

HISTORIES AND TEXTS: REFIGURING THE DIARY OF SAMUEL PEPYS*

MARK S. DAWSON

Wolfson College, Cambridge

ABSTRACT. *The following attempts a modest reconsideration of one of the most well-known early modern Englishmen, Samuel Pepys. More precisely, the article suggests that much closer attention needs to be paid to Pepys's textuality (not sexuality). In modern times, his diary has achieved canonical status to the detriment of other texts scripted in unison with the famed Cambridge manuscript, now meticulously transcribed. Tracing the multiple textual transactions elided by the final manuscript allows for important insight into the diary's partiality. We need to resist, as much as possible, the temptation of contextualizing the diary with biographical detail because that detail is so often derived from the diary itself. We should reverse our interpretive strategy: begin with Pepys's texts (plural), unravel their main interconnections, and only then reach tentative conclusions about the man. Establishing motive is a risky business when there is no subject for interrogation. There is, however, a text that wants a more rigorous contextualization.*

I

If his reading of John Wilkins's *An essay towards a real character, and a philosophical language* (1668) is any indication, Samuel Pepys would have been intrigued by the far-reaching and wide-ranging phenomenon known to historians as the 'linguistic turn'.¹ Yet, with a few exceptions, the reverse does not apply: postmodern torque has barely been applied to Samuel Pepys.² This does not mean that the mass of Pepysian scholarship is defunct or that the numerous wider early modern studies which seek to exploit Pepys's diary as a primary source present interpretations which are well shy of their mark.

* For their insightful criticism and encouragement of the wider research which this article represents, I would like to thank Barry Reay (University of Auckland, New Zealand) and Keith Wrightson (Jesus College, Cambridge). Thanks also to Malcolm Campbell (University of Auckland) for his comments on an earlier draft.

¹ Reference will be to the latest transcription of the diary, recently reprinted in paperback: R. C. Latham and W. Matthews, eds., *The diary of Samuel Pepys, 1660–1669, volumes I–IX* (London, 1970–83; repr., London, 1995). Entries will be cited by date, followed by volume and page numbers. For Pepys's reading of Wilkins see 15 May 1668, ix, 200; 17 May 1668, ix, 202; 27 May 1668, ix, 215; 5 July 1668, ix, 255; 1 Dec. 1668, ix, 381; 2 Dec. 1668, ix, 382.

² While this article was with the editors, Pepys's diary received independent treatment in H. Berger, Jr, 'The Pepys show: ghost-writing and documentary desire in *the diary*', *ELH*, 65 (1998), pp. 557–91. It is hoped that what follows elaborates the nature and impact of what Berger refers to in general terms as the 'rhetorical forces of the register'. In addition, Berger's emphasis on how Pepys might have chosen to live certain events because he saw them as grist for the diary's mill will be complemented by equal stress on how the diary fashioned Pepys's identity, as lived and as textualized.

Nevertheless, discussion of Pepys, be it biography or monograph, does display a noticeable homocentricity: the focus has been overwhelmingly on the life of Samuel Pepys the person,³ or a particular aspect of this life such as his career, domestic situation, and experience as a member of Restoration London's genteel set.⁴ An examination of the main titles produced by the Pepys industry would suggest we are meant to come away with the impression that Pepys the man is locked away in a room where we can put him on the couch and probe the depths of his 'personality',⁵ 'inner mind',⁶ or 'soul'.⁷ To state the obvious: Pepys the man died in 1703. Only his library and the diary which is its most treasured possession remain. Yet we are assured that the latter text in particular, so lucid despite its original tachygraphic script, easily allows us to observe the man and his inner thoughts with the result that we are able to draw near-clinical conclusions about Pepys and perhaps even those around him.⁸

³ Principal works in English include: P. Lubbock, *Samuel Pepys* (London, 1909); H. B. Wheatley, ed., *Occasional papers read by members at meetings of the Samuel Pepys club: volume I* (London, 1917); G. Bradford, *The soul of Samuel Pepys* (New York, 1924; reissued, 1969); P. Norman, ed., *Occasional papers published for members of the Samuel Pepys club: volume II* (London, 1925); J. R. Tanner, *Mr Pepys: an introduction to the diary together with a sketch of his later life* (London, 1925); A. Ponsonby, *Samuel Pepys* (London, 1928); J. Drinkwater, *Pepys: his life and character* (London, 1930); J. Lucas-Dubreton, trans. H. J. Stenning, *Samuel Pepys: a portrait in miniature* (London, 1935); A. Bryant, *Samuel Pepys: the man in the making* (London, 1933; 2nd edn, 1948); A. Bryant, *Samuel Pepys: the years of peril* (London, 1935, 2nd edn, 1948); A. Bryant, *Samuel Pepys: the saviour of the navy* (London, 1938, 2nd edn, 1948); A. G. Matthews, *Mr Pepys and nonconformity* (London, 1954); J. Cleugh, *The amorous Master Pepys* (London, 1958); P. Hunt, *Samuel Pepys in the diary* (Pittsburgh, 1959); C. S. Emden, *Pepys himself* (London, 1963); R. Barber, *Samuel Pepys esquire* (London, 1970); G. Trease, *Samuel Pepys and his world* (London, 1972); J. E. N. Hearsey, *Young Mr Pepys* (London, 1973); R. Ollard, *Pepys: a biography* (London, 1974); I. E. Taylor, *Samuel Pepys* (Boston, 1967, rev edn, 1989); V. Brome, *The other Pepys* (London, 1992).

⁴ For his career, see J. R. Tanner, *Samuel Pepys and the Royal Navy* (Cambridge, 1920); B. McL. Ranft, 'The significance of the political career of Samuel Pepys', *Journal of Modern History*, 24 (1952), pp. 368–75; L. M. Wilcox, *Mr Pepys' navy* (London, 1966); B. Pool, 'Sir William Coventry: Pepys's mentor', *History Today*, 24 (1974), pp. 107–11; H. Tomlinson, 'Samuel Pepys, le père de la Royal Navy', *Histoire*, 50 (1982), pp. 94–8; J. D. Davies, 'Pepys and the Admiralty commission of 1679–1684', *Historical Research*, 62 (1989) pp. 34–53. On the domestic side, see J. H. Wilson, *The private life of Mr Pepys* (New York, 1959); O. A. Mendelsohn, *Drinking with Pepys* (London, 1963); C. Johnson, 'Samuel Pepys: the texture of daily life', *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 1 (1974), pp. 22–7; O. Ranum, 'Inventing private space: Samuel and Mrs Pepys at home, 1660–1669', *Jahrbuch* (Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin) (1982–3), pp. 259–76; K. E. Westhauser, 'Friendship and family in early modern England: the sociability of Adam Eyre and Samuel Pepys', *Journal of Social History*, 27 (1994) pp. 517–36. For Pepys as diarist and virtuoso, see C. Marburg, *Mr Pepys and Mr Evelyn* (n.p., 1935; Norwood editions, repr, 1977); D. G. Weiss, *Samuel Pepys, curioso* (Pittsburgh, 1957); M. Willy, *English diarists: Evelyn and Pepys* (London, 1963); M. H. Nicolson, *Pepys' diary and the new science* (Charlottesville, 1965).

⁵ Tanner, *Mr Pepys*, p. xii; Ponsonby, *Samuel Pepys*, p. 34; Hunt, *Pepys in the diary*, p. 11.

⁶ Tanner, *Mr Pepys*, pp. 204–5; Cleugh, *Master Pepys*, pp. 156–8; Emden, *Pepys himself*, pp. xi, 142.

⁷ Bradford, *Soul of Pepys*, p. 9; Bryant, *Man in the making*, p. 72; Brome, *Other Pepys* p. 104.

⁸ See for example L. Stone, *The family, sex and marriage in England, 1500–1800* (London, 1977), pp. 546–7, 561. See also L. M. Beier, *Sufferers and healers: the experience of illness in seventeenth-century England* (London, 1987), passim; R. and D. Porter, *In sickness and in health: the British experience, 1650–1850* (London, 1988), passim.

Maybe such licence is understandable given that much of what we know about Pepys does come from his diary, that *res gestae* maintained assiduously for nine and a half years in diurnal, linear sequence.⁹ That is what keeping a diary involved for Pepys is it not? As cause and result of the fixation with Pepys the man, a comfortable familiarity built up over some 150 years since the diary was ‘re-discovered’ at Magdalene College (Cambridge), there has been a strong tendency to regard the question of the diary’s textuality as largely resolved. Or perhaps it would not be too much of an exaggeration to say that modern readers of the diary’s breath-taking descriptions of mid-seventeenth-century London are still waiting to exhale. What is implicitly viewed as a flawless artefact beyond need of sustained criticism is so often rummaged through for just the right quote; the text in its entirety is neglected.¹⁰ The constraints of context are circumvented and the diary, or typically the anthropomorphized text named ‘Pepys’, treated as an encyclopaedic, impartial early modern guide-book.¹¹ Since we read a modern transcription of the diary, complete with index and footnotes, textual barriers have been too readily ignored.

This article makes no claim to be the definitive interpretation of Pepys as that would be an impossible task even for a much longer study. The following is a modest attempt to reconsider Pepys’s diary as a whole and to suggest, somewhat paradoxically, where its basic partiality might lie. Not to attempt to understand even the barest essentials of the nature of the diary as a fictive text is to risk its misuse.¹² We must try to establish the diary’s discursive context: to explain the specific form and function of the text as we have it, or, to put it another way, how this diary and not another bearing the name Pepys came to exist. What gives this text its peculiar momentum?

II

Various reasons for Pepys’s desire to become a diary’s author on the eve of 1660 and to continue in this role for nearly a decade have been advanced by critics.¹³ Yet often this is to beg the question; to conceal the fact that an attempt to explain the diarist is not the same as explaining the diary, the text. The

⁹ With the exception of an unexplained omission of twelve days from 29 Sept. 1668 to 10 Oct. 1668, ix, 323–5.

¹⁰ Particularly prone to this are writers of studies of Restoration drama. See, for example, M. Summers, *The playhouse of Pepys* (London, 1935; repr, New York, 1964); D. Roberts, *The ladies: female patronage of Restoration drama, 1660–1700* (Oxford, 1989).

¹¹ On the issue of context, and the mass of literature concerned with this issue, particularly thought-provoking are R. F. Berkhofer, *Beyond the great story: history as text and discourse* (London, 1995), and J. Tully, ed., *Meaning and context: Quentin Skinner and his critics* (Cambridge, 1988).

¹² The main but ultimately problematic exception to this lack of criticism is F. Barker, *The tremulous private body: essays on subjection* (London, 1984).

¹³ For summaries of these motives see W. Matthews, ‘The diary as literature’, in R. C. Latham and W. Matthews, eds., *The diary of Samuel Pepys: volume I 1660* (London, 1995), pp. cvi–cx; Ollard, *Pepys*, pp. 19–21.

standard approach to Pepys is to begin with the man and then attempt to analyse him (including the assignment of motive) from a single text. Rather, any analysis should move in the opposite direction: begin with Pepys's texts, establish the diary's primary discursive context, and only then make tentative observations about the author.

Critiquing the diary on the basis of supposed authorial motive is a poor substitute for contextual analysis. For instance, some view the diary as a means to greater self-control on the part of its writer.¹⁴ Whilst there is a visible disciplinary thread running through the diary, we need some comprehension of the whole maze and not simply one strand running through it. In any case, Pepys's main means to discipline were his vows: '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.'¹⁵ He listed these vows separately. Frequently we learn of the nature of these strictures only when diary entries become elaborate evasions of regimen:

for *Heraclius* being acted, which my wife and I have a mighty mind to see, we do resolve, though not exactly agreeing with the letter of my vowe, yet altogether with the sense, to see another this month – by going hither instead of that at Court, there having been none conveniently since I made my vow for us to see there, nor like to be this Lent; and besides, we did walk home on purpose to make this going as cheap as that would have been to have seen one at Court; and my conscience knows that it is only the saving of money and the time also that I entend by my oaths, and this hath cost no more of either – so that my conscience before God doth, after good consultation and resolution of paying my forfeit did my conscience accuse me of breaking my vow, I do not find myself in the least apprehensive that I have done any vyolence to my oaths.¹⁶

There was a need for vows to maintain the diary itself: 'I close to my papers to set all in order, and to perform my vow to finish my Journall and other things before I kiss any woman more, or drink any wine, which I must be forced to do tomorrow if I go to Greenwich.'¹⁷ This last feature of the diary text points to the fact that any diarist needs strong self-discipline if he or she is to maintain the rigorous routine required to script entry upon dated entry.

For some, context can be what they already know about Pepys's early years and the seventeenth-century efflorescence of autobiography. Perhaps the single most important influence working to bring about this growth in England was Calvinist theology.¹⁸ We have a number of extant diaries kept by individuals as records of the hand of God in the world and the individual's spiritual progress.¹⁹ Hence Pepys's diary is viewed, with varying degrees of conviction,

¹⁴ Hunt, *Pepys in the diary*, p. 157; R. A. Fothergill, *Private chronicles: a study of English diaries* (London, 1974), p. 71. ¹⁵ 17 Aug. 1662, III, 167. ¹⁶ 8 Mar. 1664, v, 78.

¹⁷ 14 Jan. 1666, VII, 15. See also 26 Jan. 1666, VII, 25; 12 Feb. 1666, VII, 40.

¹⁸ For a succinct and suggestive survey of this tradition see T. Webster, 'Writing to redundancy: approaches to spiritual journals and early modern spirituality', *Historical Journal*, 39 (1996), pp. 33–56; O. C. Watkins, *The Puritan experience* (London, 1972), pp. 18–36, 182–207.

¹⁹ See, for example, A. Macfarlane, ed., *The diary of Ralph Josselin, 1616–1683* (London, 1976), and the related study by Macfarlane, *The family life of Ralph Josselin a seventeenth-century clergyman:*

as primarily informed by this discourse: Pepys's 'fundamental Puritanism emerges... in the diary which distinguish[es] him sharply from the ordinary Cavalier. His devout appeals to God Almighty, his passionate outpourings of grief over and repentance for his sins are real and not hypocritical.'²⁰ Similarly, Lawrence Stone concludes that the diary was a 'means both of confession of sin and of checking upon [his] moral balance-sheet... brought up under Puritan direction... [he was] haunted thereafter by a lingering sense of guilt about [the] exuberant enjoyment of all the pleasures of life, especially those of the flesh'.²¹ Others, seemingly unsure whether Pepys was really pious, trace a more general provenance for the text by viewing the diary as a 'spiritual self-portrait'; 'an exercise in spiritual book-keeping'.²²

Those who note that Pepys grew up in a Puritan world are correct, despite the chronic ill-definition of 'Puritan' or 'puritanism'.²³ There are points where the motive force behind an entry appears to be confessional and we might go so far as to conjecture that the particular religious milieu of Pepys's formative years had a lasting impact on his psyche. However, we cannot make too fine a point of the need to maintain a critical distance between the man, whom we can never know directly, and the text which mediates his existence. Unlike the autobiographical texts of near contemporaries Ralph Josselin and Nehemiah Wallington, the text of Pepys is manifestly not the product of someone who conceives of God looking over his very shoulder as he writes. Pepys's diary is not a sustained, gratulatory account of God's mercies or condign punishments; a searching of the soul for signs of election or damnation.

Comparison of similar incidents in the lives of Josselin and Pepys, or more precisely the textual trajectories which trace these events, makes this clear. For example, we find that Josselin and Pepys had lost siblings in the course of keeping their diaries. However, each author had arrived at the 'death notice' in a different manner and for different reasons. In late December 1673 Josselin wrote: 'god... the lord had his hand then on my sister Anna. who was taken suddenly ill. dropsicall when with us, and went away cheerfull. a good woman and now happy. shee died Friday 26. god hath broken the brood there are now but three of us. shee was next above mee in age. lord fit me for my change.'²⁴

an essay in historical anthropology (Cambridge, 1970). See also P. S. Seaver, *Wallington's world: a Puritan artisan in seventeenth-century London* (Stanford, 1985); M. Todd, 'Puritan self-fashioning: the diary of Samuel Ward', *Journal of British Studies*, 31 (1992), pp. 236–64.

²⁰ Tanner, *Mr Pepys*, pp. 180–1.

²¹ Stone, *Family*, p. 264; cf. *ibid.*, p. 245. See also Taylor, *Samuel Pepys*, pp. x, 5–6.

²² Respectively, Barber, *Pepys esquire*, p. 5; C. Hill, *Some intellectual consequences of the English Revolution* (London, 1980), pp. 50–1. See also Matthews, 'Diary as literature', p. cvii.

²³ Especially Bryant, *Man in the making*, pp. 7–18; Brome, *Other Pepys*, pp. 3–17. Also A. G. Matthews, *Pepys and nonconformity*, pp. 32–9. For a concise introduction to the discourse of puritanism see C. Durston and J. Eales, 'Introduction: the Puritan ethos, 1560–1700', in C. Durston and J. Eales, eds., *The culture of English Puritanism, 1560–1700* (London, 1996), pp. 1–31.

²⁴ 25 Dec. 1673; Macfarlane, *Diary*, pp. 571–2.

Josselin views his sister's illness and death with exclusive reference to the workings of a merciful Almighty. When Josselin assesses the consequences for himself, he interprets Anna's passing as a further test of his faith and, ultimately, his own salvation.

By comparison, the account we find in Pepys's diary of his brother Tom's death is far more detailed, but preoccupied throughout with this world rather than the next.²⁵ Although we glimpse Pepys's grief at his brother's illness, the narrative is concerned primarily with the social ramifications of Pepys having a brother who was in deep financial trouble and, scandalously, also rumoured to have the pox:

The Doctors give him over and so do all that see him. He talks no sense two words together now. And I confess it made me weep to see that he should not be able when I asked him, to say who I was. I went to Mrs. Turners, and by her discourse with my brother's Doctor, Mr. Powell, I find that she is full now of the disease which my brother is troubled with, and talks of it mightily; which I am sorry for – there being other company; but methinks it should be for her honour to forbear talking of it. The shame of this very thing, I confess, troubles me as much as anything ... that if he lives, he will not be able to show his head – which will be a very great shame to me.²⁶

Throughout there is no accounting of the hand of God at work, an apparent lack of concern with his brother's spiritual fate, and no meditation upon the author's own. Any reference to the divine is incidental. Instead, the diary finally records the good show which Pepys put on for the mourners: 'Their service was six biscuits a-piece and what they pleased of burnt claret ... and had a very good company along with the Corps ... being too merry for so late a sad work; but Lord, to see how the world makes nothing of the memory of a man an hour after he is dead.'²⁷ Even the diary's rather graphic but second-hand description of the deathbed emphasizes that Tom Pepys had not 'made a good end' as social conventions of the day insisted the dying should.

Given the arguments about Pepys's 'fundamental Puritanism', it is ironic that Pepys should be held to have kept his diary for the pleasures it offered: 'the preservation of erotic thrills otherwise doomed to the uncertain power of memory',²⁸ the bureaucrat's need to reduce daily chaos to scripted neatness,²⁹ or the desire to carve out a personal, private space where Pepys could be himself with himself.³⁰ Confusing motive with context again proves problematic. For we also find discomfort and, eventually, humiliation in the wake of these pleasures. Some time after Pepys's wife had found him in flagrante delicto with her companion the diary reads: 'This night the Upholsters did finish the hanging of my best chamber, but my sorrow and trouble is so great about this business [i.e. the discovery], that put me out of all joy in looking upon it or

²⁵ 13–19 Mar. 1664, v, 80–92.

²⁶ 14 Mar. 1664, v, 84–5.

²⁷ 18 Mar. 1664, v, 90–1.

²⁸ Brome, *Other Pepys*, p. 72.

²⁹ Ponsoyby, *Samuel Pepys*, p. 81; R. C. Latham, 'The diarist', in *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, 1, p. xxviii; Matthews, 'Diary as literature', p. cvi; Fothergill, *Private chronicles*, pp. 71–2.

³⁰ Matthews, 'Diary as literature', pp. cix–cx.

minding how it was.³¹ As for the argument of neatness, the same assumption could be made of many diarists. And finally, regardless of whether it is actually possible to commune only with an otherwise hidden existential self, is not this also what all diarists, to one degree or another, hope to achieve? We have failed to explain the diary's uniqueness because we continue to interrogate the diarist and not his text.

Nor should we assume that Pepys wrote for a perceived posterity and intended for the diary to be read by unseen scholars of the future: 'much of it reads like material for a scientific report on sexual behaviour in the human male. That Pepys included it, although ashamed, is the most evident testimony to the full objective reporting, the scientific outlook, the Baconianism that went into the diary and the manner in which it was reported.'³² The main argument asserting that Pepys planned to leave such a legacy is the inclusion of apparently unnecessary exegesis explaining who certain people, already well known to Pepys himself, were (notice, once more, the privileging of man over text). It seems obvious that Pepys intended his diary for posterity because it 'state[s] facts so well known to the diarist that he would hardly have included them for his own benefit'.³³ For example,

To my office...Hither comes Major Tolhurst, one of my old acquaintance in Cromwell's time and sometimes of our clubb, to see me, and I could do no less then carry him to the Miter; and thither having sent for Mr. Beane, a merchant, a neighbour of mine, we sat and talk – Tolhurst telling me the manner of their Collierys in the North. We broke up, and I home to dinner.³⁴

As shall be argued below, there is an alternative, textual explanation for this practice. Besides, it seems odd that Pepys, supposedly so attuned to the future value of his diary, never left the name of his wife, Elizabeth, to a perceived posterity. In the diary she is always referred to simply as his 'wife'. By contrast, we know most of his servants' first names. Nor did Samuel leave obvious instructions to his idiosyncratic version of Shelton's shorthand system in which the final manuscript is written. An obvious anomaly in this regard is that Pepys records a change to his system with the coded text itself.³⁵ Finally, one might anticipate some sort of programmatic, even if retrospective, statement upon the purpose of the diary. By way of comparison, John Evelyn made it quite plain that his journal was intended for future generations of his family. He also included a retrospective of years not covered by the diary; details of his childhood, parents, and other kin which he perceived to be of use to later readers.³⁶ We find nothing like this in Pepys's journal. The diary's prologue merely sums up Pepys's condition on the eve of the new year, as it will do for each new year of the ensuing decade: 'My own private condition very

³¹ 19 Nov. 1668, ix, 368. [Interpolation added.]

³² Matthews, 'Diary as literature', p. cx, also pp. cvii–cix. See also Ollard, *Pepys*, p. 19.

³³ Emden, *Pepys himself*, p. 142. See also Fothergill, *Private chronicles*, pp. 98–9.

³⁴ 9 Jan. 1663, iv, 10.

³⁵ See 8 Mar. 1667, viii, 104.

³⁶ G. de la Bédoyère, ed., *The diary of John Evelyn* (Woodbridge, 1995), pp. 19–21.

handsome; and esteemed rich, but ended very poor, besides my goods of my house and my office, which at present is somewhat uncertain. Mr Downing master of my office.³⁷

That Pepys never really acted on his idea of continuing the diary text with the help of an amanuensis, after 1669,³⁸ adds further weight to the contention that the primary function of the diary for Pepys was not deliberately to record important, wider historical events for future readers.³⁹ For in the years after 1669 Pepys was just as much a part of important historical events as he had been in the 1660s, perhaps even more so given that his continued importance as a civil servant brought him closer to those in power.⁴⁰

III

The search for Pepys's motives is very much a false quest; its parameters confined to rationalizing the mere existence of a single text which bears his name, it fails to explain the diary's distinctive texture. If anything, it leads us in the wrong direction. For the motives assigned to Pepys could be applied to other early modern diarists and do not explain why the diary is what it is; cannot explain the surviving text's peculiar discursive framework. This failure is the result of paying too much attention to the diarist and anthropomorphizing the text in order to match it with our suppositions about the man. To explain the diary we need to pay more attention to other Pepysian texts dating from the 1660s. Although the diary itself will always reign supreme it was ringed by other texts which helped gave it substance. The diary did not stand alone in a discursive void.

This is not to ignore our sense of the diary's rich uniqueness. The diary certainly seems quite unlike the other daily records with which Pepys may have had contact. These include the journal of his patron, Edward Montagu,⁴¹ and

³⁷ Prologue to 1 Jan. 1660, 1, 2.

³⁸ An apparent exception to this is Pepys's so-called 'second diary', see R. G. Howarth, ed., *Letters and the second diary of Samuel Pepys* (London, 1933), which he kept during a voyage to Tangier in the 1680s. In tone, length, and subject it is quite unlike *the* diary and, if there were space for a detailed comparison, would serve largely to highlight the 'singular' characteristics discussed below.

³⁹ An argument usually advanced with reference to the coincidence of the opening pages of the diary with the significant political changes which Monck et al. were about to set in motion. Of course, many of Pepys's business records were continued after 1669. In particular, his *Navy white book* was kept by the use of an amanuensis from 1667. However, since this book, concerned with the daily minutiae of naval business, was already in existence, Pepys must have had something rather different and presumably more personal in mind.

⁴⁰ Pepys did think it worthwhile to record for posterity Charles II's version of events after the Royalist defeat at the battle of Worcester. See C. G. Thomas, ed., *Boscobel, or, the history of the most miraculous preservation of King Charles II... To which is added the king's own account of his adventures, dictated to Mr Samuel Pepys* [1680] (London, 1894). See also Pepys to the duke of York, 4 June 1681, in J. R. Tanner, ed., *Private correspondence and miscellaneous papers of Samuel Pepys, 1679-1700* (London, 1926), pp. 13-14.

⁴¹ See R. C. Anderson, ed., *The journal of Edward Montagu, first earl of Sandwich, 1659-1665* (London, Naval Records Society, 64, 1929), especially pp. 67ff.

the journals which Pepys seems to have encouraged other naval officials to keep.⁴² In terms of content, Pepys seems to have recognized that his diary went beyond the more typical collections of useful memoranda or accounts. He made this distinction after a meeting with his one-time superior Sir William Coventry and after the diary had been at least eight years in the making: ‘find Sir W. Coventry alone, writing down his journall, which he tells me he now keeps of the material things’.⁴³

There is no denying that in the diary one finds many instances of these more mundane material records, ranging from memoranda of health remedies to notes of monthly income.⁴⁴ In fact, these are important obiter dicta which shall lead us closer to the diary’s function. For now, we should observe that the diary cross-references other more specific records of sermons, personal transactions and official dealings, letters, table talk, and household expenditure which were also maintained by Pepys.⁴⁵ So, for example, one Sunday morning we find that Samuel and his wife had balanced ‘our reckonings and have a great deal of serious talk, wherein I took occasion to give her hints of the necessity of our saving all we can’.⁴⁶ Similarly, details of meetings, be they official or social, were recorded elsewhere. After a morning spent at the Dolphin tavern ‘where mighty merry by pleasant stories of Mr. Coventry’s and Sir J. Mennes’, Pepys wrote down some of these ‘in my book of tales’.⁴⁷ For the details of a meeting at the naval office, the diary notes: ‘(vide memorandum = book of the office this day)’.⁴⁸ A year later, Pepys began a more personal collection of official minutes and memoranda which was to become known as his *Navy white book*: ‘Vexed to see how Sir W. Batten ordered things this afternoon (vide my office book; for about this time I have begun, my notions and informations increasing now greatly every day, to enter all occurrences extraordinary... in a book by themselves).’⁴⁹ Likewise, at the entry for 1 July 1667, Pepys noted: ‘Thence to the office and did write to my Lord Brouncker... it is worth while to read my letter to him entered in my letter book.’⁵⁰ The diary was important, yet we would do well to bear in mind that it was first among equals.

The diary’s significance has long been over-publicized at the expense of these other texts. Moreover, writing itself, as for some diarists of the seventeenth

⁴² R. C. Latham, W. Matthews, and C. Knighton, eds., *Samuel Pepys and the second Dutch War: Pepys’s navy white book and Brooke House papers* (Hants., Naval Records Society, 133, 1995), pp. 167–8, 170, 183, 249. Pepys was later to collect several of these nautical journals for his much-planned history of the Royal Navy. See, for instance, Pepys to Dr Charlett, 21 Oct. 1699, in Howarth, *Second diary*, p. 286.

⁴³ 9 Mar. 1669, ix, 475.

⁴⁴ See, for example, 31 Dec. 1664, v, 360–3 and 11 Dec. 1665, vi, 325–6.

⁴⁵ For the keeping of sermon notes and records of family business, see respectively 9 Aug. 1663, iv, 268; 19 Mar. 1662, iii, 48. The importance of these other records is usually ignored and often leads to ‘singular’ and hence partial explanations of the diary text. See, for example, Fothergill, *Private chronicles*, p. 71.

⁴⁶ 14 June 1663, iv, 183.

⁴⁷ 24 Oct. 1663, iv, 346. See also 5 Dec. 1663, iv, 406.

⁴⁸ 23 July 1663, iv, 241.

⁴⁹ 7 Apr. 1664, v, 115–16. See also 9 Apr. 1669, ix, 513.

⁵⁰ 1 July 1667, viii, 314. For the initiation of this practice, see 6 Jan. 1661, ii, 7. Of course, the diary does actually enclose one very important letter for which see 18 Nov. 1663, iv, 386–9.

century, was not an unusual occupation for Pepys. For instance, he wrote many letters, both personal and official, each week. Indeed, we sometimes find echoes of the diary in these letters or perhaps vice versa.⁵¹ Writing, as these other texts demonstrate, was his business as private secretary, exchequer official, and clerk of the Acts.

IV

Paying closer attention to the precise nature of this business of writing provides the outline of an all-important context. We need to focus our attention on the internal workings of the diary text, to examine the nature of its construction, and to ask anew: what was the nature and function of diary-writing for Pepys? We should begin by discarding generic notions about the manner in which the diary was kept, the text created, and also be wary of prevailing characterizations of this text as being ‘honest’ and ‘private’. We must attempt to reconstruct how Pepys apprehended the diary manuscript, as both author *and* reader of this text *and* others scripted simultaneously.⁵²

There is a strong temptation to read the diary consecutively; to view it as a daily record ‘written frankly and swiftly to get down what had stirred [Pepys’s] mind each day’.⁵³ However, this is a dangerous assumption. 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 mémoire* of a day’s events, many of which he had not authored himself.⁵⁴ 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

⁵¹ Compare for example the following pairs of diary entries and letters: 16 Aug. 1661, II, 155–6 – Pepys to the earl of Sandwich, 29 Aug. 1661, in Howarth, *Second diary*, pp. 20–1; 19 Sept. 1664, V, 275 – Pepys to the earl of Sandwich, 20 Sept. 1664, in J. R. Tanner, ed., *Further correspondence of Samuel Pepys, 1662–1679* (London, 1929), p. 27; 17 June 1665, VI, 131 – Pepys to the earl of Sandwich, 17 June 1665, in Tanner, ed., *Further correspondence*, pp. 46–7; 25 Aug. 1665, VI, 203 and 3 Sept. 1665, VI, 210–12 – Pepys to Lady Carteret, 4 Sept. 1665, in Howarth, *Second diary*, pp. 24–6; 4 Nov. 1665, VI, 288 – Pepys to Sir William Coventry, 2 Nov. 1665, in Tanner, ed., *Further correspondence*, p. 74; 13 and 14 Dec. 1665, VI, 327–9 – Pepys to Sir William Coventry, 14 Dec. 1665, in Tanner, ed., *Further correspondence*, p. 88. Given the strong verbal parallels between the diary and some of Pepys’s correspondence, it would be tempting to surmise that Pepys referred to the diary when writing his letters. However, in light of the complex process of composition which the diary’s creation involved, it is impossible to determine the nature or direction of this textual interaction with any certainty. As will be discussed below, this interaction is indicative of the confounding of the ‘public’ and the ‘private’ which the diary text typically involves.

⁵² For the importance of audience and reader-response in the juxtaposition of text and context see R. D. Hume, ‘Texts within contexts: notes toward a historical method’, *Philological Quarterly*, 71 (1992) pp. 73–4, 80–3. As shall become clear in the following pages, reading was a crucial aspect of the diary’s protracted composition.

⁵³ Hunt, *Pepys in the diary*, p. 175.

⁵⁴ For instance, Pepys evidently consulted bills of mortality. See, for example, 15 June 1665, VI, 128.

right-hand columns or margins.⁵⁵ 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-emphasize 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. Principally the process seems to have contributed significantly and regularly to Pepys's account books and the diary manuscript. Less frequently, the rough notes made textual contributions to official papers, perhaps a commonplace book, and even the odd letter.

Hence William Matthews's description of the Cambridge manuscript as a 'fair copy' does not do this process, this textual commerce, justice.⁵⁶ Although Pepys's referring to his notes was crucial, he did not simply copy. He composed and recomposed what we single out as the diary with an eye to other texts. The Cambridge manuscript never had a slightly older and ill-kempt twin, it was not cloned by means of mechanical transcription. Rather, it was conceived and evolved like its siblings, the account book, the records of naval comings and goings, from common ancestry: the initial ledger notes. Much of this textual multiplicity is obscured by the 'complete' transcription of the Cambridge text – a transcription which is, in effect, a partial and isolated textual fragment that erases the formative impact of these other texts on the diary manuscript.⁵⁷

The implications of these textual permutations need careful unravelling. There is an insistence that the diary somehow represents a single unmitigated stream of scripted consciousness,⁵⁸ meaning that the text is 'honest' and 'true'; that the squiggles of the shorthand are the readout of some sort of polygraph conducted daily in the solitude and privacy of Pepys's study. Margaret Willy concludes that it is 'in the psychological truth of this great *Diary* we recognize the fundamental and reassuring sameness of human nature through the centuries'.⁵⁹ Even Robert Latham, in the face of Matthews's analysis, maintains that Pepys's narrative 'never suffers from the silent distortions and insidious afterthoughts... which disfigure so much of the diary of his friend Evelyn'.⁶⁰ Although he is ultimately unsuccessful in demonstrating an alternative approach to the text, we would do well to heed Francis Barker's

⁵⁵ For the surviving sequences of these notes see 10–20 Apr. 1668, ix, 160–8, and 5–17 June 1668, ix, 224–43.

⁵⁶ Matthews, 'Diary as literature', pp. xcvi–cvi. See also Fothergill, *Private chronicles*, pp. 40–3.

⁵⁷ For the importance of form in relation to a text's meaning as a social product, see D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the sociology of texts* (London, 1986), pp. 8–10. For early modern accounting texts see M. Hunt, *The middling sort: commerce, gender, and the family in England, 1680–1780* (Berkeley, 1996), especially pp. 53–62; Sandra Sherman, *Finance and fictionality in the early eighteenth century: accounting for Defoe* (Cambridge, 1996), especially pp. 132–8.

⁵⁸ See also Ollard, *Pepys*, pp. 18–19; Taylor, *Samuel Pepys*, p. 117.

⁵⁹ Willy, *English diarists*, p. 39. See also Bradford, *Soul of Pepys*, pp. 4, 24, 27, 32; Tanner, *Mr Pepys*, p. 204; Bryant, *Man in the making*, p. 71; Matthews, *Pepys and nonconformity*, p. 10; Emden, *Pepys himself*, p. 99; Brome, *Other Pepys*, p. 32.

⁶⁰ R. C. Latham, 'The diary as history', in *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, 1, p. cxvi.

warning that we have been ‘taught to read ... a plainness, an obviousness given in the image of a mind writing down mundane events according to the clear order of their unfolding, providing a text whose regularities, it is said, are determined only by the pattern of the empirical, whose transcription it is’.⁶¹ Unfortunately, Barker fails to pay close enough attention to the multiple, related scriptings; the numerous texts co-authored by Pepys.⁶²

V

This lack of attention has given rise to confused assumptions concerning the issues of readership and privacy, the breadth of the diary’s discourse and audience. It has been said of the diary that ‘the revelation is absolutely unconscious. There are no unrealities and no reserves; [Pepys] stands today naked before a world he never knew ... he had no audience before which to pose.’⁶³ We can identify at least one reader of the text: Pepys. In other words, the writing of the diary was a conscious but complexly reflexive process.

There are those who define this reflection as moving along a single axis, between Pepys and his mirror and back again, with the result that we see all of Pepys because his study and diary constituted a sealed domain where Pepys was at liberty to record his every thought, whim, and lust which if they had become public would have destroyed his credit.⁶⁴ Why else would Pepys have felt compelled, yet free, to record so many details of his private life such as the fact he argued with his wife and was unfaithful to his marriage?

We need to be careful about characterizing the diary as a private confessional.⁶⁵ Certainly no one that we know of, except Pepys, read the text in the course of his lifetime. His use of shorthand, in addition to being a labour-saving device, was undoubtedly meant for reasons of security.⁶⁶ That the shorthand had this function Pepys makes clear when he brings the diary to a close. He voices the intention to keep a diary of public business by an amanuensis in longhand:

⁶¹ Barker, *Private body*, p. 4.

⁶² For a cogent reply to Barker’s thesis see J. G. Turner, ‘Pepys and the private parts of monarchy’, in G. MacLean, ed., *Culture and society in the Stuart Restoration: literature, drama, history* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 95–110.

⁶³ Tanner, *Mr Pepys*, p. xii. See also Willy, *English diarists*, p. 8; J. S. Pipkin, ‘Space and the social order in Pepys’ *Diary*’, *Urban Geography*, 11 (1990), p. 162.

⁶⁴ See Hunt, *Pepys in the diary*, pp. 158–9; R. Sharrock, ‘Modes of self-representation: Herbert of Cherbury, Kenelm Digby, Pepys’, *Seventeenth Century*, 3 (1988), p. 15; Taylor, *Samuel Pepys*, p. 6. For the socio-economic importance of credit see C. Muldrew, ‘Interpreting the market: the ethics of credit and community relations in early modern England’, *Social History*, 18 (1993), pp. 163–83; Hunt, *The middling sort*, passim.

⁶⁵ A perception shared by Emden, *Pepys himself*, p. 138; Brome, *Other Pepys*, p. 131.

⁶⁶ For the seventeenth-century impulse toward encrypting and the role of shorthand, see L. Potter, *Secret rites and secret writing; Royalist literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 38–45; A. Geneva, *Astrology and the seventeenth-century mind: William Lilly and the language of the stars* (Manchester, 1995), pp. 17–54.

and must therefore be contented to set down no more then is fit for them and all the world to know; or if there be anything (which cannot be much, now my amours to Deb are past, and my eyes hindering me in almost all other pleasures), I must endeavour to keep a margin in my book open, to add here and there a note in short-hand with my own hand.⁶⁷

This last qualification makes it clear that the diary's main function was for Pepys's sole benefit.

However, we must not proceed to assume that the actions or feelings that the words of the text narrate were equally private, that they existed only in a textual vacuum, and that what Pepys reveals is, therefore, inherently honest and neutral. Vincent Brome maintains: 'A kind of self-destructive dedication to the truth runs through the diary which is also a confessional. He is hell-bent to get it all down on paper. Why? ... in the diary he had a completely reliable confidant.'⁶⁸ One asks how, or against what, has the degree of the text's veracity been measured? The apparently straightforward privacy of the diary text is held to guarantee its absolute and all-encompassing 'truth'.

Let us examine this fallacy in relation to some of the diary's more candid 'revelations', as they are often termed.⁶⁹ The diary provides fascinating details of the Pepyses' marriage; that Samuel hit his wife and blackened her eye, for example.⁷⁰ It is argued that had Pepys not searched his soul and written the entry no one would have been any the wiser about this 'private' incident confessed at the end of a hard day spent next door at the naval office. It supposedly follows, therefore, that Pepys must have recorded exactly what happened, how he felt at the time of the act, because he had no public to inform or mis-inform. Yet there are various flaws in this scenario. Elizabeth knew, and, in many instances of marital disharmony, so too did the Pepyses' servants. On this occasion, Pepys even realized that 'the people of the house observed it'.⁷¹ The problem is that we cannot always see or hear them watching and listening because their vocalicity is very much dependent on Pepys's text.

Critics of the text employ a modern distinction of individual, secretive privacy to Pepys's situation when privacy was not necessarily so clearly or so narrowly defined in the early modern period.⁷² Pepys's text is itself potential evidence of an incipient desire for individual privacy as opposed to the more entrenched conception of the household, servants and all, as being the private

⁶⁷ 31 May 1669, ix, 564–5.

⁶⁸ Brome, *Other Pepys*, p. 72. Also Fothergill, *Private chronicles*, pp. 83, 97; Taylor, *Samuel Pepys*, p. 6.

⁶⁹ For example, Ponsonby, *Samuel Pepys*, p. 85; Sharrock, 'Modes of self-representation', p. 1.

⁷⁰ 19 Dec. 1664, v, 349.

⁷¹ *Ibid.* For further instances where Pepys writes that the servants may have witnessed either marital conflict or inappropriate behaviour on his part, see 29 Sept. 1661, ii, 186; 21 May 1663, iv, 150; 19 Apr. 1667, viii, 171–2; 23 May 1667, viii, 233. Cf. T. Mallon, *A book of one's own: people and their diaries* (London, 1985), p. 5.

⁷² L. A. Pollock, 'Living on the stage of the world: the concept of privacy among the elite of early modern England', in A. Wilson, ed., *Rethinking social history: English society 1570–1920 and its interpretation* (Manchester, 1993), pp. 82–3, 90–1.

sphere within which there were few well-established personal boundaries.⁷³ Yet even if we accept that the early modern conception of the private was wider than our own, its boundaries were easily breached.⁷⁴ Thus, Pepys was concerned if his servants gossiped about his domestic goings-on in the company of the hired help of his colleagues: ‘yet being a neighbour’s child, and young and not very staid, I dare not venture of having her, because of her being able to spread any report of our family upon any discontent among the heart of our neighbours’.⁷⁵

As noted earlier, the diary was not finally composed on a daily basis. Returning to our example of the confession of domestic violence, this means that in the interim between action and composition Pepys had already stepped beyond the confines of his household and into a decidedly public gaze. He had attended a dinner where his wife’s absence was noticed:

Up (my wife’s eye being ill still of the blow I did in a passion give her on Monday last) to church alone... 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.⁷⁶

This partial but nevertheless public recognition of what had been a ‘private’ act, whether we identify the dominant locus of privacy in the mid-seventeenth century as the individual or the household, undermines any notion of the transparent frankness of the account registered by the preceding entry.

We encounter a similar anomaly with the characterization of Pepys’s sexual exploits as being secret and their subsequent recounting in the diary as representing an encapsulated and pruriently introspective experience,⁷⁷ or, a guilt-ridden process of private, sinful confession.⁷⁸ Pepys was not preoccupied with admitting or describing to the diary something he, and he alone, already knew. For one, his female partners knew as much as he did, but there is more to it than just this qualification. For as so many of the accounts of his conquests make clear, Pepys was primarily concerned with evaluating exactly who might know about this behaviour rather than simply giving lurid descriptions of what he had done behind supposedly closed doors. For instance:

I have forgot to set down a very remarkable passage: that Lewellen being gone and I going into the office and it begin to be dark, I found nobody there, my clerks being at a burial of a child of W Griffins; ... in the meantime, ... Mrs. Pen’s pretty maid came by

⁷³ Ranum, ‘Inventing private space’, p. 270. See also N. Tadmor, ‘The concept of the household-family in eighteenth-century England’, *Past and Present*, 151 (1996), pp. 119–20.

⁷⁴ Ranum, ‘Inventing private space’, p. 266. See also Pollock, ‘Living on the stage’, pp. 86–7, pp. 89–90; W. H. Sherman, ‘The place of reading in the English Renaissance: John Dee revisited’, in J. Raven, H. Small, and N. Tadmor, eds., *The practice and representation of reading in England* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 69–76.

⁷⁵ 1 Aug. 1664, v, 229. See also 31 Mar. 1661, ii, 63; 5 Nov. 1662, iii, 249–50; 31 Dec. 1662, iii, 302; 6 Aug. 1666, vii, 238; 6 Aug. 1667, viii, 376.

⁷⁶ 25 Dec. 1664, v, 356.

⁷⁷ For instance, Wilson, *Private life*, p. 2.

⁷⁸ E. H. Pearlman, ‘Pepys and Lady Castlemaine’, *Restoration*, 7 (1983), p. 43.

my side and went into the office; but finding nobody there, I went in to her, ... so I carried her some paper and kissed her, ... But Lord, to see how much I was put out of order by this surprisal ... how afterward I was troubled to think what if she should tell this, and whether I had spoke or done anything that might be unfit for her to tell. *But I think there was nothing more passed then just what I here write.*⁷⁹

The fear of discovery and the need to assess the consequences for his assumed role as patriarch dictated the scripting of these actions, a scripting which could be rehearsed in front of wife, servants, and neighbours as a kind of social damage control if the need arose.⁸⁰

Certainly there are some 'intimate' moments in the diary, yet even here the public encroaches at various points. For example, the celebrated episode concerning French pornography begins, despite Pepys's hurried efforts, with the purchase of *L'Eschole des Filles*,⁸¹ contains several 'public' justifications for why Pepys should be found reading such material – 'but yet not amiss for a sober man once to read over to inform himself in the villainy of the world'⁸² – and ends with the book's destruction in order that 'it might not be among my books to my shame'.⁸³

More importantly, perhaps, this last reference to Pepys's books suggests that any textual vacuum which the diary text may have potentially achieved was violated not only by the reality of life for Pepys its reflexive author. The integrity of the diary text was also continuously compromised by the presence of the co-texts we have identified, related by Pepys's reading of the originating notes which all Pepysian texts shared. Thus, if we return to Pepys's pornographic encounter, we might anticipate that the diary would relate something of his pleasure. Instead, Pepys is held liable for the loss of a book (a glance at both his initial notes and final account book admonished him for the money lost) and for compromising his social worth. Otherwise, why describe the climax of the episode in the punctilious lexicon of the accountant; as 'one time to *dis-charge*'?

The identification of this paradox, that the diary of Pepys, so often viewed as the most private and singular of early modern English documents, was at the

⁷⁹ 12 Dec. 1663, iv, 416–17. *Emphasis added.*

⁸⁰ A. Fletcher, *Gender, sex & subordination in England, 1500-1800* (New Haven, 1995), pp. 144, 170–2. Fletcher notes that his role as patriarch and the sexual politics this involved were, on occasion, a conscious concern for Pepys. However, Fletcher makes no connection between this concern and the keeping of the diary. Instead, he follows the established approach to the text with talk of 'posterity' and its being so 'candid', p. 169. A similar argument, that Pepys struggled to live up to the patriarch ideal whilst being 'extraordinarily frank' in the diary, is made by J. H. O'Neil, 'Samuel Pepys: the war of will and pleasure', *Restoration*, 19 (1995), p. 89, and hinted at by Pearlman, 'Lady Castlemaine', pp. 43–6.

⁸¹ 8 Feb. 1668, ix, 57–8.

⁸² 9 Feb. 1668, ix, 58. Pepys's comments at the time he first saw this book suggest, to the contrary, that he was not entirely unfamiliar with pornography. See 13 Jan. 1668, ix, 21–2. See also 15 May 1663, iv, 136. For a close analysis of this most 'private' of episodes as a case study for the wider argument that the construction of sexuality under Charles II was problematic, given the collapse of public-private, political-personal distinctions, see Turner, 'Pepys and the private parts of monarchy'.

⁸³ 9 Feb. 1668, ix, 59.

same time very much preoccupied with the public (or the very tenuous nature of any sense of privacy) and a companion to several other similar textual enterprises, brings us a step closer to the functionality of the text for Pepys. To point the way ahead, if Pepys was the author-itative subject of these texts there was equally a sense in which the texts made of him their discursive object.

VI

The diary is essentially a narrative of social accounting by a middling man on the make.⁸⁴ The scope of the diary's accounting was far wider than keeping track of money or providing an end-of-the-month balance sheet of Pepys's material condition. Other texts served this narrower but fundamentally related function. We should recall the textual interrelationships traced earlier; the diary refers to working on financial accounts (both personal and fiscal) and journal at the same time.⁸⁵ The processes of monetary and social accounting went hand in hand. Contrary to Matthews's claim that this accounting 'loses distinctiveness in the body of the diary' it comprises the text's fundamental logic and is reflected in the very idiom.⁸⁶ For example, after Pepys had been too busy to meet a friend of his wife the diary relates: 'vexed at myself for *not paying her* the respect of seeing her. But I will come out of *her debt* another time.'⁸⁷ Or, 'But in the whole, I was mightily pleased, *reckoning* myself now 50 per cent securer in my place than I did before think myself to be.'⁸⁸ And, 'For now my business is a delight to me and brings me great *credit*, and my purse encreases too.'⁸⁹ The diary still bears material resemblance to a ledger with its precisely ruled margins, the careful chronological disposition of the contents across the six volumes, and Pepys's preference for confining each entry to its assigned page – a reflection of its genesis from the all-important draft notes already described.⁹⁰ As we shall see, the discourse of accounting confounds, at various levels, the transparent recollection of lived experience.

The diary is constantly noting social debts, credits, and assessing Pepys's status. For instance, after he had called on his superior, Sir William Coventry, it registers 'my good fortune to visit him, for it keeps in my acquaintance with him, and the world sees it and *reckons my interest* accordingly'.⁹¹ Two years

⁸⁴ J. Barry and C. Brooks, eds., *The middling sort of people: culture society and politics in England, 1550–1800* (London, 1994), passim; J. Barry, 'Review article: the making of the middle class?', *Past and Present*, 145 (1994), pp. 194–208. See also P. Earle, *The making of the English middle class: business, society and family life in London, 1660–1730* (London, 1989), although Earle often seems to find that the case of Pepys fits rather awkwardly with his overall argument, see, for example, pp. 229, 288.

⁸⁵ See, for example, 8 Aug. 1664, v, 236; 23 Apr. 1666, vii, 109; 18 June 1666, vii, 170; 4 Dec. 1666, vii, 397.

⁸⁶ Matthews, 'Diary as literature', p. cvi. For similar arguments, see Cleugh, *Master Pepys*, p. 32; Matthews, *Pepys and nonconformity*, p. 20.

⁸⁷ 24 Aug. 1666, vii, 259. *Emphasis added.*

⁸⁸ 14 May 1669, ix, 555. *Emphasis added.*

⁸⁹ 28 June 1662, iii, 125. *Emphasis added.*

⁹⁰ See W. Matthews, 'The diary', in *Diary of Samuel Pepys*, 1, pp. xliv–xlviii.

⁹¹ 9 June 1667, viii, 255. *Emphasis added.*

earlier Coventry had been knighted and made a privy councillor and, on this occasion, we find evaluation, indeed rationalization, of the effect upon Pepys's position:

I observing with a little trouble that he is too great now to expect too much familiarity with, and he I find doth not mind me as he used to do; but when I reflect upon him and his business, I cannot think much of it – for I do not observe anything but the same great kindness from him.⁹²

The primary concerns which determined what was included (or equally, what was excluded and instead helped form another Pepysian text) in the Cambridge volumes operated in respect of Pepys's official comings and goings. Notice is taken of naval affairs in the diary as they related to the fate of Pepys's superiors and patrons because their success related to his own:

I do hope that in all my three places which are my hopes and supports, I may not now fear anything; but with care, which through the Lord's blessing I will never more neglect, I don't doubt but to keep myself up with them all – for in the Duke and Mr. Coventry – my Lord Sandwich and Sir G Carteret, I place my greatest hopes.⁹³

Often, in writing the diary and assessing his current career position, Pepys forecast the next move in a never-ending struggle for influence and prestige, weighing up his options and deciding on the best strategy:

So by Coach home to the office, where I was vexed to see Sir Wms [Penn & Batten]: both seem to think so much that I should be a little out of the way, saying that without their Register [i.e. Pepys, the implication being that he was their office junior] they were not a Committee, which I take in some dudgeon and see clearly that I must keep myself at a little distance with them and not Crouch, or else I shall never keep myself up even with them.⁹⁴

Otherwise, routine matters of business were more fully recorded in those other texts which Pepys maintained.

These same margins determined the nature and extent of the record which the diary provides of the seemingly routine aspects of daily life. As suggested earlier, Pepys's concern for his position as patriarch, and the sexual politics this involved, informed the recounting of his extra-marital behaviour. This concern also operated in relation to the notice taken of the contretemps of his marriage and of Elizabeth's behaviour as perceived – even analysed – by Samuel as he kept his diary.⁹⁵ Thus, we discover apparently intimate evidence of the distress which Elizabeth's dancing lessons caused her husband as he believed this freedom jeopardized his control over her, and, by extension, his social reputation:

upon which she [i.e. Elizabeth] took me up most scornfully; which before Ashwell [i.e. their maidservant] *and the rest of the world*, I know not nowadays how to check as I would

⁹² 23 July 1665, VI, 166.

⁹³ 25 Nov. 1663, IV, 397.

⁹⁴ 21 Dec. 1661, II, 236. [Interpolations added.]

⁹⁵ For recent analysis of early modern concepts of honour see the symposium collected in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th ser., 6 (1996).

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; and nothing doth it more then giving her this occasion of dancing and other pleasure.⁹⁶

In contrast, the diary is near-silent about certain personal matters. For instance, the death of the child of one of the Pepyses' close friends is recounted in the following manner: 'Mrs. Pierce hath lain in of a boy about a month – the boy is dead this day. She lies in in good state, and very pretty she is. But methinks doth every day grow more and more great, and a little too much – unless they got more money then I fear they do.'⁹⁷ If unaware of the diary's context, historians of childhood and the family might be tempted to read pessimistically the perfunctory notice given to this tragedy; further evidence of a lack of concern in an age of high mortality rates.⁹⁸ Pepys may very well have expressed his condolences to the boy's parents, may well have felt the loss himself, but simply not written about doing so because such concern fell outside the general ambit of the diary. Conversely, the social display of the parents, even during mourning, deserved close attention in the process of composition, a process which had only just narrated the duke of York's commendation of Pepys for his management of naval victualling, thus juxtaposing events apparently related only by the demands of chronology.

No matter how complete a source we believe the diary to be, it is not a constant record of everything that Pepys saw, heard, or did.⁹⁹ Its constant refrain 'among other things' makes this selectivity obvious. For instance, in the course of the diary's nine and a half years, Pepys mentions dining at home on hundreds of occasions. However, we cannot always discover what the Pepys household had consumed, even though dinner was the main meal of the day. We should not jump to the banal conclusion that 'next to his appearance, Pepys cared almost as much for his food. On days when little happened, he records what he had had to eat, and the diary gives us a fascinating picture of a Londoner's diet in the seventeenth century.'¹⁰⁰ Certainly the diary does mention the enjoying of a particular food or meal, but there was usually more to detailing what was eaten for dinner than mere gastronomical delight. It most frequently records what food was served at Pepys's table for dinner when that food had an added social value which said something about his status; his household accounts highlighting unusual expenditure on such 'luxury' items.¹⁰¹

⁹⁶ 21 May 1663, IV, 150. [Interpolations added.] *Emphasis added*.

⁹⁷ 26 July 1666, VII, 220.

⁹⁸ See, for example, Stone, *Family*, p. 66.

⁹⁹ Cf. Taylor, *Samuel Pepys*, p. ix; Pearlman, 'Lady Castlemaine', p. 45.

¹⁰⁰ Barber, *Pepys esquire*, p. 54.

¹⁰¹ There is not space to develop this line of argument fully here. However, detailed analysis has revealed that this social economy heavily determines the recording of the consumption of specific foods in the diary. See also S. W. Mintz, 'The changing roles of food in the study of consumption', in J. Brewer and R. Porter, eds., *Consumption and the world of goods* (London, 1993), especially pp. 262–7.

In the process of writing the diary, Pepys was watching not just himself but paying much keener attention to others watching him. He was taking the measure of their gaze; evaluating, with his several texts, his social worth in relation to those around him; reading and writing, acting and feeling accordingly. Therefore, the diary is one facet of a prism which distorts rather than a mirror which faithfully reflects the reality of Pepys and his world.¹⁰² For example, after the encounter with Sir William Penn's maid quoted earlier, Pepys was trying to convince himself that he had done nothing too improper. At the same time as he writes about what had happened, he is composing his features and considering a possible alibi. Likewise, some time after an afternoon spent at Islington with Penn's family, Pepys writes of one of Penn's sons-in-law:

[He] did take me up very prettily in one or two things that I said, and I was so sensible of it as to be a caution to me hereafter how [I] do venture to speak more then is necessary in any company, though, as I did now, I do think them incapable to censure me.¹⁰³

We do not discover what these 'one or two things' which now troubled Pepys himself were. Unable to recant the speaking of these things, he instead censures himself and, as he composes the diary, censors his surviving text. Hence, it is misleading to conclude that 'even though there is evidence that Pepys wrote up his original stark jottings into a more continuous form, the immediacy of concrete experience is rendered and the thin surface of social and moral control is lifted'.¹⁰⁴

By these 'others' watching Pepys is meant not just the people whom Pepys wanted to impress, but everybody. Thus the need to identify and evaluate explicitly even the people most well known to Pepys. As mentioned earlier, Pepys calculates his morning spent at the Miter tavern with Major Colhurst and Mr Beane in terms of the socio-political standing of his companions. So too with countless entries recording meetings, both official and social, the topics of conversation receive only passing mention unless these relate to Pepys's fellow actors and to assessing their performances in relation to his own.

VII

It would seem appropriate to pull together the various strands of our argument in a detailed example. On Sunday, 29 November 1663, Pepys's morning undoubtedly comprised countless actions and thoughts. Yet apparently all that occurred that morning, as represented by the diary, is as follows:

29. *Lords day*. This morning I put on my best black cloth-suit trimmed with Scarlett ribbon, very neat, with my cloak lined with Velvett and a new Beaver, which altogether is very noble, with my black silk knit canons I bought a month ago. I to church alone, my wife not going.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² For this analogy applied to French autobiography, see R. Chartier, 'The practical impact of writing', in R. Chartier, ed., trans. A. Goldhammer, *A history of private life III: passions of the Renaissance* (Cambridge, MA, 1989), p. 159.

¹⁰³ 24 May 1667, VIII, 234–5.

¹⁰⁴ Sharrock, 'Modes of self-representation', p. 15.

¹⁰⁵ 29 Nov. 1663, IV, 400.

Some would see this simply as another instance of Pepys's conceitedness: 'This innocent vanity was perhaps due partly to his father's trade, which made him more conscious than most people of cut and texture, and partly to memories of earlier poverty.'¹⁰⁶ An exact consonance of identity between Pepys the active individual and Pepys the textual, fictive character pieced together from several other texts is assumed. Beginning at the temporal reference point 'Lords day', we progress with relentless ease, as if the events, like the words on the page, were unfolding in a mono-linear progression before our eyes, moving toward the final period and the image of a man seemingly obsessed with what he wore.

We need to recall certain details about the making of the text. In the notes made for that day, the earlier visit to church was probably prominent. Whilst listening to the sermon, Pepys had (as a reading of what purports to be the afternoon's experience reveals) looked about at his fellow parishioners amongst whom he had noticed 'my Lady Batten', wife of a senior colleague at the naval office. Pepys's observation of this woman had survived in his memory to be noted down within the next few days and then written up neatly as part of the Cambridge text at some indeterminate point. We now read the later text, but we need to ask: of all the people at church that morning why should the diary belatedly preserve the presence of Lady Batten? Because Pepys had seen her 'in a velvet gowne, which vexed me that she should be in it before my wife, or that I am able to put her into one; but what cannot be, cannot be'.¹⁰⁷ This observation reverberates throughout the rest of the entry for that Sabbath in late November as Pepys's texts collectively fractured the lived continuum of time and space.

Pepys the individual who dressed that morning probably donned his Sunday best out of mere habit and did not consciously pause to admire or remark to anyone about the superior colour and cut of his clothes. Indeed, it is much more likely that the acquisition of the items now worn, including the 'black silk knit canons I bought a month ago', would have already been entered as a debit in his account books and so achieved no further textual acknowledgement. Even if Pepys had, in fact, preened himself in front of his mirror before stepping abroad to church, this would have been only one of many actions and events of that particular morning and an action not necessarily, in and of itself, worthy of the diary's recognition.

However, in the wake of the sociability that going to church had involved, Pepys the author, anxiously seeking to reassure himself about his social status – particularly anxious in that we also find the added detail, 'a good dinner we had of *boeuf a la mode*, but not dressed so well as my wife used to do it'¹⁰⁸ – retroactively invested the action of clothing *the Pepys of the text* with an added dimension, significance, and permanence that it had not originally possessed. He was confirming to himself in writing the diary that the clothes he had worn earlier had been appropriate to his social circumstances. He was now very

¹⁰⁶ Willy, *English diarists*, p. 29. See also Ponsonby, *Samuel Pepys*, p. 36; Latham, 'Diarist', p. xxviii.

¹⁰⁷ 29 Nov. 1663, iv, 400.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, iv, 400–1.

aware of this thanks to another of his texts, the account of his savings, so that ‘it would undo me to think of doing as Sir W. Batten and his Lady do, who hath a good estate besides his office’.¹⁰⁹ Therefore, everything else that had happened that morning before Pepys went to church faded into silent oblivion. For instance, did he talk to Elizabeth? Did he try and persuade her to accompany him? Thanks to Lady Batten’s velvet gown, its textual existence heightened by the parallel record of Pepys’s net worth, we will never know.

If the Pepys of the text is a constructed identity it is a profoundly social one. Michael Mascuch has highlighted ‘the importance of narrative modes of perception in defining what counts as reality, especially the reality of self-identity’.¹¹⁰ Thus from Pepys’s concern for his clothes we should take not that he was a vain man, but a person who considered himself to be (and who wanted to be seen as) the equal of his longer-established government colleagues. As dress, or more specifically, fashion, was a means to this genteel identity, so the diary was another technology of self-fashioning. Yet as we have seen, in a perpetual dialogue the diary also fashioned Pepys: both the dead author and his surviving textual persona. We need to keep this textual dialogic constantly in view because this is what the surviving text ceaselessly enshrines. Admittedly this is a difficult task: we tend to focus on the upstroke of middling man making up his accounts, rather than the downstroke of the accounts making the man in our text.

VIII

In a recent study, Stuart Sherman has argued that the diary’s fundamental momentum derives from time itself, an innovative ‘minute-wise’ conception of time as comprised by new pocket-watch, pendulum technology.¹¹¹ The diary is a self-conducted time-and-motion study of a radically innovative kind; its whirlpool of details can be explained by Pepys’s attempt to capture and frame time itself. The narrative has no final destination or objective except its very mobility; tracing the movement of Pepys himself through time. Sherman maintains that the diary’s isochronous progression is its one constant, otherwise its scripted content varies infinitely. As narrative time must compress real time, so Pepys is free to decide how much (or how little) attention each temporal unit or entry, given an a priori equivalence, should then receive: ‘Pepys fills the blank [entry] by forms and criteria of his own devising, even to the extent of determining its dimensions as a correlative of the day’s abundance and significance, privately reckoned.’¹¹²

In one sense, the purpose of this article has been to explain the forms and criteria at work, to explicate seemingly random compression or expansion. Why does the diary tick monotonously on for some mornings, but chime loudly

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, iv, 400.

¹¹⁰ M. Mascuch, ‘Social mobility and middling self-identity: the ethos of British autobiographers, 1600–1750’, *Social History*, 20 (1995), p. 48.

¹¹¹ S. Sherman, *Telling time: clocks, diaries, and English diurnal form, 1660–1785* (Chicago, 1996), p. 91.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 99.

at others? On some days we lack direct textual indication that Pepys actually got out of bed, or it is simply ‘up’ and no more, a sure sign for Sherman that Pepys’s watch is again off and running.¹¹³ On the other hand, some entries dwell in the moment. For example, in an entry for early December 1664: ‘10. Lay long; at which I am ashamed, because of so many people’s observing it that know not how late I sit up, and for fear of Sir W. Batten’s speaking of it to others – he having stayed for me a good while. At the office all the morning ...’¹¹⁴

We might concede that Sherman’s thesis complements the argument of this article: that time was an important factor in Pepys’s social rise and was to be expended to advantage. Unfortunately, Sherman’s perception of the nature of the time which Pepys’s diary was perpetually telling precludes this possibility. The first indications of an underlying problem occur at the points where textual compression actually disrupts the flow of time which the text is, according to Sherman, always tracking in relentless, ordered succession. For instance:

9. To the office, where we sat all the morning, busy. At noon home to dinner and then to my office again, where also busy, very busy, late; and then went home and read a piece of a play (*Every Man in his Humour*, wherein is the greatest propriety of speech that ever I read in my life); and so to bed. || This noon came my wife’s Wachmaker and received 12l of me for her watch; but Captain Rolt coming to speak with me about a little business, he did judge of the work [i.e. on Elizabeth’s watch] to be very good work, and so I am well contented; and he hath made very good, that I know, to Sir W. Penn and Lady Batten.¹¹⁵

Sherman’s argument has a more difficult task explaining the narrative’s ability to turn the clock back and forth at will. Tending to underplay this characteristic of the diary text, and, in spite of his own awareness of the manuscript’s compositional complexities,¹¹⁶ Sherman considers that the diary’s narrative is perpetually *in medias res* and so faithfully representing real time.¹¹⁷ As we have seen with reference to the seemingly routine narrative of getting dressed for Sunday service, the time narrated is itself demonstrably a fiction which rests in complex, conflicting, and frequently *unparallel* relation to real, lived time. In real time Pepys admired his clothes *after* he had been to church, during the process of writing the diary. As a result, by the diary’s time, this action appears before Pepys takes his place in the social hierarchy demarcated by church pews and fashions worn by those present. From this position Pepys’s knowledge is not so much retrospective as deceptively prospective, causing a profound disjunction in the time’s accounting. Pepys gives his textual subject both motion and time that he himself had neither fully experienced nor possessed. Here Pepys the author is not so much time-keeper as time-master, able to wind back

¹¹³ Ibid., pp. 34, 68.

¹¹⁴ 10 Dec. 1664, v, 341.

¹¹⁵ 9 Feb. 1667, viii, 50–1. [Interpolation added.] *Textual break added.*

¹¹⁶ Sherman, *Telling time*, pp. 32, 44.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., p. 94.

the clock and literally re-live the moment anew. Sherman confounds the nature of the diary's time and this is reflected in his ambivalent language. He clearly wants the text to encompass the lived, chronometric time. The diary is described as the 'textual analog' of Pepys's timepiece and the text assumes a near autonomic function as it 'represents', 'tells', 'measures', or 'records' time.¹¹⁸ Yet elsewhere we find that *Pepys* 'produces' and 'constructs' time. This often subtle but crucial modulation between narrative and lived time precludes a monotonous textual tick-tock.

Sherman maintains that the time which the diary records, the time of Pepys's watch, is exclusively his own; a possession discreetly pocketed and secretly preserved by Pepys. Both watch and text are a source of pleasure for two reasons. First, because they are instruments of private knowledge relating to time and the self. Second, they allow for a novel autonomy given that Pepys is no longer beholden to the discipline of heaven-sent time as told by the church steeple.¹¹⁹ Therefore the diary is 'a work that deals in pleased sight but not a reformatory surveillance, in measured time but not a relentlessly articulated self-discipline'.¹²⁰

The ceaseless interplay of public with private prohibits such isolation. As the hushed ticking of Pepys's pocket-watch will inevitably be disrupted, temporarily silenced, by the chimes of the public standing clock,¹²¹ so the diary's secret narrative and its own very tenuous seclusion will be similarly intruded upon by other Pepysian texts which are in turn regulated by a more public time. These combined writings fashioned and disciplined Pepys's socio-cultural identity. Recall for example, his written vows:

and my conscience knows that it is only *the saving of money and the time also that I intend by my oaths*, and this hath cost no more of either – so that my conscience before God doth, after good consultation and resolution of paying my forfeit did my conscience accuse me of breaking my vow, I do not find myself in the least apprehensive that I have done any violence to my oaths.¹²²

Sherman places much emphasis on Pepys's awareness of a new temporality, pointing to his role in acquiring nautical journals for the Royal Society with which to check their latest chronometrical and navigational experiments.¹²³ However, Sherman neglects to mention that no notice is taken of this activity

¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 91. This description contrasts oddly with several of Sherman's earlier statements. Cf. p. x, 'Time in narrative is *always* "dialogic". The telling will always entail an encounter between at least two temporalities: between narrative's deployment of its special temporal properties and privileges (elasticities of language) on the one hand, and on the other the time (duration, sequence) of the events narrated'; 'diaries deal in temporality, or rather in a mesh of temporalities, both narrative and "real"', p. 17. ¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, see especially pp. 99–107.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 107.

¹²¹ Cf. *ibid.*, p. x, 'As a historian of chronometry has recently remarked, it makes sense to speak not of a culture's "time" but only of its several "times," precisely distinguished and carefully related, in their conflicts, their alignments, their convergences'; 'In an England where few owned clocks and even fewer owned watches, bells rang everywhere, and every ringing signaled a time of one kind or another', p. 37. ¹²² 8 Mar. 1664, v, 78. *Emphasis added.*

¹²³ Sherman, *Telling time*, pp. 82–3.

by Pepys in the diary – most probably because Pepys recorded it in an official minute, an institutional text of the Foucauldian kind. Time could also prove a valuable public resource and, as such, had to be carefully managed by several related texts.

The diary's narrative moves along an all-important social (as opposed to purely temporal) trajectory.¹²⁴ This progression, both real *and* projected, is the diary's grander design which, in turn, prohibits the simple conflation of textual time with that of Huygensian chronometry. Sherman acknowledges the diary's relation to accounting, albeit financial accounting narrowly conceived.¹²⁵ He wants to privilege time over money, but a careful examination of the extant rough notes shows that each resource was implicated in the other.¹²⁶ Both threatened to make (or unmake) Pepys's social identity for which the diary took careful but fundamentally creative account.

IX

The approach to Pepys mooted here is different from that usually adopted. The typical interpretive strategy starts with a man named Pepys, held in a state of suspended animation, and looks for transhistorical human qualities in an apparently straightforward quotidian record. This article has advocated turning this orthodoxy on its head, beginning with the diary as text, and always keeping an eye on the wider context no matter how enthralling the revelations written for (not *of*) a particular day might seem.

Perhaps part of our problem is that we know how the story of Pepys ends. As we read the diary we see, in our mind's eye, the well-heeled, more self-assured individual who had established himself as a member of genteel society by the time of his death, not the son of a tailor and washerwoman who faced an uncertain future as he penned his diary some thirty years earlier.¹²⁷ We tend to conflate his life progression with the textual trajectory of the diary and, by the same token, usually disregard the parallel trajectories of account book or office ledger. Certainly his social ambition and mobility of the 1660s has been

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 101.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 49–50; 58–68. After first distancing Pepys's text and his own argument from this paradigm (p. 59), Sherman writes of the rough notes, 'They make clear how thoroughly the diarist's practice was engaged with the forms and practices of the account book', p. 64. And again, 'Even in its absence, though, the daily record of disbursements contributes much to the diary's texture as a representation of space and time', p. 67.

¹²⁶ In his discussion of the rough notes, Sherman underplays (perhaps accidentally given the inaccurate modern transcription of the notes at p. 64) the significance of the obvious temporal index at left which balances the fiscal one at right (p. 65). Sherman later regards this index as pivotally unique for the Cambridge manuscript (pp. 91, 93). As a result, he complicates the relation of notes to manuscript (p. 68) and inflates time's importance.

¹²⁷ See, for example, 11 Mar. 1668, ix, 113. See also *The diary of Samuel Pepys volume X, companion*, pp. 318–19, and the numerous disparaging observations Pepys made in the diary concerning his 'lesser' kin.

recognized.¹²⁸ However, Pepys's mobility is not simply one facet of the diary. It informs the whole text at the most fundamental level. The diary is a social ledger, but more than this it is the text in which Pepys creates what he is endeavouring to be, but is unsure whether he will actually become.¹²⁹

We might speculate that Pepys chose not to continue the diary in some manner after 1669 because it had served its time. For in May of that year the acquisition of a coach and a fine new wardrobe signalled his debut amongst London's elite: '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; ... walking out of my coach *as other gentlemen did*.'¹³⁰ He could now live the day-dream.¹³¹ Fortunately for us the diary survives as an enigmatic monument to his achievement, as lived but also as incessantly scripted and re-scripted.

Those who have read the diary and claim to know Pepys need to wrestle further with its essence: that it is irresolvably recursive in nature. One can begin with the idea that Pepys's diary project evolved to account for, indeed shape, his social identity and progress. However, Pepys is neither simply nor any longer the diary's intending subject or author. Pepys becomes subject-ed to his texts, collectively a discourse of accounting, both as he reads them and as we read them now, with the result that our Pepys is as much a complex projection of the texts. Almost without exception, the Pepys of the diary performs, or is getting ready to perform, before a contemporary audience. Thus the text involves no simple, free-flowing, spur-of-the-moment self-expression about what had happened in the past. It constitutes a broader process of self-evaluation and censorship in the present act of writing, writing very much reliant upon reading other texts. This multiple auditing leads, in turn, to the constant creation and re-creation of a future-orientated textual ethos separate from the 'I' that held the pen that wrote the diary or made the fist which had blackened Elizabeth's face.¹³²

¹²⁸ See, for instance, Taylor, *Samuel Pepys*, pp. 1, 3, 6. See also Drinkwater, *Pepys*, pp. 208–9; Mallon, *Book of one's own*, pp. 2–3.

¹²⁹ Cf. Fothergill, *Private chronicles*, pp. 96–103.

¹³⁰ 19 May 1669, ix, 557. *Emphasis added*.

¹³¹ See C. Campbell, *The Romantic ethic and the spirit of modern consumerism* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 86–7.

¹³² For the concept of 'ethos', see Mascuch, 'Social mobility', p. 50.