (535).

With Cromwell dead, his son Richard dismissed, and war coming to an end in October 1659, the Diary now records the movements of armies, mainly Monk’s and Fleetwood’s in great detail. It is proposed Whitelocke should be part of a council of
ten “to consider of fitt wayes to carry on the affayres & government” but Whitelocke writes that Mary, after the birth of another child, is against this (536).

Halfway through the entry of 19 November 1659 there is written thus, centred in the page:

This private history is continued

in another volume of this binding

In Volume two, the continuing entries from 19 November 1659 onwards are no longer in statement form, but in continuous prose, and describe the different factions vying for power as Monck advances on London, which completely takes over the pages of the Diary, with no mention of domesticity. By 27 December 1659 Whitelocke finds himself in dire straits. He writes:

Whitelocke, seeing how things passed & that the old Parlement were now mett again, whom he knew would be severe against him for acting in the Committee of safety & against them, & being informed that Scott, & Nevill & others had threatened to take away his life, & Scott said that he should be hanged with the Great Seale about his necke, & knowing Scots malice to him, upon some former contests about elections to Parlement, this made Whitelocke to consider how to provide for his own safety. (554)

At the end of December 1659 Whitelocke tells how he is hiding out in a small upper room in his sister’s house in Hunsden, where only she and her husband know of his presence.

It is at this time in Whitelocke’s Diary that that of Pepys begins. Pepys, in 1660, was twenty-seven years old, just about to put his foot on the bottom rung of the ladder of public service. The civil war was over and Charles II was about to be restored to the throne. Whitelocke was then fifty-four years old, fighting for his formerly
prestigious, legal and political, and, possibly, his actual life, amidst uproar in London, where nobody, not an elected Parliament, the Army nor a king, was in control.

General Moncke was in Scotland ready to march to London, “he having a call from God” to do so (547). No-one knew at first what his intentions were, or whether he favoured Parliament, military rule, or a return of an autocratic King (552).

Whitelocke’s entries follow Moncke’s advance, from early December on, written in serial style, all the way to the capital. Whitelocke leaves himself open to danger by writing in the *Diary* of his distrust of Moncke, documenting his reason for this by his reaction to the general’s reply to a letter from Fleetwood in which Moncke prevaricated over peace talks. Fleetwood had already signed the peace agreement, after which Moncke belatedly wanted to add two more provisos:

> Upon consideration of this letter Wh[itelocke] declared his opinion that this was only a delay in Moncke to gain time, & be the better prepared for his design to bring in the King, & to bring the Army heer & their party into more streights for want of pay, w[hi]ch he had gott for his forces & therfore Wh[itelocke] advised to fall upon Moncke presently to bring the matter to an issue, before his soldiers were more confirmed & Fletewoods party discouraged, butt this advise was not taken; butt a new treaty consented to by Com[missione]rs on each part, to be att New Castle. (547)

Although Whitelocke has often been accused of remaining neutral in his writings and opinions, he makes it plain in this section that he and Fleetwood and his followers fear that Moncke’s wish was to bring in another autocratic King (Charles II), without the balance of a free Parliament (552). In the paragraph quoted above Whitelocke again states a fact which sounds like a reprimand, without making comment. It may seem surprising that Whitelocke writes of his hopes in the situation, and mentions the
names of everyone concerned in the discussions, as he leaves himself open in documentation when he, supposedly, didn’t know the outcome. But of course, at this point he was writing retrospectively, and knew already what the result of all this was to be.

Blair Worden, however, questions whether a previous diary did actually exist because Spalding’s evidence on this supposition seems fragile (24). Nevertheless, in his writing up of these events, still in the third person, after the Restoration, Whitelocke is dating all the entries as if he is actually living them at the time, and therefore he is constructing the proceedings as “truth.” Also, on many occasions, as Worden shows (25), especially in the earlier parts of the Diary, he “cannot resist looking ahead” to the coups by Oliver Cromwell (278, 284), and George Moncke in 1660 (522), when Moncke arrived in London before the restored King.

Whitelocke, in volume two of the Diary, documents at considerable length, and in detail, a worrying time for himself, after the interregnum, when Charles II was restored to the throne in 1660. Many former Members of Parliament, including Whitelocke, who had supported Cromwell, were to be excepted from the “Act of Oblivion and Generall Pardon” and excluded from taking up their pre-Interregnum positions as MPs. To be so excluded could brand those affected as anti-royalists who could also have been complicit in Charles I’s execution, and maybe lead to a stay in the Tower, or worse, execution (562). Whitelocke’s wife Mary, fearing that some of Whitelocke’s diary entries could damn him in the eyes of the royalists, “burnt many papers of her husband relating to publicke affayres […] but she did it in pure love to her husband and care to prevent any prejudice to him” (Diary 559).

Whitelocke writes a serialised version of his battle not to be excluded from the King’s pardon. His main stated fear was that his wife and many children would be
destitute were he imprisoned (Spalding 227). On 1 June 1660 Whitelocke writes that “his troubles began to multiply,” but before citing his detractors he looks forward saying, “butt God made their endeavours not to succeed against Whitelocke” (590-95). He then goes back into great detail (as he always does when his emotions are involved, or when suffering under a rebuke, or a perceived injustice) to 1 June 1660 when the first of the accusations were aimed his way (590).

Whitelocke writes that he became angry at the ill-treatment of his wife when she went to Prinne, one of his accusers, to ask for his support, and was denied, although the man was a former friend to whom she had given help “when he was in distresse & under displeasure.” Prinne humiliated her because he was still bearing a grudge against Whitelocke, who had opposed him once on a point of law (590). Again, Whitelocke writes at length, as again his emotions are involved:

After she had waited a long time in his Common roome, he came forth into it w[i]th St. John[,] who was with him to intreat his favour, & he was St. John’s friend, Whitelockes wife then supplicated his H[ighness]s & went after him into his study, where he rayled to her ag[ains]t her husband, who never did halfe so much ag[ains]t the K[ing] as Pryn had done, Whitelockes wife endeavoured to excuse her husband, butt Prynne would not hear it, & when she intreated his favour for her husband he rancorously denyed it. And imperiously told the tender wife that her husband must suffer & ought to be excepted from pardon & that he knew he would be excepted, & that he would further it, with many words to that effect, testifying his height of malice and bloudy mind ag[ains]t Whitelocke upon which Whitelockes wife could hardly be kept from sounding in his presence, & having used her more like a kitchen wench then a gentlewoman, with no other gratitude or
acknowledgement of her former kindnesses to him, he churlishly dismiss her.

(591)

Although the above passage is written in the third person, its emotive tone, style and content make the reading of it subjective. In his position as a husband Whitelocke’s style of writing here overrides that of his legal stance, which emerges again soon after as he follows this entry by writing over five pages of quasi-legal detailed presentation of every accusation levelled against him by his detractors, until on 7 June, probably because of his pre-Cromwellian reputation and his success as ambassador to Sweden, he hears that he has escaped the first exception. There was still the threat of a second.

Still uneasy, Whitelocke details his fears and meetings, and his need for constant moving about, writing that he never stays long in one place. From 11 January 1660, after hiding in his brother-in-law’s house, he is transferred to a “small smoaky room” (561) after which he stays at a surgeon’s residence until 25 February 1660, when the case against him is temporarily dropped, and he returns to Fawley Court, his home in the country.

On 2 June he writes in the Diary, under the heading “The Case of Bulstrode Whitelocke Kt.,” four detailed pages of his defence against his being excepted, in the manner of legal argument, after which he records an interview with Charles II. Whitelocke asks his pardon while on his bended knees. Many were against his exception, but finally, after paying large sums in “gratifications, buying his enemies out of destroying him,” Whitelocke received his pardon on 11 July 1660 under the Great Seal of England (610). But he was now out of all public employment. He could only try to return to the legal profession to provide for his family.
From the end of November 1660, Whitelocke records, monthly, his meagre monetary gains from his legal practice, which range from a starting point of six pounds ten shillings to amounts of a little over twenty pounds. (By the end of May 1669 this amount had dwindled to one pound ten shillings.) The whole tenor of the diary has changed from the more political and public record of his early years in office to one of concentrating wholly on his private and domestic life, as he spends more and more time in the country struggling with family responsibilities. He diligently records the constant illnesses of his wife, of himself (of the stone) and the tragic loss of his daughters.

His writing the next month, covering its entirety, characterizes again how his style changes to verbosity when his emotions are high, as he exhibits examples of two tenets to which Whitelocke strongly adheres in his *Diary*, that of strictly upholding the law, and of citizens being allowed freedom of conscience. He justifies his actions in a legal manner in dialogic form:

7 May 1662. Whitelocke was waiting to speake with the Chancellor, & the Bishop of London came & went in to him whilst Whitelocke waited which did a little distast Whitelocke butt in a little time after, he was sent in for, & bade to sitt down with the Chancellor and the Bishop, none else being present, then the Chancellor told Whitelocke he was sorry to heare that Whitelocke was the head of the Phanatickes [Puritans] in the Citty, which might prove of ill consequence, Whitelocke answered that he should be glad if he were the head of the Phanatickes, the Chancellor replyed with seeming anger Why should you be glad of it? Whitelocke said his reason was because the Phanatickes were a very great and considerable body, & if he were the head of
them he should be able to doe the King good service by keeping them in good
order and duety to his Majesty, which he would doe. (646-47)

Then they “had discourse” which Whitelocke records as verbatim dialogue. The
Chancellor says the Bishop accuses Whitelocke of setting the Bishop’s parishioners
against him by advising them that a Commission for a Vestry he, the Bishop, granted
was against the Law. Whitelocke answers, at length, proclaiming his right as a lawyer
to uphold the law against anyone, even the King. The Chancellor’s answer, directed at
the Bishop, was brief: “My Lord of London, Whitelocke is a shrewd fellow, we were
best to lette him alone, that which he saith hath some weight.” Whitelocke continues:

After much other discourse, wherin Whitelocke was more sharpe then
Ordinary, remembering the great injuries done to his children by this BishoP,
Whitelocke took his leave and left them. (648)

There follow from 9 to 20 May 1662 domestic entries made in one or two lines a day
only until 21 May 1662 when letters inform him that his daughter Harvey was
“extreame ill,” until 27 May 1662 when, under great distress, Whitelocke’s first two
lines head a lengthy obituary of praise finishing with the reason he so hated the
Bishop:

Between 7. & 8 a clocke in the morning, his deare daughter Cecill
Harvey dyed in his house in Coleman street, she never injoyed her selfe
after her husbands death, whom she truly loved, as he did her […]
She was of a sweet disposition & conversation, lamented by all that
knew her, God was pleased upon the barbarous dealing of the BishoP
of London and his Agents with her and her husband, to cast her into
an illness & griefe, & shortly after to take away her childe, after that he
took away her husband, and within 5 moneths after that, she dyed, & all
The Bishop had used soldiers to turn his daughter and her family onto the street by taking over their house illegally. The long passage covering his daughter’s death once again proves how emotion leads Whitelocke to write at length, after which he continues his short entries, from 28 January to 17 June 1662, none of which exceed two lines, practically all pertaining to familial and social matters.

The remainder of his entries until his death, which occurred but a week after the last day he recorded, 21 July 1675, that “Whitelocke was extreame ill of bloody water” revolve mainly around his family (841). Their incessant demands, their various illnesses, and his own, the sad deaths of some of the siblings, and constant business and financial worries which dominate the later entries, all this takes place in the country, far from the politics of London and the Royal court. Whitelocke does not betray his distress with recalcitrant members of his family. On 25 January 1674 he writes “Whitelocke had unkind & hard words given him by some in his family” (821) with no indication of cause. 12 January 1675 he shortly writes, “Troubles in the family” with no explanation, but by 31 January 1675 he writes “Letters of horrid malice from young Pile [his son-in-law] against Whitelocke & all his family & that he threatened (sic) to accuse Whitelocke & Mr Cokain for treasonable words” (835).

From then on the constant reporting of “bloody water” appears, Sir Seymour Pile is paid a settlement of 1250 pounds 22 March, and the almost daily one-line entries speak matter-of-factly of extremities of pain, and troubles from different members of his family, until his last entry on 21 July 1675. He died a week later.

(c) THE DIARY OF JOHN EVELYN.

Virginia Woolf described Evelyn’s Diary as “the uninspired work of a good man,” but suspected that he was “censorious and patronising” (117). Nevertheless it “is one
of the major sources for English history in the second half of the seventeenth century” (De Beer, *Diary* 1: 107).

In this section Evelyn’s curiosity, and his all-encompassing religious beliefs, will be primary subjects. These take precedence in the *Diary* over reporting on political and historical developments, reflecting Evelyn’s more private interests. Apart from being offered a position looking after the welfare of wounded soldiers and seamen and prisoners during the Dutch war, and the contact he had with the powerful, through fraternising with Charles II and his court, he took little part in, and “kept too much aloof, from politics” (1: 113) and the running of the country.

John Evelyn was born at Wotton on 31 October 1620. The family wealth came from his grandfather George, who, following the Armada in 1588, was given sole rights for the manufacture of gunpowder (Strong vii). Evelyn’s father John was the younger son of the two from his second wife. John the diarist, born 1620, was the middle son of three surviving, sired by his father, and there were two sisters also who survived past the infant stage (Strong viii). When he was four Evelyn was sent to live with his grandfather and his second wife in Lewes. His grandfather died two years later, but he continued to live with his step-grandmother who remarried two or three years after. He stayed with them, attending a local school before going to Oxford. It was in those years that he became strongly attached to the Church of England (1: 4-5).

The diarist left Balliol College after three years, without a degree. He refused to study law, and because he was left money enough to be financially secure for most of his life, he had no need to obtain a paying position. He left England in November 1643 after the outbreak of the Civil War, and for four years gained what he calls his “education,” from travels through Holland, Italy, Spain and France (1: 80).
He writes of meeting his wife in Paris, and marrying her, when she was twelve years old. She was the daughter of Sir Richard Browne, a Protestant expatriate royalist who was the king’s representative at the French court (1: 8). In the Diary Evelyn describes how he was struck at that first meeting with her piety and domestic industry, and a little later considered that, with these virtues, she would make him a good wife (Harris 41). She outlived him by three years. They had six children who survived infancy, Richard (who later died when five years old), George and John, then Mary and Elizabeth (who both died of smallpox in early adulthood) and Susannah (Strong xii-xiii).

Evelyn began, when a boy, in 1631, to keep memoranda. He explains: “In imitation of what I had seene my Father do, I began to observe matters more punctually which I did use to set downe in a blanke Almanac” (2: 10). His early few-word entries expanded considerably when he started to travel in his early twenties. Like other travel writers of his time, Evelyn considered that travelling had mainly educational benefits (1: 80.n.2). He wrote only of early Christian memorials and antiquity, modern art and the “wonders and beauty of nature” (1: 80). He omitted politics, and the manners and behaviour of the people he met, except for occasional recordings of his own experiences. He drew on travel books and other materials; De Beer says “his own impressions were to be excluded except where they amplified the information which he had found elsewhere” (1: 80). He also used newspaper articles for chronicling the events in his diary (1: 86, 89-90).

De Beer claims that Evelyn’s earliest notes in the Kalendarium, as he originally called what are now his Diary volumes 2-5, were written for himself, possibly his

---

27 Monconys's Journal is mentioned in Diary (3: 88.n.3). Evelyn also quotes from Pflaumern's Mercurius Italicus (2: 409).
family, but especially for his grandson, and that he had no intention of publishing them (1: 84-5). This can be questioned in the light of all the following works which have been published. The *Diary* explains how his curiosity has led to his gathering of prodigious knowledge,28 and how he made exposition of it to the public, and even to Charles II, personally, in his work *Fumifugium*. This was an epistle “To the Reader” published 1 May 1661, which was a treatise on dissipating “the aer and smoak of London” (3: 295-96. n.9). He published “Chalcography” on the art of engraving copper, which was a paper presented to The Royal Society 10 June 1662 (126). Added to these are the book *Navigation and Commerce* (128), and *Numismata*, a book discoursing on “Medals, Antient and Modern” (130).

His book on trees, *Sylva*, was reprinted in many editions from the original published in 1661. Its preface has a passionate denunciation of the indiscriminate cutting down of trees that seems at odds with the mild mannered character some critics attribute to him as the persona of his *Diary*. For example, David Piper finds that Evelyn “emerges from his diary a little pale in character, perpetually elusive” (qtd. in Darley 308). However, when it comes to horticulture, a spirited figure emerges when Evelyn writes in the Preface of *Sylva*:

> But what shall I then say of our late prodigious Spoilers, whose furious devastation of so many goodly Woods and Forests have left an Infamy on their Names and Memories not quickly to be forgotten! I mean our unhappy Usurpers, and injurious Sequestrators […]. (np)

The manuscripts of the *Diary* were originally found in the house of the widow of Sir Frederick Evelyn April 1813. William Upcott was visiting her, and the

28 An appendix detailing the bulk of Evelyn's writings may be found in Volume 1 of the *Diary* edited by De Beer (124-34).
manuscripts were produced from “the ebony cabinet in an upstairs billiard room” (1: 54). Lady Evelyn remarked (regarding using such old papers, which happened to include the *Diary*) that they had “furnished the kitchen with an abundance of waste paper” (1: 53). *The Diary of John Evelyn* was first published in two quarto volumes in 1818, edited by William Bray and William Upcott. De la Bédoyère describes Evelyn as conveying in the “collections of reminiscences” in his diary his nature as “an obsessive moralist who knew how to pose as a learned savant” ("Samuel Pepys's Use of Shorthand"). He is alluding to Evelyn’s constantly expressed religious observances and his lengthy descriptions of his European travels. De Beer goes on to note that in the diary “there are in addition considerable possibilities of error owing to the fact that it was not written day by day and that a large part of it is not taken from Evelyn’s original notes, but is a more or less free copy of them” (1: 106). As de la Bédoyère says, by 1665 “Evelyn had something of a reputation as a virtuoso, writer and public servant” (*Particular Friends* 10).

Roy Strong says the *Diary* “at times may seem little more than a dispiriting list of one man’s movements laced with an obsession for attending sermons and recording every biblical text upon which they were based” (vii). It is full of details of sermons he has heard, who made them, and their subject matter. Added to this were his approbation of the sermons’ contents and delivery, and conversely, his pithy condemnation of boring or “weak” homilies. Gillian Darley complains that “from the beginning of 1684, the *Diary*, [becomes] increasingly laden with his sermon notes” (260). John Spurr discusses Evelyn’s addiction to devotional writing in his book chapter “A Sublime and Noble Service” in *John Evelyn and his Milieu*:

> While other gentlemen also composed and indeed published their own “meditations,” “devotions,” or “scriptural paraphrases,” it is rare for a
seventeenth-century individual’s spiritual life and devotional regime to be recorded in the kind of detail afforded by Evelyn’s diary and archive. (149)

That Evelyn so often makes reports on the sermons he hears on Sundays, detailing them to a greater or lesser degree, suggests that, in writing them in his Diary, he is recording them as lessons for his spiritual improvement, or admonitions whenever he felt he had fallen short of God’s teaching. Pepys judged sermons much as he judged the plays he so often frequented, that is, more or less as entertainment, and categorized them as interesting, boring or just plain bland. However, according to his Diary, Evelyn’s piety was so entrenched in the everyday happenings of his life, that everything he heard from a sermon was written down, absorbed, and existed in the Diary, in its own right, to be lived by when the occasion to do so arrived.

If things were going well, Evelyn writes thanks to God; if they were not, he accepted that God was testing his faith, and that He would give him the strength to work through the troubles. Evelyn’s faith was tested throughout his long life, especially with the loss of several of his children. This was seen in the Diary entry dated 27 January 1658 when he relives the death of

the prettiest, and dearest Child, that ever parents had, being but 5 yeares & 3 days old in years, but even at that tender age, a prodigie for Witt, & understanding, for beauty of body a very Angel, & for endowments of mind, of incredible & rare hopes. (2: 208)

Evelyn then writes four pages detailing the astounding ability for learning that the dead child had, including Greek, French, Latin, Mathematics and Euclid and, of course, religion. Despite this terrible loss, Evelyn records that he blesses God, even though a few weeks later his seven weeks old son also died. “Gods holy will be don” [sic] he writes (3: 209-211).
It is telling, however, to read that, despite Evelyn’s religiosity in the *Diary*, he offered no forgiveness to his daughter Elizabeth when she eloped with a young man against his wishes, especially when he had earlier written that he would not impose his will on her sister, Mary, regarding her choice of a husband (4: 425). Evelyn was unforgiving of Elizabeth, writing at great length of which the following is a small part:

I was the more afflicted & astonished at it, in reguard, we had never given this Child the least cause to be thus disobedient, and being now my Eldest, might reasonably have expected a double Blessing... having ben bred-up with the utmost Circumspection, as to principles of severest honour and Piety. But so far it seems, had her passion for this Young fellow made her forget her duty, and all that most Indulgent parents expected from her as not to consider the Consequence of her folly and disobedience, ‘til it was too late….That we had not ben wanting in giving her an Education every way becoming us […]. (4: 461)

To his condemnation he adds a self-congratulatory glorification of her upbringing. Evelyn regarded her action as a “Chastisement” from God, to which he and his wife had to submit (4: 461). He asks that “God direct us how to govern our resentments at her disobedience” and then righteously excuses himself for cutting her out of his will, praising himself for thus teaching her a lesson (4: 462).

Two weeks later he writes: “Came news to us that my undutiful daughter was visited with the small-pox, now universally contagious: I was yet willing my Wife should go visite & take care of her” (4: 463). A further two weeks after, on 30 August 1685, after referring the day before to “this sad accident," he baldly writes, “My child was buried by her sister on 2d [sic] September in the Church of Deptford.” (4: 464).
He follows this the next day with a long, self-praising entry on being made a Commission of the Privy Seal, of his kissing the king’s hand and being lauded at court by “greate Men to give me joy” (4: 465).

The strong religious cast that Evelyn gives to his activities as recorded in the *Diary* extends to his evident powerful attraction to Margaret Blagge (later Godolphin). Frances Harris calls it a “seraphic” love (149). Blagge was nineteen, Evelyn over fifty years old. Quoting Evelyn’s *Diary* and the many letters which passed between the two, Harris shows how Evelyn rationalises and represses his feelings under the cloak of a religious “world” for two, or three if one includes God. The iconic drawing that he and Margaret Blagge sign as a contract of mutually binding friendship resembles an altar, but its upside-down heart positioned atop the picture can also be suggestive as part of a woman’s anatomy. Harris argues that "no-one seeing the sensually swelling curves of his version of the heart for the first time could have failed to find them at least as suggestive of secular as of sacred love" (152).

This drawing came about when Evelyn was visiting Margaret. In the eulogy in book form which he wrote of her after her death, *The Life of Margaret Godolphin*, he writes:

> and there standing pen and ink upon the table, in which I had been drawing something upon a paper like an altar, she writ these words *Be this the symbol of Inviolable Friendship,--Marg. Blagge, 16th October, 1672* and underneath *For my brother E--;* and so delivered it to me with a smile.  (25)

So the drawing, which Harris suggests looks erotic, was Evelyn’s, but her signing it made it a document of innocence. Thereafter she was referred to in his diary by a pentacle as he recorded almost weekly visits to her. This drawing, repeatedly inserted into the diary instead of her name, betokens her uniqueness to Evelyn. On at least
three other occasions Evelyn also uses the sign of Libra to represent Margaret, on 30 December 1673 and again on 13 October 1674. Moray’s pentacle was the sign of the zodiac for Libra which was prevailing at the time of their pact of friendship (Harris 186). On 16 October Evelyn writes “Anniversary [then again draws the Libra sign] inviol.” This last entry refers to the day of signing the Altar of Friendship drawing (4: 27.n.4).

In the Margaret Blagge passages, Evelyn writes of his “friendship” as if he has convinced himself that that is how it is, perhaps because that is the only way he can cope with the situation and continue the relationship. Beneath the praise of her religious attainments can be read his hidden feelings. He censors his entries while seemingly unable to restrain himself from writing about her (3: 628). Evelyn’s description of Margaret’s early death, when she was twenty-six years old, just after the birth of her first child, is overtly emotional. Evelyn writes five pages in the diary extolling his grief and describing her funeral (4: 148-52). The intensity and extent of these passages contradict his contention that his feelings for Margaret Godolphin are just of friendship. This episode in Evelyn’s diary could be described as one of censored candour. He wants to write of his love for her, but still spreads over his written grief a mantle of religious praise:

I cannot but say, my very Soule was united to hers & that this stroake did pierce me to the utmost depth: for never was there a more virtuous, & inviolable friendship, never a more religious, discrete, & admirable creature; beloved of all, for all the possible perfections of her sex: but she is gon, to receave the reward of her signal Charity, & all the other Christian graces, too blessed a Creature to converse with mortals, fitted (as she was) by a most holy Life, to be receeveiv’d into the mansions above…but how! ah how! shall I ever
repay my obligations to her for the infinite good offices she did my soule, by so o'ft ingaging me to make religion the termes and tie of the friendship which was betweene us [...]. (my emphasis) (4: 148-49)

His writing of the tragedy in the Diary reveals his pain at her loss, replicating the same intensity of written expression he allows when recording the loss of some of his children:

She was most deare to my Wife, affectionate to my Children, interested in my Concernes, in a word, we were but one soule, as abundance of her professions and letters in my hands testifie: But she is gone, & the absence so afflicting to me, as I shall carry the sense of it to the last: This onely is my Comfort, that she is happy, & I hope in Christ, I shall shortly behold her againe in the boosome of our deare Saviour, where she is in bliss, & whence we shall never part. (3: 151)

The idea of "observation" links Evelyn’s interest in recording events in his diary with his activities as a traveller and his passion for science and scientific inquiry. As stated above, he was taught by his father, when only a boy “to observe matters more punctually” and he began making notes on an almanac at about eleven years, and from this time on, his prolific note-taking began (2: 10). As a young man, he left England on 21st July 1641 to tour the Continent. His journey was partly motivated by a desire to escape the dangers of the civil war in England: he says “The ill and Ominos face of the Publique at home made me resolve to spend some time abroad” (1: 22). Nevertheless, he was also driven by his curiosity to see more of the world beyond England, and the general education that this would bring (viii).

True to his predilection for detail, he prefaced the recording of the start of his journey with a description of the magnificent, but contentious, frigate built for the
King, for which His Majesty raised “a very slight tax” (1: 23). Evelyn used his usual prolixity, having a “desire to write” (1: 41). His “mentoring” writing style, so obvious in his tutoring of Pepys, his grandson John, and anyone else who would read his prolific writings on religion, trees, and science, goes beyond recording eye-witness accounts of what he saw. He intersperses his accounts of them with historical information in volumes one and two of the *Diary* which mainly cover his travels. For example, after stating that they “safely Landed at our port desir’d in Zeland” he writes:

> And now methought the *Scene* was strangely chang’d to see so pretty & neate a Towne on the Fromtiere; with its church stat-house fortifications; & that of *Ramekins* once Cautionary to *Q. Elizabeth*, when she Assisted the Distressed (Netherlanders) on their Defection from the Tyranny of Spaine. (23)

Evelyn's accounts of his travels are, as de Beer rightly says, mainly concerned “with natural scenery and landscape, and with buildings and works of art … but when original… are frequently too summary to provide useful objective information” (1: 107-8). De Beer writes that his descriptions of his travels, often using other printed texts, fall down in providing detail (1: 106-11). Evelyn used material from other printed and manuscript materials, which included travel books, sometimes almost word for word, in some of his accounts of the places he visited on the Continent (85). Each town’s architecture never seems to fail to evoke his curiosity, and in nearly every town he mentions, he describes the architecture of the local church, often inside as well as out. He especially details the contents of the Cathedral in the town of St. Denys, wherein are deposited many supposed relics of Jesus and the Virgin Mary: “their hair, swaddling clothes, a part of the crown of thorns, and even including in the list ‘a pretended Naile’ of the Crucifix.” He also details, in three closely printed pages
of the Diary, the often heavily bejewelled relics of past royalty, prophets, and statesmen. Apart from two sentences, one to do with the “pretended” nail, and the other dealing with a red stain which “the devout Father would make us believe was of the Natural Blood of our Savior” (2: 87), Evelyn makes no written comment on all the claims except to finish with “What a Strong Faith is required to believe all these wondrous things” (1: 61). This sentence, devoid of irony, again emphasises the tension between religion and curiosity for Evelyn. In these instances he simply leaves the question of faith to the believers in the Catholic religion.

As Evelyn’s curiosity generates descriptive text detailing all that he sees on his travels through Paris, Orleans, Chambord, Tours, Richelieu, Moulins, Vienne, Marseilles, Cannes, Savona, Genoa, Pisa, Livorno and Florence, the sheer volume and style leads to the certainty that Evelyn does take some descriptions and pertinent information from guide books, as already intimated. Although he had taken notes on his travels, such intricate descriptions would probably not have come from memory alone after so many years.

The obviously curious, generally unusual, things Evelyn sees and hears, which pique his curiosity enough for him to consider that they merit entry in the Diary, will be described in this section. His curiosity about the following seems to focus more on the exotic or bizarre. For instance, travelling through Holland Evelyn writes of some abnormal creatures he comes across, like the cockerel in Worcom that had four legs and two rumps and vents, and whose hen had “two large spurs growing out at her sides” (1: 30).

In Amsterdam, after visiting a synagogue and commenting on the different clothing of the men and women at their prayers, Evelyn was curious enough about their religious practices to decide to visit sepulchres in one of the Hebrew cemeteries:
Looking in at one of them through a narrow Crevice of the ill-joyned stone, I perceived divers old Books & papers lie about the Corps or Coffin (for it seemes when any eminent Rabby dies they use to bury some of his books with them) so as with my stick, I raked out some leaves, which had Hebrew Characters written [...] (1: 31)

Desecration of a grave seemed of no consequence when his inquisitiveness was aroused. As his contemporary, William Rand, commented, his "sprightly curiosity left nothing unreacht into, in the vast all-comprehending Dominions of Nature and Art" (qtd. in Darley 155). Evelyn is curious about even the most seemingly banal local details of oddities or bizarre situations. While travelling farther and reaching Haarlem, he remarks “By the Way it is not to be omitted” that a woman living nearby who had ben widow to 25 Husbands [...] and was ready for more, but was prohibited by the magistrate to multiply them: tho’ it seemes, it could not be proved she had made any of them away. (2: 49)

It seems strange that Evelyn includes in the Diary the nonsensical hearsay about a woman who was reported to have had 365 children at one birth (1: 38). It could be supposed that he thought that it was the locals’ acceptance of the purported proof of this happening, which they claimed lay in the several basins hanging on the wall said to have been used for the babies’ Baptism, that was the most remarkable aspect (1: 38). Evelyn’s curiosity, and his penchant for recording such things about the most obviously illogical local beliefs, is here once more exemplified.

Village by village, town by town, Evelyn describes what he saw or claims to have seen, recounting an occasional locally learned anecdote along the way, or making a short observation on an unusual sight which sparks his curiosity, such as that in Dunkirk in October 1641:
We met divers little Wagons, prettily Contriv’d, and full of peddling Wares & Merchandizes, which were drawn by Masty-Dogs, completely harnessed, like so many Coach-horses, in some 4, in some six, according to the charge they bare. (2: 47-8)

Evelyn journeyed back to England, arriving November 1642, but left again for France after a short while, as described above, when he found that the political situation was still unsettled between the King and Parliament. After furthering his travels he spent two years in Paris 1650-52, and it was in this period that he married, before leaving for England, which he was never to leave again.

In 1661 Evelyn became a member of the Philosophical Society which, with Charles II’s approbation, on 15 July 1662, later became The Royal Society (3: 272). He was an important member of the Society and had taken part in discussions with John Wilkins and Robert Boyle which had led directly to its foundation (Agassi 368). Evelyn records numerous, sometimes bizarre, experiments made or seen by many of the Royal Society’s members. He generally says little about his own reaction to the suffering involved, though does admit that an experiment on a dog, which he luridly describes in detail, disturbs him. It was artificially and crudely being “kept long alive after the Thorax was open…his eyes quick all the while and exhibited more cruelty than pleased me” (3.497-98). While in France on 11 March 1651, his curiosity must have led him to agree to witness a man being tortured. He enters this in his Diary in horrifying detail, writing that he “found the spectacle so uncomfortable, that I was not able to stay the sight of another” (3: 29), but he must have had some idea of what to expect, his curiosity for knowledge overcoming trepidation. On the 24 March 1672, Evelyn describes an operation performed by his surgeon with a knife and a saw for the removal of part of the gangreneous leg of a sailor “a little under the knee” which
was unsuccessful. He continued to watch a second operation on the sailor, which extended up to the man’s thigh, which caused his death. Evelyn writes that he could not “endure to see any more such cruel operations” (3: 610).

One episode recorded in the *Diary* unites Evelyn’s curiosity and his religiosity and brings the two, temporarily, into tension. He confesses, in a long entry, his being for a short time in emotional turmoil as the result of a visit when he is sent a servant-maid who appeared to be a victim of stigmata:

The last month as she was sitting before her mistris at work (I think “twas sewing”) felt a secret stroke upon her arme a little above her wrist, the upper part for a pretty height, the smart of which as if she had been strock with another hand, caus’d her to hold her arme a while, ‘til it was somewhat mitigated; but so it put her into a kind of convulsion fit, or rather Hysteric: A gentleman coming casualy in, looking on her arme, found that part poudred with red Crosses, set in most exact and wonderfull order
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neither swelled up, nor depressed, about this shape and bignesse -----I--- [sic] neither seeming to be any ways made by artifice; of a redish colour, not so red as bloud, the skin over them smooth, but the rest of the arme livid & of a mortified hue with certain prints as it were of the stroke as of fingers: This had hapned three several times in *July* at about ten days interval, the Crosses beginning to ware out, but the successive ones set in other different (yet uniforme) order […]. (3: 557)
Lowell Gallagher argues “that Evelyn’s handling of the event, the way he comes to terms with it, discloses the ethical force of a baroque intuition of the perceptible world” (203). De Beer points out:

The whole universe was anthropocentric and the only acceptable explanation of natural phenomena and of the events of human history was that they were the particular dispensations of God. In view of man’s place in the universe they were provided for his use, or were sent to reward, or to punish him of the consequences of his sins. (1:110)

The seventeenth-century population’s relationship to God differs from modern conceptions of the Deity. The stigmata occurring and re-occurring on the “working Wench’s” arm fell outside the norm of everyday happenings, but appeared not to emanate from any artifice, as Evelyn stated, on the part of the wretched, hysterical girl. Evelyn writes that he “dare not suggest the supernaturall” but he obviously realizes that it could be construed as the work of the devil and he fears becoming involved. The whole Diary points towards God’s universe, but how could this stigmatization be proved a work of God? If not, who could say it is not the work of the devil? Evelyn sticks to the tried and true of his devotion, although clearly non-plussed when he says “So as I professe, I know not what to think of it,” and tells the girl the crosses are Christian signs which tell her to remain constant to the Church of England, and that she should not be pressured by priests who could use this strange happening to get her to convert to Catholicism (3: 557).

Evelyn makes no comment when he writes entries reporting the various strange experiments conducted by members of the Royal Society and others. He just states the bare facts of the happening. There appears no permanent conflict between Evelyn’s religious faith and his scientific (and traveller’s) curiosity. Perplexity, yes, but one can
suppose that he accepts the very general idea that in exploring nature, whether on
man, beast or an inanimate object, a Christian is seeing more of God’s creation, the
meaning of which will be revealed in His good time. These entries are juxtaposed
with other normal happenings of a day, just as are similar entries made by Pepys in
his *Diary*, who mostly makes no comment on his reporting of Royal Society
experiments in his entries either.

Evelyn’s diary is written more like an educational tome than a work purporting to
let his descendants really know of the man who preceded them, as he originally states
was the reason for his beginning to write it. As it happens it is only in Pepys’s *Diary*
that we get a glimpse of Evelyn as a man who could be highly amusing when
improvising on some verses made up of nothing but the various “acceptations of
‘May’ and ‘Can’” (6.220).

(d) THE ENTRING BOOK OF ROGER MORRICE.

Roger Morrice (c.1628-1702) tells little of himself in his diary, which he calls his
*Entring Book*. He tells a very great deal about late seventeenth-century politics and
religion. Mark Goldie writes: “If Pepys relished a nation’s relief at Restoration of the
monarchy and its liberation from civil conflict and Puritan fanaticism, Morrice, also
involved in public life in the 1680’s, repined at the nation’s renewed ordeal under the
Stuart monarch’s regime of “popery and arbitrary power” (xiv). One may conjecture
why certain diarists and journal keepers chose to write such works in the seventeenth
century: for instance, some were secretive, some were private, some were written for
family. There is no conjecturing regarding the diary of Roger Morrice. He is
described by Mark Goldie as a journalist as well as an ecclesiastic (1: xiii), and wrote,
ultimately, for the public (1: 34.n.4), especially, at the time, for those Puritan and
other non-conforming Protestants who, late in the seventeenth century, became known
as Dissenters. As a Dissenter Morrice was ejected from his position as a minister in the Church of England in 1662. The prevalence of religiosity expressed from his stance as a Dissenter is reflected when Protestants are mentioned in the *Entring Book* 1062 times. 29

The term “Dissenter” covered several religious bodies when the non-conformists themselves split into varying protestant groups such as Quakers and Congregationalists (Goldie 1: 15). Pepys was always a staunch supporter of the Church of England. Morrice would like to have been, but disagreed with the authoritarian limitations of the Church, and throughout the mass of manuscripts, pamphlets, and his *Entring Book*, his writings show his fight for Presbyterian freedom of belief. However, until Conventicles, Protestant religious meetings other than Church of England services were banned, but he sometimes attended services in the Church of England, while still regularly committed to Presbyterianism. He did not want to be excommunicated from the Church of England, but he objected to its not being flexible, in that it refused to accept change which would also still allow the Protestant Non-conformists to be part of its membership (Goldie 1: 16). So in his diary Morrice writes as a Dissenter and a Non-conformist who is part of politics, but on the outside of institutional religion. The *Entring Book* is consistent in style in that it follows an undeviating Dissenting point of view.

A.G. Matthews says that Morrice’s collection and production of manuscripts were “evidently made with intention of writing a history of [the] Reformation of England” (qtd. in Goldie 1: 34). However, despite his prolific literary output, none of it was published. Morrice was so interested in writing history in all its facets, that when his

29 This figure was obtained by searching a DVD copy of the diary.
multitudinal Parliamentary reports had to cease when Parliament was not sitting, he wrote about the political and religious events occurring in Europe.

For example, on 24 April 1684 it is entered that: “the Janissaries have strangled the Grand Seigneur and placed his brother upon the throne,” that “The Cossacks have slaine their Generall Hunisky accuseing him of cowardice, which is somewhat grievous to the King of Poland that set him over them,” and that “the Morloques of Croatia have taken severall Turkish Merchants and a great Booty in money and Goods that came from Constantinople.” There follows “It is said that Sophy of Persia is actually on his March with 100000 men to besiege Babylon” and “The Muscovite is not very forward to enter into the League with the Emperour to make a War against the Turk.” Similar short sentences of news from Holland, Lunninberg and Hanover follow (2: 468).

Little is known about Roger Morrice the man, even from outside his *Entring Book*. Mark Goldie tells us “Almost everything we know about Roger Morrice derives from his own archive in Dr Williams’s Library, from his will, and from inferences drawn from these documents” (1: 33), while Stephen Taylor comments, “We are allowed little insight to Morrice himself, but his selection of news is enormously revealing of the pre-occupations and concerns of the Puritan Whig group of which he was part” (4: xxiii).

Morrice is considered to have been born about 1628 (Goldie, *Diary* 1: 35), and it is known that he died in 1702 (Goldie 1: 34 and n.1). He was educated at Cambridge, and became a minister of the Church of England. He was ejected from his living in August 1662 because of his non-conformist views, which were possibly exacerbated by his objection to the absolutism of Charles II who supported the Anglican Church’s hierarchy (1: 23). Morrice thought that his ejection had been manipulated by “a
vindictive and persecuting party of triumphalist churchmen” (1: 34-5). The Act of Uniformity of 1662 was passed with such haste that many ministers were unable to find out what they were subscribing to. It was required that a minister “swear unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained in the [revised] Prayer Book, and to repudiate the Covenant of 1643, which most Puritan ministers had solemnly swore before God” (Goldie 1: 16). Morrice’s disgust at Episcopalian power in matters legal and politic is also a strong theme in his diary, as was his derision of those he considered useless Tory Cavaliers who surrounded Charles II.

Mark Goldie describes Morrice as a Puritan clergyman turned confidential reporter and agent for a group of senior Whig politicians. He was remarkably well connected and well informed, a confidential go-between, a conduit for public business, and a barometer of public opinion. (1: xiii)

Morrice was a disseminator to other Dissenters of everything he learned from his connections.

*The Entring Book* virtually disappeared from view between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries. There was a failed earlier attempt at publication (Goldie 1: 309) before it was published in six volumes in 2007, followed by a seventh volume, the index, in 2009. Mark Goldie details its themes: “Catholicism,” “Dissent,” “Hierarchists, Tories and Jacobites,” “Parliament,” “Place, office and patronage,” “Litigation and the courts,” “The military,” “City politics,” “Scotland and Ireland,” and “The European balance of power” (20-8). From these headings it can be seen that Morrice spread his interests widely, and in his several packed volumes it is apparent that he reported on them with prolixity. Some subjects, though, are practically omitted from *The Entring Book*: for instance, Quakers and Baptists. Neither does he go to
great lengths to discuss the prevalence of the promotion of monarchical absolutism which was emanating from the pulpit, even though it was also strongly debated in the mainly masculine world of coffee houses, in bookshops and the like (1: 32).

Goldie also considers that (although Morrice was still a churchman in private), the *Entring Book* “is, in some ways, a strikingly secular work” (1: 32). It certainly does not include the endless word for word reporting of sermons made by Evelyn in his *Diary*, or even the almost weekly criticisms of sermons by Pepys in his. Despite its being written from a dissenting point of view, Goldie considers that “the Entring Book is not a record of spirituality, piety, or theology” (1: 32). As Goldie remarks rightly, “no chronicle brings out more forcibly the interleaving of religion and politics.” In his opinion “it can be argued that it is a cardinal document of the Puritan Whig tradition” (1: 32). As such, it can only be, and is, especially in the first half of the work, strongly anti-Catholic. By my count, the word “Popery” alone is derogatively mentioned in the *Entring Book* 282 times, and “Papists” 707 times.

Throughout his *Entring Book* Morrice expresses his fear of the return of the power of "Popery." It is obvious that his wish for religious tolerance does not extend to Catholics. As an example, it is interesting to note that he chooses to include, verbatim, a speech showing how strongly the landed gentry felt about the Catholic threat. This can be read in the following short extract from the very long word for word record of a speech Morrice includes under the entry for 27 May 1679. He himself writes no comment on it. Entitled “A Speech made by a Cornish Gentleman in the House of Commons” it is thought to have been made by Hugh Boscawen, MP (Goldie 2: 157.n.9). The dramatic imagery the speaker uses is, no doubt, meant to inculcate fear in all who heard it. This may explain why Morrice, who shared the same views, chose to include it in its entirety. The first section is as follows:
Wee have the weightiest matter upon our consideracion that can come before us, and therefore wee ought with the highest zeale to speak our minds boldly for the King and the Kingdomes good. For as the matter is of such importance to secure our religion to posterity; so much the rather should wee apply ourselves to manifest [...] That this is the time, so I must repeat it, that it is indeed the time, that is to say the Moment of time, for if we Suffer it to slip from us, it may never be in our power to regaine it, and then our children may be bound to curse us, for I tell you it is utterly impossible ever to secure the Protestant religion under a Popish Successour for unlesse you do totally disable him from inheriting the Protestant Countrey; the tyranny of the Sea of Rome will infallibly steale upon You, for to think to restraine a King under the power of a penal Law thereby to secure Religion is no more than to tye Sampson with cords who as soone as tis said the Philistines bee upon thee, will breake them in pieces, and carry the gates away, and leave open to the invasion of an Enemy. Nothing therefore can be able to secure us but to clip his locks…our Estates could not bee secure nor our very lives…and Massacres might be as frequent and as great as they were formally in Paris [...] to <be> preist ridden everyday is worse than Egyptian Slavery[...] Therefore in my opinion tis farr better to returne and maintaine our Religion, and secure ourselves, and oppose any violence that shall be offered us from abroad, then being in danger of heving our throats cut every moment by those that are amongst us [...]. (2: 157-59)

On 30 June 1679 Morrice enters into his journal a controversial Bill, associated with Bishop Dolben, first presented to Parliament 20 March 1677, headed “An Act for further securing the protestant Religion by Educating of the Children of the Royall
family therein, and providing for the continuance of a Protestant Clergy." There are seven closely printed pages of it, with 62 numbered articles (2: 162-69), which, the Bill suggested, should be signed by the reigning or future king or queen, their descendants, and the religious protestant hierarchy, restricting them in national and religious affairs. This entry, here quoted in very small part, reads:

I [blank] King or Queene of England doe declare and sweare that I do believe, that there is not any Transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, or in the elements of bread and wine at or after the Consecration of it by any person whatsoever so help mee God. (2: 162)

Transubstantiation is a key element in the dogma of the Catholic Church, and is perhaps the most marked difference between Protestantism and Catholicism. About Morrice’s decision to incorporate the long tirade in the journal, suggesting support of the bill, John Spurr, editor of the second volume writes, “The bill foundered,” and the editor’s note suggests that Morrice’s inclusion of the failed bill in his MS “may indicate its relevance as an alternative to exclusion [from Parliament]” (2: 162.n.1).

Volume 2, the beginning of the actual text of *The Entring Book*, covers the Popish Plot, Exclusion Crisis, several parliaments, Whigs and Non-conformists to the Church of England rules, and the foiled Rye Plot against Charles II and the Duke of York in 1683. Its style “appears at different times to be a notebook, a newsletter, or a documentary scrapbook” and, in the beginning, the contents are “diverse and disorderly, with missing sheets and an ‘aberrant’ pagination.” However, “the second half of the diary seems to reflect a more settled and purposeful composition with regular entries and a continuous scribal hand” (Goldie 2: xxiii). It is not recorded whose hand it is, because Morrice used amanuenses, which is understandable when he chose to copy so prolifically from other sources, often word for word (Goldie 2:
This is attested to in the very opening twenty-nine pages of the second volume where, according to Goldie, every page is a somewhat condensed, transcribed, copy of a Popish Plot document (*A True Narrative of the Horrid Plot and Conspiracy of the Popish Party*) relating to Titus Oates’s claim of a plot to kill Charles II (2: 1.n.6).

Morrice’s writing spreads information amongst a select social group of individuals of his day. Spurr argues that Morrice’s reporting is reliable: “Roger Morrice appears to be a consistently trustworthy, meticulous, and diligent chronicler of the reign of Charles II” (2: xxvii). Morrice, himself, admits to his inclusion in the diary of outside printed works when he says that his journal is not a personal account, but that “I will labour to give you as exact an account as I can recover” (2: xxiv).

Metropolitan life of the late seventeenth century also crowds the pages of the *Entring Book*. “In his plain prose Morrice reports duels, and pope-burnings, fires and murders, abductions and marriages, and debauchery at the 1684 Frost Fair on the Thames” (2: xxvi). Yet there is no sense of immediacy in the way he expresses himself when writing of social life around him, although it does contrast with the pomposity of the official documents he copies. He simply states the news he is imparting. There is, however, an exception when he writes of the Frost Fair where the juxtaposition of the many unusual happenings Morrice reports become more alive, even though he still relays the incidents without emotional comment. He writes against the date Feb. 12 1683/4 that on the 20th December 1683 such a strong frost occurred that people and many coaches crossed the Thames on the ice so solid that booths were able to be built, bull-baitings were held, and games and exercises took place, a whole ox was roasted, and all manner of debauchery took place. The thaw did not set in until February 11th 1683/4 (2: 450-1).
Throughout his *Entring Book* Morrice mentions over thirty “duells,” several of them on one day, as if he had been saving them up. Morrice writes on Saturday 2 March 1679/80:

> On the 27th of February there was a Duell betwixt Mr. Oglethorp and Mr. Poltney on the one side and Mr. Henery Wharton (who wounded his opposite and was wounded) and Mr. Warcop on the other, because one of them trode upon the toes of another in the Play house and did not cry him Mercy. On Saturday the 28th there was another Duell betwixt the Earl of Plimoth and Viscount Mordent on the one side and Sir George Huit and the Lord Cavendish on the other side about some words that passed concerning some oranges they were buying. On Lords day there was another Duell betwixt Mr. Mecarte, Mr Parker, Mr. Brewer, and another about a foolish trifle; there is another duell houerly expected betwixt Mr. Lucy Mr. Oglethorp, and Sir Scroop How and a (4th) person. (2: 221-22)

He goes on to mention discrete subjects one after the other in a paragraph, which also reads like a list, in the half-page entry of 23 March 1680. This contains fifteen different subjects in almost as many sentences all under the one date:

> The Duke had come home on Saturday to have mett the Duchess of Modena; but that he staid to receive a Compliment from the University of Cambridge [...].

> There was a Common Counsell held at Guildhall last night [...].

> They say there will be a Parliament in Ireland.

> Some say Sir George Jeffryes hath his place at Chester [...].

> Yesternight the Duke came home from Newmarket expecting to meet his mother in Law the Dutchess of Modena [...].
He’s (the Duke) been on horseback 6 10 or 12 hours together.

The Universitie chose the last Lords Day to waite upon his Majestie and afterwards upon the Duke […].

The Lord Brewerton Sir Thomas Davis, the Lady Heningham, and the Lady Ingram are very lately dead.

The Deputy Leiutenants are also writt to so take care now that the letters sent to the Corporations produce their full and proper effects.

The Duke of Lauderdale had on Fryday something like an Apoplective fitt, but is pretty well again […].

I am one of those that expect great things from beyond seas in a little time; for I very much wonder what Causeth the French King to stand in this suspense, I looke every Post to hear what way he will determine those great preparacions he hath made and hath in actual readynesse. (2: 223)

Other than the last sentence, regarding the French King, there is no comment on the above entries recorded, but it is easy to see where, in social standing, the subjects lay. Pepys does not go into the meticulous detail that Morrice practices.

Morrice’s meticulousness in listing is also seen when he enters 124 names in columns, of those Members of Parliament who declared themselves against the Bill for excluding or disabling the Duke of York from inheriting the throne (because of his Catholic religion). This was before them 21 May 1679 upon which they voted for the negative (2: 204). Similarly there was an even longer listing of those who voted for the Bill. However, Appendix 31 in Volume I states that, unusually for Morrice, these lists were not entirely accurate. However, they were written into the Entring Book in November when the vote had been taken six months before, so they may have been relayed to him incorrectly. There are many other lists throughout the journal, and
many reports of trials, not only of the rich, but of the poor. These show a kaleidoscope
of lives from many social classes. The drawing-up of lists is an embodiment of the
comprehensive, informational quality of the *Entring Book*. Morrice peoples it with
roughly 6300 names (Goldie 5: viii). It is this that tends to lend it a nascent database-
like compendiousness. He is especially interested in recording proclamations by the
King.

About five percent of Morrice’s *Entring Book* is written in shorthand, printed in
the modern edition in a different font, the bulk of it (just under half) in 1686. Morrice
used the earlier Willis shorthand invention, not that of Shelton which was more
popular, and was used by many in the seventeenth century, mainly for speed it seems
(1: 130). Many of the better educated citizens of the day habitually recorded sermons
heard in church in shorthand, much to the amazement of the visiting Moravian scholar
Comenius, who was “astonished” to see so many people in churches doing just that
(1: 130). It was also used extensively to record trials. The practice of using shorthand
by Morrice could be attributed to a desire to employ speed of dissemination as well as
speed of entry, but it is obvious also that Morrice used shorthand for concealment
whether the information concerned him or others (1: 135). Judging by the content of
the entries in shorthand it becomes apparent that Morrice is often concealing, not only
the names of the people involved, but also their sentiments, and actions. He wrote
their names in shorthand and then left a blank space where he was obviously not
going to translate them:

A gentleman Mr William Baber [written in shorthand] [blank] that was fellow
Pupill with him under the same tutor Arthur Ward [written in shorthand]
[blank] told me how he was subservient to the debauching of his pupils both
in their principles and their practices, and that scarcely any one of them
escaped and very few of them since have ever been reclaimed [...]. (4: 174)

Obviously, for Morrice, the moral and political nature of Baber’s “debauchery” is too
sensitive to be allowed to exist without being censored by the use of shorthand.

The shorter blanks left in specific entries are most likely to be primarily for those
“in the know,” that is, fellow Dissenters who would recognise the individuals
supposedly hidden in the report. The fact that the name is elided by a blank suggests
Morrice’s caution about having facts written down as historical and political records.
Goldie suggests that the larger blanks (sometimes of several pages) follow pages of
shorthand untranscribed, which point to an intention to transcribe them later, either
when he has the time, or when the political environment becomes safer (1: 136).

Morrice’s censorship of his entries take place with his use of shorthand, and
blanks left in his manuscripts text which relate mostly to his dissemination of
Dissenting information written for those who, it was expected, were able to transcribe
it. Morrice is so intense, one could say passionate, in his anti-Catholicism, his
condemnation of which is so overt in his writing. He also declares his antipathy to the
Bishops and the powerful Church of England hierarchists in no uncertain manner and
yet he writes so little about his private self.

In Morrice’s *Entring Book* shorthand was used for secrecy, mostly to protect
others, or himself, from possible condemnation in a time of political and religious
turmoil. As Goldie agrees, “Examining the text itself, the conclusion seems
inescapable that Morrice used shorthand to hide information. Typically this is the
name of a person, either the subject of a politically sensitive report, or the source of
the report” (1: 137). He says further:
Other sensitive information in shorthand mainly concerns political opinions of, or about, members of the royal family; speculations about which politicians are in the ascendant, or are being sidelined; incidents and remarks that cast individuals in a sordid light, such as Bishop Fell’s alleged cynical indifference to aristocratic immorality at Oxford, or the brutalities of Lord Chancellor Jeffreys; and sexual scandal surrounding people in high places, notably allegations of Episcopal debauchery. (1: 137)

Stephen Taylor says, “As the second great crisis of the Stuart monarchy approached its resolution in November 1688, the Entring Book becomes more dense and the weekly entries become longer, sometimes extending to twenty pages or more” (4: xxiii). This is apparent especially in volumes three and four wherein also, occasionally, Morrice writes in the first person, such as when he is commenting on the group known as The Dissenters Liberty, a group of Dissenters who did not wish to take advantage of the King’s offer of freedom of choice of religion, because they objected to papists being included in the offer (4: 112, 2: 467). Again, this highlights the way the Entring Book registers the dynamic movements of historic and political events during the period. The number and lengths of the entries act as a kind of "political barometer."

In the second volume, on page after page, entries are also written in the same guise, that is, as statements of fact. Whether he is reporting what the King or the Duke had been doing or where they were going, or who said what about them, or who had been committed for trial and for what, or to whom someone was married, or who had died, it was all written as an item to be disseminated, and only rarely, dispassionately commented upon. If something quoted is passionately expressed, then more often than not, it can usually be attributed to another, sometimes unmentioned, author. Morrice
achieves anonymity by often prefacing entries with “some say… some say” without telling us who the “some” were (2: 39). This phrase appears 227 times. It is interesting that on at least one occasion, made obvious in a deletion in the text, that “Some say” was substituted for “I incline to think” (2: 37.8), which supports the suggestion that Morrice allows little of his intimate self to be expressed, except for his strong feelings of Dissension and his paranoid fear of the return of Catholicism. It is to be noted, also, that the word “some” signifies the inscription of a social “voice” as opposed to an individual one. This lends social authority to Morrice’s reports. In addition, the use of “some” also foregrounds, again, the way that Morrice protects both the sources of his informants and also, importantly, himself. Similarly, the use of “It is said” prefaces information in the diary 279 times.

Interspersed within the pages are often long copies of gazetted documents in their entirety, such as that of the “Judgement and Decree of the University of Oxford against pernicious Bookes and damnable Doctrins, Destructive to the Sacred persons of Princes their State and Government, and of all Humane Society” presented to his Majesty on 21 July 1683. Morrice transcribes all twenty-seven "Propositions." Yet the sentence preceding this long entry reads, “Mrs Mary Sanders was borne on Friday morning about 3 a clock September 29 1682 being Michaelmas day,” and the sentence after the “Judgement” reads: “As for the whole story concerning the Apparition of the Lord Russell’s Ghost in Southampton Square this 27 of July about 11 or 12 a Clock at night, you may find it at large under Tuesday November 27 1683.” On that date, in all solemnity, we read that a Mr. Colley “mett the Ghost and gave him a slap or two and the Ghost discovered himself to be Mr. Rutland of the Fountaine Taveron in Holbourne…” (2: 412). This section illustrates the fragmentation of many of Morrice’s entries, where comments on citizens from high and low social levels, and
important and trivial entries follow one another without, seemingly, any kind of thematic or narrative consistency. Morrice declares “I Cannot but Adore the Infinite Goodness of God” at the news that there was an intention to make a breach with France (2: 37), then records on 12 December 1677 that the Duke of York’s young son has died, and adds a report that three English merchants in the East Indies on business were speared by Indians while “coming up a River in 3 Boats.” Then he notes that the Dutch welcomed Prince William and his wife “with all possible expressions of Respect and complacency” (2: 39). This type of disconnected information differs exceedingly from his long and detailed reports of incidents leading up to “the Great Revolution.” His writing at this period gives a sense of the drama of the times, one which is often based on rumours, especially regarding the absent King James II’s whereabouts, his intentions, and whether the throne was, indeed, vacant.

Morrice did not hold a public position of power as such. He created a position as a man of collected knowledge with his writings. As a member of the educated class he forged a role for himself among fellow Dissenters with his communications. Only when the threat of Popery faded with the deposition and absence of James II, and the anticipated offer of the kingdom to the protestant William and Mary (which was accepted soon after on 13 February 1689) does he write that he “walked with true liberty and freedome” in Westminster Hall for the first time since 1662 (4: 520).

All in all, Morrice’s Entring Book, dated in a diary format, but not necessarily diurnally, is deliberately written as an historical record from a Dissenter’s point of view, possibly for the later edification of a primarily Protestant readership. Morrice’s work bears little of the personal and private life of the author, except for his extraordinary zeal in writing, and his wish to record as faithfully as he can the events,
as he sees them, shaped by the power of religion and politics in the late seventeenth century.

(e) COMPARISON OF THE OTHER THREE DIARIES WITH THAT OF SAMUEL PEPYS.

The writings of the other diarists, important though they are for capturing history for posterity, do not match the immediacy, vividness and complexity of the writing of Pepys’s Diary. From a biographical point of view, however, it is notable that in a comparison with the other three, Pepys tends to shrink somewhat from the image one builds up of the author after following his life in the Diary, from the time he is a young, impecunious, married man who is a runabout for his distant relative, to when he emerges as a wealthy man of consequence. Unlike Evelyn he did not receive critical public acclaim for having work published in his lifetime. Nor did he represent his country as an ambassador as did Bulstrode Whitelocke, a statesman and important lawyer. Moving from personal achievements to the recording of history, Roger Morrice’s diary records the traumatic events of the period 1677 to 1691, during which Charles II died, James II was overthrown, and the Protestant William and Mary came to the throne. Looking back from this period covered by Morrice’s diary, with its great density of political and religious information, Pepys’s Diary, important and unique as it is in its personal portrayal, occupies a smaller part on the overall historical stage.

The contrast with the other diaries reveals the peculiarities of Pepys’s Diary in other ways as well. The four diarists’ mode of recording events in their lives, including their choice of subjects and objects, are very different, and can be seen to be connected to their domestic background, the class in society in which they were raised, and their political position at the time of writing. For instance, Pepys’s
upbringing in relatively modest circumstances must help explain why, in his early years of marriage, at the very beginning of his career, he so relishes recording in the *Diary* what he eats, and the special food provided at his home: “a dish of marrow-bones. A leg of mutton. A loin of veal. A dish of fowl, three pullets, and two dozen larks, all in a dish. A great tart. A neat’s tongue. A dish of anchovies. A dish of prawns: and cheese” (1: 29). It is presumed that this would have been normal daily fare for the wealthy which Pepys at that time was not. Food is almost never mentioned in the more sober recordings of the other diarists in this study.

Pepys also makes entries about his personal and domestic acquisitions -- curtains, furniture, works of art, clothing -- and revels in his wife’s appearance when she outshines the attractiveness of “ladies.” Pepys records how much he can save in his early married years towards owning the trappings of a member of a higher social class, something towards which he works so assiduously. This can be seen all the way through his *Diary*, consistent with his avowed wish to “be a Knight and keep my coach” (Diary 3: 40). Pepys was a great keeper of business records in his Navy Board position, and in his *Diary* he provides an account of the state of his finances, his domestic life, and that of the nation, at each year’s end, in the early years of his career – as Latham and Matthews put it, the better to see how his ambition to become wealthy is being fulfilled (1: cxiv). None of the other diarists provide anything like this sort of personal balance sheet. Whitelocke, after his career ended does write of his declining financial standard as stated earlier in this chapter.

When, in March 1662, Pepys finds himself 100 pounds worse off than he had been six months earlier, a setback on his path to becoming a “gentleman,” he makes earnest vows to God to make penalties against himself if he does not keep to “rules for my future practice in my expenses” and goes on “And I do not doubt but hereafter
to give a good account of my time and to grow rich” (1: 39-40). Pepys makes and breaks many vows, which include those made against too much drinking, theatre-going, idleness and extravagance, as discussed in Chapter 5. The other diarists are intensely interested in religion, but unlike Pepys they never assume in their diaries such an intimate relationship with God that they can bargain with Him.

Whitelocke’s and Pepys’s diaries provide interesting contrasts in their treatment of their own political involvement. Whitelocke portrays himself as the statesman and the parliamentarian that he is, and his Diary is mostly written with the cautious precision which befits a man who has attained the top of the legal profession. His extreme caution is shown in his diary by his recordings of his indecisions, and his reluctance to commit to one side or the other in the political field in which he found himself. For instance, although Whitelocke disagreed with Charles I’s growing authoritarianism, Whitelocke writes of removing himself out of London, presumably rather than appear to be for or against the King’s execution, whereas Pepys, although always the royalist in the reign of Charles II -- even when he later disapproves of the laxity with which that king minds the country’s welfare -- records that, as a student, he applauded the execution of Charles II’s father. He writes of his fears in adulthood that this may, to his detriment, become common knowledge, and in his Diary he records his relief to find that the witness he meets, who knew of this expressed sentiment, had a poor memory (1: 280). There are no blatantly public incriminating incidents like this in Whitelocke’s diary, although he does sometimes make some injudicious remarks, for he tells us that his wife destroyed some of his papers for fear that the contents may have done him harm when Charles II returned (559). Whitelocke’s diary is written objectively as a public document which is exemplified by his choice to use the third person. This also allows him certain freedoms of expression, for instance, being able
to record self-praise. This style of writing might also be a matter of political
expedience because it can be suggested that the comments were written by another.
Also, writing in the third person, as already stated, gives his statements the stamp of
historical truth. Paradoxically, Pepys’s \textit{Diary}, though written subjectively, also has an
aspect of truthful audacity, the difference being that Whitelocke’s is a sombre public
document, while Pepys gives us a more intimate and down to earth picture of his
private world. Pepys’s public area of commitment was confined to the King and the
Navy Board, but Whitelocke had the greater public position to enable him to write a
larger view of the government and the inside politics of the day.

Whitelocke had a fear of committing to the wrong side, and this is illustrated
when he records his relationship with Oliver Cromwell, for this later put him in a
dangerous position upon the return of Charles II. He censors the entries in his diary
about the Protector by being very guarded in his comments. For instance, in February
1655, when a conspiracy being led by Major Wildman against the Protector sought to
gain support from Whitelocke upon promise of his being given the charge “to
Command of 3000 horse,” Whitelocke refused, for “the Protector was not without
jealousy of him, as some private friends informed Whitelocke” (401-2), so he does
not commit himself, either, by telling Cromwell of the offer. By the time Whitelocke
wrote this information in his diary, it was safe to do so because Cromwell had died.

There is something remarkable about the way Whitelocke writes about Cromwell
– a sense of continuing awe and trepidation. In spite of recording Cromwell’s
outbursts of temper and use of his power, Whitelocke refers to him as “being not ill-
natured” (410), and insists he was not ambitious in spite of his considering making
himself King, his becoming The Protector, and his dismissal of the Rump Parliament.
Of the three diarists used for comparison, Whitelocke gives us the more intimate, if
cautious, details of a relationship with Oliver Cromwell because he had the closest contact with him in his various positions during the Interregnum. An example of this is Whitelocke’s detailed report of the discussion of his attempts to refuse to obey when Cromwell makes the decision to get him out of the country by sending him as an Ambassador to Sweden, when he (Cromwell) is thinking, against Whitelocke’s advice, of making himself King. Pepys’s *Diary* of course begins after Cromwell’s death in September 1658, but he makes several references to Cromwell. He too always protects himself by writing as if his knowledge of Cromwell comes to him by way of other people, whom he names, a practice he also uses when writing extensively about Charles II and the court’s profligate behaviour. Whitelocke gives his reader a sense of what it is like to confront an immensely powerful ruler like Cromwell; Pepys writes of his fears of recrimination and litigation, but in a much more private capacity.

Whitelocke does not prevaricate, however, when he bolsters his image in his writing by reporting others’ praise of himself, and when he tells us of pivotal and political historic moments to which he has been witness. Pepys records great historical moments too, like the burning of the ships by the Dutch in the Medway, as well as his personal experiences during the Plague and the Great Fire of London in 1665-66, but he also records a great many private trivial instances, such as when the maids do the family laundry (1: 19) and his whipping of his “boy” (7: 19). Pepys’s personal focus on these historical periods is the greater as he is writing of them contemporaneously, telling us of stressful sights, sometimes within hours of seeing them, and thus passing on, in his graphic words, the emotion of the experience (e.g. 7: 267-79). Pepys, wearing another of his protean faces, also often writes without consciousness of historical import, or of any relationship to his life story. However,
apart from wars, the plague, and the fire, Pepys in his diary writes in a tone generally
more lightheartedly of life as he lived it, quite unlike the other diarists. He and
Elizabeth laugh at the maid with an aching tooth who decided against its removal with
the first “twitch” by the dentist, for instance. The incident gave them, says Pepys,
“good sport” (4: 97). He intersperses writing of being merry, his enjoyment of food,
his pleasure in seeing good plays, making and listening to music, between problems
with his superiors, and his experiences of political, social and domestic events, and his
writing of pleasure derived from his peccadilloes with compliant women.

Whitelocke’s emotional experiences with women relate mainly to his three wives
and his daughters, of whom he writes with warmth and caring, as befits the image of
the good husband and father he sustains in his Diary. His depth of feeling is evident
when he writes of the losses of his second wife and his daughters. When Whitelocke
does write of deep human emotions in family losses his tone is sober and decorous,
quite unlike Pepys’s entries concerning the loss of his brother. These have a black
element of comedy, as Pepys writes worriedly of the prospect of social repercussions
over his brother’s suspected venereal disease, and expresses relief when it transpires
that this was not the cause of his death (5: 86).

Whitelocke writes of no extra-marital affairs. If he is flattered by the warmth of
Queen Christina’s attention to him in Sweden, when he is on his ambassadorial
mission, his writing maintains the professionalism required of his position, and that of
his marital state, although he does choose to mention her advances which, again,
reflect positively on himself. The Queen’s ladylike flirtations strike a different note
from the exploits with women lasciviously described by Pepys. Pepys’s hunger for
sexual experience is like his physical hunger for food. Both are frequently entered in
his diary, which contains numerous gleeful descriptions of eating, playgoing, music-making, and sinning.

As with Whitelocke, we are spared Evelyn’s gastronomical intake, probably because he, like Whitelocke, was born comparatively wealthy, and stayed so for the rest of his life. Evelyn’s mentioned associates are from the same class as himself (apart from the wretched sick seamen and prisoners he tries to succour), and are those like him who have access to the court of Charles II and are members of the aristocracy. Evelyn does not have to try to prove himself a gentleman – his society recognises him as one -- whereas Pepys, born the son of a tailor and a washwoman, writes of his yearning to be thought of as being of a socially higher class by those who he considered had the good fortune to be born into it (1: 97).

Evelyn was definitely writing his diary with a larger audience in mind, as suggested by the long descriptions of his travels and of the results of experiments of the Royal Society. He was already a “writer” as the author of the acclaimed *Sylva*, published in 1664. His writing in the diary is informative, but its style is not vivid and exuberant as is Pepys’s. Evelyn’s writing seems staid in comparison. Pepys’s style and mode of writing is conversational and immediate, and its constant movement, parading his daily comings and goings, creates a different picture of London life than does Evelyn’s *Diary*, which depicts a daily life mainly spent socially among his peers. Pepys’s style of writing, which differs so much from that of the other three diarists, must partly stem from the constant changes of place and characters he introduces us to in his day. One could say that the liveliness and the hustle and bustle of the London streets are mirrored in the structure of his diary. Evelyn’s family home in Deptford, by comparison, was rural, and outside the London scene.
Pepys’s *Diary* entries are differently constructed from Evelyn’s, with interpolated, internal clauses, leading to very long sentences, which have the feeling that a mobility of thought is being activated as they are being written as discussed in Chapter 2. Whitelocke, Evelyn and Morrice write as “writers” and consequently their work seems more consciously constructed and so less immediate. Their writings are also, to a great degree, written retrospectively, so that the diarists are distanced from their writings by the passing of time and the frailties of memory.

Evelyn’s records of his travels concentrate on buildings, especially churches. Pepys’s descriptions are more likely to deal with people he comes across. Evelyn’s writing lacks the liveliness of Pepys’s descriptions. There is nothing in Evelyn to match Pepys’s account of the lady who, unintentionally, spat back on him at the theatre, but whom he forgave when he saw she was pretty (2: 25).

In his diary Evelyn presents himself as a well-educated, well travelled, mature man, confident of his high social acceptance. He is wealthy, a man of property, and an authority on trees and gardens. He was, at the time of writing his diary, what one might describe as the complete, self-controlled, steady example of a good Protestant of the seventeenth century. In his diary he presents himself as secure in his marriage, and as a good God-fearing citizen. Pepys regarded him as a mentor. De la Bédoyère says that by October 1665 “Pepys was already quite certain that Evelyn was someone in command of all manner of learning” (*Particular Friends* 11). The finished, formal style of Evelyn’s entries on the classical texts differs from the staccato entries of Pepys as he describes his rapid acquisition of the technical knowledge of shipbuilding, as well as his learning the commercial handling of Navy business, while moving up in the new social world this opens up for him, a world where Evelyn is already ensconced. Pepys’s *Diary* could not be less like that of Evelyn’s, which was
constructed to present a learned, religious and consistent face of respectability to the world, as it seeks constantly to be educational for his family, and for the public.

Education of others was not the primary motive of Pepys for writing his diary, but it may have been, at the time of writing, a tool to educate himself, to see where only he stood in the world around him, for he kept his *Diary* private until nearer his death.

Evelyn’s diary presents us with the finished product of a man, while Pepys, in his *Diary*, is continually changing. It is not so much that, as Arthur Bryant wrote, “He is a man in the making” (xiii), but more that he never presents a fixed and coherent self in the *Diary*. It is likely that Pepys did not think of its interest for posterity until very late in his life, when he decided to place it in his library, which was then publicly accessible in his lifetime, although the *Diary* was not published until 1825. Evelyn’s diary had been published earlier under different circumstances as explained above.

Pepys’s *Diary* would no doubt have shocked the staid Evelyn with its explicit descriptions of dalliances with lower-class women. Pepys’s style when entering into his journal his encounters with the women in his life differs in style from all three of the other diarists under consideration. Neither Whitelocke or Evelyn write of extra-marital affairs, and they make little or no mention of women of a lower-class than their own. In Morrice’s work it is as though women hardly exist. Because of the profoundly male world Morrice inhabited (judging from his will, he appears not to have married or to have left children [Goldie 1: 61-9]), there were “limitations to his sensibility” where women were concerned. He hardly mentions them except when they “marry, give birth or die” (Goldie 1: 31: n.2). When unnamed women (as opposed to gentlewomen) are written about by Morrice it is usually in reference to a man, such as a Mr. Moulinoux who chased a woman through the streets so that she turned into a house to escape him -- he rode so hard after her that he hit his head
against a doorpost and died two or three days after (4: 36) -- or such as Major Parry, the Justice who solicited a woman who repulsed him. He then offered her marriage, but had the ceremony performed by one of his servants in a Minister’s garb, and later repudiated it. He was rebuked (2: 425). There are but four or five such episodes in the diary. The focus of Morrice’s writing is mostly confined to the legal, political and ecclesiastical spheres, from where women were all but excluded.

In Evelyn’s journal, as we have seen, there are two passages which show us a different perspective of Evelyn from the self-assured, self-controlled gentleman whose persona dominates in the written word of his diary. Both Pepys and Evelyn write their desire or love for a woman outside their marriage, but they choose to record this differently. Evelyn’s account of his feelings for Margaret Blagge, a very young woman of his wife’s acquaintance, opens up for the reader a new conception of Evelyn’s vulnerability. At a very mature age he appears to have fallen in love with the much younger, devoutly religious young woman. In his diary he cloaks his emotions in religious language, but his erotic attachment is evident nevertheless.

We can compare Evelyn’s relatively unguarded writing about what are evidently forbidden feelings for Margaret Bragge, hardly acknowledged even to himself, with the way Pepys presents to us a confounded and confused persona when, as detailed in Chapter 7, he becomes emotionally, as well as sexually, involved with his wife’s young companion, Deb Willet. That Pepys becomes interested in her comes as no surprise, for throughout his Diary he writes repetitively about his sexual escapades, which offer many examples of his failing to conform to religious axioms regarding the opposite sex. Deb, though, is in a higher social class than his usual lower-class female acquaintances. When writing of Deb, Pepys exposes his vulnerability in a power struggle between his own sexual desires and genuine fondness for the girl, and
the sanctity of a marriage that also upholds his social standing. Here he is writing
from a public stance as well as a private one. As discussed in Chapter 7 above, his
narrative style of presentation over several days shows us a face of insecurity, caused
by his loss of willpower where his affection for Deb is concerned, and later, his
having to deal with the horror of his wife’s violent physical reaction when she is
aware of the ongoing relationship.

When Pepys writes of his wish to bed Deb, he expresses his interest in sexually
explicit terms, albeit in his fairly transparent polyglot shorthand. Pepys in his Diary
does not censor his feelings for Deb. He writes several times that he loves her, and
wants her, despite the trauma which ensues when their intimate relationship comes to
light. Pepys’s longing for Deb can be described as uncensored candour as he records
his confusion in the situation.

Pepys’s writing also reveals a divided consciousness when he records taking
bribes, as described in Chapter 6. None of the other diarists writes of personally
accepting bribes. Pepys writes that he does not look at the money he has received so
that he can truthfully say, if questioned, that he had not seen any money, but he is not
deceiving himself because he describes his subterfuge. This incident once again is
quite comical. It is a Pepys of two faces here; he is juggling the wish to appear honest,
while he knows he is being dishonest, yet trying to convince himself that he is after all
being true to his word.

The second section in Evelyn’s Diary where he reveals a degree of confusion
relates to the young serving woman who appeared to have received the stigmata. As
interested in scientific phenomena as Evelyn was, this incident presented an enigma,
one which confounded the steady and confident persona he usually presented to the
world. This entry of Evelyn’s has a quite different tone from those about the
“strange” things Pepys records matter-of-factly in his *Diary*, such as an experiment on a cat’s spinal artery (9: 263), and a dog which carefully buries cats after he has killed them, even to digging them up and burying them deeper should a tail protrude above ground (2: 176).

Pepys often simply states what he has seen, however momentous or affecting it may have been, and then moves on to writing on a different, possibly banal topic in the next sentence without its appearing to give him further thought. He can move from mentioning that his mother did not after all arrive on the coach, to a report of watching a cat killed in an experiment, and seeing a preserved aborted foetus, to a disappointment at work and his return home to bed (6: 96). What is at work in Pepys and Evelyn (and indeed all of the other diarists I am looking at) is internal “censorship” operating in different forms. Evelyn does this when witnessing scientific oddities or experiments about which he seems to write in a casual tone and does not refer to again. This then appears not to conflict with his religious belief that God made everything. Whitelocke’s censorship of his writings on Cromwell have already been discussed above, as have Evelyn’s concerning Margaret Blagge, and Pepys’s on corruption. There is censorship of a more obvious kind in the diary of Roger Morrice, in the omission of proper names and the attribution of opinions to others, although Pepys does this too in some cases.

Evelyn chooses, in his diary writings, to present himself in a serious, one-dimensional way, although, according to Pepys’s diary entry of 10 September 1665, he was merry company (6: 220), but, when Evelyn records almost everything he does, and everything that happens, as deriving from God’s will, this gives his work a consistently sober tone.
This cannot be said of Pepys, whose writing on religion has a different tone as he regularly pays lip-service to God, often begging his forgiveness, then “sinning” sometimes the same day. He accepts that most faults (except corruption, on which he prevaricates) are his. He writes that he attends church regularly, although his wayward thoughts when seeking to admire pretty women among the congregation, which he writes down, prove his attendance is not always strictly for spiritual reasons (8: 389). Pepys gives brief critical comments in his diary on the sermons he hears, but his succinct, often uncomplimentary writings on the perspicacity of the preacher, are a far cry from the very long, and numerous, entries, written mostly verbatim by Evelyn of (seemingly) every sermon that he has ever heard.

In Evelyn’s diary constant references to religion reflect his Presbyterian fear of not gaining entrance to heaven in the hereafter. His is not a private diary, and his constant enterings about religion are consistent with his expressed wish to live a Christian, Protestant life, a wish reflected in “the occasional pious ejaculations [which] also betoken the Christian diarist” as de Beer says (1: 83). Evelyn’s diary is overpowering in its constant religious exhortation. Whitelocke’s references to religion are not so assertive but are nonetheless prevalent in his diary, and Morrice’s work brims over with his aversion to “popery” and fear of England being overtaken by Catholicism.

Pepys also declared himself against Catholicism. He writes, for example, that “[Sir William Penn] told me that this day the King [Charles II] hath sent to the House his concurrence wholly with them against the Popish priests, Jesuits, &c., which gives great content and I am glad of it” (4.92), but the railing of Morrice is absent. Pepys makes entries relating to the Catholic religion throughout his Diary, but he makes many more in reference to his own Protestantism. Even so, he was accused at one
stage of “popery” by a malcontent, but was exonerated (4.92). His fear was not of England being taken over by “popery” so much as that he should be accused of being a Catholic.

In none of the aforementioned diarists’ writings do we encounter the lust for living which is expressed in Pepys’s *Diary*. Pepys writes of being "merry" and having "pleasure" 1,522 times. In these instances, being “merry” was usually associated with eating and drinking with friends, and making or listening to music with friends, and “pleasure” involving such pastimes as horse-riding, seeing and learning about art such as paintings or sculptures. Coupled with his never ending vows to God, which increase his contributions to the poor box as they were so often broken and renewed, his exuberance brings a comical element into his writing. Evelyn makes many entries in his diary of seeing plays, but simply states his attendance mostly, occasionally criticizing them, but does not write whether or not the performances give him pleasure. Whitelocke does not show exuberance in his diary writing, and Morrice rarely mentions anything of his private life at all.

When Pepys writes of his endless curiosity, for example his boyish jubilation when watching the hand movements of his newly acquired timepiece ticking away the hour (as discussed in Chapter 3), his wonder is imparted with his words, whereas when Evelyn writes of curiosities he witnesses, his style is that of a sedate pedagogue. Indeed the physical cruelty he witnesses in the name of science leads one to consider whether he forced himself to observe such acts to use the experiences as fodder for use in his diary, or whether he was simply oblivious to terrible physical suffering. He goes into gruesome detail about an operation on a sailor with a gangrenous leg, as we have seen, and watches it until the man dies, although he does say that he will not see another.
John Spurr writes that Morrice’s diary “appears at different times to be a notebook, a newsletter, and a documentary scrapbook” (2: xxiii). As a newsletter, which is an apt description, as Morrice disseminated Dissenters’ current information, his writing is obviously public, even if selectively so. Goldie tells us that Morrice was “a Puritan clergyman turned confidential reporter and agent for a group of senior Whig politicians” (1: xiii). This communicative sort of relationship does not exist in Pepys’s Diary. Where Morrice’s diary is almost totally about reporting on others from many walks of life, Pepys makes himself the centre of attention.

Morrice could be said to have been addicted to writing. He wrote prolifically and extensively without ever publishing anything. His Entring Book includes all sorts of governmental administration happenings, Parliamentary decisions and Charles II’s and James II’s proclamations, many of which were already in print, together with reports of all sorts of trials, as well as news reports from across the country. Always the writing is measured and sedate. Pepys’s entries in his Diary, in their exuberance, give the impression that, to Pepys, writing is a pleasant experience. Pepys conveys his delight in so many happy times spent in the company of friends and his wife, Elizabeth, and his other “pleasures” he finds time to include in his day. He is not given to including huge tracts of printed material with a journalistic bent, such as the Parliamentary proceedings in Morrice’s diary. Neither does he write of getting caught up in endless discussions regarding religion and politics. He writes about them as they are reported to him by business friends and people he encounters throughout the day in Whitehall and the streets of London, and by the many visitors he entertains in the middle of the day at dinner, in his own home. He achieves an immediacy almost unfound in Morrice’s Entring Book.
The most pressing issue emerging from Morrice’s *Entring Book* is the fear of Popery taking over the country. This hardly arises at the time when Pepys was writing his *Diary*. Protestant Charles II had been restored to the throne, and although James, Duke of York hovered in the background as a Catholic at that time, it is not the same threat to the populace as it was in James II’s time when Morrice was writing his *Entring Book*, and felt the need to censor his entries.

Whitelocke and Evelyn could also be described as addicted to writing. De Beer says “Evelyn enjoyed writing; it would be more correct to say that he could not refrain from it” (*Diary* 1:41). The three diarists wrote, or rewrote copious amounts, written more or less *en bloc*, when time and their relevant positions allowed, but Pepys is not an addictive writer although he left considerable amounts, numerous letters, a song, and other manuscripts intended for publishing as a history of the navy. The only book he had published was *Memoirs relating to the State of the Navy* in 1690 (11: 317), although he had collected data for a proposed history of the English Navy which was never published in his lifetime. Writing was an everyday necessity for Pepys from the beginning of his employment with the Navy Board - composing letters, orders, account books, receipts, all requirements of his position. His writing of the *Diary* followed on from these daily written chores, being a similarly integral part of his day. His entering of his *Diary* appeared to be more of a pleasant practice. As William Matthews writes of Pepys, “As a young man, he took vows on several matters of conduct, but never a vow to keep a diary, that came naturally. In the whole of the diary there is no complaint that it was a drudgery to keep it. The *Diary* is a by-product of his energetic pursuit of happiness” (1: xxviii-xxx). This can be deduced from his numerous entries citing the plays he had seen, the music he heard or himself played, his art collections, the food he enjoyed, the new clothes he bought and the
social occasions which gave him joy. Evelyn, when writing of his early years at 27 years or so, simply states that he drank too much (2: 38, and 3: 54) but makes no comment on “being merry.” He writes of much travelling round the country, playing a bowling match (3: 219) but with no expressions of merriment thereto, or even of pleasure. Conversely, such items of “merriment” or “pleasurable” events do not appear in great numbers in the other diaries here discussed. Evelyn seems to be compelled to list the sermons he hears, Morrice the religious contentions, and Whitelocke evidence of his self-aggrandisement. His recording of his ambassadorial sojourn is written less like a report, and with more warmth than the rest of his diary, other than his writings of family matters. Because he had a different family background, his social life in no way emulates that of Pepys.

Pepys manages to create a consistent vividness of life in London in words, not only from the viewpoint of a person of the middle class which he eventually became, but from that of a young, married, and impecunious clerk who was eagerly embracing his opportunities. Pepys took away from those around him, who were not only the illustrious, but also the seedy, fodder for knowledge and experience to be relayed to his Diary in a way not employed by his fellow diarists here discussed.

Apart from Evelyn’s repeated pleas for money in his concern for the sick soldiers sailors and prisoners with whom he had to deal, the other two diarists wrote little of the poorer classes. Pepys must have had a clearer understanding of how ordinary people lived their lives, from his close association with the port and naval workers and his own simple upbringing, which did not compare with that of Whitelocke or Evelyn. (We know nothing of Morrice’s childhood.)

At the end of their lives, Whitelocke and Morrice do write more contemporaneously, but still not on a regular daily basis as Pepys endeavours to do.
Admittedly, Pepys also uses notes of his own to be later transferred to his diary as well, but these are brisk and lively, for they are usually made, if not on the same day (except for specific happenings like the great fire of London in 1666), very soon after. Pepys is living his inclusions, not looking back over years since they happened. In their rewriting as entries in the *Diary*, from the minutiae of everyday living to the historical dramas played out in the seventeenth century, Pepys chooses to record them diurnally with a hearty and persistent endeavour. He does this even in times of personal and political turmoil, with an effervescent enthusiasm for the trivial, such as avoiding hatpins wielded by a pretty lady in church who objects to Pepys’s attempts to fondle her (8: 389) to creating, in a letter sent to Lady Carteret, a real sense of the dramatic, when writing of the daylight trundling of carts through the streets, stacked high with the bodies of the plague dead, because there were too many victims to hide in the shadows of the night (6: 189).

(f) CONCLUSION.

Many of the themes traced earlier in this thesis are brought into sharp relief by a comparison with the other diarists. There is little in the other diaries of Pepys’s sense of wonder, which he replayed to himself through writing in the diary. He watched himself as they rarely do. Where they almost always write from a single, finished viewpoint, he presents a divided self, with one self watching (and writing) and the other self a spontaneous, uncontrolled being that desires, that changes, and cannot be fixed by a vow or promise. Pepys is creative, unlike the other diarists. They are recorders. They aim to impress an audience. Pepys, on the other hand, is amazed at being where he is. He cannot believe he is doing the things he records. He cannot quite believe that he is getting away with what he does — as with his pursuit of women. He remains fascinated by the idea that there are really no boundaries. The
Diary is his own private theatre, where a privileged audience (himself) sees his inner turmoil as well as the outward satisfactions and frustrations of desire, but this illicit theatre begs the question of moral surveillance in the larger sense: who is watching, who will know? Corruption is dangerous because he puts himself in the power of someone else, but if he can escape wider notice of what he is doing, does that mean that he is getting off scot free? The women he pesters and fondles are powerless to report him because they are of lower social station. It is only from Deb Willet, who is a little closer to his own class, that consequences come. Evelyn struggles with powerful feelings for Margaret Blagge, and Whitelocke finds himself in dangerous, desire-charged waters with Queen Christina and her court ladies, but these diarists maintain a much more obdurate self-censorship than does Pepys. Pepys was exceptional in his own time in his recording of protean selves in vivid written form. In his Diary and his other writings there are multiple, authentic Pepyses, yet none is more "real" than another. The interaction between them makes for a remarkable episode in the history of the writing of experience.
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